

Guidelines for Antibiotics Prescription in Critically-ill Patients

Gopi C Khilnani¹, Pawan Tiwari², Saurabh Mittal³, Atul P Kulkarni⁴, Dhruva Chaudhry⁵, Kapil G Zirpe⁶, Subhash K Todi⁷, Anant Mohan⁸, Ashit Hegde⁹, Bharat G Jagiasi¹⁰, Bhuvana Krishna¹¹, Camila Rodrigues¹², Deepak Govil¹³, Divya Pal¹⁴, Jigeeshu V Divatia¹⁵, Manju Sengar¹⁶, Mansi Gupta¹⁷, Mukesh Desai¹⁸, Narendra Rungta¹⁹, Parikshit S Prayag²⁰, Pradip K Bhattacharya²¹, Srinivas Samavedam²², Subhal B Dixit²³, Sudivya Sharma²⁴, Susruta Bandopadhyay²⁵, Venkat R Kola²⁶, Vikas Deswal²⁷, Yatin Mehta²⁸, Yogendra P Singh²⁹, Sheila N Myatra³⁰

Received on: 14 February 2024; Accepted on: 17 February 2024; Published on: xx xx xxxx

Keywords: Antibiotics, Guidelines, Intensive care unit, Infections, Prescription.

Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine (2024): 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-24677

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics

Evidence Statement

Time-dependent antibiotics require drug concentrations greater than the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for a certain time period between doses, which usually ranges from 40 to 50% of inter-dose interval for their best action. Continuous infusions are preferred over extended infusions for beta-lactam antibiotics and are associated with clinical benefits like decrease in hospital stay, cost of therapy and mortality. For vancomycin, continuous infusion is associated with reduced toxicity and cost of therapy but no mortality benefit.

Newer Diagnostics Including Multiplex PCR

Recent times have seen a surge in rapid culture-independent novel assays and molecular diagnostics for common respiratory pathogens, as well as the availability of updated tests for newer strains of pathogens. These include antigen detection assays, reverse transcription-quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) testing, multiplex PCR panels targeting multiple organisms, plasma cell-free DNA, next-generation sequencing (NGS), etc. on blood, and upper and lower respiratory tract specimens to detect viral, bacterial, fungal, and mycobacterial infections. Appropriate use of these newer methods leads to reduced antibiotic usage.

COMMUNITY-ACQUIRED PNEUMONIA IN THE INTENSIVE CARE UNIT

What are the Common Organisms Causing Community Acquired Pneumonia in Intensive Care Unit Worldwide and in India?

Evidence Statement

Viruses (including influenza), *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, gram negative bacilli (including klebsiella), *Hemophilus influenzae* and atypical organisms (*Mycoplasma pneumoniae*) and are common causes of community acquired pneumonia (CAP) in intensive care unit (ICU). *Staphylococcus aureus*, legionella and mycobacterium tuberculosis are less common causes of CAP in ICU. Pseudomonas aeruginosa is an important pathogen causing CAP in patients with structural lung disease. Methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) and multidrug resistant gram-negative organisms

¹Department of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, PSRI Hospital, New Delhi, India

^{2,3,8}Department of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, AIIMS, New Delhi, India

⁴Division of Critical Care Medicine, Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care and Pain, Tata Memorial Hospital, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

⁵Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, University of Health Sciences, Rohtak, Haryana, India

⁶Department of Neuro Trauma Unit, Grant Medical Foundation, Pune, Maharashtra, India

⁷Department of Critical Care, AMRI Hospital, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

⁹PD Hinduja Hospital, Mumbai, India

¹⁰Department of Critical Care, Kokilaben Dhirubhai Ambani Hospital, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

¹¹Department of Critical Care Medicine, St John's Medical College and Hospital, Bengaluru, India

¹²Mumbai, India

^{13,14,28}Department of Critical Care and Anesthesia, Medanta The Medicity, Gurugram, Haryana, India

^{15,24,30}Department of Anaesthesiology, Critical Care and Pain, Tata Memorial Hospital, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

¹⁶Department of Medical Oncology, Tata Memorial Centre, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

¹⁷Department of Pulmonary Medicine, Sanjay Gandhi Postgraduate Institute of Medical Sciences, Lucknow, India

¹⁸Department of Immunology, Pediatric Hematology and Oncology, Bai Jerbai Wadia Hospital for Children, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

¹⁹Department of Critical Care & Anaesthesiology, Rajasthan Hospital, Jaipur, India

²⁰Department of Transplant Infectious Diseases, Deenanath Mangeshkar Hospital, Pune, Maharashtra, India

²¹Department of Critical Care Medicine, Rajendra Institute of Medical Sciences, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

²²Department of Critical Care, Ramdev Rao Hospital, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

are relatively infrequent causes of CAP in India and are associated with risk factors such as structural lung disease and previous antimicrobial intake. Anaerobic organisms may cause CAP or co-infection in patients with risk factors for aspiration like elderly, altered sensorium, dysphagia, head and neck malignancy. *S. pneumoniae* remains sensitive to beta-lactams and macrolides. *Hemophilus influenzae* has good sensitivity to beta-lactam with beta-lactamase inhibitors and fluoroquinolones. Recent studies show increasing prevalence of extended spectrum β -lactamase (ESBL) producing enterobacteriaceae. Newer agents like omadacycline, delafloxacin and Lefamulin have added advantages of being effective against MRSA and anaerobes. Omadacycline and delafloxacin are effective against GNBs, whereas only Delafloxacin has good sensitivity against pseudomonas. Nafcillin and oxacillin are preferred agents for MSSA whereas agents effective against MRSA pneumonia include linezolid, vancomycin and teicoplanin.

What are the Risk Factors for Multidrug Resistant (MDR) Pathogens for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for multidrug resistant (MDR) organisms include age > 65 years, antimicrobial therapy in the preceding 3 months, high frequency of antibiotic resistance in the community, hospitalization for ≥ 48 h in the preceding 3 months, home infusion therapy including antibiotics, home wound care, chronic dialysis within 1 month, family member with MDR pathogen and ongoing immunosuppressive treatment.

Recommendation

- All patients admitted with CAP in ICU should be evaluated for risk factors for infection with MDR organisms (2A).
- Antibiotic therapy should be individualized to cover the commonly implicated organisms according to risk factors, including Pseudomonas, ESBL producing enterobacteriaceae or MRSA (3A).
- If antipseudomonal, MRSA specific or non-standard antibiotics are initiated empirically, early microbiologic diagnosis of respiratory secretions (gram stain, PCR or multiplex PCR) and blood cultures should be sought for early de-escalation or narrowing down antimicrobial therapy (3A).

Should Serum Procalcitonin Levels be Done at Baseline in Patients Admitted with CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Serum procalcitonin has moderate sensitivity and specificity in differentiating bacterial and viral etiology in CAP. Serial measurements of procalcitonin are useful in limiting antibiotic exposure in ICU patients with lower respiratory tract infections, predominantly by early cessation.

Recommendation

- Serum Procalcitonin should not be used to differentiate bacterial and viral etiology in CAP in ICU (1A).
- Serum procalcitonin levels should be measured at baseline and serially for use in antibiotic de-escalation for CAP in ICU (1A).

How Early should the Antibiotics be Initiated in Patients with CAP Who Require ICU Admission?

Evidence Statement

Early initiation of antibiotics has been associated with reduction in all-cause mortality in community acquired pneumonia, including severe pneumonia with sepsis or septic shock.

²³Department of Critical Care, Sanjeevan and MJM Hospital, Pune, Maharashtra, India

²⁵Department of Critical Care, AMRI Hospitals Salt Lake, Kolkata, India

²⁶Department of Critical Care Medicine, Yashoda Hospitals Hyderabad, Telangana, India

²⁷Consultant, Infectious Diseases, Medanta - The Medicity, Gurugram, Haryana, India

²⁸Medanta Institute of Critical Care and Anesthesiology, Medanta - The Medicity, Gurugram, Haryana, India

²⁹Department of Critical Care, Max Super Speciality Hospital, Patparganj, New Delhi, India

Corresponding Author: Gopi C Khilnani, Department of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, PSRI Hospital, New Delhi, India, Phone: +91 9810353696, e-mail: gckhil@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Khilnani GC, Tiwari P, Mittal S, Kulkarni AP, Chaudhry D, Zirpe KG, *et al.* Guidelines for Antibiotics Prescription in Critically-ill Patients. Indian J Crit Care Med 2024;x(x):xx-xx.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None

Recommendation

- Appropriate antimicrobial therapy should be initiated as early as possible in patients of CAP requiring ICU admission, preferably within the first hour after obtaining necessary microbiologic samples (3A).
- Respiratory samples should be sent for gram stain, bacterial culture, and other investigations as clinically indicated, as early as possible (3A).
- Multiplex PCR may be used to obtain precise microbiologic diagnosis in patients with CAP admitted to ICU if feasible (2B).

Should CAP in ICU Receive Empirical Antimicrobials or Upfront Targeted Antimicrobial Therapy?

Evidence Statement

Early institution of targeted antibiotic therapy in severe CAP based on urinary antigen testing is associated with higher relapse rate without any mortality benefit in prospective randomized studies. Retrospective studies have shown mortality benefit with narrowing down of antibiotic therapy based on results from cultures of respiratory specimens, blood cultures as well as legionella and pneumococcal urinary antigen testing. Multiplex PCR based diagnostic testing of respiratory specimens leads to more appropriate and focused antimicrobial therapy administration.

Recommendations

- Empirical therapy covering common etiologic organisms should be initiated for severe CAP requiring ICU admission (2A).
- Investigations including culture of respiratory secretions (sputum, endotracheal aspirate), blood cultures, urinary antigen testing for pneumococcus and legionella may be performed to narrow down therapy. (UPP)
- Multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing of respiratory specimens, if available, should be performed for CAP in ICU for microbiologic diagnosis and subsequent antibiotic modification or de-escalation (3A).
- PCR testing for viral etiology (e.g., influenza, SARS-Cov2) should be performed based on seasonality and local guidelines (3A).
- Bronchoscopic BAL or protected specimen brush samples may be performed for microbiologic diagnosis on case by case basis (3A).

What is the Current Role of Radiologic Investigations in Guiding Antibiotic Therapy for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Lung ultrasound has high sensitivity and specificity in diagnosis of pneumonia, and better diagnostic accuracy as compared to chest X ray. Addition of lung ultrasound aids in improving confidence in diagnosis of CAP and leads to significant treatment modification. CT Chest leads to early diagnosis of CAP in ICU and modification of treatment in significant proportion of cases, though there is insufficient evidence in impact on short term outcomes.

Recommendations

- Bedside chest ultrasound should be done for all suspected CAP patients in ICU at baseline, and at frequent intervals as indicated (1A).
- CT Chest may be done for diagnosis of CAP in ICU in cases where diagnosis is in doubt, alternate causes (heart failure, pulmonary embolism) are suspected, to rule out rarer causes (e.g., tuberculosis, nocardia) or to decide on site of invasive sampling (bronchoscopy or image guided sampling) (3A).

For Empirical Therapy in Patients With CAP in ICU, Should Combination Therapy be Preferred Over Monotherapy?

Evidence Statement

Empirical combination therapy covering common organisms causing community acquired pneumonia improves survival without any significant increase in microbial resistance.

Recommendation

- Patients with CAP requiring ICU admission should initially receive combination of empirical antimicrobial agents covering common causative organisms (2A).

What should be the Preferred Combination Therapy for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

For patients with severe CAP requiring ICU admission without risk factors for pseudomonal infection, a combination of beta-lactams alongwith macrolides is better as compared to beta-lactam fluoroquinolone combination in terms of mortality benefit and length of hospital stay.

Recommendation

- For patients with CAP requiring ICU admission, a non-pseudomonal beta-lactam (cefotaxime, ceftriaxone, or amoxicillin-clavulanic acid) plus a macrolide (azithromycin or clarithromycin) should be preferred if there are no risk factors for pseudomonas aeruginosa infection (1A).
- For penicillin-allergic patients, a respiratory fluoroquinolone (levofloxacin, moxifloxacin or ciprofloxacin) and aztreonam may be used (3A).
- If macrolides cannot be used, a fluoroquinolone may be used if there is no clinical suspicion of tuberculosis, after sending sputum or endotracheal aspirate for AFB and Genexpert (3A).

When should Anti-pseudomonal Cover be Added for CAP in ICU? If Required, which are the Preferred Antimicrobials for Anti-pseudomonal Cover?

Evidence Statement

For patients with severe CAP requiring ICU admission, risk factors for infection with pseudomonas aeruginosa include chronic pulmonary disease (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, bronchiectasis), frequent systemic corticosteroid use, prior antibiotic therapy, old age, immunocompromised states, enteral tube feeding, cerebrovascular or cardiovascular disease. Prior antibiotic therapy is a risk factor for multidrug resistant pseudomonal infection.

Recommendation

- If P. aeruginosa is an etiological consideration, antipseudomonal antibiotic (like ceftazidime, cefoperazone, piperacillin-tazobactam, cefoperazone-sulbactam, imipenem, meropenem or cefepime) should be used (2A).
- Combination therapy should be considered with addition of aminoglycosides or antipseudomonal fluoroquinolones (e.g., ciprofloxacin) (3A).
- If empiric antipseudomonal treatment is started, a culture of respiratory specimens (sputum, miniBAL or BAL) should be obtained to confirm pseudomonal infection or subsequent de-escalation (3A).

When should MRSA Cover be Added to Empiric Regimen for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for MRSA in CAP in ICU include close contact with MRSA carrier or patient, influenza, prisoners, professional athletes, army recruits, men having sex with men (MSM), intravenous (IV) drug abusers, regular sauna users and those with recent antibiotic use. MRSA pneumonia should be suspected after influenza or in previously healthy young patients, if there is cavitation or necrotizing pneumonia, alongwith rapid increase of pleural effusion, massive hemoptysis, neutropenia or erythematous rashes. Vancomycin, teicoplanin, linezolid and tigecycline are effective antibiotics against MRSA.

Recommendation

- All patients admitted with CAP in ICU should be evaluated for presence of risk factors associated with MRSA (3A).
- If MRSA is a consideration, empiric linezolid (1A), vancomycin (1A) or teicoplanin (2A) should be added to the regimen. Linezolid should be used for vancomycin intolerant patients, vancomycin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (VRSA), or patients with renal failure (1A).
- PCR and gram stain of nasal swab, alongwith gram stain and culture of respiratory specimens should be obtained for microbiologic diagnosis of MRSA if empiric MRSA treatment is initiated, for future de-escalation or targeted antimicrobial therapy (3A).

When should Anaerobic Cover be Added to Empiric Antibiotic Regimen for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for aspiration pneumonia in patients admitted with CAP in ICU include dysphagia, altered sensorium, coma, witnessed

aspiration, putrid discharge, presence of lung abscess, empyema, or necrotizing pneumonia. There is no significant difference in anaerobic flora of CAP patients with or without aspiration. Severe aspiration related CAP has increased prevalence of GNBs and decreased prevalence of GPCs.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotics with anaerobic coverage should be considered for treatment of CAP in ICU in presence of witnessed aspiration, lung abscess, empyema, or necrotizing pneumonia (2A).
- Specific antibiotics with anaerobic coverage (such as clindamycin and metronidazole) should not be routinely prescribed in severe CAP (UPP).

Which Antibiotic should be Preferred for Anaerobic Coverage for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Commonly prescribed empirical antibiotics for CAP in ICU such as ampicillin-sulbactam, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, piperacillin-tazobactam and carbapenems have excellent anaerobic coverage. Clindamycin and moxifloxacin are effective against aspiration pneumonia and lung abscess caused by anaerobic organisms. Lung abscess and necrotizing pneumonia may require prolonged treatment upto 4 to 6 weeks.

Recommendation

- Patients with CAP due to anaerobic infection should be initiated on antibiotics with anaerobic activity such as amoxicillin-clavulanate, clindamycin or moxifloxacin (1A).
- Piperacillin-tazobactam or carbapenems can be used for empirical therapy in CAP due to anaerobes if otherwise indicated (3A).
- Duration of treatment should be individualized according to response and severity of disease (3A).

What should be the Optimal Duration of Antibiotics for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

For CAP in ICU, there is limited evidence regarding duration of treatment, with no significant mortality benefit beyond 7 days of antimicrobial therapy in uncomplicated cases. However, CAP due to GNB, enterobacteriaceae, *P. aeruginosa*, *S. aureus* bacteremia and *L. pneumophila* requires prolonged treatment. Necrotizing pneumonia, lung abscess, empyema or extrapulmonary infective complications like meningitis or infective endocarditis also require longer duration of treatment.

Recommendation

- Patients with CAP requiring ICU admission should receive antibiotics for 7 to 10 days (2A).
- Patients with CAP due to *Pseudomonas* or aspiration pneumonia should be treated for 14 days (3A).
- Necrotizing pneumonia due to GNB, MRSA or anaerobes also require treatment for 14 to 21 days (3A).
- Duration of treatment should be individualized according to causative organism, response, severity of disease and complications (3A).

What is the Role of Adjunctive Therapy, i.e., Systemic Corticosteroids and Inhaled Antibiotics for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Short course of systemic corticosteroids has been associated with reduced risk of mortality, need for endotracheal intubation and inotrope initiation in severe CAP. Systemic corticosteroids are associated with reduced need for ICU admission and endotracheal intubation in patients hospitalised with CAP, albeit with higher risk of readmission rates. However, large trials have excluded patients with septic shock, pregnancy, immunodeficiency, viral infections (influenza, herpes, acute viral hepatitis), tuberculosis and invasive fungal infections. Hydrocortisone 200mg to 240 mg daily infusion was most commonly used regimen in CAP trials for 7 to 10 days.

The evidence for inhaled antibiotics is predominantly from hospital-acquired and ventilator-associated pneumonia, with better odds of clinical cure and microbiologic eradication in adjunct inhaled antibiotic therapy.

Recommendation

- Short courses of systemic steroids should be given for patients with severe CAP after careful risk-benefit analysis (1A).
- Hydrocortisone 200 mg infusion over 24 hours for 5 to 7 days should be used for systemic corticosteroid administration in severe CAP patients (2A).
- Inhaled antibiotics may be used in severe CAP patients on a case-to-case basis. (UPP)

Should Procalcitonin be Used to Determine Duration of Antibiotic Administration for CAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Serial procalcitonin levels can be used to de-escalate antibiotics for CAP in the ICU without increasing mortality or recurrence rates.

Recommendation

- Procalcitonin levels can be used along with clinical judgement for de-escalation of antibiotics in CAP in ICU in patients treated beyond 5-7 days (1A).

HOSPITAL-ACQUIRED PNEUMONIA AND VENTILATOR ASSOCIATED PNEUMONIA

What are the Common Organisms Causing HAP/VAP in ICU and What is their Antibiotic Susceptibility Pattern?

Evidence Statement

Ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP) and hospital acquired pneumonia (HAP) are commonly caused by aerobic gram-negative bacilli, such as *acinetobacter baumannii*, *klebsiella pneumoniae*, *pseudomonas aeruginosa*, or by gram-positive cocci (*Staphylococcus aureus*). In Indian ICUs, gram negative organisms are most common etiologic agents (i.e., *acinetobacter*, *klebsiella* and *pseudomonas* spp). Most of these pathogens have been found to be multidrug resistant. Frequency of specific MDR pathogens causing HAP and VAP may vary by hospital, patient population, type of ICU patient, and change over time. Pan resistant organisms are increasingly being reported. Invasive sampling (including bronchoalveolar lavage) leads to better microbiologic diagnosis in HAP and VAP, but has not been associated with improved outcomes.

Should Baseline Serum Procalcitonin be Measured in Patients with Suspected VAP?

Evidence Statement

Baseline serum procalcitonin has moderate sensitivity and specificity for the diagnosis of ventilator and hospital acquired pneumonia, and cannot reliably differentiate between ventilator associated tracheobronchitis and ventilator associated pneumonia. An 80% decline from baseline procalcitonin levels has been used along with absolute value of less than 0.5ng/L to make decisions regarding antibiotic de-escalation.

Recommendation

- Serum procalcitonin should not be used for diagnosis of Ventilator Associated or Hospital Acquired Pneumonia or for decision making regarding antibiotic initiation (1A).
- Baseline procalcitonin levels may be measured in VAP, for future use in antibiotic de-escalation (2B).

What are the Risk Factors for MDR Pathogens in VAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

The risk factors for VAP due to MDR organisms include age >60 years, duration of mechanical ventilation ≥ 7 days, prior antibiotic use within 3 months, presence of severe sepsis or septic shock at time of VAP, ARDS preceding VAP, renal replacement therapy prior to VAP, systemic corticosteroid therapy and high prevalence (>25%) of MDR organisms in the hospital setting.

What should be the Initial Combination of Empiric Antibiotic Therapy for VAP in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Use of combination therapy for VAP has better outcomes in patients who are at risk for MDR pathogens. Commonly used antimicrobial agents include piperacillin-tazobactam, cefepime, levofloxacin, imipenem and meropenem. Among antimicrobial agents, carbapenems have a higher chance of clinical cure than non-carbapenems. Patients with high risk of MDR HAP or VAP, i.e., those admitted in ICUs with high prevalence of MDR organisms, prior isolation of MDR GNBs from respiratory secretions have been treated with combination therapy of carbapenems or beta-lactams with colistin or polymyxin. Monotherapy with newer beta-lactam-beta-lactamase combinations (e.g., ceftazidime-avibactam) or carbapenem-beta-lactamase combination (e.g., Imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam, meropenem-vaborbactam) have better outcomes and less toxicity as compared to other available regimens or polymyxins. Polymyxin B and colistin have been found to be efficacious in treatment of carbapenem resistant Klebsiella and Acinetobacter, but colistin has a higher incidence of nephrotoxicity. Tigecycline and minocycline are alternative options for CRE infections when pseudomonas is not a consideration. Aztreonam as a part of combination therapy is an alternative when newer beta-lactam-beta lactamase combinations are not available, or in presence of metalloproteinases like NDM. For treatment of VAP due to MRSA, glycopeptides and linezolid have similar clinical success, however, linezolid may be associated with higher chance of thrombocytopenia and gastrointestinal adverse events. Adjunct nebulised antibiotics (colistin, aminoglycosides) have been found to increase microbiologic eradication without any mortality benefit in VAP and HAP.

Gram staining of respiratory secretions can lead to lesser prescription of anti-pseudomonal and anti-MRSA antibiotics

without compromising clinical cure rates in ICUs with low MDR organism prevalence. Molecular techniques like multiplex PCR have a very less turnaround time and can be used to effectively modify empiric regimen for HAP and VAP.

Recommendation

- Among patients with VAP who are at high risk of MDR pathogens or are in ICU with high prevalence of MRSA (>15%) and resistant gram-negative organisms (>10%), an agent active against MRSA and at least two agents active against gram-negative organisms including *P. aeruginosa* is recommended (3A).
- Among patients with VAP who are not at high risk of MDR pathogens and are in ICU with high prevalence of resistant gram-negative organisms (>15%) but low prevalence of MRSA (<10%), two agents active against gram-negative organism including *P. aeruginosa* is recommended (3A).
- Linezolid, vancomycin or teicoplanin should be used for empiric MRSA coverage in patients at high risk of MRSA (1A).
- In patients with high risk for MDR GNBs and prior isolation of MDR or carbapenem resistant GNBs from respiratory secretions, monotherapy with newer agents (Ceftazidime-avibactam, Ceftolozane-tazobactam, Imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam or Meropenem-vaborbactam) should be preferred to combination therapy (2A).
- Polymyxin B (preferred) or colistin as part of empiric combination regimen can be used in the ICUs with high prevalence of carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae (>20%) in patients with risk factors for MDR or XDR gram negative pathogens (2A).
- In patients with high risk for MDR GNBs or prior isolation of MDR/carbapenem resistant GNBs from respiratory secretions, tetracyclines (tigecycline or minocycline) may be used as part of combination therapy if no alternate drugs can be given, in patients without bacteremia, and pseudomonas is not a consideration (3B).
- In patients with high risk for MDR GNBs, aztreonam can be used as part of combination regimen if no alternate drugs are available or pseudomonal coverage is needed (3A).
- In ICU where distribution of pathogen and antibiotic resistance pattern is known, empiric treatment should be designed accordingly, based upon patient risk factors for MDR pathogens (UPP).
- Adjunct nebulised antibiotics (colistin, aminoglycosides) can be used in combination with systemic therapy for empiric treatment of VAP on case-to-case basis or microbiologic sensitivity (3A).
- Invasive sampling (Nonbronchoscopic BAL or bronchoscopic BAL, protected specimen brushing) should be performed in VAP for microbiologic diagnosis and definitive antibiotic therapy (2A).
- Multiplex PCR of respiratory specimens (non-bronchoscopic BAL, or bronchoscopic BAL) should be used for early identification of causative organisms and appropriate modification of antibiotic therapy (2A).
- Gram stain of respiratory specimens can be used for early de-escalation of empiric anti-MRSA therapy (2A).
- In our country or in areas with high endemicity of tuberculosis, use of linezolid may be restricted unless no suitable alternative is available (UPP).
- Fluoroquinolones and aminoglycosides should be cautiously used as monotherapy in VAP in our country as well as in other areas with high endemicity of tuberculosis. (UPP)

When to Give Antipseudomonal Drugs for VAP in ICU?*Evidence Statement*

Prior use of antibiotics (most consistent association), prolonged duration of mechanical ventilation, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) have been identified as risk factors for MDR *P. aeruginosa* infection.

Recommendation

- Empiric treatment should be given to cover *Pseudomonas* if there are risk factors for MDR *Pseudomonas* infection (2A).
- In ICUs where gram-negative isolate resistance rate is high (>10 % gram-negative isolate resistant to agent being considered for monotherapy or not known), two anti-pseudomonal antibiotics from different class to be given (3A).

What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment for HAP/VAP?*Evidence Statement*

Short-course regimens for VAP are associated with significantly more antibiotic-free days without any significant difference in duration of ICU or hospital stay, recurrence of VAP and mortality. Short-course regimens are associated with more recurrences in VAP due to non-fermenting gram-negative bacilli (NF-GNB).

Recommendation

- Short course (7-8 days) of antibiotic therapy should be used, in case of VAP with good clinical response to therapy (1A).
- Longer duration (14 days) of antibiotic therapy should be considered, in case of VAP caused by NF-GNBs or is associated with severe immunodeficiency, structural lung disease (COPD, bronchiectasis, and interstitial lung disease), empyema, lung abscess, necrotizing pneumonia and inappropriate initial antimicrobial therapy (3A).

When should Anaerobic Cover be Added for VAP and Which is the Preferred Antimicrobial Agent?*Evidence Statement*

Incidence of anaerobic bacteria as causative agent of VAP is 2 to 7%. Risk factors for VAP due to anaerobes are altered consciousness, aspiration pneumonitis and high simplified acute physiology score (SAPS).

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic regimen for VAP should not include coverage for anaerobic organisms routinely (2A).
- In presence of risk factors for VAP due to anaerobic pathogens, anaerobic antimicrobial coverage should be added in empirical regimen (2B).
- In patients with risk factors for anaerobic organisms, clindamycin or metronidazole should be added to empirical antibiotics regimen for VAP, if it does not include carbapenems (meropenem or imipenem) or piperacillin-tazobactam in the ongoing empirical regimen (UPP).

When to Give Atypical Cover for VAP and Which is the Preferred Agent?*Evidence Statement*

Incidence of a typical bacteria as causative agents of VAP is low (5 to 7.5%). Risk factors for VAP due to legionella are legionella colonization in hospital water supply, prolonged use

of corticosteroids, cytotoxic chemotherapy, elderly, chronic renal failure, previous antibiotic use, granulocytopenia and poor Glasgow coma score.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic regimen for VAP should not include coverage for atypical organisms routinely (2A).
- In the presence of risk factors for VAP due to atypical bacterial pathogens, atypical antimicrobial coverage should be added to empirical regimen (2B).
- The preferred atypical coverage in combination antibiotics regimen is fluoroquinolones (levofloxacin or moxifloxacin) or macrolides (azithromycin or clarithromycin) (UPP).

Can Serum Procalcitonin be Used for De-escalation of Antibiotic Therapy in VAP?*Evidence Statement*

Use of procalcitonin to guide de-escalation of antibiotic treatment in patients with VAP is effective in reducing antibiotic exposure, without an increase in the risk of mortality or treatment failure.

Recommendation

- Serum procalcitonin may be used to guide the de-escalation of antibiotics in VAP, when the anticipated duration of therapy is >7-8 days (1B).
- Serum procalcitonin levels (together with clinical response) should be used for de-escalation of antibiotic therapy in VAP in specific clinical conditions (severely immunocompromised patients, drug resistant pathogens-NF-GNB, initial inappropriate therapy) (3A).

How to Approach a Patient of Non-responding VAP?*Evidence Statement*

Re-evaluation at 48 to 72 hours after the initial diagnosis of VAP is the most suitable time. By then the results of the initial microbial investigation are usually available and treatment modification can be done. Evaluation of treatment response for VAP should be on the basis of clinical, laboratory, radiograph and microbiological results. Factors associated with treatment failure in VAP includes host factors (advanced age, immunosuppressed, chronic lung disease, ventilator dependence), bacterial factors (drug resistant pathogens, opportunistic pathogens), therapeutic factors (inappropriate antibiotics, delayed initiation of therapy, insufficient duration of therapy, suboptimal dosing, inadequate local concentration of drugs), complications of initial VAP episode (lung abscess, empyema), other non-pulmonary infections or non-infectious mimics of pneumonia.

Recommendation

- Non-responding VAP should be evaluated for non-infectious mimics of pneumonia, unsuspected or drug-resistant pathogens, extrapulmonary sites of infection, and complications of pneumonia or its therapy and diagnostic testing should be directed to whichever of these causes is likely (2A).
- CT Chest and other indicated imaging modalities should be performed to clarify diagnosis in non-responding VAP and HAP (3A).
- Microbiologic analysis of blood, respiratory specimen (non-bronchoscopic or bronchoscopic BAL) and other samples like pleural fluid should be performed using conventional culture and molecular methods for identification of pathogens in non-responding HAP and VAP (3A).

CATHETER RELATED BLOODSTREAM INFECTIONS (CRBSI)

What is the Incidence of Catheter Colonization and CRBSI?

Evidence Statement

The global incidence of CC ranges from 1.4 % to 19.4 % whereas CRBSI incidence ranges from 2.4 % to 12.5 %. The incidence of CC is higher in Indian ICUs ranging from 18 % to as high as 59 %, whereas incidence of CRBSI is upto 16.1 per 1000 catheter days.

What are the Risk Factors for CRBSI?

Evidence Statement

Longer indwelling catheter duration, immunosuppression, diabetes mellitus, sepsis at the time of insertion, multi-lumen catheters and APACHE >23 are important risk factors for CRBSI. APACHE at admission, renal failure, central venous catheterization and steroid therapy are important risk factors for fungal CRBSI.

What are the Common Organisms Causing CRBSI and their Antibiotic Susceptibility?

Evidence Statement

Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CONS), *S. aureus*, enterococcus and candida species are the common organisms accounting for majority of the CRBSIs. Large proportion of *Staphylococcus aureus* and CONS are methicillin resistant ranging from 11 % to 87 %. There is an increased incidence of CRBSI due to gram-negative organisms (most of which are ESBL producers) and candida especially the non-albicans candida.

What is/are the Empiric Antibiotic(s) of Choice for CRBSI in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Vancomycin, teicoplanin, linezolid and daptomycin are effective in treatment of CRBSI due to MRSA and MR-CONS. Fourth-generation cephalosporin, carbapenem or beta-lactam/beta-lactamase combination like piperacillin-tazobactam and aminoglycosides might be used for gram negative organisms causing CRBSI. Caspofungin and fluconazole have been equally effective as amphotericin-B for treatment of candidemia. However, increasingly fluconazole resistant candida are becoming more common, and echinocandins are preferred as initial therapy in suspected catheter related blood stream infections due to candida.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic regimen for CRBSI should include coverage for both gram-positive and gram-negative organisms. (2A)
- Vancomycin or teicoplanin is the recommended first line drug for the empiric treatment of CRBSI for MRSA and MR-CONS while linezolid and daptomycin are good alternative agents. (2A)
- Empiric coverage for gram-negative bacilli should include a fourth-generation cephalosporin, a carbapenem, or a β -lactam/ β -lactamase inhibitor combination, newer agents (like ceftazidime-avibactam) or without an aminoglycoside. (UPP)
- An echinocandin should be used as empirical antifungal agent for treatment of suspected central line-associated candidemia. (2A)

What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment for CRBSI?

Evidence Statement

Short duration (<14 days) of antibiotics is as effective as longer duration (>14 days) for uncomplicated *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia. Complicated bacteremia due to *S. aureus* or those associated with endocarditis should receive longer duration. For gram-negative bacteremia, seven days of antibiotics is sufficient. In responding patient with uncomplicated CONS infection, 5-7 days therapy is considered optimum. Minimum 14 days treatment with antifungals is required for fungal CRBSI.

Recommendation

- Minimum 2 weeks antibiotics should be given for uncomplicated and 4-6 weeks for complicated *Staphylococcus aureus* CRBSI and infective endocarditis (2A).
- Minimum 7 days of antibiotics should be given for gram-negative CRBSI (2A).
- Five to seven days antibiotics are recommended for CONS bacteremia (3A).
- For suspected fungal CRBSI, antifungal therapy for at least 14 days is recommended (UPP).

EMPIRICAL ANTIBIOTICS FOR URINARY AND UROGENITAL SEPSIS IN ICU

What is the Incidence of UTI in ICU? What are the Common Organisms and Risk Factors for UTI in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Incidence of CA-UTI ranges from 5-30% of all ICU admissions. The most common organism causing UTI in ICU are gram-negative bacteria (*E.coli*, *Klebsiella*) and fungi (especially *Candida*). Risk factors for UTI in ICU include duration of catheterization, length of ICU stay, prior antibiotic use, higher disease severity score, and female Gender.

What is the Empirical Antimicrobial Agent of Choice for Treating UTI in ICU?

Evidence Statement

There has been a trend towards increasing prevalence of extended spectrum beta-lactamase producing gram-negative bacteria in the urinary cultures of catheter associated UTI. Aminoglycosides, beta-lactams along with a beta-lactamase inhibitor as well as carbapenems and fosfomycin have good efficacy in catheter associated UTI. The susceptibility for fluoroquinolones is decreasing over time among organisms isolated from nosocomial UTI. *Candida* species isolated from the patients with UTI show sensitivity to fluconazole, but increasingly fluconazole resistance is being reported.

Recommendations

- Initial choice of antibiotics should cover for ESBL producing gram-negative organisms and includes aminoglycosides, beta-lactam along with a beta-lactamase inhibitor or carbapenems (2A).
- In initial empirical regimen for UTI, antibiotics against gram-positive organisms is not recommended (3A).
- In appropriate clinical settings antifungals should be considered in the empirical regimen. Fluconazole is preferred, amphotericin

- deoxycholate is an alternative if fluconazole resistance is suspected (3B).
- Catheter removal, if no longer indicated, or intermittent catheterization should be done in patients with catheter associated urinary tract infection (3A).

ACUTE INFECTIVE DIARRHEA, ANTIBIOTIC INDUCED DIARRHEA, AND CLOSTRIDIUM DIFFICILE ASSOCIATED DIARRHEA IN THE ICU

What are the Common Organisms Causing Acute Infective Diarrhea in the ICU?

Evidence Statement

The incidence of diarrhea in the ICU ranges from 12.9 to 38%. Majority of the cases of diarrhea in ICU are non-infectious in etiology. *Clostridium difficile* is responsible for majority of infectious cases of diarrhea in ICU.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating Acute Infective Diarrhea in the ICU?

Evidence Statement

Empirical use of metronidazole in patients with diarrhea suspected due to *Clostridium difficile* in ICU setting results in significant symptomatic improvement.

Recommendation

- We recommend that empiric metronidazole be used for therapy of patients with acute diarrhea in the ICU with suspected *Clostridium difficile* infection (3A).

What are the Risk Factors for the Development of CDI or CDAD?

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for development of CDI include prior antibiotic therapy, advanced age, prolonged ICU/hospital stay, immunosuppression, proton pump inhibitors and enteral feeding. Cephalosporins, clindamycin, fluoroquinolones, carbapenems and penicillin derivatives are the commonly implicated antibiotics for CDAD/CDI.

What is the Recommended Treatment for CDI/CDAD: Which Antibiotics and Duration? Should Offending Antibiotics be Stopped? What is the Role of Probiotics in the Treatment of CDAD? How Should Recurrent *Clostridium Difficile* Infection be Treated?

Evidence Statement

Both metronidazole and oral vancomycin have similar efficacy in clinical and bacteriologic cure of CDI. Use of implicated antibiotic after completing the treatment of CDI is associated with increased risk of recurrence of CDI. There is insufficient evidence to justify the use of probiotics as an adjunct to antibiotics in the treatment of CDAD. In a single RCT, fecal microbiota transplantation was found to be highly efficacious for treatment of recurrent CDI.

Recommendations

- We recommend metronidazole as the first line treatment of mild to moderate CDI/CDAD (1A).
- We recommend oral vancomycin as the first line treatment of microbiologically proven severe CDI/CDAD (1A).

- We recommend oral vancomycin as the treatment of recurrent CDI/CDAD infection (2A).
- We recommend fecal microbiota transplantation as an alternate treatment of recurrent CDI/CDAD infection (2A).
- We recommend that implicated antibiotics should be discontinued as soon as clinically feasible (2A).
- We recommend against the use of probiotics as an adjunct for the treatment of CDI/CDAD (2A).
- We recommend addition of vancomycin to a patient with microbiologically proven CDI/CDAD, if the patient is already on metronidazole or has no clinical response to metronidazole within 3-4 days (UPP).

ABDOMINAL INFECTIONS IN ICU ACUTE PANCREATITIS AND INFECTED PANCREATIC NECROSIS

What is the Incidence, Risk Factors and Microbiology of Pancreatic Infection Following Acute Pancreatitis?

Evidence Statement

Incidence of pancreatic infection following acute pancreatitis ranges from 12-37%. Presence of pancreatic necrosis of >50% is a major risk factor for pancreatic infection following acute pancreatitis. Primary organ failure predicts development of infective pancreatic infection in patients with acute pancreatitis.

Evidence Statement

Gram-negative organisms are the most common organisms isolated from infected pancreatic necrosis following acute pancreatitis in Indian patients. Prophylactic antibiotic use in patients of AP to prevent IPN has been associated with increased risk of infection with gram-positive organisms. Resistance to carbapenems, beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitors and quinolones in gram-negative organisms isolated from IPN has increased, however, with maintain sensitivity to colistin and tigecycline.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics if Choice for Treatment of Pancreatic Infection Following Acute Pancreatitis?

Evidence Statement

Prophylactic use of antibiotics in patients with necrotizing pancreatitis has not been shown to reduce incidence of pancreatic infection and mortality. Presence of persistent fever, leucocytosis, multiorgan failure and presence of air within pancreatic necrosis suggest infected pancreatic necrosis. Cephalosporins, piperacillin-tazobactam, quinolones and carbapenems have the highest whereas aminoglycosides have the lowest penetration into necrotic pancreatic tissue. Response to antibiotic therapy is assessed by clinical and radiological parameters.

Recommendation

- Routine use of prophylactic antibiotics to prevent pancreatic infection following acute pancreatitis of any severity is not recommended (1A).
- Empirical antibiotic regimen in patients with infected pancreatic necrosis should be guided by local microbiological data, susceptibility pattern, pharmacokinetic property of antibiotics and previous antibiotic exposure (UPP).

- In treatment-naïve patients with evidence of infected pancreatic necrosis, we recommend empirical treatment with either carbapenems, piperacillin-tazobactam or cefoperazone-sulbactam (2A).
- In patients not responding or already exposed to the piperacillin-tazobactam, cefoperazone-sulbactam or carbapenems, colistin should be added to the empirical regime (3B).
- Duration of antibiotic therapy should be guided by clinical, radiological and laboratory parameters (UPP).
- Patients not responding to antibiotics should undergo necrosectomy and drainage (3B).
- Anti-anaerobic therapy (such as metronidazole, tinidazole, or clindamycin) is required if a biliary-enteric anastomosis is present and the primary antibiotic therapy does not include carbapenems, piperacillin/tazobactam, or cefoperazone/sulbactam as these drugs have sufficient anti-anaerobic activity. (3A)

BILIARY SEPSIS, ACUTE CHOLANGITIS

What are the Incidence, Risk Factors, and Microbiology of Biliary Infection in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Incidence of acute cholangitis varies with underlying etiology and ranges from 0.2 to 10%. Cholelithiasis, choledocholithiasis, benign and malignant common bile duct (CBD) strictures, CBD interventions, and stenting are the most common risk factors for cholangitis.

Evidence Statement

Gram-negative organisms are the most common organisms isolated from patients with acute cholangitis. Most of the pathogens isolated are susceptible to third-generation cephalosporins (such as cefoperazone-sulbactam), aminoglycosides, quinolones, ureidopenicillins, and carbapenems. Risk factors for multidrug resistance organisms causing acute cholangitis include an indwelling biliary stent, malignant biliary obstruction, previous hospitalization, and antibiotic use within 90 days.

What is the Empirical Antibiotic Regimen for Acute Cholangitis?

Evidence Statement

The empirical antibiotic regime in patients with acute cholangitis is guided by the severity of the disease, local antibiotic susceptibility pattern, and biliary penetration of the antibiotics. The duration of antibiotics depends on the severity of cholangitis and adequacy of source control. Biliary drainage (percutaneous or endoscopic) is required in addition to antibiotic use in the management of acute cholangitis.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic therapy should be guided by the severity of the cholangitis, local microbiological susceptibility patterns, biliary penetration of antibiotics, and previous antibiotic exposure (UPP).
- We recommend either beta-lactam/ beta-lactamase inhibitor (such as cefoperazone-sulbactam or piperacillin/tazobactam) or carbapenems (imipenem/meropenem) as monotherapy in patients with moderate to severe cholangitis (3B).
- We recommend antibiotic duration for 4-7 days in patients with acute cholangitis after adequate source control (2B).
- Biliary drainage should be considered in all patients with cholangitis in addition to empirical antibiotic therapy (1A).

LIVER ABSCESS

What are the Most Common Organisms Causing Liver Abscess in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Amoebic liver abscess is the most common cause of liver abscess in Indian setup. The incidence of pyogenic liver abscess varies from 2.3 to 446 per 100000 hospital admissions per year. Gram-negative organisms (E.coli and Klebsiella) are the most common organisms causing pyogenic liver abscess. Risk factors for pyogenic liver abscess include diabetes mellitus, older age, male gender, biliary diseases, biliary procedures, alcoholism, malignancy, intra-abdominal infection, and cystic lesions in the liver.

WHAT ARE THE EMPIRICAL ANTIBIOTICS OF CHOICE FOR TREATING LIVER ABSCESS IN ICU?

Amoebic Liver Abscess

Evidence Statement

Metronidazole is the drug of choice for the treatment of amoebic liver abscess. The optimum duration of treatment in patients with amoebic liver abscess is 7-10 days. Routine needle aspiration of amoebic liver abscess is controversial. Addition of aspiration to drug therapy in patients with amoebic liver abscess of >5 cm in size hastens clinical improvement.

Recommendation

- We recommend metronidazole as an initial antibiotic of choice in patients with amoebic liver abscess (2A).
- We recommend antibiotic treatment for a period of 7-10 days in patients with amoebic liver abscess (3B).
- Needle aspiration of amoebic liver abscess is recommended in patients with a lack of clinical improvement in 48-72 hours, left lobe abscess, abscess more than 5-10 cm or thin rim of liver tissue around the abscess (<10 mm) (UPP).
- The luminal agents used to remove any intraluminal cysts (paromomycin, diiodohydroxyquin or diloxanide furoate) should be used even if the stool microscopy is negative (UPP).

Pyogenic Liver Abscess

Evidence Statement

Beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitors, metronidazole, and carbapenems are effective antibiotics for management of pyogenic liver abscess. Carbapenems are effective in case of suspected infection with ESBL producing organisms or melioidosis. Antibiotics are required for prolonged periods ranging from 4-6 weeks. Clinical and radiological assessment is required to guide the adequate treatment duration. Initial 2-4 weeks therapy may parenteral while oral therapy may be given for rest of the duration.

Recommendation

- We recommend beta lactam/beta lactamase inhibitors with metronidazole in patients with pyogenic liver abscess for a duration of 4-6 weeks (2A).

- We recommend carbapenems in case of infection with ESBL-producing organisms or melioidosis (2B).
- The empiric regimen should also cover *E. histolytica* until the causative pathogen is found or amebic abscess is excluded (UPP).

PERITONITIS

What are the Most common Organisms Causing Peritonitis in ICU?

Evidence Statement

The risk factors for development of primary peritonitis are decompensated cirrhosis, nephrotic syndrome and peritoneal dialysis. The risk factors for development of secondary peritonitis include intra-abdominal organ perforation, post intra-abdominal surgery, and trauma. Longer ICU stay, urgent operation on hospital admission, total parenteral nutrition, and stomach-duodenum as primary infection site are associated with the development of tertiary peritonitis. Gram-negative enteric organisms (such as *E. coli*, and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*) are the common causes of primary and secondary peritonitis. Other organisms include gram-positive as well as anaerobic bacteria. The organisms commonly isolated in tertiary peritonitis are *Candida*, *Enterococcus faecium* and *Staphylococcus epidermidis*.

WHAT ARE THE EMPIRICAL ANTIBIOTICS OF CHOICE FOR TREATING PERITONITIS IN ICU?

Primary Peritonitis

Evidence Statement

Third-generation Cephalosporins are the most effective antibiotic therapy for primary peritonitis. Antibiotics are usually required for 7-10 days for adequate treatment. Most of the organisms isolated in secondary peritonitis are sensitive to beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitors or carbapenems. For gram-positive organisms, vancomycin and linezolid are effective treatment options. Short duration of antibiotic treatment (4 days) is as effective as a longer duration after adequate source control.

Recommendation

- We recommend third generation cephalosporins (such as cefotaxime and ceftriaxone) for a duration of 7-10 days in patients with primary peritonitis (2A).
- We recommend either beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitor or carbapenems with an anaerobic cover (using metronidazole) for the treatment of secondary peritonitis (2A).
- For secondary peritonitis, antibiotic treatment is required for at least 4 days after an adequate source control; however, longer treatment is required if adequate source control is not achieved (2A).

CNS INFECTIONS IN ICU

What are the Most Common Organisms Causing Acute Bacterial Meningitis in ICU?

Community-acquired Meningitis

Evidence Statement

The incidence of community-acquired pyogenic meningitis ranges from 2 to 7.40 per lakh population and data suggest higher incidence in children. The common causative organisms include *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *neisseria meningitidis*, other streptococci, *Hemophilus influenzae* and *listeria monocytogenes*.

Other causative organisms are *staphylococcus* species, gram-negative bacilli, and *Pseudomonas*. Common risk factors for community-acquired bacterial meningitis are otitis media, elderly population, depressed immune status and prior use of antibiotics.

Nosocomial Meningitis

Evidence Statement

Incidence of post-ventricular drain or catheter meningitis ranges from 2% to 27%. Commonly implicated organisms are CONS (especially *staphylococcus epidermidis*), *Staphylococcus aureus*, *acinetobacter*, *pseudomonas*, and *Enterobacteriaceae*. Risk factors are repeated catheterization, higher catheter duration, CSF sampling, presence of concomitant systemic infection, and surgical technique i.e., subcutaneously tunneled extraventricular drain (EVD), Rickham reservoir with percutaneous CSF drainage. The incidence of post craniotomy or post neurosurgery meningitis is 0.02% to 9.5%. Most commonly implicated organisms are *Staphylococcus aureus*, coagulase-negative staphylococci (especially *S. epidermidis*), *Enterobacteriaceae*, *acinetobacter*, and *pseudomonas*. Risk factors include CSF leak, EVD, longer duration of drainage, multiple operations, lack of antibiotic prophylaxis, and emergency surgery. The incidence of post-neuroaxial blockade meningitis is 0.2 per 10000 with viridans streptococci and *Staphylococcus aureus* being common organisms. Exogenous inoculation is the main risk factor. Post-head trauma meningitis incidence ranges from 1.39% to 2% with CONS, *acinetobacter*, and *Enterobacteriaceae* as common microbes and prolonged hospitalization, and insertion of a lumbar and ventricular drain as common risk factors. Post-internal ventricular drain infection incidence ranges from 5.9% to 15.2%. The most common causative organisms are CONS, *Staphylococcus aureus*, gram-negative bacilli, group D streptococci, and *propionibacterium acnes*. CSF leak, single gloves use, and number of times shunt exposed to breached surgical gloves are the risk factors.

WHAT ARE THE EMPIRICAL ANTIBIOTICS OF CHOICE FOR TREATING ACUTE BACTERIAL MENINGITIS IN ICU? WHAT SHOULD BE THE DURATION OF ANTIBIOTIC TREATMENT?

Community-acquired Meningitis

Evidence Statement

Choice of antibiotics depends on the most likely causative microorganisms, local antibiotics sensitivity patterns, mechanism of infection, and patient's predisposing condition. Most commonly recommended empirical antibiotic regimens include third-generation cephalosporin plus vancomycin, third-generation cephalosporin monotherapy and penicillin monotherapy. Addition of amoxicillin, ampicillin or benzyl-penicillin has been recommended in patients older than 50 years. However, antibiotic therapy should be modified according to the isolated organisms since MDR organisms are being reported from community as well.

Recommendation

- We recommend third-generation cephalosporin (preferably ceftriaxone) plus vancomycin as empirical antibiotics of choice for community-acquired meningitis (3A).
- We recommend adding ampicillin or amoxicillin if the age >50 years (3A).

- If beta-lactams are contraindicated, we recommend chloramphenicol plus vancomycin as the antibiotic of choice, and to add cotrimoxazole if age >50 years (3A).
- We recommend ciprofloxacin or aztreonam plus vancomycin as an alternative regimen and to add cotrimoxazole, if age greater than 50 years (UPP).
- We recommend the duration of antibiotics based on suspected or isolated organisms i.e., 10 to 14 days for *streptococcus pneumoniae*, 14 to 21 days for streptococcus agalactiae, 7 days for neisseria meningitidis or *Hemophilus influenzae*, 21 days for aerobic gram negative bacilli, and 21 days or more for listeria monocytogenes (3A).
- If no microorganism is identified, antibiotics should be given for at least 10 to 14 days (3A).

Nosocomial Meningitis

Evidence Statement

Vancomycin in combination with cefepime, ceftazidime or meropenem is a commonly recommended empirical antibiotic regimen for nosocomial meningitis. Alternative regimens include third-generation cephalosporin or meropenem monotherapy or ceftriaxone plus flucloxacillin or cloxacillin combination therapy. Limited available evidence shows the efficacy of intraventricular or intrathecal antibiotics in the management of nosocomial meningitis poorly responsive to systemic antibiotics.

Recommendation

- We recommend vancomycin plus cefepime or ceftazidime or meropenem as empirical antibiotics of choice for nosocomial meningitis (3A).
- Colistin may be given if the incidence of CRE or drug-resistant acinetobacter is high in the specific unit (UPP).
- If beta-lactams are contraindicated, we recommend replacing beta-lactam with aztreonam or ciprofloxacin (3A).
- Intraventricular or intrathecal antibiotics should be considered if infection responds poorly to appropriate systemic antibiotics clinically or microbiologically (3A).

What are the Most Common Organisms Causing Brain Abscess in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Incidence of brain abscess ranges from 1.3 to 2.6 cases per lakh population. Most commonly involved micro-organisms include streptococcus (especially *S. viridans*), staphylococcus (especially *S. aureus*), gram negative bacilli, anaerobes (bacteroides, peptostreptococcus, fusobacterium), pseudomonas and *H. influenzae*. Polymicrobial aetiology accounts for 23-26% cases. Risk factors include otitis media, sinusitis, head trauma, congenital heart diseases, hematogenous spread, surgery, immunocompromised status, pulmonary disease, meningitis and odontogenic infections.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating Brain Abscess in ICU? What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment?

Evidence Statement

The most common empiric treatment consists of a third-generation cephalosporin combined with metronidazole. Antibiotic duration ranges from 4 to 8 weeks.

Recommendation

- We recommend third-generation cephalosporins plus metronidazole as the empirical antibiotic of choice for brain abscess (3A).
- We recommend adding vancomycin if there is a high likelihood of MRSA (3A)
- We recommend vancomycin plus ciprofloxacin if beta-lactams are contraindicated (3A).
- We recommend aztreonam if ciprofloxacin cannot be given or contraindicated (UPP).
- We recommend a minimum 4 weeks of therapy; however, duration may be extended according to clinic-radiological response irrespective of aspiration or excision of abscess (3A).

SKIN AND SOFT TISSUE INFECTIONS IN ICU

What are the Most Common Organisms and Risk Factors for SSTI in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Older age, diabetes mellitus, obesity, malignancy, cirrhosis and longer ICU stay are risk factors for SSTIs. Gram positive organisms (*Staphylococcus aureus*) are the most common organism responsible for the SSTIs. *E. coli* and pseudomonas are common pathogens among gram negative organisms. MRSA and ESBL producing gram negative organisms are the most common causative agents for SSTIs in ICU. Monomicrobial necrotizing fasciitis is commonly caused by *Streptococcus Pyogenes*; mixed coliforms, anaerobes and staphylococci are common causes of polymicrobial necrotizing fasciitis.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating SSTI in ICU? For Empirical Therapy, should Combination Therapy be Preferred Over Monotherapy?

Evidence Statement

Vancomycin, teicoplanin, daptomycin and linezolid are effective in SSTIs caused by MRSA. Piperacillin-tazobactam and carbapenems are the most effective antibiotics for ESBL producing gram negative organisms. Penicillin plus clindamycin are most effective antibiotics in monomicrobial necrotising fasciitis, whereas a combination of piperacillin-tazobactam, fluoroquinolone and clindamycin is effective for polymicrobial necrotising fasciitis.

Recommendation

- For moderate non-purulent SSTI, we recommend intravenous penicillin or clindamycin as first choice of antibiotics (2A).
- Severe non-purulent SSTI should be treated with a combination of piperacillin-tazobactam alongwith coverage for MRSA (vancomycin, teicoplanin, daptomycin or linezolid) (2A).
- Concomitant surgical inspection or debridement should be considered for severe non-purulent SSTIs (2A).
- For severe purulent SSTI, incision and drainage followed by empiric antibiotics including piperacillin tazobactam, alongwith MRSA coverage (vancomycin, teicoplanin, daptomycin or linezolid) is recommended (3A).
- Penicillin plus clindamycin is recommended for monomicrobial necrotising infection caused by streptococcus pyogenes or clostridial species. For polymicrobial necrotising fasciitis, a combination of piperacillin-tazobactam, fluoroquinolone and clindamycin is recommended (3A).

What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment for SSTI?

Evidence Statement

Shorter course of antibiotic therapy is adequate for uncomplicated SSTIs while complicated SSTIs require longer duration of antibiotic therapy.

Recommendation

- Severe non purulent SSTIs should be treated with at least 5 days of antibiotics. (3A)
- Severe SSTIs with organ dysfunction should be treated with a prolonged course of antibiotics of 2-3 weeks duration. (3A)

SEPSIS OF UNKNOWN CAUSE IN ICU

What is the Empirical Treatment for Sepsis of Unknown Cause in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Empirical therapy with dual class (with different mechanisms of action) combination antimicrobial therapy for sepsis of unknown cause in ICU is associated with have better clinical outcomes. Empirical therapy with either piperacillin-tazobactam or carbapenems in combination with aminoglycoside or fluoroquinolone has been shown to give appropriate broad coverage leading to better clinical outcomes as compared to monotherapy.

Recommendation

- We recommend empirical antimicrobial therapy with combination of ceftriaxone and doxycycline or macrolide for community acquired sepsis of unknown origin in ICU (UPP).
- We recommend empirical antimicrobial therapy with combination of beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitor and fluoroquinolone or aminoglycoside for nosocomial sepsis of unknown origin in ICU (UPP).
- Empiric therapy should attempt to provide antimicrobial activity against the most likely pathogens based upon clinical features alongwith local patterns of infection and resistance (UPP).
- Duration of therapy is 7 to 10 days, though longer courses may be appropriate in patients with slow response (3B).

EMPIRICAL ANTIFUNGALS FOR NON-NEUTROPENIC PATIENTS IN ICU

What are the Risk Factors for Invasive Fungal Infections in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for invasive fungal infections in non-neutropenic patients in ICU are surgery, total parenteral nutrition, renal replacement therapy, cardiopulmonary bypass >120 minutes, diabetes mellitus, central venous catheters, urinary catheters, candida colonisation with colonization index >0.5, use of broad spectrum antibiotics, acute renal failure, mechanical ventilation >3 days and APACHE II score >16.

What is the Role of Empirical Antifungals in Non-neutropenic Patients in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Empirical antifungals for non-neutropenic patients in ICU routinely has not been associated with decrease in mortality or hospital length of stay. Empirical antifungals in patients at high risk for

invasive fungal infections in ICU has been shown to reduce incidence of subsequent proven invasive fungal infections.

Recommendation

- We do not recommend the routine use of empirical antifungals in non-neutropenic patients in ICU (1A).
- Empirical antifungals may be considered in critically ill patients with high risk of invasive fungal infections to reduce the incidence of subsequent invasive fungal infections (1B).

What is the Antifungal Agent of Choice and Duration of Empirical Therapy in Non-neutropenic Patients in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Fluconazole and caspofungin are useful as empirical antifungal therapy in non-neutropenic ICU patients at high risk of Invasive fungal infection. In India, rate of fluconazole resistance is up to 7%, especially in non-albicans candida species.

Recommendation

- We recommend fluconazole or caspofungin as preferred empirical antifungal agents in non- neutropenic ICU patients at risk for invasive fungal infection (1A).
- Caspofungin may be preferred in areas with high prevalence of fluconazole resistance (1B).
- Micafungin or anidulafungin may be used as alternative agents (3A).
- Recommended duration of empirical antifungal therapy is 2 weeks (3A).

ANTIBIOTIC STEWARDSHIP

Does Antibiotic Stewardship Improve Patient Outcome in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic stewardship programs in hospitalised patients are associated with reduction in number of antibiotic days, duration of hospital stay and all-cause mortality.

Recommendation

All hospitals should have an antibiotic stewardship program including the intensive care units (1A).

What are the Essential Strategies of Antibiotic Stewardship in an ICU Setting?

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic stewardship requires a multidisciplinary approach with integration of infectious disease physician, microbiologist with logistic and financial support from hospital administration. Both enablement and restrictive strategies are useful in improving adherence to antibiotic stewardship programs. Restrictive strategies give immediate results. Enablement practices are more resource intensive. Most studies have used a combination of both the methods and have shown additive effects. Providing feedback to the treating team improves adherence. A single RCT has shown that restrictive strategy alone may cause delay in initiation of antibiotics.

Recommendation

Prospective audit of antibiotic use and/or preauthorization (if feasible) along with feedback to the treating team is recommended as part of antibiotic stewardship program (1A).

What is the Role of Antibiotic Cycling, Intravenous to Oral Switch and De-escalation in the ICU?

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic cycling in the intensive care unit has not been adequately studied in randomized controlled trials. Non-randomized studies show significant heterogeneity in terms of site of study, method of cycling and confounders like simultaneous infection control measures being employed. Evidence of benefit of antibiotic cycling is lacking, with few studies demonstrating reduction in colonization though mortality and length of hospital stay remain unchanged.

Recommendation

Antibiotic cycling should not be used as a method of antibiotic stewardship program (2A).

Scheduled Intravenous to Oral Switch

Evidence Statement

Early intravenous to oral transition of antibiotics reduce hospital length of stay and cost of care. There is no increase in mortality or other adverse events when this is done after assessing as to which patients can be safely transitioned to oral therapy.

Recommendation

Antibiotic stewardship programs should implement strategies to improve timely transition from parenteral to oral antibiotic therapy (2A).

De-escalation in Intensive Care Unit

Evidence Statement

Pooled results from observational studies in an ICU setting do not show any increase in mortality with antibiotic de-escalation while significantly reducing antibiotic exposure days and ICU length of stay.

Recommendation

Antibiotic de-escalation in the ICU is recommended as part of antibiotic stewardship program (2A).

What is the Role of Procalcitonin in Antibiotic De-escalation in ICU?

Evidence Statement

Implementation of antibiotic de-escalation algorithm based on serial procalcitonin measurements has been shown to reduce mortality, length of ICU stay, total duration of antibiotic days and health care costs.

Recommendation

Procalcitonin based algorithms may be used for antibiotic de-escalation (1A).

ANTIMICROBIAL PRESCRIPTION IN CRITICALLY ILL IMMUNOCOMPROMISED PATIENTS

What should be the Empiric Antibiotic Therapy in Critically Ill Febrile Neutropenic Patients with Suspected Blood Stream Infection?

Evidence Statement

Gram positive and gram-negative organisms are common causes of febrile neutropenia, with gram negative organisms predominating in India. The commonly isolated GNBs include Enterobacteriaceae (*E. coli* and *Klebsiella* species) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

to be the most common among gram negative organisms. *Staphylococcus aureus* and Coagulase negative staphylococcus are most common gram-positive isolates. Recent studies have reported increasing prevalence of MDR organisms. Choice of antibiotics depends local epidemiology, focus of infection and host and disease characteristics. Current evidence shows carbapenem resistance among Enterobacteriaceae is 35-50 %, *Pseudomonas* spp 47% and *Acinetobacter* spp 62%. Acute leukaemia patients presenting to the ICU, patient already on carbapenem shifted to ICU from ward, previous multi-drug resistant infections in the last 1 month and patients on vasopressors are at risk of harbouring carbapenem resistant organisms. Empiric upfront vancomycin has not been shown to improve clinical outcomes or mortality in febrile neutropenia. Patients at risk of MRSA infections include suspected indwelling catheter infection (rigors following infusion, cellulitis at exit site), skin and soft tissue infection, severe mucositis, culture growing gram positive cocci pending identification, previous MRSA colonization/ infection and hemodynamic instability at admission.

Recommendation

- In a critically ill febrile neutropenic patient presenting to the ICU with organ failure, empiric antibiotic therapy should be initiated with or escalated to a broad spectrum carbapenem like imipenem or meropenem (UPP).
- Empiric combination of Meropenem and Colistin/Polymyxin B should be considered in patients having high risk of infection with resistant gram-negative organisms (3A). Following risk factors should be assessed:
 - Critically ill patients with underlying acute leukaemia (on induction or consolidation therapy) presenting to the ICU
 - Patients of acute leukaemia/lymphomas on beta-lactam/ beta lactamase inhibitor±aminoglycosides, shifted to ICU from ward
 - Previous history of infection with multi-drug resistant organism in last 1 month
 - Hypotensive patients requiring vasopressor infusions (refractory septic shock)
 - Patient shifted to the ICU on carbapenem therapy
- We strongly caution against the use of empiric combination of Meropenem and Colistin/Polymyxin B or Colistin/Polymyxin B alone in patients who are not high risk of infection with carbapenem resistant gram negative organisms as defined above (3A).
- We caution against use of other carbapenems like Doripenem and Ertapenem due to lack of positive evidence and inadequate spectrum respectively (2A).
- Vancomycin/Teicoplanin should be added as empiric therapy in critically ill febrile neutropenic patient with risk factors for MRSA infection (3A). These include:
 - Suspected indwelling vascular catheter infection
 - Skin and soft-tissue infection
 - Previous colonization/infection with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
 - Blood Culture growing Gram-positive cocci awaiting identification
 - Severe mucositis
 - Hemodynamic instability(hypotension) at admission from home or outpatient department (UPP)
- Empiric MRSA coverage should be avoided in absence of risk factors for MRSA and in ICUs with low prevalence of MRSA(UPP).
- After the initiation of empiric therapy based on the factors listed above, the subsequent therapy should be based on the organisms

isolated and sensitivity patterns. In patients with no isolates, the treatment should be continued as per the response to ongoing antibiotics and appearance of any new focus of infection (UPP).

What Methods Should be Used for Early Identification of Causative Organisms in Febrile Neutropenia Patients?

Evidence Statement

Two sets of blood cultures drawn prior to antibiotic administration yields microbiologic diagnosis in 30% cases. Addition of multiplex PCR techniques can aid in early diagnosis and has high sensitivity and specificity as compared to culture-based methods.

Recommendation

- We recommend collection of at least 2 sets of blood cultures, with a set collected simultaneously from peripheral site and one central. In case of multi lumen catheter, one set per lumen should be collected (1A).
- Two blood culture sets from separate venepunctures should be sent if no central venous catheter is present (1A).
- One set includes one aerobic and one anaerobic culture bottle. Blood culture volume should be atleast 10 ml/bottle (1A).
- The use of molecular methods for identification of multi-drug resistant organisms and their antibiotic sensitivity pattern can be considered in critically ill patients, however, the availability and cost may be a concern along with risk of false negativity and false positivity (2B).

What should be the Approach to Empiric Antifungal Therapy in Febrile Neutropenia in Critically Ill Immunocompromised Patients?

Evidence Summary

Patients with febrile neutropenia are at risk of developing invasive fungal infections. IFIs have high mortality in patients with febrile neutropenia. Persistent or recurrent febrile neutropenia and development of lung infiltrates may be clues to fungal etiology of febrile neutropenia. Yeast (primarily *Candida* species) and moulds are common etiologic agents. In patients with persisting fever without any localisation, empiric antifungals targeting *Candida* species are initiated. Chest radiograph has poor sensitivity for pneumonia detection in patients with febrile neutropenia, and CT Chest is preferred. Galactomannan assay is highly specific for *Aspergillus* species with some cross-reactivity with *Histoplasma capsulatum* and *Penicillium* species. False positive reaction can occur with concomitant use of b-lactam/b-lactamase combinations, such as piperacillin/tazobactam. Use of Beta-D Glucan alone has limited sensitivity for the diagnosis of invasive candidiasis. Invasive aspergillosis should be suspected in patients with persistent febrile neutropenia with the development of signs of pneumonia including lung infiltrate.

The echinocandins have demonstrated significant fungicidal activity and treatment success against most of the *Candida* species in randomized clinical trials. Individual echinocandins namely caspofungin, micafungin and anidulafungin have similar efficacy and are interchangeable. Echinocandins have poor penetration in eye, CNS, and urine. Echinocandins are not active against *Zygomycosis*. Voriconazole is the preferred agent for invasive aspergillosis, whereas liposomal amphotericin B is preferred for *zygomycosis*. Echinocandins have been useful in salvage therapy of aspergillosis. Guidelines advise to continue treatment for candidemia for at least two weeks after 2 weeks

after documented clearance of *Candida* from the bloodstream, and resolution of neutropenia and symptoms attributable to candidemia. Recommended duration of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis is 6-12 weeks based on the resolution of symptoms and neutropenia. Combination antifungal treatments have limited evidence for added efficacy.

Recommendation

- Following patients should be considered for initiation of antifungal therapy when they present to ICU with shock or respiratory distress especially when they have persistent or recurrent fever or clinical deterioration after >3 days of broad-spectrum antibiotics (2A).
 - Allogenic HSCT
 - Severe mucositis with diarrhoea
 - Prolonged/anticipated duration of neutropenia >10 days
 - Worsening on broad spectrum antibiotics like BL/BLI and Carbapenems
 - More than 2 weeks of high-dose steroids (more than 15-20 mg of prednisolone or equivalent)
 - History of invasive fungal infection
 - New onset lung infiltrate. (Since chest x ray has low sensitivity, HRCT should be done in these patients)
- We recommend the use of caspofungin (echinocandin group) as initial antifungal therapy. Caspofungin should be avoided in patients with chronic liver disease (Child-Pugh C) (2A).
- Anidulafundin and Micafungin can be considered if there are contraindications to use of caspofungin (3A).
- Voriconazole is the drug of choice for proven, probable or possible aspergillosis. Due to its variable bio-availability voriconazole should be administered IV. In patients with renal dysfunction caspofungin can be given instead of IV voriconazole (1A).
- Liposomal Amphotericin B is the drug of choice for suspected or confirmed *Mucormycosis* (1A).
- All efforts should be made to confirm presence of invasive fungal infection with the use of tests including CT Chest/suspected site (abdomen for hepatosplenic candidiasis or *mucormycosis*/paranasal sinus for *mucormycosis*), β -D-glucan, serum and BAL Galactomannan, fungal culture. Tissue (lung/other clinically involved sites) biopsy should be performed if required, whenever feasible and safe (1A).
- We do not recommend routine use of combination antifungal therapy for probable or proven Invasive aspergillosis (IA) due to lack of strong evidence (3A).

Which Patients Empiric Treatment against Pneumocystis Jiroveci Pneumonia?

Evidence Statement

HSCT, high dose corticosteroids, T-cell depleting agents and rituximab predispose to PCP infection. Hypoxemia and characteristic radiologic abnormalities indicate PCP pneumonia, though chest radiograph might be normal in early disease. Empiric treatment with trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole is indicated in suspected PCP pneumonia.

Recommendations

- Treatment with sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim should be considered in high risk patients such as allogenic HSCT, high-dose corticosteroid therapy administration of T-cell-depleting agents such as fludarabine/purine analogues and rituximab when such patients present with hypoxemic respiratory failure

- with or without radiological evidence of *Pneumocystis carinii* pneumonia especially if they are not on PCP prophylaxis (3A).
- Every attempt should be made to confirm PCP infection (3A).

What is the Role of Empiric Antiviral Therapy in Immunocompromised Patients with Febrile Neutropenia?

Evidence Statement

Antiviral therapy in febrile neutropenia is given according to treatment guidelines of the etiologic agent. There are no effective agents for treatment of parainfluenza and respiratory syncytial virus infection at present.

Recommendations

- There is no role of empirical antiviral therapy with febrile neutropenia. Active HSV or VZV infections in neutropenic patients indicated by clinical or laboratory evidence should be treated with Acyclovir (3A)
- Immunoglobulin tests should not be used to diagnose VZV or HSV infection (3A).
- Ganciclovir is recommended for the empiric therapy for CMV in patients with high risk of CMV reactivation (3A):
 - Administration of T-cell-depleting agents such as fludarabine/ purine analogues, rituximab
 - Patients on high dose steroids who develop diarrhoea
 - Pneumonia not responding to antibiotics & antifungals.
- No specific treatment for infections with RSV and parainfluenza viruses due to lack of specific evidence (3A).

What is the Role for Empiric Antimicrobial Therapy for Tropical Infections like Malaria, Leptospirosis in Patients with Febrile Neutropenia?

Evidence Statement

There is insufficient evidence regarding tropical infections in patients with hematologic or solid organ malignancies and febrile neutropenia.

Recommendation

- There is no role for empirical antimicrobial therapy against tropical infections like malaria, leptospirosis in febrile neutropenia patients (3A).
- Documented tropical infections in neutropenic patients in ICU should be treated similar as they are treated in non-neutropenic patients (UPP).

What is the Role of Surveillance Cultures in Guiding Therapy in Febrile Neutropenia Patients?

Evidence Statement

Surveillance cultures have not been shown to correlate with subsequent causative organisms in immunocompromised patients.

Recommendation

- We strongly recommend against repeated surveillance cultures as these do not help to guide antibiotic therapy (3A).

What is the Role of Source Control in the Treatment of a Febrile Neutropenic Patient?

Evidence Statement

Source control at the earliest possible time reduces microbiologic burden and improves outcomes. Source control includes

debridement, drainage of collections, removal of incriminated indwelling catheters and implanted devices.

Recommendations

We recommend that in patients with febrile neutropenia with clinically documented source of infection (as defined below), immediate intervention should be undertaken for source control (3A).

What should be the Approach to Antibiotic De-escalation in Patients with Febrile Neutropenia?

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic de-escalation to definitive therapy is feasible after identification of causative organism or in patients who remain afebrile for >48 hours with evidence of marrow recovery.

Recommendations

Antibiotic de-escalation should be considered in the following situations (3A):

- Once and if a pathogen is identified, we recommend de-escalation to an antibiotic that the organism is susceptible to.
- Treat with appropriate agents based on the site and pathogen until the patient is afebrile for at least 48 hours and there is evidence of marrow recovery (neutrophil count ≥ 500 cells/mm³).
- In patients without microbiologically documented infection continue empirical antimicrobials until the patient is afebrile for at least 48 hours and there is evidence of marrow recovery (neutrophil count ≥ 500 cells/mm³)

Which Antibiotics should be Used for Febrile Neutropenia due to Multidrug Resistant Bacteria?

Evidence Statement

Antibiotics like fosfomycin, tigecycline and minocycline have activity against variety of MDR gram negative organisms. For MRSA, vancomycin, teicoplanin and linezolid have most evidence. Linezolid is effective against vancomycin resistant enterococci. However, good quality RCTs for MDR infections are lacking in immunocompromised patients.

Recommendation

- Antibiotics like Fosfomycin, tigecycline and minocycline may be considered in infection with multidrug resistant bacteria in presence of in-vitro susceptibility after considering the in vivo penetration at source of sepsis, and if alternate agents with proven efficacy are not available or contraindicated (3A).
- Vancomycin or linezolid can be used in cases of MRSA (1A).

ANTIMICROBIAL GUIDELINES IN SOLID ORGAN TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS

What are the Common Infections in Post Solid Organ Transplant Patients? What should be the Preferred Approach to Empiric Therapy and Diagnostic Evaluation?

Evidence Statement

Incidence of sepsis in solid organ recipients ranges from 20% to 60% and is associated with in-hospital mortality of 5% to 40%. Nosocomial infections predominate in the first month, opportunistic infections till six months post transplant and subsequently community acquired infections become most

common. In the Most of these infections are of bacterial followed by fungal etiology. Most common site remains urinary tract infection, followed by line related infections, and *E.coli* the most common etiology. CMV is most common infection from 1 month upto 3 months, whereas tuberculosis reactivation is more common from 3 months to 1 year post transplantation. Pneumocystis and aspergillus infections are common after 1 year. MDR GNB isolates are increasing in prevalence, especially in nosocomial infections. Risk for developing sepsis with bacteremia can be lowered significantly by antibiotic prophylaxis. Prophylaxis is governed by type of transplant and risk of specific infections. Liver transplant patients often receive antibiotics covering skin flora, enterobacteriaceae, enterococci and anaerobes whereas post lung transplant, prophylaxis is against moulds, gram negative bacteria or colonisers. Post kidney transplantation trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole given for PJP prophylaxis reduces UTI and bacteremia. Alternatives include nitrofurantoin and cephalexin. Fluorquinolones increase risk of resistant infections like pseudomonas, and should be used with caution. Opportunistic infections have decreased due to anti-infective prophylaxis for CMV and PJP. TMP-SMX provides protection against toxoplasma, and protects against UTI, listeria meningitis and nocardial infections.

Recommendation

Anti-infective Prophylaxis

- Prophylaxis in first month post transplant should depend upon the nosocomial infections, colonisation of donor and recipient, and the organ transplanted (1A).
- Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) for primary prophylaxis for urinary tract infection (UTI) in renal transplant patients is recommended; TMP-SMX usually given for 6 months for PJP prophylaxis decreases UTI and bacteremia in renal transplant recipients (1A).
- Primary prophylaxis for UTI with agents other than TMP-SMX may be limited to the first month after transplant (3B).

Approach to Diagnosis and Treatment of Infection

- Infections in the first month (0–30 days) of post SOT period should be investigated and treated similarly to those of non-immunocompromised postoperative patient (1A).
- Infections in the first month (0–30 days) of post SOT period should be investigated and treated on the lines of nosocomial infections/ donor derived infections (1A).
- Complete blood count with differential, liver and renal function tests, serum electrolytes should be obtained in all patients with suspected infection (3A).
- We recommend obtaining blood cultures at presentation and preferably prior to initiation of antibiotics in all patients presenting with features suggestive of infection (3A).
- Antimicrobials should be administered considering prior cultures, local antibiogram and susceptibility patterns (1A).
- Asymptomatic bacteriuria (AB) should not be treated (1A) unless same pathogen has been isolated twice consecutively >10⁵ CFU/mL in first 2 months post SOT (2B) or AB is found in post kidney transplant recipients. (1B).
- Multi drug resistant (MDR) urinary tract infection (UTI) with Gram-negative bacteria such as *Pseudomonas spp* and *Klebsiella spp*, newer agents like ceftazidime-avibactam can be considered as alternatives to colistin or aminoglycosides. (1B).

Approach to Diagnosis and Treatment of Respiratory Infection

Evidence Statement

Acute respiratory failure (ARF) following SOT can be due to variety of infective and noninfective causes. Patterns of involvement on chest radiograph or CT scan can help to narrow down diagnosis. Ground glass opacities and micronodular infiltrates can suggest PJP or CMV, whereas lobar consolidation suggests bacterial etiology. Nodular infiltrates suggest fungal, tubercular or malignant etiology. Majority of cases of community acquired pneumonia have been seen after 6 months post transplantation. Early initiation of antibiotics after sending blood cultures in patients with septic shock leads to better outcomes. Organisms responsible for CAP include viruses, bacteria, fungal and mycobacteria. *Streptococcus pneumoniae* has been reported to be most common bacteria causing CAP, whereas *P. aeruginosa* was the most common microorganism isolated in nosocomial pneumonia. Bronchoscopic BAL leads to microbiologic diagnosis in upto 77% cases. CT Guided biopsy has been used for diagnosis of patients with lung nodules. Open lung biopsy has been reported to have high yield (85%) but with increased risk of complications. Empiric antimicrobial therapy for pneumonia in SOT patients would depend upon the net state of immunosuppression, the epidemiological exposures, the clinical and radiological profile of the patient, and the local antibiogram.

Recommendation

- We recommend obtaining chest radiograph in all patients with suspected pneumonia (2A).
- We recommend performing a chest computerized tomography (CT) scan in all SOT patients with pneumonia (I,A) and high resolution CT (HRCT) scan in patients with nodular infiltrates with suspected invasive aspergillosis (1A).
- We recommend obtaining nasopharyngeal swab for influenza virus testing by PCR if seasonally appropriate and high suspicion for viral pneumonia(1A).
- Early BAL should be considered in SOT patients with suspected pneumonia admitting to ICU (1A).
- We recommend BAL in patients with pulmonary infiltrates not improving on empiric antimicrobial therapy or in whom there is diagnostic uncertainty on non-invasive testing (1A).
 - BAL fluid should be tested for:
 - Stains and immunohistochemistry- Gram stain, KOH/ Calcofluor white, Auramine-rhodamine, auramine-o, or ziehl-neelson, Modified acid-fast stain, Silver methenamine stain, Galactomannan assay (<0.5 Negative predictive value, >3 positive predictive value)
 - Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)- Mycobacterium tuberculosis (Cartridge Based Nucleic Acid Amplification Test (CB-NAAT or GeneXpert), Multiplex PCR assay [(Including Respiratory viruses, CMV)(Quantitative or semiquantitative detection- particularly bacterial)].
 - Culture- Aerobic culture for bacteria, mycobacterial growth indicator tube (MGIT) for mycobacterium tuberculosis, fungal culture.
- Following organisms are diagnostic of infections. If identified, they are less likely to be the contaminants/ colonisers and should be treated: *Pneumocystis carinii*, *Toxoplasma gondii*, *Strongyloides stercoralis*, *Legionella pneumophila*, *Cryptococcus neoformans*, *Histoplasma capsulatum*, *Mycobacterium*

tuberculosis, *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, Influenza a and b viruses, Respiratory syncytial virus. (2A)

- Open/ Video- assisted thoracoscopy (VATS)/ CT guided/ transbronchial biopsy should be done in patients with lung infiltrates where the non-invasive testing/ BAL haven't been able to provide the diagnosis and who have failed to respond to therapy, after risk-benefit assessment on case to case basis (2A).
- Any prior microbial colonisation or antimicrobial resistance pattern of particular organisms should be considered while deciding empiric treatment for pneumonia in SOT patients, particularly so in case of colonisation of airway in lung transplant patients (3A).
- Empiric antibiotic therapy with carbapenem based on local susceptibility patterns for suspected community acquired bacterial pneumonia along with coverage of atypical / intracellular pathogens like *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, Chlamydia pneumonia, and Legionella spp. is recommended (2A). For the coverage of latter, among macrolides, consider using azithromycin instead of clarithromycin or erythromycin because of its relatively less likelihood to interact with immunosuppressants.
- For suspected viral pneumonia, adding antiviral for influenza should be considered (2A).
- We recommend empiric treatment of recipients requiring hospitalisation for pneumonia with broad spectrum antibiotics (carbapenem ± antipseudomonal ± anti MRSA) depending on local flora and resistance patterns, along with coverage for atypical organisms (2A).
- Antipseudomonal agent/ polymyxin should be added if the patient is admitted in the hospital for ≥ 48 hours before symptoms (nosocomial pneumonia) (2A), visited medical care (hemodialysis, wound care, immunosuppressants) within the previous 30 days, or hospitalised in an acute care hospital ≥ 2 days within the prior 90 days (UPP).
- Empiric antifungal therapy may be initiated where there is strong suspicion based on the clinical and radiological profile of the patient (3B).
- Empiric therapy should be initiated/ modified as per clinical, radiological and microbiological findings and response (2A).

CMV Management

Evidence Statement

CMV reactivation risk is increased in post SOT patients due to immunosuppression induced lymphopenia and lymphocyte anergy. Preoperative CMV-IgG serology of donor and recipient can be used to assess risk and guide prophylaxis. In post transplant period, CMV DNA using quantitative nucleic acid amplification is the diagnostic modality of choice. Detection of CMV by QNAT in BAL fluid and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) is feasible. For end organ CMV disease, histopathologic diagnosis is the gold standard. CMV retinitis is diagnosed based on ophthalmologic examination. RT-PCR was a more reliable tool to monitor the response to therapy. Pre-emptive therapy is used for most SOT recipients, however, lung transplant patients should receive prophylaxis. Valganciclovir and intravenous ganciclovir have good efficacy and are used for prophylaxis and disease respectively. Letermovir has been shown to be noninferior to valganciclovir for prophylaxis in post renal transplant patients. Post prophylaxis delayed onset CMV disease

occurs in donor positive recipient negative SOT recipients three to six months after completion of antiviral prophylaxis and should be treated with pre-emptive therapy. High dose ganciclovir or foscarnet are effective in empiric treatment of refractory disease, along with cautious reduction in immunosuppression. Immunoglobulins as adjunct therapy have been used in refractory disease.

Recommendation

Antiviral Prophylaxis

- Antiviral prophylaxis should be initiated within 10 days post SOT in all at-risk recipients for prevention of CMV infection/ disease (1A).
- Valganciclovir (oral 900 mg once daily) or intravenous ganciclovir (5 mg/kg IV once daily) should be used for prophylaxis in all SOT recipients. Only in post kidney transplant patients, high dose oral valganciclovir (2gram qid) may be used as an alternative agent (1A).
- The duration of prophylactic therapy depends upon the CMV serostatus of the donor (D) and recipient (R) pre-transplant and the specific organ transplanted (Table 5).
- For patients receiving lymphocyte-depleting anti-lymphocyte antibodies (e.g. anti-thymocyte globulin ATG) for rejection, antiviral prophylaxis with valganciclovir or intravenous ganciclovir should be initiated (1A).

Pre-emptive Therapy

- Pre-emptive therapy for prevention of CMV disease in asymptomatic CMV infection in SOT patients (tested weekly post-transplant for up to 12 weeks or longer) with valganciclovir 900mg twice daily or intravenous ganciclovir (5 mg/kg twice daily) should be initiated once the predefined viral load threshold has been achieved, and duration be guided by viral load monitoring (ie, CMV DNAemia or antigenemia below the predefined threshold or not detected) (1A).
- Antiviral prophylaxis is preferred over pre-emptive therapy for prevention of CMV disease heart transplant patients (1A).
- Preemptive therapy is not recommended for prevention of CMV disease in lung transplant patients (1A).

Therapy for CMV Disease

- We recommend CMV DNA by QNAT as the laboratory method of choice for rapid diagnosis of CMV infection in blood after SOT (1A)
- We recommend treatment of CMV disease with intravenous ganciclovir (5mg/kg 12th hourly) or oral valganciclovir (900 mg twice daily) (in renally adjusted dosages) (1A).
- For severe or life-threatening CMV disease, very high viral load, and doubtful gastrointestinal absorption, use of intravenous ganciclovir is recommended (1A).
- Oral valganciclovir is an effective initial therapy for mild to moderate CMV disease (I, A), or as a step down to intravenous ganciclovir after clinical improvement (2B)
- Foscarnet and cidofovir can be used only as second-line agents for SOT recipients (due to high risk of nephrotoxicity associated) who are unable to tolerate intravenous ganciclovir or valganciclovir (2A).
- We recommend against use of acyclovir, valganciclovir, and oral ganciclovir for treatment of CMV disease (1A).
- We recommend a duration of treatment with antiviral for a minimum of two weeks and till there is resolution of clinical signs

along with viral clearance as tested by weekly CMV quantitative NAT (QNAT: polymerase chain reaction- PCR). (1A)

- After completion of full-dose antiviral treatment, a 1 to 3 months course of secondary prophylaxis may be considered depending on the clinical situation (2B).
- We recommend monitoring complete blood count with differential and serum creatinine weekly for assessment of potential haematologic and renal toxicity. (1A)
- The drug dosage of antiviral should be adjusted as per the renal function test. (1A)
- The drug dosage of antiviral should not be decreased due to neutropenia or pancytopenia (1A). Haematopoietic growth factors may be used to counter the myelosuppressive effect of the drugs.
- Cautious reduction in immunosuppression should be considered in SOT patients presenting with CMV disease, especially if the disease is moderate to severe, or with severe lymphopenia or with refractory/ resistant CMV disease (2B).
- Empiric treatment of suspected resistant CMV disease include high-dose intravenous ganciclovir (up to 10 mg/kg q12 hours, renally adjusted) or foscarnet. Definitive antiviral treatment should be guided by results of genotypic testing. (2B)
- CMV immunoglobulin or IVIg may be used as an adjunct to antiviral drugs in transplant recipients with life-threatening disease, CMV pneumonitis or resistant CMV disease. (2B).

Tuberculosis (TB) in SOT Recipient

Evidence Summary

Incidence of tuberculosis is higher as compared to general population. Upto 50% cases of tuberculosis can be disseminated or extrapulmonary in post SOT patients. Atypical clinical presentations, less sputum positivity and false negative tuberculin and IGRA tests lead to delays in diagnosis. Radiological investigations like CT scan along with bronchoscopy, BAL or histopathologic evaluation from involved site are needed for prompt diagnosis. Rifampin containing regimens reduce serum concentrations of tacrolimus, cyclosporine, sirolimus and everolimus, whereas rifampin free regimens increase the duration of antitubercular therapy.

Recommendation

- The diagnosis of active TB in transplant recipients requires a high index of suspicion. Although the diagnostic modalities and treatment of TB in SOT patients remains the same as that in immunocompetent hosts, these individuals often require an invasive procedure, such as bronchoscopy with BAL or lung biopsy (1A).
- Rifamycins, particularly rifampin, reduce serum concentrations of tacrolimus, cyclosporine, rapamycin (sirolimus), and everolimus via induction of the cytochrome p450 isoenzyme CYP3A4, necessary dose adjustments, and therapeutic drug monitoring are warranted to avoid development of rejection (II, A). When rifampin is not used, a longer than usual duration of treatment is required (2B).

Infective Diarrhoea in SOT Recipient

Evidence Statement

Diarrhoea in post transplant patients can be due to infectious and non-infectious causes. Drug induced diarrhea and infections are most common reported causes. Bacterial infections, parasitic infections (giardiasis) and viral infections (CMV, norovirus) are

common infectious causes. Due to frequent exposure to antibiotics and frequent hospitalisation, *clostridium difficile* associated diarrhea is also common. Stool investigations should be performed for all suspected organisms. The initial management of C difficile infection (CDI) remains similar to non-transplant patients.

Recommendation

- We recommend empiric management of gastrointestinal infections/ diarrhoea with ceftriaxone iv + ganciclovir 5mg/kg BD IV and vancomycin 125mg PO QID (if the patient is already on antibiotics to cover CDI) till definitive diagnosis is made (1A).
- If the patient is in septic shock, based on local resistance pattern, and previous drug history of patient consider carbapenems (UPP).
- We recommend cessation of the inciting antimicrobial agent whenever possible (2A).
- We recommend using a NAAT alone or a multistep algorithm for testing (ie, GDH plus toxin; or NAAT plus toxin) rather than a toxin test alone for the diagnosis in stool specimens likely to be having *Clostridium difficile* infection CDI (2A).
- For treatment of CDI in adults, either vancomycin (125mg given 4 times daily orally for adults; 40 to 50mg/kg/day divided QID for pediatric patients, not to exceed adult dosing; for 10-14 days) or fidaxomicin (200mg given twice daily orally for 10 days) is recommended over metronidazole (1A). If these agents aren't available, metronidazole 500mg 3 times daily by mouth can be used as an alternative.
- We recommend oral vancomycin up to 500 mg orally QID in adults for the treatment of severe/fulminant CDI (I,A). If ileus, consider adding rectal instillation of vancomycin 500mg in 100ml normal saline as retention enema 4 times a day (2B).
- Intravenous metronidazole 500 mg intravenously every 8 hours may be administered together with oral or rectal vancomycin (1B).
- In cases of multiple recurrences of CDI, we recommend prolonged courses of oral vancomycin, either in a tapering or pulse dose schedule (2A). Fidaxomicin can be used if available (2B)
- Faecal microbiota transplant (FMT) may be considered in recurrent or relapsing CDI (2B).
- We suggest consideration for surgical intervention in cases of complicated CDI. (2B).

Invasive Fungal Infection in SOT Recipients

Evidence Statement

SOT recipients are at increased risk of fungal infections, highest risk in small bowel transplant, followed by lung, liver, heart, pancreas and kidney transplant. Invasive candidiasis is most common fungal infection, followed by aspergillosis, cryptococcosis, non-aspergillus moulds, endemic fungi and zygomycosis. Emerging candida strains that are drug resistant are a cause for concern and pose challenge in the management. India data is limited, and mucormycosis is the commonest infection. Candida infections are most commonly blood stream infections followed by intraabdominal infections. Aspergillus colonisation and infection is associated with increased mortality in lung transplant recipients. Various diagnostic modalities including serum markers such as beta-D glucan, galactomannan, imaging (CT scan), bronchoscopic evaluation or histologic evaluation of involved site lead to early diagnosis.

Voriconazole remains the drug of choice for treatment of IA, isavuconazole and lipid formulations AmpB being the alternative agents. Echinocandins can be used as salvage therapy. Isavuconazole is non-inferior to voriconazole for the primary treatment of invasive mold disease caused by *Aspergillus* and other filamentous fungi. Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) for azole antifungals (especially voriconazole and posaconazole) improves clinical efficacy and is preferred. For IC or candidemia, echinocandins remain the drug of choice and in a clinically stable patient it can be switched to fluconazole if the *Candida* isolate is susceptible to fluconazole. Duration is dependent on culture negativity and resolution of features of invasive candidiasis.

Recommendation

Invasive Aspergillosis (IA) Treatment

- It is recommended not to use serum galactomannan (GM) to diagnose IA in SOT patients (1A)
- Serum or BAL beta-D-Glucan should not be used to screen or diagnose SOT patients for IA (1B).
- BAL GM is the preferred parameter for diagnosis of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis and a value of ≥ 1.0 in combination with other fungal diagnostic methods is used to diagnose IA in SOT recipients (1A)
- For IA or positive BAL galactomannan, we recommend voriconazole in the dose of 6mg/kg bd for 1 day f/b 3mg/kg bd (1A).
- Isavuconazole and lipid formulations of Amphotericin B (AmB) can be used as alternative agents (1A).
- As a salvage therapy, posaconazole can be used where patients fail to respond or are intolerant to first line agents (1B).
- Echinocandins are not recommended as a primary therapy (1B) and can be used only as a salvage therapy or as a second agent where combination therapy is being considered (3B).
- We recommend therapeutic drug level monitoring (TDM) for voriconazole when using it for the treatment of IA (1A).
- We recommend that treatment be continued for minimum 12 weeks, if tolerated, and guided by clinical and radiological response (1A).

Other Emerging Fungal Infections

- For infection by mucormycetes, lipid formulations of AmB is the drug of choice for induction therapy (1A).
- Posaconazole or isavuconazole can be used as alternative agents for induction and for maintenance therapy (2B).
- Surgical excision or debridement is recommended for all wherever feasible, particularly for mucormycetes infection outside of lungs (2A).
- For trichosporon, azoles are the recommended first line agents (3A), subject to the susceptibility.

Pneumocystis Jirovecii Infection Management

Evidence Statement

Incidence of PJP infections in SOT recipients ranges from 0.6% to 9% in various studies. Risk depends on degree of immunosuppression. PJP infection, in turn, leads to more episodes of rejection and increased need for steroids and immunosuppression. TMP-SMX has high efficacy and availability in both oral and IV preparation with good oral bioavailability. The optimal duration of therapy is usually 14 days which can be extended to 21 days in severe cases with slow clinical improvement. Adjunctive glucocorticoids are recommended for moderate to severe PCP. PJP prophylaxis reduces incidence of PJP in the first year after transplant.

Recommendation

Anti-pneumocystis Prophylaxis

- We recommend anti-pneumocystis prophylaxis to all SOT recipients for 6 to 12 months post transplant, particularly for centres with incidence $\geq 3\%$ -5% among transplant recipients (1A).
- Longer duration of prophylaxis may be considered in patients with prior history of PJP (*Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia) infection, chronic CMV infection, higher intensity of immunosuppression, lung and small bowel transplant recipients, prolonged neutropenia (1A).
- Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) is the drug of choice for prophylaxis of PJP, in a (adult) dose of either 80mg TMP/400 mg SMX (single strength) daily or 160mg TMP/800 mg SMX (double strength) orally three times weekly (1A).

PJP Treatment

- We recommend TMP-SMX as the first-line agent and drug of choice with the Trimethoprim component being 15-20 mg/kg / day in 3 to 4 divided doses (1A).
- In severe infections, if available, intravenous pentamidine probably remains the second-line agent after TMP-SMX (2A). Its usage should be avoided in pancreas transplant recipients (1B).
- Primaquine and clindamycin in combination may be used as alternative in mild to moderate infection. However, primaquine should be avoided in G6PD deficient patients, and association of *clostridium difficile* associated diarrhoea (CDAD) with long term usage of clindamycin should be considered. (2B)
- In patients with hypoxemia ($\text{PaO}_2 < 70$ mmHg on room air), adjunctive corticosteroids should be administered with antimicrobial therapy, ideally within 72 hours of initiating antimicrobial therapy for maximum benefit (2A). The dose of steroids should be 1 mg/kg/day prednisone (or equivalent) given in two divided doses daily for 5 to 7 days (2A). Steroids should be tapered over a period of 7 to 14 days (2B).
- Duration of antimicrobial therapy should be for at least 14 days (1B)

CNS Infections in SOT Recipients

Evidence Statement

SOT patients with altered sensorium have multifactorial causes and need extensive work up, with MRI being the initial preferred imaging modality. Empirical regimens with bactericidal or fungicidal agents having CNS penetration are initiated at admission, until definitive diagnosis. Common pathogens causing CNS infections in SOT are viral followed by fungal and bacterial agents. Viral meningoencephalitis is most common CNS disease in large prospective studies. Thus, antibiotics covering both gram positive and gram negative pathogens alongwith Acyclovir is part of initial empiric regimen. Amphotericin B plus 5-flucytosine is used as initial treatment of cryptococcal meningitis.

Recommendation

- We recommend initial workup for suspected CNS infections should include (1A)
 - MRI over CT scan
 - CSF analysis including India ink preparation
 - Rapid multiplex PCR on CSF
 - Serum cryptococcal antigen

- We recommend empiric treatment to be started with Ceftriaxone + Vancomycin + Acyclovir (1A)
- We recommend liposomal Amphotericin B or AmB lipid complex (ABLC) plus flucytosine as the initial treatment for *Cryptococcus* for minimum 2 weeks for CNS disease, disseminated disease, or moderate-to-severe pulmonary disease (1A). Alternatively, liposomal AmB or ABLC can be used for minimum duration of 4 to 6 weeks (1B).

Nocardia in SOT Recipients

Evidence Statement

Nocardia infection can occur post solid organ transplants. Lung transplant patients seem to be at highest risk. TMP-SMX, carbapenems and linezolid have efficacy against nocardia. Combination therapy is recommended in critically ill patients with pulmonary, cerebral and disseminated nocardial infection.

Recommendation

We recommend the following regimens for treatment of post-transplant nocardia infections

1. Pulmonary: TMP-SMX (1A) (TMP-SMX 15 mg/kg in 3-4 divided doses, for 6 to 12 months)
2. Disseminated or CNS, Critically ill: Imipenem plus TMP-SMX or Amikacin (2A)
3. Alternative: Linezolid, Meropenem (1A)

Multidrug Resistant (MDR) Infections in SOT Recipients

Evidence Statement

Carbapenems are effective for treatment of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae. For Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE), preferred antibiotics are ceftazidime/avibactam is preferred, whereas ceftazidime/avibactam plus aztreonam or ceftiderocol monotherapy are useful in metallo- β -lactamase producing CRE. Tigecycline is useful in treatment of CRE infections outside the urinary tract, and in absence of bacteremia, as combination therapy. For MDR pseudomonas, effective drugs are antipseudomonal β -lactam or Ceftolozane/tazobactam or Ceftazidime/avibactam. For carbapenem resistant acinetobacter, high dose ampicillin-sulbactam, tetracycline derivatives (minocycline/ tigecycline), polymyxin B, or ceftiderocol are options for combination therapy. For MDR *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*, combination therapy with two agents (TMP-SMX, minocycline/ tigecycline, ceftiderocol, or levofloxacin) is effective. However, critically ill patients can be treated with ceftazidime-avibactam plus aztreonam. For MRSA, vancomycin with therapeutic drug monitoring has most evidence. Linezolid can be used for skin and soft tissue infection (SSTI) and nosocomial pneumonia. Teicoplanin is another efficacious alternative.

Recommendation

Empiric antibiotics for MDR pathogens should be chosen to cover the suspected pathogen spectrum and local microbiology (2A).

The Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Positive Patient in the Intensive Care Unit

Evidence Statement

Respiratory failure is the most important cause of ICU admission among HIV patients. Causes of community acquired pneumonia are similar to non-HIV patients. However, tuberculosis, and opportunistic infections (like *Pneumocystis jirovecii*, *cryptococcus*,

CMV) are also common, and can present with respiratory failure. Viral infections like influenza and covid-19 are other important causes. Increasing age, comorbidities, severity of illness, extent of organ dysfunction and cART naivety are predictors of increased mortality.

Recommendation

- Patients with severe pneumonia who require intensive care and without risk of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* should be empirically treated with an IV β -lactam plus IV macrolide (2A). Preferred β -lactams are ceftriaxone, cefotaxime, or amoxicillin-clavulanic acid. In patients who are allergic to penicillin, aztreonam plus azithromycin should be used (3A).
- If patients with HIV/AIDS develop acute respiratory failure and they have any of the risk factors (Table 1) for *Pseudomonas* infection we recommend dual antipseudomonal coverage such as anti-pseudomonal β -lactam plus aminoglycoside (examples of anti-pseudomonal β -lactams include ceftazidime, cefoperazone, cefoperazone-sulbactam, piperacillin-tazobactam, imipenem-cilastatin, or meropenem (3A).
- In patients who are allergic to penicillin, aztreonam can be used in place of the β -lactam. Combination therapy may be considered with the addition of aminoglycosides or antipseudomonal fluoroquinolones (e.g., levofloxacin, ciprofloxacin) (3A).
- We recommend continuing Azithromycin along with anti-pseudomonal therapy for coverage of atypical pathogens (2B).
- We recommend against using fluoroquinolones empirically to avoid development of drug-resistant TB. Patients should also undergo sputum testing for acid-fast *bacilli* simultaneously if fluoroquinolones are being used (3A).
- In patients who have risk factors for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infection—empiric treatment should include vancomycin or linezolid (3A).
- Empiric therapy should cover *P. aeruginosa* or MRSA if previously isolated from sputum cultures (3A).
- Steroids are not indicated except in cases of refractory shock (2A).
- We suggest the addition of clindamycin (to vancomycin, but not to linezolid) in cases of severe necrotizing pneumonia to minimize bacterial toxin production (3B).
- Those with CD4 counts $<200/\text{mm}^3$ and without signs of focal consolidation may be suspected to have PCP (2A).
- All diagnosed cases of HIV should receive cART and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) for PCP prophylaxis to reduce the risk of pneumonia (1A).
- A switch to oral therapy should be considered in patients with community acquired pneumonia (CAP) on IV antibiotic therapy who have improved clinically, can swallow, and tolerate oral medications, and have intact gastrointestinal function (2A).
- cART should be initiated promptly within 2 weeks of initiating therapy for the pneumonia if not started (2A).
- Diagnostic work up of acute respiratory failure in HIV patient should consist of: (3A)
 - Complete blood count with CD4 cell count
 - Sputum microscopy and culture especially for acid fast bacilli (AFB), Nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) for TB.
 - Chest imaging, lung ultrasound
 - Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) for culture, staining with Gomori-Grocott or Giemsa or direct fluorescence antibody for PCP, PCR

- Blood culture
- BAL 1, 3 beta-D-glucan (BDG)
- Urine antigen for *L. pneumophila* and *S. pneumoniae*
- Serum LDH, BDG
- Rule out non-infectious causes of respiratory failure- COPD, Bronchiectasis, lung cancer, heart failure, lung fibrosis, interstitial pneumonitis, drug toxicity, asthma, pulmonary embolism (3A).

Hiv Positive Patient Presenting with Signs of CNS Infection in ICU

Evidence Statement

Patients with HIV and low CD4 counts are prone to opportunistic CNS infections like toxoplasmosis, tuberculosis, cryptococcosis. Less common opportunistic CNS infections are CMV, nocardiosis, aspergillosis, and neurosyphilis. CNS mass lesions and lymphoma are also common with low CD4 counts, Multiple etiologies can often co-exist. Clinical and laboratory evaluation and prompt management is associated with improved outcomes.

Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS) is another differential if cART is started in undiagnosed or partially treated opportunistic infections.

cART should be continued in the HIV patients admitted to intensive care unit as much as possible.

Recommendation

- For a patient coming to ICU with altered CNS function and suspicion of meningitis, we recommend a third-generation cephalosporin- known to penetrate the blood-brain barrier - at higher doses, e.g., Ceftriaxone 2 gm BD intravenously (1A).
- We suggest the addition of vancomycin empirically to the initial treatment regime (1B).
- We recommend de-escalating antibiotics after culture reports are available (1A).
- In patients above 50 years of age, we suggest the use of additional ampicillin at high doses of 2 gm every 6th hourly (1B).
- In very young infants of age <1 month, we suggest Ampicillin plus cefotaxime or ampicillin plus an aminoglycoside as the initial management (1B).
- Diagnostic work up for CNS infection in HIV patient should consist of: (3A)
 - Complete blood count with CD4 cell count
 - Lumbar puncture, CSF (Cerebrospinal fluid) for cell count, glucose, protein, ADA (Adenosine deaminase), lactate, culture, PCR
 - For immunocompromised host- *Toxoplasma gondi* IgG antigen and antibodies, cryptococcal antigen (serum and CSF)
 - Brain imaging preferably MRI (Magnetic resonance Imaging)

HIV Positive Patients Presenting with Suspected Bloodstream Infections or Sepsis of Unknown Origin

Evidence Statement

Lack of cART, low CD4 count, alcohol abuse, smoking, and comorbidities such as liver disease are risk factors associated with bacteremia in HIV patients, Common organisms seem to be non-typhoid *Salmonellae*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and coagulase-negative *Staphylococci*. Unidifferentiated fever in patients with low CD4 counts may be due to viral syndromes such as CMV, Disseminated mycobacterial disease, disseminated fungal disease or noninfectious etiology.

Disseminated opportunistic infections may trigger hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis. Drug-resistant organisms are also seen more commonly in HIV patients. Extensive diagnostic work up is needed in HIV patients with sepsis of unknown origin. In-hospital mortality in HIV patients depends on age, underlying comorbidities and extent of organ dysfunctions and not HIV related parameters such as viral load, CD4 cell count, admission for AIDS-related diagnoses, and prior cART use.

Recommendation

- In the presence of sepsis or septic shock, we recommend following the surviving sepsis guidelines like the management of other patients with sepsis (UPP).
- In the absence of septic shock or absence of risk factors for *Pseudomonas* a monotherapy with a third-generation cephalosporin or a cephalosporin, the b-lactamase inhibitor is sufficient (2A).
- In more severe disease states, such as in the presence of organ dysfunction or septic shock—a combination of broad-spectrum antibiotics may be used for initial empiric therapy (3A).
- Empiric gram-positive coverage is suggested for those who have risk factors for MRSA (UPP).
- Anti-fungal agents may be considered only if there is no clinical improvement or there is clinical deterioration even after 72 hours of appropriate empirical antibiotics therapy and CD4 counts <200/mm³ (2A).
- We recommend against the use of routine empirical antifungal therapy (2A).

CONGENITAL AND ACQUIRED HYPOSPLENISM AND ASPLENIA

What should be the Approach to Empiric Therapy in Patients with Hyposplenism or Asplenia who Develop Sepsis?

Evidence Statement

Patients with congenital and acquired hyposplenism/ asplenia are at high risk for encapsulated bacterial infections like *Neisseria meningitidis*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Hemophilus influenzae* type b. These patients are more likely to have severe sepsis, and overwhelming post-splenectomy infection (OPSI). OPSI can present with flu-like illness at onset, and rapidly progress to septic shock and death, and therefore needs prompt institution of antibiotics covering for both gram positive and gram negative organisms under close observation in high dependency or intensive care units.

Recommendation

- If an asplenic or hyposplenic patient is suspected to have sepsis we recommend administration of IV ceftriaxone before transferring the patient to a higher centre (2A).
- We recommend that all patients with Overwhelming Post-Splenectomy Infection (OPSI) be treated in the ICU (UPP).
- We recommend empiric antibiotic therapy for asplenic patients with a combination of ceftriaxone and vancomycin. (1A).
- In case of allergy to β-lactams, we recommend vancomycin with aztreonam or fluoroquinolones in adults. Do not delay administration of antibiotics, be prepared to treat reaction (UPP).
- We recommend to add clarithromycin or erythromycin in case of respiratory symptoms (3A).

- We recommend empiric therapy with IV Cefotaxime + vancomycin+ ampicillin, if the patient age <2 months (3A).
 - All febrile asplenic patients should be screened for malaria with peripheral smears. Start artesunate based antimalarial therapy, if the history is suggestive of Malaria (UPP).
 - If gram staining of peripheral blood smear shows gram negative bacilli, we recommend addition of antipseudomonal coverage to the therapy (3A).
 - We recommend that urine be checked for urinary antigen for streptococcus pneumonia. (2A).
 - We suggest RT-PCR test for simultaneous identification of 3 main encapsulated bacteria (Str pneumonia, H. influenzae type B and N. meningitidis) (3B).
 - We recommend that all asplenic patients should receive immunization against encapsulated bacteria (S. pneumoniae, H. influenzae, and N. meningitidis) (1A).
 - Immunization against seasonal flu is recommended for patients over 6 months of age (1A).
 - Vaccination programs should be started no sooner than 14 days after splenectomy (1A).
 - If the patient is discharged before 15 days after splenectomy or angioembolization, where the risk to miss vaccination is deemed high, we suggest that patient be vaccinated before discharge (1B).
 - Antibiotic prophylaxis is indicated in patients for 1-2 years after splenectomy and lifelong for patient had an episode of overwhelming infection or immunocompromised (2B).
 - We recommend self-administration of one dose of, in stock "pill in pocket", prescribed antibiotics in the event of any sudden onset of unexplained fever, malaise, chills or other constitutional symptoms, when medical consultation not readily accessible within 2 hours (2A).
 - We suggest that any patient with sepsis having risk factor for hyposplenia, the peripheral smear should be checked for Howell-Jolly bodies. (2B)
 - We recommend formulation of Spleen registry. (UPP).
- Two or more serious sinus infections or pneumonias within 1 year
 - Two or more months on antibiotics with little effect
 - Two or more deep seated infections including septicemia
 - Persistent thrush in mouth or fungal infection on skin
 - Infections in multiple anatomic locations
 - Increasing frequency and severity of infections with age
 - Recurrent serious infections with common pathogens
 - Serious infections with unusual pathogens
 - We recommend that when PID is suspected, HIV infection should also be considered, and testing should be performed for HIV (UPP).
 - We recommend that patient should be investigated for PID when: (3A)
 - In neonates, Absolute Lymphocyte count (ALC) of <2000/mm³ in cord blood or in an infant an ALC of <4000/mm³
 - Severe hypogammaglobulinemia with IgG <1 50mg/dL.
 - Absolute Lymphocyte count <4000/mm³ (In non-chemotherapy setting)
 - Unusual organism picked up on microbiology
 - Unexplained neutropenia
 - We recommend that Initial laboratory screening should include a complete blood count with differential counts (including Absolute Lymphocyte Count, Absolute Neutrophil Count, Absolute Monocyte Count) and measurement of serum immunoglobulin and complement levels (UPP).
 - We recommend Severe Combined Immune deficiency (SCID) be considered as a pediatric emergency and attention be paid to Absolute Lymphocyte Count, at all time in ICU. If the Absolute Lymphocyte Count is less than normal for the age, we recommend to take immunology reference, use irradiated blood products, and avoid live vaccines till diagnosis is confirmed or ruled out (UPP).
 - We recommend that patient be investigated for Combined Variable Immuno-deficiency (CVID) when patient has any of the following: (UPP)
 - Recurrent bacterial infections.
 - Serum IgG, IgM, IgA levels (at least two of the three) with a marked decrease (at least 2 SD below the mean for age)
 - Onset of immunodeficiency at more than 2 years of age.
 - Absence of isohemagglutinins and or poor response to vaccines.
 - We recommend that immunology consult be obtained for these patients and the patient be investigated to diagnose specific form of immunodeficiency (UPP)
 - Lymphocyte subpopulations by Flow cytometry (CD3, CD4, CD8, CD19, CD20, CD16 & CD56).
 - Naive T cells, Memory B cells, Memory T cells
 - T-cell response to mitogens.
 - Nitroblue Tetrazolium-NBT test
 - Complement levels
 - Bone Marrow and Genetic tests
 - We recommend for all critically ill patients with suspicion of PID the empirical antimicrobial treatment with IV Carbapenems with IV Vancomycin/Teicoplanin for broad spectrum coverage.(UPP, A). Voriconazole is the preferred antifungal in case of proven, possible or probable invasive fungal infection with aspergillus (IA).
 - In critically ill patients diagnosed with Combined B and T cell deficiency the antimicrobial drug of choice is IV

Patients with Primary Immune Deficiency in the ICU

Evidence Statement

A diagnosis of primary immunodeficiency should be considered in patients with serious infections. Significant family history, hematologic abnormalities like neutropenia, lymphopenia, recurrent infections, or infections with uncommon organisms can lead to evaluation for primary immunodeficiency. Recurrent sinopulmonary infections are seen with humoral immunodeficiencies. Recurrent infections with organisms like tuberculosis or endemic fungi should lead to evaluation for cell mediated immunodeficiency. Microbiologic diagnosis is important in patients with suspected immunodeficiency due to higher incidence of co-infections and drug resistant infections. In patients with primary immunodeficiency with serious infections, empiric coverage for causative organisms, including viruses and invasive fungal infections is practiced. Treatment for underlying immunodeficiency (e.g., intravenous immunoglobulin therapy) and comorbid autoimmune conditions improves outcomes.

Recommendations

- PID should be suspected when the following history/symptoms or signs are present: (UPP)
 - Family history of sibling death
 - Four or more ear infections within 1 year

- Carbapenems with Vancomycin/Teicoplanin and Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole (UPP).
- In critically ill patients diagnosed with Combined B and T cell deficiency with suspicion of viral infections, we recommend: (UPP)
 - IV Acyclovir if herpes group of infection is suspected
 - Oral Oseltamavir if Influenza virus is suspected
 - IV Ganciclovir if CMV is suspected radiologically or by laboratory tests
 - In critically ill patients diagnosed with B cell deficiency, based on the organisms expected (Capsulated), we recommend IV ceftriaxone with IV Vancomycin/ Teicoplanin (UPP).
 - We recommend IV Immunoglobulin (IVIg) at dose of 1 gm/kg weekly in cases of severe infections especially ECHO/Enterovirus/ Polio virus induced encephalitis (UPP).
 - In critically ill patients diagnosed with Phagocyte disorder we recommend
 - Antimicrobial drug of choice to be IV Carbapenems with IV Vancomycin/ Teicoplanin and Voriconazole (UPP)
 - We recommend the use of Granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF) in patients of congenital Neutropenia (UPP).
 - In critically ill patients diagnosed with complement deficiency the antimicrobial drug of choice is IV Cephalosporin (UPP).
 - We recommend appropriate cultures, and PCRs; for organisms likely to cause infections pertinent to the conditions they are suffering from (UPP).
 - Attempt should be made to identify the microorganisms directly or on PCRs as serological tests in infectious diseases could give false-negative results if there is an antibody defect (UPP).
 - We recommend the use of Multiplex PCR to help diagnose infections (UPP).
 - We recommend intravenous Immunoglobulin for treatment of all antibody deficiency diseases, at doses of 400 mg/kg/doses every 4 weekly. We recommend 2 gm/kg single dose (Severe Infections) or 1 gm/kg weekly till infection subsides (UPP).
 - We recommend to maintain serum IgG trough levels above 500mg/dl and above 700 mg/dL in bronchiectasis (3A).
 - We recommend thoracic computed axial tomography, lung function tests with spirometry and DLCO every 6 months after discharge (UPP).
 - We recommend hematopoietic stem cell transplantation in cellular and macrophage immunodeficiency (UPP).
 - We recommend monoclonal antibodies such as rituximab only in autoimmune complications related to CVID (UPP).
 - We recommend Rituximab be given in PID complicated with EBV viremia (UPP).
- We recommend vaccination for diagnosed patients with complement deficiency at time of discharge (UPP).
 - We recommend avoiding BCG vaccination in Chronic Granulomatous Disease /MSMD patient (UPP).
 - We recommend antifungal and anti PCP prophylaxis for all patients diagnosed with PID shifted from ICU (UPP).
 - PID patients with chronic granulomatous disease should be treated with Itraconazole (IA) and Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole (2A).
 - PCP prophylaxis should be given to all patients with Combined B and T or T cell deficiency with drug of choice being Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole (1A).
 - We recommend antifungal prophylaxis in all patients with T cell defects (3A).

What should be the Approach to Vaccinations and Antimicrobial Prophylaxis at Discharge for Patients with Primary Immunodeficiency Requiring Intensive Care?

Evidence Statement

Live vaccines are contraindicated in SCID whereas all vaccines are safe and effective in complement deficiency. Antifungal prophylaxis and PCP prophylaxis are important to prevent invasive life-threatening infections in patients with PID.

Recommendations

- All forms of live vaccines, viral and bacterial, are contraindicated in patients with SCID (UPP).

INTRODUCTION

Severe infections are common indications requiring admission to intensive care units (ICU). For these patients, effective antibiotic therapy is lifesaving. The resistance to currently available antibiotics has increased over the last few years. Secondly, only a few new antibiotics have been marketed over the last few years and will be available in the coming years. Another issue is the ever increasing number of admissions of immunocompromised patients in the intensive care units due to the availability of effective treatment options for acquired immunodeficiency states and cancer, resulting in prolonged survival and cure, use of multiple lines of myelosuppressive therapies at diagnosis and relapse, and better outcomes in these patients. The best way to preserve the efficacy of existing antibiotics is to use these drugs appropriately. One way to do this may be to increase awareness and develop guidelines for the prescription of antibiotics. International guidelines on antibiotic prescription in ICUs have been framed. The Indian Society of Critical Care Medicine also formulated guidelines for empiric antibiotics in intensive care units and immunocompromised patients.^{1,2} Regular updation of guidelines is important with arrival of new research and evidence.

Scope of the Guidelines

The scope of these guidelines includes antibiotic prescription for common bacterial infections for pneumonia (community acquired, hospital acquired and ventilator associated), blood stream infections, abdominal infection (hepato-biliary, pancreatic, urogenital), central nervous system, skin and soft tissue infections in patients admitted in ICU. These guidelines also include recommendations for use of empiric antimicrobials in immunocompromised patients.

METHODOLOGY

This document is the latest effort to improve existing antibiotic prescription guidelines in the intensive care unit (ICU) and antimicrobial prescription guidelines in critically ill immunocompromised patients under the aegis of Indian Society of Critical Care Medicine.^{1,2} The committee was composed of experts from various fields specializing in ICU infections and was divided into five groups. The team updated the evidence by extensively reviewing the literature through various electronic databases, including Pubmed and Embase. The team also reviewed cross-references from articles and all major international guidelines on the topic. The experts in each group exchanged and reviewed relevant literature, and consensus was reached on the scope and questions

Table 1: Criteria for level of evidence and grading of strength of recommendations used in formulation of current guidelines

<i>Quality of evidence</i>	<i>Level</i>
Evidence from ≥ 1 good quality and well conducted randomized control trial(s) or meta-analysis of RCT's.	1
Evidence from at least 1 RCT of moderate quality, or well-designed clinical trial without randomization; or from cohort or case-controlled studies.	2
Evidence from descriptive studies, reports of expert committees, or opinions respected authorities based on clinical experience.	3
Not backed by sufficient evidence; however, a consensus reached by the working group based on clinical experience and expertise.	Useful practice point (UPP)
<i>Strength of Recommendation</i>	<i>Grade</i>
Strong recommendation to do (or not to do) where the benefits clearly outweigh the risk (or vice versa) for most, if not all patients.	A
Weak recommendation, where benefits and risk are more closely balanced or are more uncertain.	B

that needed to be addressed in formulating the guidelines. After thorough discussions and review, the guidelines were framed to ensure their reliability and relevance in clinical practice. Modified Grade System was utilized to classify the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations (Table 1). Draft document thus formulated was reviewed by all committee members; comments and suggestions were incorporated after discussion, and a final document was prepared. The final document was reviewed and accepted by all expert committee members.

Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics

Pharmacokinetics deals with the time course of drug absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion while pharmacodynamics involves relationship between drug concentration and its effects including toxicity. Each antibiotic has its own pharmacokinetic profile though each class of antibiotics has its class specific properties as well. Each class of antimicrobials has a different pharmacodynamic profile based on different inhibitory characteristics on bacteria.

Individualized dosing regimens using known pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamic characteristics are important to optimize patient outcomes and minimize antimicrobial resistance. Pharmacokinetic profiles change over time in critically ill patients, warranting periodic reconsideration of dosing regimens.

The factors determining metabolism and effects of an antibiotic include basic antibiotic characteristics such as lipophilic or hydrophilic, patient status such as volume status and end organ function and changes in pathophysiologic characteristics i.e., systemic inflammation and hemodynamics. Hydrophilic antibiotics have low volume of distribution, predominantly renal clearance and low intracellular penetration as compared to lipophilic antibiotics. Examples of hydrophilic antibiotics include beta-lactams, aminoglycosides, vancomycin, linezolid and colistin while lipophilic antibiotics are fluoroquinolones, macrolides, clindamycin and tigecycline.³

The antibiotics can be broadly classified into those with concentration dependent killing activity and those with time

dependent killing activity. The examples of former include aminoglycosides, fluoroquinolones, metronidazole, colistin and clindamycin whereas that of latter include beta-lactams, linezolid and tetracyclines.

Sepsis affects the drug metabolism by various mechanisms. Being a hyperdynamic state it (pharmacologically or pathophysiologically enhanced) can increase creatinine clearance and hepatic perfusion thus increasing drug removal. At the same time, sepsis induced organ-dysfunction can reduce metabolism and elimination of active drug. Renal replacement therapies can increase clearance for some drugs like piperacillin-tazobactam and meropenem. Body has adaptive methods for increasing drug clearance during states of multiorgan failure. For example, gastrointestinal clearance of ciprofloxacin is increased in renal failure while biliary clearance of piperacillin increases in renal failure. Serum protein concentration also affects the antibiotic concentration. Significant changes in free fractions of drug are only relevant for highly protein bound drugs (>95%). Small changes in protein binding result in huge relative changes in free (unbound) drug. Changes in protein binding will affect both clearance as well as volume of distribution. Most antibiotics have low protein binding (<90%) except ceftriaxone (95% bound to albumin), ertapenem, teicoplanin, aztreonam and daptomycin.

An open-label RCT involving 140 patients with sepsis compared continuous infusion of beta-lactams with intermittent infusion and demonstrated higher clinical cure rates and higher ventilator-free days in continuous infusion group without any mortality difference between two groups.⁴ Similar results have been found in various other studies as well though a double-blind study by Dulhunty et al did not find any difference in ICU-free days, 90-day survival and clinical cure between continuous infusion and intermittent infusion groups.⁵ An individual patient data meta-analysis found significantly lower hospital mortality rates with continuous infusion of beta-lactams as compared to intermittent infusion in patients with severe sepsis.⁶ Prolonged infusion (>3 hours) of antipseudomonal beta-lactams was associated with lower all-cause mortality than short-term infusion (<60 minutes) in a meta-analysis of 22 studies comprising 1876 patients with sepsis (Risk ratio, RR 0.70, 95% CI 0.56-0.87).⁷ Regarding vancomycin, a meta-analysis including 11 studies comparing continuous versus intermittent infusion found that patients treated with continuous infusion had a significantly lower incidence of nephrotoxicity without any difference in treatment failure and mortality.⁸

Evidence Statement

Time-dependent antibiotics require drug concentrations greater than the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for a certain time period between doses, which usually ranges from 40 to 50% of inter-dose interval for their best action. Continuous infusions are preferred over extended infusions for beta-lactam antibiotics and are associated with clinical benefits like decrease in hospital stay, cost of therapy and mortality. For vancomycin, continuous infusion is associated with reduced toxicity and cost of therapy but no mortality benefit.

Newer Diagnostics Including Multiplex PCR

Respiratory tract infections (RTIs) are amongst the most common infections in ICUs with high morbidity and mortality rates reported worldwide.^{9,10} A wide variety of agents, including bacteria, viruses, and fungi are responsible for causing RTIs, which are subclassified as upper respiratory infections (URTIs) and lower

respiratory infections (LRTIs).^{11,12} Viruses followed by bacteria, are the most common cause of RTIs, although mycobacterial and fungal pathogens can cause them as well.¹¹ Syndromic diagnosis is the most used strategy for clinical management because a careful evaluation by trained physician backed by radiological imaging and laboratory based biomarkers, is rapid, inexpensive, and easy to implement.^{13,14} However, syndromic approach fails to establish the definite etiological diagnosis. At present there is a great deficit in establishing the etiologic diagnosis of RTIs; in most studies almost 30–60% of cases remain without an etiologic diagnosis.^{14–17} Pathogen-specific microbiological diagnostic test can be categorised into direct diagnosis (microscopic examination, cultures, antigen detection and molecular detection) and indirect diagnosis (antibody detection by serological tests).^{14,16} Despite being the gold-standard, microbiological diagnosis cannot rely on conventional culture methods alone. These methods have low diagnostic yields due to various host factors, severity and extent of pneumonia, use of empirical antimicrobials, and sampling method used (quality and site of specimens, transportation conditions, etc.). In addition, for pathogens such as *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, atypical organisms like *Legionella*, *Chlamydia pneumoniae*, *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, fungi, and viruses; culture has either a low sensitivity and/or is time-consuming.^{16,17}

Recent times have seen a surge in rapid culture-independent novel assays and molecular diagnostics for common respiratory pathogens, as well as the availability of updated tests for newer strains of pathogens. These include antigen detection assays, reverse transcription–quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) testing, multiplex PCR panels targeting multiple organisms, plasma cell-free DNA, next-generation sequencing (NGS), etc. on blood, and upper and lower respiratory tract specimens to detect viral, bacterial, fungal, and mycobacterial infections.^{11,18–21} These have enabled major advances in the speed and sensitivity of diagnostics for RTIs, although the clinical utility of these methods is still under evaluation. However, the clinical implementation of these techniques is challenging as mere detection of pathogens in respiratory specimens does not necessarily imply acute infection.^{14,16} The increased sensitivity for detection of pathogens poses problem of distinctions between pathogens, colonizers, commensals, and contaminants. Other challenges include detection characteristics, bioinformatics requirements, and reimbursement issues.^{16,20,21}

The disease prevalence (i.e., the pretest probability of a given pathogen) is integral to diagnostic decision making since it affects the positive- and negative-predictive values of these assays.^{14,16,20}

Routine viral testing for influenza by molecular methods in general adult population with RTIs is not recommended, especially in periods of low prevalence. However, for more serious cases, such as those requiring hospitalization, ICU care or therapy, or pneumonia in pediatric patients or immunocompromised hosts (ICHs), rapid diagnosis can be important.^{19,22–25}

Rapid molecular diagnostics for viral, bacterial, and fungal pathogens should be considered in carefully selected cases symptomatic cases with worsening or new radiological infiltrates, having moderate/ severe illness requiring hospitalization/ICU care; pediatric or ICH population, and/or in cases suspected to have polymicrobial/multi-drug resistant infections.^{14,16} NAATs (nucleic acid amplification tests) for the detection of respiratory pathogens have been available since early 2000s. These tests differ in complexity (i.e., PCR, nucleic acid sequence-based amplification

(NASBA), transcription-mediated amplification (TMA), strand displacement amplification (SDA), loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP), rolling circle amplification (RCA), and others) and, pathogen coverage.^{12,26,27} Moreover, the accuracy is not only dependent on their specific chemistry, but also critically affected by the type, quantity, and quality of specimens collected.^{26,28} There are a number of NAATs available commercially for the detection of respiratory pathogens, many of which are FDA approved. Simple to complex sample-to-answer molecular platforms and panels are available, which can be subclassified as low-plex integrated test systems (targeting 1–4 pathogens per assay, allow random access), moderate complexity multiplex integrated systems (moderate sample throughput i.e. 1–12 samples/run, with a fast turnaround time (TAT) of 1–2 hours, and allowing random/batched access), and high complexity multiplex panel assays (high sample throughput i.e. more than 20/run, usually batched access, with higher TAT). Syndromic multiplex panels require considerable knowledge, training, and experience. Despite the advantages, implementation of high throughput panels can be challenging because of demanding sample preparation, processing, and result interpretation procedures, and the turnaround time varies from approximately 5–16 h.^{26,28} NAAT based point-of-care (POC) testing is relatively new in the realm of RTI diagnosis, with contradicting opinions regarding their implementation and clinical utility. These have extremely short turnaround times (<30 min), minimal hands-on time (1–2 min), and can be easily operated by non-laboratory staff members, thereby making them suitable for near patient implementation and testing. However, these can be costly and more prone to incorrect results and contamination due to laboratory handling by inexperienced personnels.^{26,27,29} These have been summarized in Table 2.

There are upcoming technologies like untargeted next-generation sequencing-based metagenomics (mNGS) testing for accurate and unbiased detection of expected or unexpected pathogens that are either not targeted by the panel or missed due to highly divergent genome sequences. However, diagnostic implementation of NGS is currently limited by incomplete understanding of analytical performance, high cost of the system and complexity of sequence data analysis.

Currently, molecular diagnostics is the gold standard for the diagnosis of viral respiratory infections.^{15–17} Several types of specimens can be used for detection of respiratory viruses, including: bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL), throat/oropharyngeal (OP) swab, nasopharyngeal (NP) washes, NP aspirates, lung aspirates, and NP swabs, although the appropriate specimen type depends on the specific patient population.^{26,27,29} However, false-positive or false negative results can be a problem due to poor handling of specimen.^{12,15} In a recent meta-analysis, the pooled sensitivity and specificity of rapid viral NAAT were 90.9% and 96.1%, respectively, for the detection of either influenza virus, respiratory syncytial virus (RSV), influenza virus and RSV, or a viral panel including influenza virus and RSV.²⁷ Upfront multiplex testing for multiple viruses may be most cost-effective in certain specific populations such as pediatric patients, ICH population, and critically ill patients with pneumonia where it can reduce unnecessary antibiotics as well as chest radiographs.^{16,23} A recent meta-analysis compared the diagnostic accuracy of Luminex NxTAG respiratory pathogen panels (RPPs)[™] (index) against other RPPs (comparator) for detection of RSV and influenza viruses.³⁰ For RSV, predicted sensitivity was 99% and specificity 100%. For influenza A and B, predicted sensitivity was

Table 2: Types of FDA approved commercially available molecular panels for bacterial and viral RTIs

Diagnostic assay	Type of respiratory specimen	Turn-around-time
Influenza A/B only		
a) Waived POCT	Nasal/Nasopharyngeal swab	15-30 minutes
b) Moderate to high complexity assays	Nasal/Nasopharyngeal swab	30 minutes to 2 hours
RSV only	Nasal/Nasopharyngeal swab	15-30 minutes
Influenza A/B plus RSV		
a) Waived POCT	Nasal/Nasopharyngeal swab	15-30 minutes
b) Moderate to high complexity assays	Nasal/Nasopharyngeal swab/ Nasopharyngeal aspirates/Nasal washings	1-3 hours
Parainfluenza viruses	Nasopharyngeal swab	2-4 hours
Multiple viruses plus atypical bacteria		
a) Waived POCT	Nasopharyngeal swab	1-2 hours
b) Moderate to high complexity assays	Nasopharyngeal swab/ Nasopharyngeal aspirates/ Nasal washings	1-5 hours
Multiple viruses (Moderate to high complexity assays)	Nasopharyngeal swab/ Nasopharyngeal aspirates/ Nasal washings/ Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL)	2-5 hours
Multiple bacteria with resistance genes (Moderate to high complexity assays)	Endotracheal aspirates/ BAL	4-5 hours
Multiple viruses and bacteria with resistance genes		
a) Waived POCT	Sputum/Endotracheal aspirates/ BAL	1-2 hours
b) Moderate to high complexity assays	Sputum/Endotracheal aspirates/ BAL	>6 hours

Adapted from: Murdoch DR, Werno AM, Jennings LC. Microbiological Diagnosis of Respiratory Illness: Recent Advances. In Kendig's Disorders of the Respiratory Tract in Children; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2019; pp. 396–405.e3. Hanson KE, Azar MM, Banerjee R, et al. Molecular Testing for Acute Respiratory Tract Infections: Clinical and Diagnostic Recommendations From the IDSA's Diagnostics Committee. Clin Infect Dis. 2020 Dec 17;71(10):2744-2751

97% and 98% respectively; specificity 100% and 100%, respectively. Multiplex vial panel can increase the detection of a number of infections that otherwise go undiagnosed because they are not suspected. A recent study demonstrated a 75% higher recovery rate of unexpected *M. pneumoniae* infection using multiple PCR.²⁸ NAAT based POC assays are currently limited to the detection of influenza A/B and RSV viruses, with the exception of the FilmArrayR RP EZ (BioFire) which detects 14 targets. The clinical performance of these assays is reported with a high sensitivity (87–100%) and specificity (>98%) for detecting influenza A/B and RSV in pediatric and adult patients. However, the clinical performance varies, and sensitivity is significantly low for influenza B (45.2–54.5%).²⁶

NAAT based PCR assays have been developed for numerous bacterial pathogens, with greater accuracy and sensitivity of identification compared to conventional culture-based diagnostics.^{12,31,32} NAAT platforms may allow co-detection of multiple bacteria, viruses, or bacteria plus viruses in up to 30–40% of cases and have important implications for hospital infection control and treatment decisions.^{31,32} High analytic sensitivity of multiplex panels also translates to high negative predictive values (i.e., generally >97%, depending on prevalence), but there may be important differences among individual panel targets or across manufacturers.^{15–17,32,33} Due to the need for isolation of the microorganism for antibiotic susceptibility testing, molecular methods can theoretically replace cultures only in cases in which the pathogens are of predictable susceptibility or the genetics of resistance are well defined.³⁴ Furthermore, there can be inconsistencies with resistance gene detection, especially in cases of co-infections or when the sample is obtained from an anatomical site with low prevalence of resistant pathogens.^{32–36} For example, the CTX-M type extended-spectrum beta-lactamases gene was reported for any member of the families Enterobacteriaceae,

Acinetobacter spp., or *P. aeruginosa*, and for this reason, when a resistance phenomenon is common to different bacteria, the conventional culture and the phenotypic AST are required to confirm the indication of the resistance marker.³²

Fungal diagnostics are rapidly evolving as conventional culture tests are faced by many challenges such as poor sensitivity, slow TATs, laborious process, and invasive nature of specimens required for testing.^{19,37} Serological testing represents a quicker way of detecting the causal fungi, aiding in the diagnostic decision-making process.³⁸ The major limitation of antibody-based testing is seen in ICH population, who are unable to elicit adequate levels of antibodies and may show false negative results.^{37,38} Galactomannan (GM) and β -1,3-D glucan (BDG) are fungal cellular wall constituents that can be detected in serum or bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) fluid to aid in the diagnosis. GM is more specific to *Aspergillus* spp. than BDG. In a recent meta-analysis, serum GM in ICHs suspected of IPA had a pooled sensitivity and specificity of 71%, and 89% respectively.³⁹ BAL GM, on the other hand, had a pooled sensitivity and specificity of 84%, and 88% respectively. BDG is pan-fungal antigen found in *Candida* spp., *Aspergillus* spp., *Mucorales*, and *Pneumocystis jirovecii*, etc. Antigen and antibody testing have made great strides with introduction of newer techniques like lateral flow assay (LFA) based tests to allow higher diagnostic accuracy; however, cross-reactivity with other fungi, and test availability remain considerable issues.^{38,39}

Fungus-specific quantitative real-time PCR amplification has been available for diagnosis of invasive fungal infections.³⁷ In the recent meta-analysis, the serum or whole-blood fungal PCR had pooled sensitivity and specificity of 81%, and 79% respectively. BAL fungal PCR in the same group had pooled sensitivity and specificity of 90%, and 96% respectively.³⁹

Early and accurate diagnosis of causative pathogens in RTIs can help in administering appropriate antimicrobial therapy (time to initiation, duration, and discontinuation), initiate effective infection control measures, and reduce length of hospital/ICU stay.^{40–42} Rapid molecular testing for influenza can decrease unnecessary antibiotic use, improve antiviral prescribing, limit ancillary testing, shorten lengths of stay, and promote infection-control practices.^{22–25} Several studies evaluated the clinical and economic impacts of multiplex respiratory testing, and concluded that, despite their high cost, multiplex panels offering custom orders can limit unnecessary testing, improvement in the clinical outcomes of patients mainly by the early administration of a targeted antibiotic therapy, and in the rapid adjustment and de-escalation of empirical therapy resulting in a short duration of treatment, minimizing patient costs. Current evidence suggests that syndromic multiplex PCR testing, coupled with antimicrobial stewardship, increases the timeliness of antiviral prescription in influenza patients and the rapid appropriateness of antibiotic treatment.

Rapid pathogen identification tools for UTIs utilize existing molecular platforms such as mass spectrometry and multiplex PCR. MALDI-TOF (matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time of flight) mass spectrometers are increasingly used for unambiguous species-level identification of bacteria and yeast.^{43,44} Multiplex PCR offers a cost-effective and rapid approach to pathogen identification. Many studies have examined PCR assays for specific UTI pathogens. All such studies have found that multiplex PCR compares favorably with a standard urine culture.^{45–47} A recent meta-analysis, concluded that multiplex PCR and RT-PCR are molecular techniques that might be comparable to standard urine culture for UTI diagnosis, with a pooled sensitivity at 80% and a specificity at 83% for multiplex-PCR.⁴⁸ Upcoming molecular diagnostics include the Next-generation sequencing (NGS) studies. Next-generation sequencing (NGS) has been used to identify causative pathogens in various infectious diseases including UTI.⁴⁹ A systematic review compared the diagnostic and therapeutic values of molecular diagnostic methods (NGS, and PCR) to urine culture in the management of UTI in adults.⁵⁰

Nucleic acid purification directly from the fecal samples is a first and key step for rapid molecular diagnosis of enteric viruses.^{51,52} Multiplex RT-qPCR assay have been developed for the detection of different enteric viruses, namely Astrovirus, Adenovirus, Rotavirus A, C, Sapovirus, and Enterovirus from stool samples; many assays being able to detect up to 19 enteric pathogens with high sensitivity.⁵³ A recent pragmatic, open label, randomized controlled trial (RCT)⁵⁴ studied the clinical impact of syndromic molecular testing (mPOCT) for gastrointestinal pathogens in 128 adult patients presenting to hospital with suspected gastroenteritis. They found that 65% of patients received antibiotics in m-POCT group versus 47% in the control group ($p = 0.0028$). Another recent prospective, single-center, RCT also found that use of multiplex GI PCR led to an increase in antibiotic use for bacterial and protozoal causes of infectious diarrhea compared to usual testing.⁵⁵

Community-acquired Pneumonia in the Intensive Care Unit

Community acquired pneumonia (CAP) refers to symptoms suggestive of acute lower respiratory tract illness (cough with or without expectoration, dyspnea, pleuritic chest pain) along with systemic manifestations (fever, chills, rigors or severe malaise), clinicoradiologic evidence (like crepitations or bronchial breath

sounds; lobar or patchy consolidation or interstitial infiltrates) and no other explanation for the illness.^{56,57} CAP can simply be defined as pneumonia which is not acquired in hospital or long-term care facility.⁵⁸

What are the Common Organisms Causing Community Acquired Pneumonia in Intensive Care Unit Worldwide and in India?

Most common etiology of community acquired pneumonia are viruses, ranging from 8.6% to 56.2%.⁵⁹ Pooled proportion of viral pneumonia was 25.5% (95% CI 22–29%) amongst patients requiring admission, and 29% (95% CI 14.5–43.4%) in patients requiring ICU admission. Most common viruses responsible for CAP were influenza (8%; 95% CI 6.3–9.6%), rhinovirus (5.7%; 95% CI 4.3–7.1%), respiratory syncytial virus (2.2%; 95% CI 1.6–2.8%) and coronavirus (3.3%; 95% CI 2.3–4.2%).⁵⁹ Common organisms causing CAP requiring intensive care admission worldwide include *streptococcus pneumoniae* (12–43%), *Hemophilus influenzae* (0–12%), legionella pneumophila (0–30%), *Staphylococcus aureus* (0–19%), gram negative enteric bacilli (0–27%), *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* (0–7%), chlamydia species (0–2%) and *Coxiella burnetti* (0–2%).⁶⁰ In a recent active population-based surveillance study, *streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and enterobacteriaceae were more commonly implicated in CAP requiring intensive care ($p < 0.001$).⁶¹ In secondary analysis of an international, multicenter, point-prevalence study on CAP in ICU, bacterial etiology could be identified in 35.3% patients. *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (8.2%), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (4.1%), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (3.4%) and methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, i.e., MRSA (3.0%) were the most common organisms isolated. MRSA and pseudomonas caused higher proportion of ICU admissions ($p < 0.01$).⁶² MRSA has been identified as important cause of CAP in intensive care unit (ICU) settings in earlier observational studies, case series and case reports.^{63–66} MRSA pneumonia.

Literature on epidemiology of CAP in India comes from hospital based observational studies and surveillance data as the ICU specific studies are not available. *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (2–35.8%), *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* (3–24%), chlamydia pneumoniae (6–18%), legionella spp. (2–15%), mycobacterium tuberculosis (0–5%), haemophilus influenzae (0–15.4%), *Staphylococcus aureus* (2–13%), klebsiella pneumoniae (3–25.5%), other gram negative bacilli (0–19%) are the common organisms implicated in CAP requiring hospitalisation in India.^{67–89} High prevalence of *Staphylococcus aureus* (26.7%) and MRSA causing CAP (60.9% of staphylococci) has been reported in one Indian study.⁶⁸

Increasing age, active smoking, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and diabetes mellitus appear to be significant risk factors for development of severe CAP. Structural lung disease and COPD are risk factors for infection due to pseudomonas aeruginosa.^{56,90–92}

Streptococcus pneumoniae largely remains sensitive to amoxicillin-clavulanic acid and azithromycin with only few studies reporting resistance to amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (20%), levofloxacin (20%) and azithromycin (13%).^{56,76,77,86} There is limited data on antibiotic sensitivity patterns of other microbes. H. influenzae also seems to be largely sensitive to amoxicillin clavulanic acid and azithromycin; in one study, 23% isolates were resistant to amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, 13% were resistant to azithromycin whereas only 6% were resistant to cefuroxime.⁸⁶ Gram negative bacilli (GNB) are usually sensitive to beta-lactams

and fluoroquinolones.⁸⁴ However, in recent studies, prevalence of extended spectrum β -lactamase (ESBL) organisms appears to be increasing with resistance to carbapenems (16.6%), piperacillin-tazobactam (39.5%), and cefoperazone-sulbactam (42%) reported in a recent prospective study.⁸⁶ Drugs effective against methicillin sensitive *Staphylococcus aureus* (MSSA) include penicillinase resistant penicillins (nafcillin, oxacillin) or penicillin-beta-lactamase combination (amoxicillin-clavulanate, ampicillin-sulbactam). Community acquired methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (CA-MRSA) has sensitivity to tetracycline, doxycycline, minocycline, tigecycline, clindamycin and co-trimoxazole, whereas hospital acquired MRSA (HA-MRSA) is sensitive to vancomycin, teicoplanin, daptomycin, linezolid and ceftaroline.⁹³⁻⁹⁷ Linezolid has shown better clinical success rate as compared to vancomycin in MRSA pneumonia (57.6% vs 46.6%; 95% CI for difference 0.5%-21.6%; $p = 0.04$) with lesser nephrotoxicity (8.4% vs 18.2%) and similar mortality in a prospective double blind RCT.⁹⁸ In a recent meta-analysis, 7 RCTs ($n = 1289$) and 8 retrospective cohort/case control studies ($n = 6125$) of MRSA pneumonia patients, linezolid was better than vancomycin in terms of microbiologic cure rates (RR = 0.81, 95% CI 0.71-0.92), microbiological eradication (RR 0.71, 95% CI 0.62-0.81) and clinical cure (0.35, 95% CI 0.18-0.69), without any significant difference in adverse drug effects or mortality.⁹⁹ Newer agents have been approved for treatment of CAP. These include omadacycline, delafloxacin and Lefamulin. Omadacycline, a tetracycline derivative, has activity against common CAP pathogens, MRSA, gram negative bacilli, anaerobes but not against pseudomonas, and has been approved in hospitalised CAP patients is US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved for the treatment of hospitalised CAP.^{100,101} Lefamulin, a pleuromutilin, another antibiotic approved for CAP, is effective against *H. influenzae*, *M. catarrhalis*, *S. pneumoniae*, MRSA, anaerobes and atypical CAP pathogens, but not against GNBs and *Pseudomonas*.^{102,103} Delafloxacin, a quinolone, has activity against gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria, anaerobes, *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*, and atypical respiratory pathogens (*Legionella*, *Chlamydia*, *Mycoplasma*), MRSA and *Pseudomonas* and is efficacious for treatment of lower respiratory tract infections.^{104,105}

Evidence Statement

Viruses (including influenza), *streptococcus pneumoniae*, gram negative bacilli (including klebsiella), *Hemophilus influenzae* and atypical organisms (*Mycoplasma pneumoniae*) and are common causes of community acquired pneumonia (CAP) in intensive care unit (ICU). *Staphylococcus aureus*, legionella and mycobacterium tuberculosis are less common causes of CAP in ICU. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is an important pathogen causing CAP in patients with structural lung disease. Methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) and multidrug resistant gram-negative organisms are relatively infrequent causes of CAP in India and are associated with risk factors such as structural lung disease and previous antimicrobial intake. Anaerobic organisms may cause CAP or co-infection in patients with risk factors for aspiration like elderly, altered sensorium, dysphagia, head and neck malignancy. *S. pneumoniae* remains sensitive to beta-lactams and macrolides. *Hemophilus influenzae* has good sensitivity to beta-lactam with beta-lactamase inhibitors and fluoroquinolones. Recent studies show increasing prevalence of extended spectrum β -lactamase (ESBL) producing enterobacteriaceae. Newer agents like omadacycline, delafloxacin and Lefamulin have added advantages of being effective against MRSA and anaerobes. Omadacycline and

delafloxacin are effective against GNBs, whereas only Delafloxacin has good sensitivity against pseudomonas. Nafcillin and oxacillin are preferred agents for MSSA whereas agents effective against MRSA pneumonia include linezolid, vancomycin and teicoplanin.

What are the Risk Factors for Multidrug Resistant (MDR) Pathogens for CAP in ICU?

Age more than 65 years, chronic respiratory disease, prior antibiotic treatment, prior isolation of resistant organisms from respiratory secretions and presentation with acute renal failure were associated with increased risk of CAP due to multidrug resistant (MDR) pathogens in prospective observational studies.¹⁰⁶⁻¹¹² Other factors associated with increased risk of MDR CAP include prior hospitalisation for more than 48 hours in the last 3 months, home infusion therapy and patients on renal replacement therapy. Immunosuppression was also considered to be a risk factor for CAP due to MDR organisms.⁵⁶

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for multidrug resistant (MDR) organisms include age >65 years, antimicrobial therapy in the preceding 3 months, high frequency of antibiotic resistance in the community, hospitalization for ≥ 48 h in the preceding 3 months, home infusion therapy including antibiotics, home wound care, chronic dialysis within 1 month, family member with MDR pathogen and ongoing immunosuppressive treatment.

Recommendation

- All patients admitted with CAP in ICU should be evaluated for risk factors for infection with MDR organisms (2A).
- Antibiotic therapy should be individualized to cover the commonly implicated organisms according to risk factors, including *Pseudomonas*, ESBL producing enterobacteriaceae or MRSA (3A).
- If antipseudomonal, MRSA specific or non-standard antibiotics are initiated empirically, early microbiologic diagnosis of respiratory secretions (gram stain, PCR or multiplex PCR) and blood cultures should be sought for early de-escalation or narrowing down antimicrobial therapy (3A).

Should Serum Procalcitonin Levels be Done at Baseline in Patients Admitted with CAP in ICU?

Procalcitonin is a promising biomarker for antibiotic stewardship in lower respiratory tract infections (LRIs).¹¹³ Various trials evaluating use of procalcitonin in LRIs tested serum procalcitonin at baseline.^{114,115} Serum procalcitonin had an area under ROC curve 0.73 (95% CI: 0.69-0.77) in differentiating bacterial from viral etiology of CAP in a recent meta-analysis.¹¹⁶ Serum PCT had low sensitivity [0.55 (95% CI: 0.37-0.71)] and specificity (0.76, 95% CI: 0.62-0.86) in differentiating bacterial from viral etiology in CAP.¹¹⁷ Though serum procalcitonin based strategies led to reduction in antibiotic exposure in a meta-analysis of 26 RCTs including 6706 patients, most benefit was attributed to early cessation, and not initiation.¹¹⁸ In the ProACT trial ($n = 1656$), PCT-based strategy did not show any significant difference in antibiotic exposure for LRI patients (-0.05 day; 95% CI: -0.6-0.5; $p = 0.87$).¹¹⁴

Evidence Statement

Serum procalcitonin has moderate sensitivity and specificity in differentiating bacterial and viral etiology in CAP. Serial measurements of procalcitonin are useful in limiting antibiotic

exposure in ICU patients with lower respiratory tract infections, predominantly by early cessation.

Recommendation

- Serum Procalcitonin should not be used to differentiate bacterial and viral etiology in CAP in ICU (1A).
- Serum procalcitonin levels should be measured at baseline and serially for use in antibiotic de-escalation for CAP in ICU (1A).

How Early Should the Antibiotics be Initiated in Patients with CAP Who Require ICU Admission?

In retrospective studies on CAP, initiation of antibiotics within 4 hours of presentation has been associated with reduction in all-cause mortality, regardless of severity [relative risk (RR) 0.24; 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.08–0.71].¹¹⁹ Systematic review of prospective studies also favored early administration of antibiotics, however, confidence interval was wide (RR 0.82; 95%CI 0.54–1.24).¹¹⁹ Recent meta-analysis of retrospective studies also showed decreased all-cause mortality with early administration of antibiotics before 4 hours of hospital admission, especially in severe CAP with pneumonia severity index (PSI) IV to V (adjusted odds ratio, AOR 0.87; 95%CI 0.78–0.97). However, no significant benefit was shown in clinical stability at 48 hours (AOR 1.04; 95%CI 0.75–1.44), length of hospital stay (AOR 0.92; 95%CI 0.84–1.01) or readmission after discharge (AOR 0.99; 95%CI 0.88–1.11%).⁵⁸ However, all the included studies were retrospective or chart reviews, with low quality of evidence. There was no significant mortality benefit with administration of antibiotics before one hour of recognition of severe sepsis or septic shock (pooled odds ratio 1.46, 95% CI 0.89–2.4) in a recent meta-analysis. Out of 18 eligible studies, 7 studies were excluded due to non-availability of data confounding the findings.¹²⁰ In a recent retrospective study of 35,000 randomly selected inpatients with sepsis, each hour delay in administration of antibiotics was associated with increased odds of in-hospital mortality in patients with sepsis (Odds ratio, OR 1.09; 95%CI 1.00–1.19; $p = 0.046$), severe sepsis (OR 1.07; 95% CI 1.01–1.24; $p = 0.014$) and septic shock (OR 1.14; 95% CI 1.06–1.23; $p = 0.001$).¹²¹

Evidence Statement

Early initiation of antibiotics has been associated with reduction in all-cause mortality in community acquired pneumonia, including severe pneumonia with sepsis or septic shock.

Recommendation

- Appropriate antimicrobial therapy should be initiated as early as possible in patients of CAP requiring ICU admission, preferably within the first hour after obtaining necessary microbiologic samples (3A).
- Respiratory samples should be sent for gram stain, bacterial culture, and other investigations as clinically indicated, as early as possible (3A).
- Multiplex PCR may be used to obtain precise microbiologic diagnosis in patients with CAP admitted to ICU if feasible (2B).

Should CAP in ICU Receive Empirical Antimicrobials or Upfront Targeted Antimicrobial Therapy?

Targeted antibiotic therapy based on legionella and pneumococcal urinary antigen testing was associated with higher relapse rate without any significant differences in clinical failure, length of hospital stay or clinical failure in a randomized controlled trial in patients with severe CAP. However, the study was inadequately

powered for outcomes as less than 50% patients had PSI IV and V CAP and only one patient required ICU admission.¹²² In another randomized controlled trial, targeted antibiotic therapy based on respiratory secretions cultures, blood cultures, paired serum samples (for mycoplasma, chlamydia and coxiella) and urinary antigens (for pneumococcus and legionella) was similar to empirical therapy in terms of clinical cure, length of hospital stay and late treatment failure or relapse. Study was inadequately powered for ICU patients, though it demonstrated significantly reduced mortality (45% vs 91%; $p = 0.02$) with targeted therapy as compared to empirical therapy.¹²³ Similarly, in a large retrospective study, targeted antibiotic therapy has been associated with reduced 30-day mortality (AOR 0.64, 95%CI 0.56–0.74) in CAP, severe CAP (AOR 0.70; 95%CI 0.54–0.91) and very severe CAP (AOR 0.51, 95%CI 0.40 to 0.64).^{58,124} Other retrospective studies have demonstrated limited utility of diagnostic testing to influence prescription modification, clinical cure or failure though lower mortality is reported with targeted therapy (RR 0.37, 0.24 to 0.57).^{58,125} Obtaining blood cultures before initiating therapy was associated with mortality benefit in a large retrospective study in 14069 patients with CAP requiring hospitalisation.¹²⁶ In a multicentric randomised controlled trial of 208 hospitalised CAP patients at risk of GNB infections and indication for bronchoscopy, multiple PCR based therapy was associated with significantly shorter duration of inappropriate antibiotic treatment (38.6 h; 95% CI 19.5–57.7; $p < 0.0001$) than conventional culture.¹²⁷ In another RCT of 294 CAP inpatients, multiplex PCR based point of care (POC) strategy did not show any difference prescriptions of no or narrow-spectrum antibiotics at 4 hours after admission (OR 1.13; 95% CI 0.96–1.34). However, POC strategy resulted in significant increase in targeted prescriptions at 4 hours (OR 5.68; 95% CI 2.49–12.94; $p < 0.001$) and 48 hours (OR 4.20; 95% CI 1.87–9.40; $p < 0.001$). Also, POC strategy was associated with more adequate prescriptions at 48-h (OR 2.11; 95%CI 1.23–3.61; $p = 0.006$) and on day 5 (OR 1.40; 95% CI [1.18, 1.66] $p < 0.001$).¹²⁸ Multiplex PCR testing of respiratory specimens in 259 hospitalised pneumonia patients showed 96.2% positive agreement and 98.1% negative agreement with routine bacterial culture, and a potential of modification of antibiotic therapy in 70.7% patients, including de-escalation or discontinuation in 48.2% patients.¹²⁹

Evidence Statement

Early institution of targeted antibiotic therapy in severe CAP based on urinary antigen testing is associated with higher relapse rate without any mortality benefit in prospective randomized studies. Retrospective studies have shown mortality benefit with narrowing down of antibiotic therapy based on results from cultures of respiratory specimens, blood cultures as well as legionella and pneumococcal urinary antigen testing. Multiplex PCR based diagnostic testing of respiratory specimens leads to more appropriate and focused antimicrobial therapy administration.

Recommendations

- Empirical therapy covering common etiologic organisms should be initiated for severe CAP requiring ICU admission (2A).
- Investigations including culture of respiratory secretions (sputum, endotracheal aspirate), blood cultures, urinary antigen testing for pneumococcus and legionella may be performed to narrow down therapy. (UPP)
- Multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing of respiratory specimens, if available, should be performed for CAP in ICU for

microbiologic diagnosis and subsequent antibiotic modification or de-escalation (3A).

- PCR testing for viral etiology (e.g., influenza, SARS-Cov2) should be performed based on seasonality and local guidelines (3A).
- Bronchoscopic BAL or protected specimen brush samples may be performed for microbiologic diagnosis on case by case basis (3A).

What is the Current Role of Radiologic Investigations in Guiding Antibiotic Therapy for CAP in ICU?

In a recent meta-analysis of 16 studies including 2040 suspected pneumonia patients, pooled sensitivity of ultrasound (0.96) was higher than chest X-ray (0.65) for the diagnosis of pneumonia. Pooled specificity was 0.85 for USG and 0.81 for CXR. The receiver operative characteristics areas under the curve for USG were 0.98 as compared to 0.77 for CXR.¹³⁰ Similar results were reported by an earlier meta-analysis.¹³¹ Amongst 140 suspected CAP patients presenting to emergency department, LUS reduced diagnostic uncertainty in CAP from 73% to 14% and led to antibiotic prescription modifications in 32% cases.¹³² Claessen et al prospectively evaluated the impact of Chest CT in 319 suspected CAP patients presenting to emergency department. Of these, 120 patients had no infiltrates on chest radiograph. CT scan revealed parenchymal infiltrates compatible with CAP in 33% ($n = 40/120$) in this group. CT chest also led to exclusion of CAP diagnosis in 29% ($n = 56/188$) patients with infiltrates on chest radiograph. CT chest led to modification in antimicrobial therapy and site of care in 194 (60.8%) patients. These included antibiotic initiation ($n = 51$), antibiotic cessation ($n = 29$), anticoagulation ($n = 3$) and diuretics ($n = 11$).¹³³ Low dose Chest CT (LDCT) in emergency department led to change in pneumonia probability levels in 54 patients (27%) in another prospective study of 200 elderly patients with suspected CAP.¹³⁴

Evidence Statement

Lung ultrasound has high sensitivity and specificity in diagnosis of pneumonia, and better diagnostic accuracy as compared to chest X-ray. Addition of lung ultrasound aids in improving confidence in diagnosis of CAP and leads to significant treatment modification. CT Chest leads to early diagnosis of CAP in ICU and modification of treatment in significant proportion of cases, though there is insufficient evidence in impact on short term outcomes.

Recommendations

- Bedside chest ultrasound should be done for all suspected CAP patients in ICU at baseline, and at frequent intervals as indicated (1A).
- CT Chest may be done for diagnosis of CAP in ICU in cases where diagnosis is in doubt, alternate causes (heart failure, pulmonary embolism) are suspected, to rule out rarer causes (e.g., tuberculosis, nocardia) or to decide on site of invasive sampling (bronchoscopy or image guided sampling) (3A).

For Empirical Therapy in Patients with CAP in ICU, should Combination Therapy be Preferred Over Monotherapy?

In a recent meta-analysis of CAP patients including 28 observational studies, combination antimicrobial regimens including macrolides have been associated with significantly decreased

mortality as compared to non-macrolides (RR 0.82; 95% CI, 0.70-0.97; $p = 0.02$), alongwith a trend towards mortality benefit favoring macrolides as compared to fluoroquinolones (RR 0.83; 95% CI, 0.67-1.03; $p = 0.09$).¹³⁵ Combination therapy also resulted in better survival in patients with shock without any significant increase in microbial resistance.¹³⁶ In a matched case-control study of prospectively studied cohorts, combination therapy including macrolides was independent predictor of survival (OR, 0.19; 95% CI, 0.07-0.51) in patients with pneumococcal CAP requiring ICU admission.¹³⁷

Evidence Statement

Empirical combination therapy covering common organisms causing community acquired pneumonia improves survival without any significant increase in microbial resistance.

Recommendation

- Patients with CAP requiring ICU admission should initially receive combination of empirical antimicrobial agents covering common causative organisms (2A).

What should be the Preferred Combination Therapy for CAP in ICU?

In a recent meta-analysis of 8 studies (1 randomised controlled trial and 7 observational studies), 2273 patients in beta-lactam macrolide arm were compared to 1600 patients in beta lactam-fluoroquinolone arm; beta lactam-macrolide combination was associated with a lower overall mortality as compared to that of beta lactam-fluoroquinolone combination (OR, 0.68; 95% CI 0.49-0.94; $p = 0.02$) alongwith decreased length of hospital stay (mean difference, -3.05 days; 95% CI, -6.01 to -0.09; $p = 0.04$).¹³⁸ In targeted maximum likelihood estimation and survival analysis of 3775 severe CAP patients, macrolide treatment was associated with significant mortality benefit at 6 months (HR 0.69; 95% CI 0.60-0.78; $p < 0.001$) and 12 months (HR 0.72; 95% CI 0.64-0.81; $p < 0.001$).¹³⁹ Aztreonam and fluoroquinolones are effective alternatives to macrolides, however, with undue risk of masking and delaying diagnosis of tuberculosis.¹⁴⁰ Aztreonam is effective alternative for patients with contraindication to beta lactams.

Evidence Statement

For patients with severe CAP requiring ICU admission without risk factors for pseudomonal infection, a combination of beta-lactams alongwith macrolides is better as compared to beta-lactam fluoroquinolone combination in terms of mortality benefit and length of hospital stay.

Recommendation

- For patients with CAP requiring ICU admission, a non-pseudomonal beta-lactam (cefotaxime, ceftriaxone, or amoxicillin-clavulanic acid) plus a macrolide (azithromycin or clarithromycin) should be preferred if there are no risk factors for pseudomonas aeruginosa infection (1A).
- For penicillin-allergic patients, a respiratory fluoroquinolone (levofloxacin, moxifloxacin or ciprofloxacin) and aztreonam may be used (3A).
- If macrolides cannot be used, a fluoroquinolone may be used if there is no clinical suspicion of tuberculosis, after sending sputum or endotracheal aspirate for AFB and Genexpert (3A).

When should Anti-pseudomonal Cover be Added for CAP in ICU? If Required, which are the Preferred Antimicrobials for Anti-pseudomonal Cover?

Age greater than 65 to 70 years, male sex, current smokers, chronic respiratory disease including chronic bronchitis, COPD, asthma or bronchiectasis, cerebrovascular disease, dementia, other chronic neurological disorders, cardiovascular diseases, cirrhosis, immunocompromised states, malignancy, current use of corticosteroids, enteral tube feeding, previous hospital admission, prior respiratory isolation of pseudomonas, prior antibiotic therapy and severe pneumonia at presentation have been reported as risk factors for CAP due to pseudomonas aeruginosa in various observational studies.^{77,110,111,141-145} In a recent multinational point prevalence study, only 2% of hospitalised CAP patients had drug-resistant pseudomonas.¹⁰⁸ Prior antibiotic therapy has been associated with increased risk of multidrug resistant pseudomonal infection.¹⁴³ Use of bronchoscopic BAL and multiplex PCR in 208 hospitalised pneumonia patients with risk factors for Gram-negative infection led to 45% reduction in duration of inappropriate antibiotic treatment (difference 38.6 hours, 95% CI 19.5-57.7) in a multicentric randomised controlled trial.¹²⁷

Antipseudomonal antimicrobial agents include aminoglycosides (gentamicin, amikacin, tobramycin, plazomicin), quinolones (ciprofloxacin, levofloxacin), penicillins (carbenicillin, ticarcillin, piperacillin), carbapenems (meropenem, imipenem, doripenem), polymyxins (polymyxin B, colistin), monobactams (aztreonam), cephalosporins (ceftazidime, cefepime) and fosfomycin. Newer antibiotics (Ceftolozane-tazobactam, Ceftazidime-avibactam, Imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam, Cefiderocol) have proven to be efficacious in the treatment of multidrug resistant pseudomonas.¹⁴⁶

Evidence Statement

For patients with severe CAP requiring ICU admission, risk factors for infection with pseudomonas aeruginosa include chronic pulmonary disease (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, bronchiectasis), frequent systemic corticosteroid use, prior antibiotic therapy, old age, immunocompromised states, enteral tube feeding, cerebrovascular or cardiovascular disease. Prior antibiotic therapy is a risk factor for multidrug resistant pseudomonal infection.

Recommendation

- If P. aeruginosa is an etiological consideration, antipseudomonal antibiotic (like ceftazidime, cefoperazone, piperacillin-tazobactam, cefoperazone-sulbactam, imipenem, meropenem or cefepime) should be used (2A).
- Combination therapy should be considered with addition of aminoglycosides or antipseudomonal fluoroquinolones (e.g., ciprofloxacin) (3A).
- If empiric antipseudomonal treatment is started, a culture of respiratory specimens (sputum, miniBAL or BAL) should be obtained to confirm pseudomonal infection or subsequent de-escalation (3A).

When should MRSA Cover be Added to Empiric Regimen for CAP in ICU?

Evidence on CAP due to MRSA is limited, and mostly based on small prospective studies, case series or case reports.⁶³⁻⁶⁶ A systematic review (81 studies; 7 case series, 71 case reports, 3 observational studies) estimated incidence of MRSA CAP to be 0.51 to 0.64 cases

per 100,000 population.⁶³ MRSA CAP carries a high mortality (upto 60%). Close contact with a MRSA carrier or patient, preceding influenza infection, prisoners, professional athletes, army recruits, men having sex with men (MSM), intravenous drug abusers, regular sauna users, immunocompromised status (HIV, acute leukemia, ongoing systemic corticosteroid therapy) and those using antibacterial agents before infection have an increased risk of MRSA CAP.^{63,147} Multilobar consolidation, necrotizing consolidation and empyema were also observed in greater proportion of patients with MRSA CAP.⁶⁵ Considering multiple risk factors, relatively low frequency but high morbidity and mortality associated with MRSA CAP, the expert group decided to emphasize on thorough assessment of risk factors for MRSA CAP in ICU, while balancing the recommendation to guard against blanket MRSA cover for all CAP cases getting admitted to ICU. The most effective antibiotics against MRSA are vancomycin and teicoplanin. Tigecycline is also effective against MRSA; linezolid has also been reported to be effective in MRSA and VRSA pneumonia.^{58,148}

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for MRSA in CAP in ICU include close contact with MRSA carrier or patient, influenza, prisoners, professional athletes, army recruits, men having sex with men (MSM), intravenous (IV) drug abusers, regular sauna users and those with recent antibiotic use. MRSA pneumonia should be suspected after influenza or in previously healthy young patients, if there is cavitation or necrotizing pneumonia, alongwith rapid increase of pleural effusion, massive hemoptysis, neutropenia or erythematous rashes. Vancomycin, teicoplanin, linezolid and tigecycline are effective antibiotics against MRSA.

Recommendation

- All patients admitted with CAP in ICU should be evaluated for presence of risk factors associated with MRSA (3A).
- If MRSA is a consideration, empiric linezolid (1A), vancomycin (1A) or teicoplanin (2A) should be added to the regimen. Linezolid should be used for vancomycin intolerant patients, vancomycin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (VRSA), or patients with renal failure (1A).
- PCR and gram stain of nasal swab, alongwith gram stain and culture of respiratory specimens should be obtained for microbiologic diagnosis of MRSA if empiric MRSA treatment is initiated, for future de-escalation or targeted antimicrobial therapy (3A).

When should Anaerobic Cover be Added to Empiric Antibiotic Regimen for CAP in ICU?

Anaerobic organisms were reported to cause majority of pulmonary infections associated with lung abscesses (26-100%), aspiration pneumonia (62-100%) and empyema (9-76%) in observational studies.¹⁴⁹⁻¹⁵⁷ In a recent observational study of 64 patients with CAP, 15.6% of BAL samples had evidence of anaerobic infection on 16S RNA analysis.¹⁵⁸ Witnessed aspiration, loss of consciousness due to drug or alcohol overdose, seizures with concomitant gingival disease and dysphagia have been considered as risk factors for anaerobic infection.¹⁵⁹ In secondary analysis of a multicentric prospective study of 2606 CAP patients, anaerobic flora was similar in patients with aspiration pneumonia as compared to overall CAP patients. Severe aspiration related CAP patients had higher prevalence of GNBs ($p = 0.02$) and lower prevalence of GPBs ($p < 0.001$). Also, more than 50% of patients received empiric

anaerobic coverage irrespective of presence of risk factors or aspiration pneumonia.¹⁶⁰

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for aspiration pneumonia in patients admitted with CAP in ICU include dysphagia, altered sensorium, coma, witnessed aspiration, putrid discharge, presence of lung abscess, empyema, or necrotizing pneumonia. There is no significant difference in anaerobic flora of CAP patients with or without aspiration. Severe aspiration related CAP has increased prevalence of GNBs and decreased prevalence of GPCs.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotics with anaerobic coverage should be considered for treatment of CAP in ICU in presence of witnessed aspiration, lung abscess, empyema, or necrotizing pneumonia (2A).
- Specific antibiotics with anaerobic coverage (such as clindamycin and metronidazole) should not be routinely prescribed in severe CAP (UPP).

Which Antibiotic should be Preferred for Anaerobic Coverage for CAP in ICU?

Clindamycin was associated with significantly higher cure rates as compared to penicillin in randomized controlled trials in anaerobic lung infections.^{154,161} In a randomized prospective study of 100 patients with anaerobic lung infections, ampicillin-sulbactam, clindamycin and panipenem-betamiprom had similar clinical efficacy ($p = 0.62$) and similar duration of treatment ($p = 0.35$) whereas non-clindamycin group had higher frequency of appearance of MRSA (22.7% vs 0%; $p < 0.01$).¹⁶² Ampicillin-sulbactam had similar clinical and bacteriologic response to clindamycin with or without cephalosporin in another prospective randomized multicenter study of 70 patients with anaerobic lung infections.¹⁶³ Moxifloxacin demonstrated similar clinical response to ampicillin-sulbactam in a prospective open label randomized multicenter study involving 139 patients with aspiration pneumonia and lung abscess, alongwith the added advantage of once daily dosing.¹⁶⁴ Moxifloxacin was also shown to be superior to levofloxacin-metronidazole combination in terms of clinical cure at 7 weeks (76.7% vs 51.7%; $p < 0.05$) as well as similar bacteriologic cure (93.3% vs 96.4%, $p > 0.05$) without any significant difference in adverse drug reactions.¹⁶⁵ Duration of treatment has been reported to be variable. Longer duration of treatment (3 to 6 weeks) is required in lung abscesses and empyema.^{154,163,164}

Evidence Statement

Commonly prescribed empirical antibiotics for CAP in ICU such as ampicillin-sulbactam, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, piperacillin-tazobactam and carbapenems have excellent anaerobic coverage. Clindamycin and moxifloxacin are effective against aspiration pneumonia and lung abscess caused by anaerobic organisms. Lung abscess and necrotizing pneumonia may require prolonged treatment upto 4 to 6 weeks.

Recommendation

- Patients with CAP due to anaerobic infection should be initiated on antibiotics with anaerobic activity such as amoxicillin-clavulanate, clindamycin or moxifloxacin (1A).
- Piperacillin-tazobactam or carbapenems can be used for empirical therapy in CAP due to anaerobes if otherwise indicated (3A).

- Duration of treatment should be individualized according to response and severity of disease (3A).

What should be the Optimal Duration of Antibiotics for CAP in ICU?

On post-hoc analysis of a RCT comparing levofloxacin treatment for 5 days to 10 days, subgroup with moderate to high severity CAP had similar clinical cure rates (RR 1.07; 95% CI 0.95 to 1.2).^{58,166} In another study on severe CAP, treatment for more than 7 days did not confer any mortality benefit.¹⁶⁷ However, this study excluded ICU admission, complicated pneumonia, non-responding pneumonia or identification of organisms requiring prolonged treatment. Also, enterobacteriaceae, pseudomonas, legionella and *S. aureus* was associated with requirement of prolonged treatment.

Evidence Statement

For CAP in ICU, there is limited evidence regarding duration of treatment, with no significant mortality benefit beyond 7 days of antimicrobial therapy in uncomplicated cases. However, CAP due to GNB, enterobacteriaceae, *P. aeruginosa*, *S. aureus* bacteremia and *L. pneumophila* requires prolonged treatment. Necrotising pneumonia, lung abscess, empyema or extrapulmonary infective complications like meningitis or infective endocarditis also require longer duration of treatment.

Recommendation

- Patients with CAP requiring ICU admission should receive antibiotics for 7 to 10 days (2A).
- Patients with CAP due to *Pseudomonas* or aspiration pneumonia should be treated for 14 days (3A).
- Necrotising pneumonia due to GNB, MRSA or anaerobes also require treatment for 14 to 21 days (3A).
- Duration of treatment should be individualized according to causative organism, response, severity of disease and complications (3A).

What is the Role of Adjunctive Therapy, i.e., Systemic Corticosteroids and Inhaled Antibiotics for CAP in ICU?

Systemic corticosteroid administration for CAP has long been debated. Wan et al performed a meta-analysis of nine RCTs ($n = 1667$) and six cohort studies ($n = 4095$) evaluating systemic steroids in CAP, and did not find any significant mortality benefit (RR, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.43-1.21) overall or in patients with severe CAP (RCTs: RR, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.43-1.21; cohort studies: RR, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.86-1.17). However, systemic steroids did reduce risk of ARDS (RR, 0.21; 95% CI, 0.08-0.59) and were not associated with significant adverse effects.¹⁶⁸ Prolonged course (20 days) of tapering doses of methylprednisolone did not show any benefit in 60 day mortality (16% vs 18%; OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.57-1.40) in a multicentre RCT. However, the study was well short of desired sample size, and could recruit only 584 patients against the planned sample size of 1420 patients.¹⁶⁹ A recent meta-analysis of 16 studies involving 3,842 patients with hospitalised CAP patients demonstrated that systemic corticosteroids were associated with reduced need for mechanical ventilation (RR 0.51; 95% CI, 0.33-0.77; $P = 0.001$) and ICU admission (RR, 0.66 [95% CI, 0.45-0.97]). However, there was no difference in all-cause mortality (RR, 0.85, 95% CI, 0.67-1.07), treatment failure (RR, 0.78; 95% CI 0.37-1.67) or incidence of adverse events (RR 1.10; 95% CI, 0.97-1.25). Also,

corticosteroid group had higher hospital readmission rates (RR 1.20; 95% CI, 1.05-1.38). Majority of trials gave corticosteroids for 7-10 days; hydrocortisone 200mg to 240 mg daily dose was the most commonly used regimen.¹⁷⁰ In a subsequent multicentre RCT investigating role of hydrocortisone in severe CAP, 795 patients were analysed. Hydrocortisone was given as an intravenous infusion of 200 mg over 24 hours for 4 days and continued till 8 or 14 days; intervention arm received hydrocortisone for a median of 5 (IQR3-8) days. Hydrocortisone infusion reduced 28 day mortality (5.6%; 95CI -9.6 to -1.7%), reduced incidence of endotracheal intubation (HR 0.59, 95% CI 0.40-0.86) and need for inotrope initiation (HR 0.59; 95% CI 0.43-0.82), without any significant increase in adverse events. However, the trial excluded patients with septic shock, pregnancy, immunodeficiency, viral infections (influenza, herpes, acute viral hepatitis), tuberculosis and invasive fungal infection.¹⁷¹

Inhaled antimicrobials have been studied as adjunctive therapy in ventilator and hospital acquired pneumonia and evidence has been summarised in subsequent section.

Evidence Statement

Short course of systemic corticosteroids has been associated with reduced risk of mortality, need for endotracheal intubation and inotrope initiation in severe CAP. Systemic corticosteroids are associated with reduced need for ICU admission and endotracheal intubation in patients hospitalised with CAP, albeit with higher risk of readmission rates. However, large trials have excluded patients with septic shock, pregnancy, immunodeficiency, viral infections (influenza, herpes, acute viral hepatitis), tuberculosis and invasive fungal infections. Hydrocortisone 200mg to 240 mg daily infusion was most commonly used regimen in CAP trials for 7 to 10 days.

The evidence for inhaled antibiotics is predominantly from hospital-acquired and ventilator-associated pneumonia, with better odds of clinical cure and microbiologic eradication in adjunct inhaled antibiotic therapy.

Recommendation

- Short courses of systemic steroids should be given for patients with severe CAP after careful risk-benefit analysis (1A).
- Hydrocortisone 200 mg infusion over 24 hours for 5 to 7 days should be used for systemic corticosteroid administration in severe CAP patients (2A).
- Inhaled antibiotics may be used in severe CAP patients on a case-to-case basis. (UPP)

Should Procalcitonin be Used to Determine Duration of Antibiotic Administration for CAP in ICU?

In a recent Cochrane meta-analysis of 26 trials involving 6708 patients, procalcitonin utilization for antibiotic discontinuation was associated with reduced mortality (adjusted OR 0.83, 95% CI 0.70 to 0.99, $p = 0.037$).¹¹⁸ In an observational cohort study of 352 hospitalised CAP patients, PCT-based therapy led to a 15% cost benefit ($p = 0.005$) and reduced duration of antibiotic therapy (8.6 days vs 12.6 days; $p < 0.001$) without affecting clinical cure rates and mortality.¹⁷² In a randomised multicenter trial of 285 severe CAP patients procalcitonin guidance did not lead to a reduction in antibiotic duration compared to guideline-based clinical assessment (9 days vs 10 days; $p > 0.05$).¹⁷³

Evidence Statement

Serial procalcitonin levels can be used to de-escalate antibiotics for CAP in the ICU without increasing mortality or recurrence rates.

Recommendation

- Procalcitonin levels can be used along with clinical judgement for de-escalation of antibiotics in CAP in ICU in patients treated beyond 5-7 days (1A).

Hospital-acquired Pneumonia and Ventilator Associated Pneumonia

Pneumonia is one of the commonest hospital acquired infection. Hospital-acquired or nosocomial pneumonia (HAP) is defined as pneumonia that occurs 48 hours (or more) after admission and did not appear to be incubating at the time of admission. Ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP) is HAP that develops more than 48 to 72 hours after endotracheal intubation. The previously used term health care associated pneumonia (HCAP) is currently not in use.¹⁷⁴ To provide a more uniform and consistent reporting of cases of ventilator associated complications, Centre for Disease Control (CDC) has proposed the term ventilator associated events which includes ventilator associated condition, infection-related ventilator associated complication, probable VAP and possible VAP.¹⁷⁵ The incidence of VAP varies among different ICUs and depends upon the definition used. In most ICUs, the incidence is around 10-20%.¹⁷⁴ Endotracheal intubation compromises the natural barrier between oropharynx and trachea as well as facilitates entry of bacteria into lungs.¹⁷⁶ Supine position also facilitates transfer of contaminated secretions leading to VAP.¹⁷⁷ VAP is suspected in patients with new or progressive pulmonary infiltrates plus supportive clinical findings suggestive of infection. The diagnosis is made on clinicoradiologic findings and is supported by isolation of microorganism from lower respiratory tract sample. VAP is associated with overall attributable mortality of 13%, and higher risk of ICU mortality (RR 2.20, 95%CI 1.91-2.54).¹⁷⁸ VAP leads to significantly longer ICU length of stay and also incur additional hospital costs.¹⁷⁹

What are the Common Organisms Causing HAP/VAP in ICU and What is their Antibiotic Susceptibility Pattern?

The microorganisms implicated in causation of VAP varies among ICUs. Studies conducted in Western countries demonstrated that majority of VAP episodes are caused by *Staphylococcus aureus* followed by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.¹⁸⁰ In a retrospective review of 8474 cases of VAP reported to CDC, staphylococcus accounted for 24.1% of cases followed by *Pseudomonas* (16.6%) and *Klebsiella* (10.1%).¹⁸¹

Studies from Asia show preponderance of gram-negative organisms as etiologic agent of VAP. A prospective surveillance study from 73 hospitals in 10 Asian countries from 2008 to 2009 including 2554 cases with HAP or VAP found that *Pseudomonas* (15.6%) was most common causative organism followed by *Staphylococcus aureus* (15.5%), *Acinetobacter* spp. (13.6%) and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (12%). Imipenem resistance of *Acinetobacter* and *P. aeruginosa* was 67.3% and 27.2% respectively. A large proportion of *Acinetobacter* (82%) and *P. aeruginosa* (42.8%) were multidrug resistant (MDR) while 51.1% and 4.9% were extensively drug resistant (XDR), respectively. The prevalence of MRSA among *S. aureus* isolates was 82.1%.¹⁸² Similarly, another retrospective study from Thailand also found *A. baumannii* (53.4%) as most common isolate followed by *P. aeruginosa* (35.2%) and MRSA (15.1%).¹⁸³

Multiple studies from Indian ICUs have also shown predominance of gram-negative bacilli (acinetobacter, pseudomonas and klebsiella) in VAP.^{184–186} These gram-negative bacilli are often multidrug resistant. A prospective study from Pondicherry showed an incidence of VAP to be 18% where pseudomonas and acinetobacter were common (21.3%) followed by staphylococcus (14.9%).¹⁸⁷ Another study from Karnataka found *A. baumannii* to be the commonest organism in both early and late onset VAP followed by pseudomonas. All isolates of acinetobacter were resistant to at least three antibiotics (i.e. MDR) and one isolate of acinetobacter was pan resistant.¹⁸⁸ There has been also a rise in carbapenem resistance of acinetobacter. A study done by Gurjar et al from SGPGI showed that 75% patients with VAP due to acinetobacter were carbapenem resistant.¹⁸⁹ Recent data from Indian Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance Network also showed high prevalence of carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae (96%), Acinetobacter (80%) and Pseudomonas (66.7%); colistin was the only drug with high sensitivity patterns (>90%).¹⁹⁰

To ensure appropriate therapy and de-escalation, microbiologic diagnosis is important in HAP and VAP. A meta-analysis of five RCTs ($n = 1367$ VAP patients) did not show any mortality benefit of using quantitative or qualitative cultures (RR 0.91; 95% CI 0.75 to 1.11), and invasive microbiologic sampling as compared to noninvasive sampling group (RR 0.93; 95% CI 0.78 to 1.11). Also, there was no difference in mechanical ventilation duration, antibiotic modifications or length of ICU stay.¹⁹⁵ Bronchoscopy is a safe procedure overall and in patients with HAP, COPD and acute respiratory failure.^{192–194} Use of bronchoscopic BAL led to significant reduction in antibiotic usage in intubated COVID19 patients.^{195,196} Bronchoscopic BAL has been the reference standard for the diagnosis of VAP in most studies.¹⁹⁷ A meta-analysis included 25 studies ($n = 1639$) which analysed various diagnostic methods for VAP with histopathologic diagnosis as the reference standard. In this meta-analysis, endotracheal aspirate had sensitivity of 75.7% (95% CI 51.5–90.1) and specificity of 67.9% (95% CI 40.5–86.8); PSB and BAL were less sensitive (PSB 61.4%, 95% CI 43.7–76.5; BAL 71.1%, 95% CI 49.9–85.9) and more specific (PSB 76.5%; 95% CI 64.2–85.6).¹⁹⁸ Nonbronchoscopic BAL had sensitivity of 0.90 (95% CI 0.78–1.00) and specificity of 0.83 (95% CI 0.72–0.94) when compared to bronchoscopic BAL for diagnosis of VAP in recent meta-analysis.¹⁹⁹ In a prospective study of 652 lower respiratory tract samples with suspected nosocomial pneumonia, multiplex PCR led to significantly higher rates pathogen identification (60.4% to 74.2%) as compared to routine microbiology.²⁰ In a retrospective multicentric study of 159 pneumonia episodes from France, which included 115 episodes of VAP and HAP, application of multiplex PCR would have led to empiric therapy modification in 77% episodes including de-escalation (40%) and escalation (22%). Application of multiplex PCR would have led to increased appropriate antibiotic therapy administration (87% vs 77%). As compared to routine care.²⁰¹

Evidence Statement

Ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP) and hospital acquired pneumonia (HAP) are commonly caused by aerobic gram-negative bacilli, such as acinetobacter baumannii, klebsiella pneumoniae, pseudomonas aeruginosa, or by gram-positive cocci (*Staphylococcus aureus*). In Indian ICUs, gram negative organisms are most common etiologic agents (i.e., acinetobacter, klebsiella and pseudomonas spp). Most of these pathogens have been found to be multidrug

resistant. Frequency of specific MDR pathogens causing HAP and VAP may vary by hospital, patient population, type of ICU patient, and change over time. Pan resistant organisms are increasingly being reported. Invasive sampling (including bronchoalveolar lavage) leads to better microbiologic diagnosis in HAP and VAP, but has not been associated with improved outcomes.

Should Baseline Serum Procalcitonin be Measured in Patients with Suspected VAP?

VAP has been associated with higher baseline serum procalcitonin (PCT) levels than controls in small observational studies.²⁰⁶ In a meta-analysis of 7 studies incorporating 373 patients, PCT had a pooled sensitivity of 76% (69–82), specificity of 79% (74–84), and positive and negative likelihood ratios of 4.35 (2.48–7.62), 0.26 (0.15–0.46) for VAP diagnosis.²⁰³ In a prospective multicentre database of 689 patients, serum PCT could not differentiate VAP from ventilator associated tracheobronchitis.²⁰⁴ Use of baseline procalcitonin to decide antibiotic initiation has been discouraged by various international guidelines.^{113,174,205} Various trials and studies of antibiotic de-escalation have used a cut off of 80% drop from baseline alongwith clinical judgement, necessitating which a baseline PCT measurement.^{115,118,206–208}

Evidence Statement

Baseline serum procalcitonin has moderate sensitivity and specificity for the diagnosis of ventilator and hospital acquired pneumonia, and cannot reliably differentiate between ventilator associated tracheobronchitis and ventilator associated pneumonia. An 80% decline from baseline procalcitonin levels has been used alongwith absolute value of less than 0.5ml to make decisions regarding antibiotic de-escalation.

Recommendation

- Serum procalcitonin should not be used for diagnosis of Ventilator Associated or Hospital Acquired Pneumonia or for decision making regarding antibiotic initiation (1A).
- Baseline procalcitonin levels may be measured in VAP, for future use in antibiotic de-escalation (2B).

What are the Risk Factors for MDR Pathogens in VAP in ICU?

Incidence of VAP caused by MDR organisms has increased in last decade and has been associated with increased cost of care, morbidity and mortality. Data from the early 1980s show that about 50% of mechanically ventilated patient develop VAP within first 4 days after intubation and were due to non-MDR pathogens. However, several recent studies show no significant difference between causative organisms in both early and late VAP.²⁰⁹ Various factors like advanced age (>60 years) and prior use of antibiotics have been consistently associated with increased risk of MDR organisms.^{210,211} In a prospective study done by Trouillet et al in 135 cases of VAP, the three variables identified as risk factors for MDR VAP were duration of mechanical ventilation (7 days or more) and prior use of broad spectrum antibiotics (third generation cephalosporins, fluoroquinolones, or imipenem).²¹² Renal replacement therapy and septic shock at admission were also found to be risk factors for MDR VAP.²¹³ Higher Acute Physiology And Chronic Health Evaluation II (APACHE II) score on admission, pleural effusion, prior antibiotic treatment, illicit drug use and tobacco are also found to be risk factors for MDR VAP due to MRSA.^{214,215} Similarly, vasopressor use, trauma and neurological emergency

were identified as additional risk factors for MDR VAP.²¹⁰ Two studies show that systemic corticosteroid therapy has also been implicated as risk factor for MDR VAP. However, both these studies do not mention the dose and duration for which corticosteroid therapy was used.^{210,216} In a recent meta-analysis of 10 studies comprising 4285 patients, Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II score (APACHE-II, OR 1.01, 95% CI 0.73-1.29), Simplified Acute Physiology Score II (SAPS-II, OR 2.81, 95% CI 0.85-4.76), length of stay in hospital prior to VAP onset (OR 2.64, 95% CI 0.39-4.89), ICU duration of stay (OR 3.95, 95% CI 0.89-7.02), Charlson comorbidities index (OR 1.00, 95% CI 0.89-1.11), overall hospital-stay [OR = 20.742, 95% CI (18.894, 22.591)], quinolone administration (OR 2.02, 95% CI 1.34-3.04), carbapenem (OR 3.53, 95% CI (2.48-5.02), combination of >2 antibiotics (OR 3.18, 95% CI 2.10-4.81) and prior antibiotic use (OR 2.97, 95% CI 2.00-4.41) were independent risk factors of MDR bacterial VAP, whereas diabetes and duration of mechanical ventilation did not show any positive correlation with MDR VAP.²¹⁷ Hospital settings with prevalence of MDR organisms more than 25% has also been identified as a risk factor for MDR VAP.²⁰⁵ Other approach has been to empirically use antibiotics against MDR GNBs and pseudomonas if their prevalence in local ICU or hospital setting is more than 15%, and to use empiric anti-MRSA antibiotics if local prevalence is >10%. If a patient has risk factors for GNBs and MRSA, empiric regimen covering both is initiated. Various guidelines suggest prescription of empiric antimicrobials based on risk factors for MDR organisms and to target threshold of 90% to 95% of prevalent MDR organisms while treating VAP.^{174,205} However, these risk factors have been criticized for having very low specificity.²¹⁸ Therefore it is pertinent to obtain a early microbiologic diagnosis to narrow down antibiotic therapy in VAP and HAP.

Evidence Statement

The risk factors for VAP due to MDR organisms include age >60 years, duration of mechanical ventilation ≥ 7 days, prior antibiotic use within 3 months, presence of severe sepsis or septic shock at time of VAP, ARDS preceding VAP, renal replacement therapy prior to VAP, systemic corticosteroid therapy and high prevalence (>25%) of MDR organisms in the hospital setting.

What should be the Initial Combination of Empiric Antibiotic Therapy for VAP in ICU?

Inadequate or inappropriate therapy for VAP has been associated with higher mortality rates.²¹⁹ A Cochrane review included four studies that compared monotherapy to combination antibiotic therapies for VAP. This analysis found no significant difference in primary end point of all-cause mortality and clinical cure rate in intention-to-treat population and clinically evaluable population between monotherapy and combination therapy. Similarly, comparison of combination therapy with optional adjunctive antibiotics (amikacin, vancomycin, linezolid, aztreonam, ceftazidime and tobramycin) did not find any difference in all-cause mortality, clinical cure rate in intention-to-treat population and clinical cure rate in clinically evaluable population. No difference in all-cause mortality or clinical cure rate in intention to treat population was found when carbapenems were compared with non-carbapenems; however, carbapenems had higher chance of clinical cure rate in clinically evaluable population. This meta-analysis supports the use of single antibiotic regimen with understanding that resistance patterns may vary depending upon the local factors.²²⁰ A similar meta-analysis by Infectious Disease Society of America

(IDSA) also found no difference between combination therapy versus monotherapy, cephalosporins versus non-cephalosporin regimen, antipseudomonal penicillin versus non-antipseudomonal penicillin regimen and carbapenems versus non-carbapenem regimen. For infections with carbapenemase producing MDR or XDR gram negative bacteria, a meta-analysis of 53 studies, including 10 studies with pneumonia, reported no mortality benefit or improved clinical cure with combination as compared to monotherapy in RCTs, whereas case series did show mortality benefit (RR 0.83, CI 0.73–0.93).²²¹ ESBL producing *E.coli* or Klebisella related bloodstream infections had significantly lower mortality with meropenem as compared to piperacillin tazobactam in a RCT of 391 patients.²²² Empiric carbapenems were associated with mortality benefit (RR 0.84; 95% CI, 0.74-0.96; $P = 0.01$) in a meta-analysis of 20 trials including 5489 patients. However, there was a trend towards resistance emergence (RR, 1.40; 95% CI, 0.95-2.06; $P = 0.09$). Also, most quantum of benefit was seen in early VAP trials prior to 2010.²²³ In a recent meta-analysis including 9 RCTs, carbapenems were associated with better resolution of pneumonia (OR 1.09; 95% CI 1.01–1.17) but had no mortality benefit (OR 0.83; 95% CI 0.67–1.02) as compared to non-carbapenem regimen in VAP.²²⁴ Among aminoglycoside versus non-aminoglycoside regimen, use of aminoglycoside regimen was associated with less chance of clinical response compared to non-aminoglycoside regimen. When comparing quinolones versus non-quinolone regimen, adverse event rates were less with quinolone regimen [Risk Ratio 0.88 (0.78-0.99) with 95% CI].¹⁷⁴ A meta-analysis by Walkey et al.²²⁵ found that linezolid was not superior to glycopeptide antibiotics for the end points of clinical success, microbiological success and mortality for patients with MRSA nosocomial pneumonia, without any significant difference in adverse events. However, another meta-analysis found more frequent gastrointestinal adverse effects with the use of linezolid.²²⁶ Colistin and polymyxin B usage has increased in recent years for use in VAP in view of increasing prevalence of multidrug resistant gram negative infections.²²⁷ A recent meta-analysis showed no significant difference in unadjusted mortality between colistin and polymyxin B (RR 0.71; 95% CI 0.45-1.13), however, colistin has increased risk of nephrotoxicity (RR 1.55, 95% CI 1.36-1.78).²²⁸ A propensity score based single center cohort study ($n = 102$) evaluated outcomes for VAP due to carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae and Acinetobacter baumannii, and did not find any benefit with tigecycline-polymyxin B combination as compared to high dose tigecycline in terms of 14-day mortality (OR, 0.72, 95% CI 0.27–1.83), clinical cure (OR, 1.09, 95% CI 0.48–2.54) microbiological cure (OR, 0.96, 95% CI 0.39–2.53) and nephrotoxicity (OR 0.85, 95% CI 0.36–1.99).²²⁹ There was no significant difference in 30 day all cause mortality between colistin monotherapy as compared to combination therapy in multidrug infections (OR OR 0.81, 95% CI 0.65–1.01).²³⁰ In a multicenter cohort study of 445 patients with pneumonia (CAP, $n = 1$; HCAP, $n = 321$), the authors used guideline-recommended risk factor assessment, and treated patients with >2 risk factors with empiric regimen covering MDR organisms, whereas patients with none or one risk factor were treated with antibiotics for CAP. Using this method, 53% patients required broad spectrum empiric therapy for MDR organisms, and yet 92.9% patients received appropriate therapy for the identified pathogen.²³¹

In a prospective study of 95 BAL and non-bronchoscopic BAL samples of HAP and VAP patients, multiplex PCR had a low turnaround time (4.6 hours), high sensitivity (80%, 95% CI, 73–88%), and specificity (99%, 95% CI 99–100). Sensitivity for GNBs was better than

that for GPBs (90% vs 62%; $p < 0.005$), with detection of extended spectrum beta-lactamases gene (CTX-M) and carbapenemase genes (NDM, oxa-48) in 75% ($n = 9/12$) cases. Multiplex PCR was simulated to have led to earlier identification of appropriate antibiotic ($n = 20$; 21%) and early de-escalation ($n = 37$; 39%) in 37 patients (39%) including de-escalation of empiric carbapenem regimen in 10 cases.²³² Multiplex PCR had a high sensitivity (100%) and specificity (87.2%) as compared to quantitative culture in a multicentric study of 842 prospectively collected respiratory specimens.²³³ However, with multiplex PCR, risk of overdiagnosis in terms of detecting resistance genes (15% to 45%) has been highlighted.²³⁴ In a multicentric randomised controlled trial of 206 VAP patients without septic shock, gram stain based empiric antibiotic regimen was noninferior to guideline based therapy in terms of clinical cure (77% vs 72%; risk difference 0.05, 95% CI -0.07 to 0.17), with reduced empiric anti-pseudomonal agents (70% vs 100%) and anti-MRSA antibiotics (61% vs 100%).²³⁵ However, the participating ICUs had low MDR GNB prevalence (<10%), and MRSA was the most common organism isolated (50%), thus limiting application in ICUs with high prevalence of NF-GNBs.

It is important to choose appropriate empiric antimicrobials for patients at high risk for MDR GNBs or in ICUs with high prevalence of MDR GNBs. However, in view of high prevalence of carbapenem resistant GNBs, it is important to plan empiric therapy to cover for these pathogens. Approaches to identify Options for empiric treatment for carbapenem resistant GNBs include addition of polymyxins to an antipseudomonal beta lactam, or treatment with newer antimicrobials or beta-lactamase combinations like ceftazidime-avibactam, ceftolozane-tazobactam, imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam, and meropenem-vaborbactam. Other options include aztreonam, tigecycline, minocycline and respiratory fluoroquinolones.

Ceftazidime-avibactam is approved for treatment of HAP or VAP and is shown to have better clinical cure rates and survival benefit in VAP due to carbapenem resistant GNB infections. In a multinational phase 3 double blind non inferiority trial randomizing 879 VAP patients, ceftazidime-avibactam met the pre-specified criteria for non-inferiority for clinical cure (68% vs 73% (difference -4.2%, 95% CI -10.8-2.5) as compared to meropenem (standard treatment group) without any significant difference in adverse events. Common isolated organisms in the study included *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (37%) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (30%); 28% were not susceptible to ceftazidime.²³⁶ Ceftazidime-avibactam salvage therapy was associated significantly lower 30 day mortality (36.5% vs 55.8%, $p = 0,005$) in a retrospective study of 138 bacteremic carbapenemase producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* infected patients.²³⁷ In a meta-analysis of prospective studies and case series (29 studies, 1620 patients), efficacy of ceftolozane-tazobactam, ceftazidime-avibactam and meropenem-vaborbactam was studied. Pneumonia was the most common infection (49.8%); common organisms were MDR *Pseudomonas* (MDRPA, 65.3%) and Carbapenem resistant enterobacteriaceae (CRE, 24%). Resistance to the studied antibiotics was seen in 8.9%. Pooled success rate for these antibiotics was 73.3% (95% CI, 68.9%–77.5%).²³⁸

Ceftolozane-tazobactam was evaluated in a randomised controlled double blind non-inferiority trial in 726 patients with nosocomial pneumonia. As compared to meropenem (control arm), treatment arm had similar 28 day mortality (24% vs 25.3%, weighted treatment difference 1.1%, 95% CI -5.1 -7.4), clinical cure rates (54% vs 53%, weighted treatment difference 1.1%, 95% CI -6.2-8.3).²³⁹

Ceftolozane-tazobactam had significantly higher clinical success rates than colistin (72.2% vs 30.3%) in a retrospective, observational study of 51 XDR *Pseudomonas* VAP patients, with higher odds for clinical success (OR 4.47, 95% CI 1.17–17.08), and lesser nephrotoxicity (11.1% vs 48.5%, $p = 0.01$).²⁴⁰ In a retrospective study of 200 patients with hospital acquired infections due to MDR *Pseudomonas*, efficacy of ceftolozane-tazobactam was compared with polymyxins and aminoglycosides. 52% of the cases had VAP, 7% had bacteremia and 42% had severe sepsis or septic shock. The ceftolozane-tazobactam arm had significantly less combination therapy (72% vs 15%, $p < 0.001$), higher clinical cure rates (adjusted OR 2.63; 95% CI 1.31-5.30) and less nephrotoxicity (aOR, 0.08; 95% CI, 0.03-0.22).²⁴¹ Ceftolozane-tazobactam has been observed to have in-vitro activity against 36.4% isolates of *Pseudomonas* with ceftazidime resistance.²⁴²

Imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam restores activity of imipenem against CRE and *Pseudomonas*, and was non-inferior in terms of 28 day all-cause mortality (15.9% vs 21.3%; difference -5.3%, 95%CI -11.9%-1.2%) and clinical response (61.0% vs 55.8%; difference 5.0%, 95% CI, -3.2%-13.2%) when compared to piperacillin-tazobactam in a randomised controlled trial of 537 bacterial HAP and VAP. Common pathogens in the trial were *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (25.6%) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (18.9%).²⁴³ Imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam had higher clinical response (71.4 vs 40 %, difference 26.3% 90% CI 1.3-51.5), lower mortality (9.5% vs 30%; difference -17.3%, 90% CI -46.4-6.7), and nephrotoxicity (10.3 vs 56.3%; difference -45.9%, 90% CI -69.1 to 18.4) as compared with imipenem plus colistin in a double blind RCT of 47 patients with imipenem resistant pathogens.²⁴⁴

Meropenem-vaborbactam, another carbapenem-beta-lactamase inhibitor, has activity against carbapenemase resistant enterobacteriaceae and had better clinical cure and 28 day all cause mortality when compared to best available therapy in an open label randomised controlled trial of 77 confirmed or suspected CRE infections.²⁴⁵ Meropenem-vaborbactam had similar mortality and adverse effects as compared to ceftazidime-avibactam in a retrospective study of 131 patients with CRE infections.²⁴⁶ However, this drug is not effective against carbapenem resistant *Pseudomonas* or *Acinetobacter*.

Prolonged infusion of anti-pseudomonal beta-lactams showed mortality benefit (30% lower, RR 0.7, 95%CI 0.56-0.87) in a meta-analysis of 22 RCTs ($n = 1876$) as compared to rapid infusion in patients with sepsis.⁷

Polymyxin B and colistin have similar microbiologic spectrum. They are highly efficacious against MDR *Pseudomonas*, *Acinetobacter* and enterobacteriaceae including *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. However, colistin is a prodrug, and needs conversion to active drug for efficacy.²⁴⁷ Pharmacokinetics of polymyxin B ensure rapid achievement of therapeutic levels in plasma, whereas even after giving a loading dose, colistin plasma levels rise slowly and variably, and desired plasma levels of 2 mg/L are difficult to achieve.²⁴⁸ A multicentre prospective trial comparing combination of colistin and levofloxacin to meropenem levofloxacin combination had to be terminated early due to excessive nephrotoxicity (33% vs 18.8%; $p = 0.012$).²⁴⁹ Polymyxin B has lesser incidence of acute kidney injury than colistin. Also, colistin achieves high concentrations in the urine due to activation into active form in the urinary tract. For this reason, polymyxin B is preferred in most invasive infections including VAP, whereas colistin is preferred in patients with complicated urinary tract infections.²⁵⁰

Aztreonam is a monobactam and acts on bacterial cell wall, though the targets are different than beta-lactams. Also, aztreonam is not degraded by class B metallo-beta-lactamases (e.g., NDM). It is active against gram negative bacteria including enterobacteriaceae and pseudomonas. However it lacks activity against gram positive organisms, anaerobes, and majority of acinetobacter or *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*.²⁵¹

Fosfomycin is bactericidal against a variety of gram negative and gram positive organisms like *Escherichia coli*, *Proteus mirabilis*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Enterobacter spp.*, *Citrobacter spp.*, and *Salmonella typhi*.²⁵² Intravenous fosfomycin use was reported in 209 ICU patients across 20 centres in Europe. Main indications were CNS infections (21.5%), CAP/VAP (15.3%), bone and joint infections (11%) abdominal infections (11%) and bacteremia (10.5%). MDR pathogens were isolated in 24.4% patients. Fosfomycin was nearly always used in combination with other antibiotics. Clinical success was 81.3% overall and 84.8% in cases with MDR pathogens.²⁵³

Tetracyclines like minocycline, tigecycline and eravacycline have been considered as potential alternatives to beta-lactams and polymyxins in CRE infections. They function independent of carbapenemases making them potentially useful in treating resistant infections. However, they have rapid distribution into tissue following administration, and thus attain low serum and urine concentrations making them ineffective for blood stream infections and urinary tract infections. Also, due to bacteriostatic nature of tetracyclines, they need to be used as a part of combination regimen. Tetracyclines can be used for carbapenem resistant enterobacteriaceae and acinetobacter, whereas pseudomonas are intrinsically resistant to tetracyclines.²⁵⁴ Minocycline, a tetracycline, has been studied for MDR VAP especially in ICUs with high prevalence of CRE *Acinetobacter*. A recent meta-analysis evaluated the efficacy of combination therapy with minocycline as compared to other combination regimens as controls. Out of 10 eligible studies, 9 were retrospective case series and one was a prospective single center study ($n = 268$). Most common comparators were *E. coli* or carbapenems. Pneumonia was the most common infection (80.6%) with VAP in 50.4% cases. Intravenous minocycline had good clinical success (72.6%) and microbiologic success rates (72.6%) with 20.9% mortality.²⁵⁵ Minocycline was effective in treating pneumonia and blood stream infections due to GNBs in a prospective study ($n = 71$) with clinical and microbiologic response in 80% patients. The most prevalent gram-negative pathogens in the study were *Stenotrophomonas* (52%), *Acinetobacter* (30%), and *Burkholderia* (10%).²⁵⁶ Tigecycline monotherapy was associated with higher mortality as empiric therapy in pneumonia in a meta-analysis.²⁵⁷ Subsequently, a phase II trial of higher doses of tigecycline monotherapy were compared to imipenem-cilastin in HAP, and had similar efficacy outcomes, without any safety issues.²⁵⁸ High dose tigecycline demonstrated efficacy in a meta-analysis of 10 studies ($n=543$) in terms of all-cause mortality (OR 0.44, 95% CI 0.30–0.66), clinical cure rates (OR 3.43, 95% CI 2.09–5.63), $p < 0.00001$, and microbiological eradication (OR 2.25, 95% CI 1.44–3.50) with mortality benefit in subgroup with CRE infections. However, most studies were retrospective, with only one observational study, and one phase II RCT. Also, most studies had given high dose tigecycline in combination with standard background therapy (i.e., beta-lactams, carbapenems, colistin or aminoglycosides).²⁵⁹ In CRE *Acinetobacter* pneumonia, tigecycline had similar mortality and clinical cure rates as compared to other regimens, but had significantly lesser microbiologic eradication

(OR = 0.43, 95% CI = 0.27-0.66) highlighting potential concerns for resistance induction.²⁶⁰ Eravacycline and has been studied in intra-abdominal infections.²⁶¹ In a retrospective study of 97 patients with *Acinetobacter* VAP, eravacycline arm had higher mortality and lesser clinical cure and microbiologic eradication rates.²⁶² Omadacycline is another tetracycline with in vitro activity against CRE, but has not been recommended due to PK/PD issues and reduced potency.^{263,264}

MDR VAP pathogens have increasing prevalence of resistance against antipseudomonal fluoroquinolones (ciprofloxacin and levofloxacin) and aminoglycosides and therefore, the merit of adding these as a part of combination therapy has been questioned.¹⁷⁴

Adjunct inhaled antibiotics have been studied in VAP and HAP treatment. In a prospective, multicenter, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3 study of 725 VAP patients with isolation of MDR GNB or presence or two risk factors for MDR GNB, inhaled amikacin did not demonstrate any mortality benefit (75% vs 77%, OR 0.84, 95% CI 0.55–1.28; $p = 0.43$).²⁶⁵ In a recent meta-analysis of eleven RCTs ($n = 1210$), adjunctive inhaled antibiotics improved clinical cure rates (RR 1.13, 95% CI 1.02-1.26) and microbiological eradication (RR 1.45, 95% CI 1.19-1.76) in VAP patients without any mortality benefit (RR 1.00, 95% CI 0.82-1.21).²⁶⁶ There was no increased risk of renal impairment, however, there was increased risk of bronchospasm (RR 2.74, 95% CI 1.31-5.73) during treatment. In another meta-analysis evaluating efficacy of adjunct nebulised colistin in VAP treatment, 7 observational studies and three RCTs including 850 VAP patients were included. Nebulised colistin had higher microbiologic eradication (OR, 2.21; 95%CI, 1.25–3.92) without any increase in nephrotoxicity (OR, 0.86; 95%CI, 0.60–1.23). However, nebulised colistin did not improve clinical response (OR, 1.39; 95%CI, 0.87–2.20), mortality (OR, 0.74; 95%CI, 0.50–1.12), duration of mechanical ventilation (mean difference -2.5; 95%CI, -5.20–0.19), or length of ICU stay (MD, -1.91; 95%CI, -6.66–2.84) as compared to intravenous therapy group. In terms of adverse effects, nebulised colistin had higher risk of bronchospasm (OR, 5.19; 95%CI, 1.05–25.52).²⁶⁷ In a retrospective multicentric cohort study evaluating efficacy of adjunct polymyxin B in 132 VAP patients, there was no significant difference in clinical cure rates (43.2% vs 27.3%, $p = 0.06$), bacterial eradication (36.4% vs 23.9%, $p = 0.132$) and mortality (34.1% vs 42.0%, $p = 0.38$).²⁶⁸

For MRSA coverage in VAP and HAP, Linezolid, vancomycin and teicoplanin are commonly used drugs. Linezolid showed better clinical success rates, microbiologic eradication and lesser nephrotoxicity than vancomycin in various trials and meta-analyses.^{98,99} Other antibiotics with activity against MRSA include daptomycin, ceftaroline, tedizolid, omadacycline, Lefamulin, Delafloxacin, telavancin and ceftobiprole. Off-label Ceftaroline had success rate of 75% in a retrospective study of 40 MRSA HAP and VAP patients.²⁶⁹ Tedizolid was compared to linezolid in a RCT of 726 patients with HAP or VAP with suspected gram positive pathogen, and was found to be noninferior in terms of all-cause mortality (28.1% vs 26.4%, difference 1.8%; 95% CI -8.2- 4.7) but had inferior clinical cure rates (56.3% vs 63.9%; difference 7.6%, 97.5% CI -15.7- 0.5).²⁷⁰ Telavancin was noninferior to vancomycin in terms of cure rates (82.4% vs 80.7%; 95% CI for difference, -4.3%-7.7%) in RCT of hospitalised patients with gram positive HAP and VAP.²⁷¹ However, telavancin had lower cure rates and lower survival rates in patients with moderate to severe renal impairment (CrCl <50 mL/minute).²⁷² Ceftobiprole was evaluated in a RCT of 781 patients with

HAP and VAP, and compared to ceftazidime-linezolid combination. Overall cure rates (50% vs 53%) and microbiologic eradication (63% vs 68%; 95% CI -16.7 to 7.6) were similar. However, VAP patients had significantly lower cure rates (23% vs 37%) and microbiologic eradication (30% vs 50%; 95% CI -38.8 to -0.4) in ceftobiprole group.²⁷³ Tigecycline has MRSA activity but has been associated with increased mortality when used for MRSA HAP and VAP.²⁷⁴

Evidence Statement

Use of combination therapy for VAP has better outcomes in patients who are at risk for MDR pathogens. Commonly used antimicrobial agents include piperacillin-tazobactam, cefepime, levofloxacin, imipenem and meropenem. Among antimicrobial agents, carbapenems have a higher chance of clinical cure than non-carbapenems. Patients with high risk of MDR HAP or VAP, i.e., those admitted in ICUs with high prevalence of MDR organisms, prior isolation of MDR GNBs from respiratory secretions have been treated with combination therapy of carbapenems or beta-lactams with colistin or polymyxin. Monotherapy with newer beta-lactam-beta-lactamase combinations (e.g., ceftazidime-avibactam) or carbapenem-beta-lactamase combination (e.g., Imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam, meropenem-vaborbactam) have better outcomes and less toxicity as compared to other available regimens or polymyxins. Polymyxin B and colistin have been found to be efficacious in treatment of carbapenem resistant *Klebsiella* and *Acinetobacter*, but colistin has a higher incidence of nephrotoxicity. Tigecycline and minocycline are alternative options for CRE infections when *Pseudomonas* is not a consideration. Aztreonam as a part of combination therapy is an alternative when newer beta-lactam-beta lactamase combinations are not available, or in presence of metalloproteinases like NDM. For treatment of VAP due to MRSA, glycopeptides and linezolid have similar clinical success, however, linezolid may be associated with higher chance of thrombocytopenia and gastrointestinal adverse events. Adjunct nebulised antibiotics (colistin, aminoglycosides) have been found to increase microbiologic eradication without any mortality benefit in VAP and HAP.

Gram staining of respiratory secretions can lead to lesser prescription of anti-pseudomonal and anti-MRSA antibiotics without compromising clinical cure rates in ICUs with low MDR organism prevalence. Molecular techniques like multiplex PCR have a very less turnaround time and can be used to effectively modify empiric regimen for HAP and VAP.

Recommendation

- Among patients with VAP who are at high risk of MDR pathogens or are in ICU with high prevalence of MRSA (>15%) and resistant gram-negative organisms (>10%), an agent active against MRSA and at least two agents active against gram-negative organisms including *P. aeruginosa* is recommended (3A).
- Among patients with VAP who are not at high risk of MDR pathogens and are in ICU with high prevalence of resistant gram-negative organisms (>15%) but low prevalence of MRSA (<10%), two agents active against gram-negative organism including *P. aeruginosa* is recommended (3A).
- Linezolid, vancomycin or teicoplanin should be used for empiric MRSA coverage in patients at high risk of MRSA (1A).
- In patients with high risk for MDR GNBs and prior isolation of MDR or carbapenem resistant GNBs from respiratory secretions, monotherapy with newer agents (Ceftazidime-avibactam, Ceftolozane-tazobactam, Imipenem-cilastatin-relebactam or

Meropenem-vaborbactam) should be preferred to combination therapy (2A).

- Polymyxin B (preferred) or colistin as part of empiric combination regimen can be used in the ICUs with high prevalence of carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae (>20%) in patients with risk factors for MDR or XDR gram negative pathogens (2A).
- In patients with high risk for MDR GNBs or prior isolation of MDR/carbapenem resistant GNBs from respiratory secretions, tetracyclines (tigecycline or minocycline) may be used as part of combination therapy if no alternate drugs can be given, in patients without bacteremia, and *Pseudomonas* is not a consideration (3B).
- In patients with high risk for MDR GNBs, aztreonam can be used as part of combination regimen if no alternate drugs are available or pseudomonal coverage is needed (3A).
- In ICU where distribution of pathogen and antibiotic resistance pattern is known, empiric treatment should be designed accordingly, based upon patient risk factors for MDR pathogens (UPP).
- Adjunct nebulised antibiotics (colistin, aminoglycosides) can be used in combination with systemic therapy for empiric treatment of VAP on case-to-case basis or microbiologic sensitivity (3A).
- Invasive sampling (Nonbronchoscopic BAL or bronchoscopic BAL, protected specimen brushing) should be performed in VAP for microbiologic diagnosis and definitive antibiotic therapy (2A).
- Multiplex PCR of respiratory specimens (non-bronchoscopic BAL, or bronchoscopic BAL) should be used for early identification of causative organisms and appropriate modification of antibiotic therapy (2A).
- Gram stain of respiratory specimens can be used for early de-escalation of empiric anti-MRSA therapy (2A).
- In our country or in areas with high endemicity of tuberculosis, use of linezolid may be restricted unless no suitable alternative is available (UPP).
- Fluoroquinolones and aminoglycosides should be cautiously used as monotherapy in VAP in our country as well as in other areas with high endemicity of tuberculosis. (UPP)

When to Give Antipseudomonal Drugs for VAP in ICU?

Antipseudomonal drugs are often started empirically in VAP when the risk factors for *Pseudomonas* infection are high. In a prospective surveillance study, it was found that the odds of developing *P. aeruginosa* VAP were 8 times higher in patients with prior *Pseudomonas* colonization than uncolonized patients.²⁷⁵ In a multicentre study, the independent risk factors for the presence of *P. aeruginosa* were duration of hospital stay ≥ 48 hours before ICU admission, prolonged duration of ICU stay before enrollment >9 days (highest quartile) versus ICU stay ≤ 4.8 days (lowest quartile).²⁷⁶ Risk factors of MDR *P. aeruginosa* include COPD, patients on mechanical ventilation >8 days or patients with >3 previous hospitalizations, and previous use of antibiotics.^{277,278}

Evidence Statement

Prior use of antibiotics (most consistent association), prolonged duration of mechanical ventilation, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) have been identified as risk factors for MDR *P. aeruginosa* infection.

Recommendation

- Empiric treatment should be given to cover *Pseudomonas* if there are risk factors for MDR *Pseudomonas* infection (2A).

- In ICUs where gram-negative isolate resistance rate is high (>10 % gram-negative isolate resistant to agent being considered for monotherapy or not known), two anti-pseudomonal antibiotics from different class to be given (3A).

What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment for HAP/VAP?

Prompt initiation of appropriate antimicrobial therapy is the main stay of treatment of VAP. Selection of correct antimicrobial agent must be paired with appropriate duration of therapy in order to optimally treat VAP/HAP. Several studies have evaluated the role of short duration antibiotic treatment in VAP/HAP. A study comparing 8 days therapy to 15 days therapy found no difference in mortality, relapses, mechanical ventilator free days, organ failure free days and length of ICU stay while short course regimen was associated with more antibiotic free days. However, gram-negative bacilli (*P. aeruginosa*) with short course regimen were more likely to have a relapse (40.6% vs 25.4%).²⁷⁹ A randomized comparison of antibiotic discontinuation policy (discontinuation group) with treating physician teams policy (conventional group) found lower antibiotic duration in discontinuation group without any difference in secondary episode of VAP, hospital mortality or ICU length of stay.²⁸⁰

A recent meta-analysis by Dimpoulous et al reviewed 4 RCTs comparing short (7-8 days) with long (10-15 days) regimens and found increased antibiotic free days with short course treatment with mean difference of 3.4 days ($p < 0.001$) and no difference in mortality, clinical and microbiological relapses, mechanical ventilation duration, mechanical ventilation free days and length of ICU stay.²⁸¹ In another meta-analysis of 5 studies ($n = 1069$), short and long course antibiotic therapy had similar VAP recurrence (OR 1.48, 95% CI 0.96, 2.28; $p = 0.08$) overall, and in patients with NF-GNB VAP (OR 1.90, 95% CI 0.93, 3.33; $p = 0.05$), without any difference in duration of mechanical ventilation, length of ICU stay or mortality.²⁸²

Evidence Statement

Short-course regimens for VAP are associated with significantly more antibiotic-free days without any significant difference in duration of ICU or hospital stay, recurrence of VAP and mortality. Short-course regimens are associated with more recurrences in VAP due to non-fermenting gram-negative bacilli (NF-GNB).

Recommendation

- Short course (7-8 days) of antibiotic therapy should be used, in case of VAP with good clinical response to therapy (1A).
- Longer duration (14 days) of antibiotic therapy should be considered, in case of VAP caused by NF-GNBs or is associated with severe immunodeficiency, structural lung disease (COPD, bronchiectasis, and interstitial lung disease), empyema, lung abscess, necrotizing pneumonia and inappropriate initial antimicrobial therapy (3A).

When should Anaerobic Cover be Added for VAP and Which is the Preferred Antimicrobial Agent?

Studies have reported variable incidence of anaerobic organism isolation in nosocomial pneumonia occurring in mechanically ventilated patients as isolation of anaerobic bacteria requires adequate transport conditions and special growth media. In a retrospective study in 415 patients, factors associated with anaerobic infection were found to be altered level of consciousness

and higher simplified acute physiology score (SAPS).²⁸³ Out of 163 isolates from VAP patients, only one was anaerobic (*Veillonella*) in a study done by PE Marik et al.²⁸⁴ Robert et al evaluated the lower respiratory tract colonization by anaerobic bacteria in ICU patients on prolonged mechanical ventilation. Out of 26 patients, 22 were colonized by at least one bacterial strain and 5 patients developed VAP following colonization and two were attributable to anaerobic bacteria.²⁸⁵

Evidence Statement

Incidence of anaerobic bacteria as causative agent of VAP is 2 to 7%. Risk factors for VAP due to anaerobes are altered consciousness, aspiration pneumonitis and high simplified acute physiology score (SAPS).

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic regimen for VAP should not include coverage for anaerobic organisms routinely (2A).
- In presence of risk factors for VAP due to anaerobic pathogens, anaerobic antimicrobial coverage should be added in empirical regimen (2B).
- In patients with risk factors for anaerobic organisms, clindamycin or metronidazole should be added to empirical antibiotics regimen for VAP, if it does not include carbapenems (meropenem or imipenem) or piperacillin-tazobactam in the ongoing empirical regimen (UPP).

When to Give Atypical Cover for VAP and Which is the Preferred Agent?

Atypical bacteria have been implicated as etiologic agents for VAP, however, no sufficient literature exists to assess size of their role as causative agent in VAP. Incidence of atypical bacteria is variable in various studies. A prospective study utilizing polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification method found 9 (15%) cases caused by atypical organisms (5 mycoplasma, 3 legionella and 1 chlamydia).²⁸⁶ Another study reported 6 cases of VAP due to legionella among 26 patients with definite VAP.²⁸⁷ *M. pneumoniae* in 3 patients and *C. pneumoniae* in 2 patients were diagnosed among 100 VAP cases in a study by Apfalter et al.²⁸⁸ The risk factors for legionella infection include use of cytotoxic therapy and corticosteroids.²⁸⁹ If *L. pneumophila* is suspected organism for VAP, the combination antibiotic regimen should include a macrolide or a fluoroquinolone rather than an aminoglycoside.²⁹⁰

Evidence Statement

Incidence of atypical bacteria as causative agents of VAP is low (5 to 7.5%). Risk factors for VAP due to legionella are legionella colonization in hospital water supply, prolonged use of corticosteroids, cytotoxic chemotherapy, elderly, chronic renal failure, previous antibiotic use, granulocytopenia and poor Glasgow coma score.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic regimen for VAP should not include coverage for atypical organisms routinely (2A).
- In the presence of risk factors for VAP due to atypical bacterial pathogens, atypical antimicrobial coverage should be added to empirical regimen (2B).
- The preferred atypical coverage in combination antibiotics regimen is fluoroquinolones (levofloxacin or moxifloxacin) or macrolides (azithromycin or clarithromycin) (UPP).

Can Serum Procalcitonin be Used for De-escalation of Antibiotic Therapy in VAP?

Procalcitonin (PCT) is a polypeptide precursor to hormone calcitonin and is up-regulated from its normal low serum concentration in response to bacterial endotoxin or mediator of bacterial infection.²⁹¹ Measurement of serum PCT has been investigated as biomarker for the presence and persistence of infection, in order to guide decisions for initiation, de-escalation and termination of antibiotic treatment. Delayed initiation of antibiotics in patients with sepsis contribute to increase mortality, while inappropriately prolonged use of antibiotics increases the risk of adverse events, including *Clostridium difficile* infection, and the development of antibiotic resistance. Various studies have evaluated the role of serum PCT in de-escalation of antibiotics. In a multicentric non-blinded RCT comparing guideline based antibiotic discontinuation with procalcitonin based antibiotic discontinuation, procalcitonin group had higher antibiotic free days and reduction in overall duration of antibiotic therapy though the ventilator free days alive, ICU free days alive, length of hospital stay and mortality on 28 days were similar.²⁰⁶ PRORATA trial found that PCT guided strategy to treat suspected bacterial infection in ICU could reduce antibiotic exposure by 2.7 days with no apparent adverse outcome.²⁹² Two meta-analyses have also demonstrated increased antibiotic free days in PCT based strategies without negatively affecting the outcome.^{293,294} International guidelines differ on using procalcitonin for antibiotic de-escalation in VAP. American Thoracic Society guidelines suggest using PCT plus clinical criteria to guide the discontinuation of antibiotic therapy rather than clinical criteria alone.¹⁷⁴ In contrast, European respiratory Society (ERS) guidelines do not recommend the routine measurement of serial serum PCT levels to reduce the duration of antibiotic course in patients with HAP or VAP when the anticipated duration is 7-8 days although panel mention that they believe in measurement of serial serum PCT levels together with clinical assessment in specific clinical circumstances (such as severely immunocompromised patients, drug resistant pathogens-NF-GNB, and initial inappropriate therapy).²⁰⁵

Evidence Statement

Use of procalcitonin to guide de-escalation of antibiotic treatment in patients with VAP is effective in reducing antibiotic exposure, without an increase in the risk of mortality or treatment failure.

Recommendation

- Serum procalcitonin may be used to guide the de-escalation of antibiotics in VAP, when the anticipated duration of therapy is >7–8 days (1B).
- Serum procalcitonin levels (together with clinical response) should be used for de-escalation of antibiotic therapy in VAP in specific clinical conditions (severely immunocompromised patients, drug resistant pathogens-NF-GNB, initial inappropriate therapy) (3A).

How to Approach a Patient of Non-responding VAP?

Non-responding VAP or treatment failure in VAP is defined as the lack of improvement in clinical parameters (48-72 hours) with or without persistence of the infecting microorganism from appropriate sample.^{295,296} Various clinical parameters such as the white blood cell count, measures of oxygenation and core temperature have been used in studies to define the normal pattern of resolution of HAP. In a prospective cohort study assessing the

resolution of VAP, it was found that temperature normalizes within a median of 3 days and ratio of arterial oxygen partial pressure to fractional inspired oxygen (PaO₂/ FiO₂ ratio) improves by 2 days.²⁹⁷ Another study evaluated bacteriological and clinical efficacy of microbiological treatment of VAP among 76 VAP cases and demonstrated that appropriate antimicrobial therapy for VAP results in the control of the initial infection in 88% of the patients, after day 3 of treatment.²⁹⁸ There are many implicated causes for non-resolution of VAP. These include wrong diagnosis (such as collapse, mass or pleural effusion), inappropriate initial treatment, delayed initiation of treatment, superinfection, concomitant focus of infection or associated complications in the form of lung abscess, empyema or drug fever.^{299,300}

Evidence Statement

Re-evaluation at 48 to 72 hours after the initial diagnosis of VAP is the most suitable time. By then the results of the initial microbial investigation are usually available and treatment modification can be done. Evaluation of treatment response for VAP should be on the basis of clinical, laboratory, radiograph and microbiological results. Factors associated with treatment failure in VAP includes host factors (advanced age, immunosuppressed, chronic lung disease, ventilator dependence), bacterial factors (drug resistant pathogens, opportunistic pathogens), therapeutic factors (inappropriate antibiotics, delayed initiation of therapy, insufficient duration of therapy, suboptimal dosing, inadequate local concentration of drugs), complications of initial VAP episode (lung abscess, empyema), other non-pulmonary infections or non-infectious mimics of pneumonia.

Recommendation

- Non-responding VAP should be evaluated for non-infectious mimics of pneumonia, unsuspected or drug-resistant pathogens, extrapulmonary sites of infection, and complications of pneumonia or its therapy and diagnostic testing should be directed to whichever of these causes is likely (2A).
- CT Chest and other indicated imaging modalities should be performed to clarify diagnosis in non-responding VAP and HAP (3A).
- Microbiologic analysis of blood, respiratory specimen (non-bronchoscopic or bronchoscopic BAL) and other samples like pleural fluid should be performed using conventional culture and molecular methods for identification of pathogens in non-responding HAP and VAP (3A).

CATHETER RELATED BLOODSTREAM INFECTIONS (CRBSI)

Intravascular catheters are integral in the management of critically ill patients, especially those who require long-term medical care. They are most commonly used to access the vascular system for the delivery of medication, parenteral nutrition, collection of blood samples and hemodynamic monitoring.³⁰¹ CRBSI is defined as the presence of bacteremia originating from an intravenous catheter is a common complication leading to morbidity, mortality and adds to the cost of ICU stay. It is also the most common cause of nosocomial bacteremia in ICUs.³⁰²

Definition and Diagnosis

Catheter Related Bloodstream Infections (CRBSI) is defined as bacteremia or fungemia in a patient who has an intravascular device

and one positive blood culture result obtained from the peripheral vein, clinical manifestations of infection (e.g., fever, chills, and/or hypotension), and no apparent source for bloodstream infection (other than the catheter). One of the following should be present, i.e., a positive result of semi-quantitative [>15 colony forming units (CFU) per catheter segment] or quantitative [$>10^2$ CFUs per catheter segment] catheter culture, whereby the same organism is isolated from a catheter segment and a peripheral blood culture; simultaneous quantitative cultures of blood with a ratio 13:1 of CFU per milliliter of blood (catheter vs peripheral blood); differential time to positivity (growth in a culture of blood obtained through a catheter hub is detected by an automated blood culture system at least 2 hours earlier than a culture of simultaneously drawn peripheral blood of equal volume).³⁰³ Catheter tip colonization (CC) is defined as significant growth of a microorganism (>15 colony-forming units) from the catheter tip culture.³⁰³ CRBSI rates are expressed as CRBSI rate per 1000 central line days. However, the suspicion of CRBSI arises in a patient using any intravascular catheter especially central venous catheter (CVC) who develops new onset fever or chills, unexplained hypotension without any other localizing signs of infection.³⁰²

What is the Incidence of Catheter Colonization and CRBSI?

Based on United States (US) data from national nosocomial infections surveillance (NNIS) from 1990 to 1994, the CRBSI incidence (per 1000 catheter days) was 4.3 for respiratory intensive care units (RICU), 4.6 for medical-surgical ICUs, 7.3 for trauma ICUs and 12.2 for burn units.³⁰⁴ Data from NNIS from January 1992 through June 2004 showed that the median rate of CRBSI in ICUs of all types ranged from 1.8-5.2 per 1000 catheter days,³⁰⁵ whereas more recent survey in 2010 showed the mean incidence upto 1.76 per 1000 catheter days, suggesting a decreasing trend.³⁰⁶

Data from extended prevalence of infection in intensive care study (EPIC 2) showed an overall point prevalence of 4.7 per 1000 catheter days.³⁰⁷ In the EPIC III study, 1239 (15.2%) patients had CRBSI with a hospital mortality of 38.1%.³⁰⁸ A prospective observational study by Lorente et al showed incidence of CC as 6.04 % and of CRBSI to be 2.79 per 1000 catheter days.³⁰⁹ Other studies have shown global incidence of CC to be 1.4-20 % while that of CRBSI to be 2.4-12.5 per 1000 catheter days.³¹⁰⁻³¹³ Majority of these studies have shown CVCs as the commonest cause for CRBSIs. The data from India suggest higher incidence of CC and CRBSI. In a study by Mittal et al CC was found in 59 % catheters with CRBSI rate of 9.5 per 1000 days.³⁰¹ Others have shown incidence of CC as 18-42 % while of CRBSI is 1-16.1 per 1000 catheter days.^{314,315}

Evidence Statement

The global incidence of CC ranges from 1.4 % to 19.4 % whereas CRBSI incidence ranges from 2.4 % to 12.5 %. The incidence of CC is higher in Indian ICUs ranging from 18 % to as high as 59 %, whereas incidence of CRBSI is upto 16.1 per 1000 catheter days.

What are the Risk Factors for CRBSI?

Incidence of CRBSI varies considerably according to various factors such as the type of catheter (single or multi lumen), duration of indwelling catheters, frequency of catheter manipulation, and patient-related factors such as age, underlying disease and severity of illness. In a retrospective study in 73 events of CRBSI, major risk factors found were advanced age, long-term indwelling catheter, parenteral nutrition, diabetes mellitus (DM), and APACHE

II score >23 , and more than three underlying diseases. Multivariate analysis showed that an APACHE II score >20 and more than three underlying diseases were independent factors associated with CRBSI occurring within 14 days of CVC insertion.³¹⁶ Duration of catheter is an important parameter and catheter duration >14 days is an independent risk factor for CRBSI.^{310,313,317-320} Risk for CRBSI is higher when the interval time for dressing change is longer than 48 hours irrespective of the dressing material (permeable or semi-permeable).³¹² Use of transparent dressings, regular change of dressings, total parenteral nutrition, and use of three way cannulas have not been consistently associated with increased risk for CRBSIs.^{312,317} Regarding hemodialysis (HD) catheters, prospective data by Caylan et al in 248 patients with HD catheters have shown acute renal disease, administration of antibiotics at the time of catheterization, insertion in the femoral vein, emergency situation for catheter insertion, high number of catheter manipulation, and inadequate hand hygiene prior to catheter manipulations as risk factors of CRBSI.³²¹ Catheter-related candidemia should be suspected in patients with any of the following risk factors: total parenteral nutrition, prolonged use of broad-spectrum antibiotics, hematologic malignancies, and receipt of bone marrow or solid-organ transplant, femoral catheterization, or colonization due to *Candida* species at multiple sites.³⁰³

Evidence Statement

Longer indwelling catheter duration, immunosuppression, diabetes mellitus, sepsis at the time of insertion, multi-lumen catheters and APACHE >23 are important risk factors for CRBSI. APACHE at admission, renal failure, central venous catheterization and steroid therapy are important risk factors for fungal CRBSI.

What are the Common Organisms Causing CRBSI and their Antibiotic Susceptibility?

Apart from severity of the patient's clinical disease and risk factors for infection, initial choice of antibiotics will also depend on the likely pathogens and their susceptibility patterns. According to the available literature, certain organisms should always be considered, apart from taking the local epidemiology into account. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) survey of nosocomial infections from 1990 to 1999 showed coagulase negative staphylococcus (CONS), *Staphylococcus aureus* and enterococcus as common organisms while *Candida albicans* accounted for 5% of the CRBSI. A large proportion of CONS isolates were methicillin resistant and the incidence of MRSA and vancomycin resistant enterococcus (VRE) was 54.5 % and 25.9 % respectively.³⁰⁴ According to NNIS 2004 data, 87 % of CRBSI were monomicrobial, out of which 65 % were gram-positive organisms, 25 % were gram-negative organisms and 9.5 % were fungi, with CONS, *Staphylococcus* and *Candida* being the common organisms.³²² During this period, there was 12 % increase in VRE and 11 % increase in MRSA. There was a marked increase in ESBL producing *Klebsiella* with 47 % increase in overall incidence. The proportion of CRBSI due to gram-negative organisms like *Pseudomonas*, *Acinetobacter* and *Klebsiella* is also on rising trends according to recent studies. In a recent observational study, CRBSIs due to *Pseudomonas* and *Acinetobacter* were 22.2% and 20% respectively.³¹⁰ This rise in gram-negative organisms has been found in various studies from India as well.^{315,316,323,324} In a meta-analysis of 11 studies including 1205 patients with blood stream infections, Ceftazidime-avibactam had significantly lower 30-day mortality than control groups overall (RR = 0.55, 95% CI 0.45 to 0.68), when compared to colistin (RR = 0.48, 95% CI 0.33- 0.69),

and in subgroup of CRE producing *Klebsiella* (RR = 0.59, 95% CI 0.46-0.75).³²⁵

In Indian ICUs the MRSA incidence ranges from 30% to 87% and that of VRE is as high as 25%.^{323,324} Incidence of ESBL producing organisms has also increased with some studies showing all isolates to be ESBL producing.³²⁶ The proportion of CRBSI caused by fungi varies among different studies and usually ranges from 4.4 % to 20 % and mostly were due to *Candida albicans*.^{324,327} However, a prospective observational study from 27 Indian ICUs found *Candida tropicalis* (41.6 %) as the most common cause of fungemia followed by *Candida albicans* (20.9%) and *Candida parapsilosis* (10.9 %). Majority of *C. tropicalis* isolates were sensitive to amphotericin B (99.0 %), azoles (90.1 %), fluconazole (97.4 %) and echinocandins (94.2 %).³²⁸

Evidence Statement

Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CONS), *S. aureus*, enterococcus and *Candida* species are the common organisms accounting for majority of the CRBSIs. Large proportion of *Staphylococcus aureus* and CONS are methicillin resistant ranging from 11 % to 87 %. There is an increased incidence of CRBSI due to gram-negative organisms (most of which are ESBL producers) and *Candida* especially the non-*albicans* *Candida*.

What is/are the Empiric Antibiotic(s) of Choice for CRBSI in ICU?

Empiric treatment, when indicated, should provide coverage against the most frequent organisms causing CRBSI i.e. gram-positive as well as gram-negative organisms. Vancomycin, teicoplanin and linezolid are considered the initial drugs of choice for empiric treatment for gram-positive organisms as the incidence of methicillin resistance is high among CONS and *S. aureus*. A recent meta-analysis by J Li et al included 7 RCTs comparing linezolid with vancomycin in 5376 patients with MRSA.³²⁹ The clinical cure rate of linezolid group was higher than that of vancomycin group after treatment (OR 1.85; 95% CI: 1.33-2.59, $p < 0.001$) and at follow-up (OR 1.49; 95% CI: 1.17-1.91, $p = 0.001$). However, linezolid monotherapy has not been recommended for empirical treatment of patients with suspected CRBSI.³³⁰ Teicoplanin is a safe and effective alternative to vancomycin considering the lesser toxicity and once daily schedule.³³¹ Quinupristin-dalfopristin and daptomycin might be alternative drugs effective in MRSA bacteremia and enterococci showing comparable results with vancomycin in RCTs.^{332,333} Dalbavancin is another drug belonging to same class as vancomycin and when used in weekly doses, has been shown higher success rate than vancomycin for treatment of CRBSI.³³⁴ For treatment of VRE, a significantly lower mortality rate and trend towards better clinico-microbiologic response has been seen using linezolid as compared to quinupristin-dalfopristin.³³⁵ Apart from gram-positive, an antimicrobial agent with activity against aerobic gram-negative bacilli should be added to the empiric coverage of CRBSI. The appropriate options include aminoglycosides, aztreonam, third-generation cephalosporins with antipseudomonal activity, fourth-generation cephalosporins, piperacillin-tazobactam or quinolones.³⁰³ In patients with risk factors for candidemia empiric treatment against *Candida* is sometimes considered. Caspofungin and fluconazole have equal success cure rates in culture positive *Candida* infections with no difference in mortality as compared to amphotericin B.^{336,337} However, increasingly fluconazole resistant *Candida albicans* are being reported in blood stream infections. Also, non-*albicans* species with fluconazole resistance, like *Candida*

auris are also becoming common in nosocomial settings.^{338,339} Echinocandins are therefore being preferred for management of patients admitted in ICU with suspected blood stream infections due to *Candida* or with *Candida* colonisation.³⁴⁰ Biofire Blood culture identification 2 (BCID2) multiplex PCR panel had high diagnostic accuracy (91.7%) for on-panel pathogens, with overall concordance of 98%.³⁴¹ In a multicenter evaluation of BCID2 multiplex PCR panel, the assay correctly classified 90% of gram negative and 89% of gram positive bacteria and had mean positive percent agreement of 97% (95%CI 95-99%) with blood culture; agreement was 67% for *Candida* and 100% for the on-panel targets. However, performance in detection of ESBL encoding genes, or other resistance targets was discordant with blood cultures.³⁴²

Evidence Statement

Vancomycin, teicoplanin, linezolid and daptomycin are effective in treatment of CRBSI due to MRSA and MR-CONS. Fourth-generation cephalosporin, carbapenem or beta-lactam/beta-lactamase combination like piperacillin-tazobactam and aminoglycosides might be used for gram negative organisms causing CRBSI. Caspofungin and fluconazole have been equally effective as amphotericin-B for treatment of candidemia. However, increasingly fluconazole resistant *Candida* are becoming more common, and echinocandins are preferred as initial therapy in suspected catheter related blood stream infections due to *Candida*.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic regimen for CRBSI should include coverage for both gram-positive and gram-negative organisms (2A).
- Vancomycin or teicoplanin is the recommended first line drug for the empiric treatment of CRBSI for MRSA and MR-CONS while linezolid and daptomycin are good alternative agents (2A).
- Empiric coverage for gram-negative bacilli should include a fourth-generation cephalosporin, a carbapenem, or a β -lactam/ β -lactamase inhibitor combination, newer agents (like ceftazidime-avibactam) or without an aminoglycoside (UPP).
- An echinocandin should be used as empirical antifungal agent for treatment of suspected central line-associated candidemia (2A).

What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment for CRBSI?

Optimum duration of antibiotic treatment to the bare minimum required to treat infections is a reasonable approach to reduce the prevalence of resistance to antibiotics. No significant differences in clinical cure, microbiologic cure and survival were detected among bacteremic patients receiving shorter (5 to 7 days) versus longer duration (7 to 21 days) of antibiotic therapy in a meta-analysis.^{343,344} There was 5-10% relapse rate after short course therapy for *Staphylococcus aureus* catheter-associated bacteremia suggesting that short course therapy is acceptable for uncomplicated infections. In case of complicated *S. aureus* infections like infective endocarditis, longer duration (4 to 6 weeks) of treatment is required. Studies have shown similar response irrespective of duration of therapy in gram-negative infections as well. A retrospective study comparing short-course (7 days), intermediate-course (8 to 14 days) and long-course (>14 days) treatment for gram-negative bacteremia has shown similar clinical response rates and microbiological cure. Regarding the duration of empirical antifungals for CRBSIs, there has been no

comparative studies but based on the consensus, approximately 14 days of empirical antifungals is recommended.

Evidence Statement

Short duration (<14 days) of antibiotics is as effective as longer duration (>14 days) for uncomplicated *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia. Complicated bacteremia due to *S. aureus* or those associated with endocarditis should receive longer duration. For gram-negative bacteremia, seven days of antibiotics is sufficient. In responding patient with uncomplicated CONS infection, 5-7 days therapy is considered optimum. Minimum 14 days treatment with antifungals is required for fungal CRBSI.

Recommendation

- Minimum 2 weeks antibiotics should be given for uncomplicated and 4-6 weeks for complicated *Staphylococcus aureus* CRBSI and infective endocarditis (2A).
- Minimum 7 days of antibiotics should be given for gram-negative CRBSI (2A).
- Five to seven days antibiotics are recommended for CONS bacteremia (3A).
- For suspected fungal CRBSI, antifungal therapy for at least 14 days is recommended (UPP).

Empirical Antibiotics for Urinary and Urogenital Sepsis in ICU

Urogenital infections in patients in the ICU include urinary tract infection (UTI) and prostatitis in males. The clinical spectrum of UTI includes asymptomatic bacteriuria and funguria to pyelonephritis, and urosepsis with or without obstructive uropathy. Urinary tract infections are the fourth most common type of healthcare-associated infection.³⁴⁵ UTI additionally account for more than 12% of infections reported by acute care hospitals. About 12%-16% of hospitalized adults have indwelling urinary catheter at some time during their hospitalization. Each day the indwelling urinary catheter is in place, there is 3%-7% increased risk of acquiring a catheter-associated urinary tract infection.³⁴⁶ UTIs in ICU have different microbiology and higher resistance rates than UTI occurring outside ICU. Urinary tract infection is defined as significant bacteriuria in a patient with symptoms or signs attributable to the urinary tract and no alternate source. Significant bacteriuria in a patient without symptoms or signs attributable to the urinary tract is defined as asymptomatic bacteriuria.

Catheter associated urinary tract infection (CA-UTI) is defined as infection occurring in a person whose urinary tract is currently catheterized or has been catheterized within the previous 48 hours with urethral, suprapubic or intermittent catheterization. It is characterized by symptoms and signs suggestive of UTI with no other obvious source, urine sample (from urinary catheter, or midstream urine for catheter duration less than 48 hours) demonstrating more than 1000 CFU per ml. On the other hand, catheter associated asymptomatic bacteriuria refers to patients with urethral, suprapubic or intermittent catheterization with urine culture positivity (>100000 CFU/mL) without any signs or symptoms attributable to UTI. According to CDC, CA-UTI is defined as a UTI in patients with an indwelling urinary catheter that had been in place for >2 days on the date of event (day of device placement = D1) and was either present for any portion of the calendar day on the date of event or removed the day before the date of event. Patient should have at least one of the following signs or symptoms: fever, supra-pubic tenderness, costovertebral angle pain or tenderness,

urinary urgency, urinary frequency and dysuria along with urine culture with no more than two species of organisms identified at least one of which is a bacterium of $\geq 10^5$ CFU/ml.³⁴⁷

What is the Incidence of UTI in ICU? What are the Common Organisms and Risk Factors for UTI in ICU?

The incidence of UTI ranges from 5 to 23 per 1000 catheter days as reported from various observational studies from the West.³⁴⁸⁻³⁵³ In an observational study, Tay MK et al from Singapore reported the incidence of UTI from mixed ICU to be 13.7% in patients admitted for more than 48 hours, with the incidence of *Candida* being about 34%.³⁵⁴ The organisms causing UTI were *Klebsiella* (7%), *E. coli* (7%), polymicrobial (37%) and others (7%). Female gender, prior antibiotic exposure, duration of ICU and urinary catheter were identified as risk factors for UTI. In a prospective observational study from China, Xie DS et al.³⁵⁵ reported the incidence of UTI to be 25.5 per 1000 catheter days. Fungi (21.3%) were most common cause of UTI followed by infection with *E. coli* (17.02%) and *Pseudomonas* (10.64%). The risk factors for CA-UTI were duration of catheter for >7 days, benign prostatic hypertrophy and >5 days antibiotic duration. *Pseudomonas* showed absolute resistance to ciprofloxacin, amikacin, ceftazidime, and meropenem. A prospective study by Leone et al reported incidence of UTI to be 9.6%. The common organisms isolated were *E. coli* (39%), *Pseudomonas* (22%) and *Enterobacter* (15%).³⁵⁶ Duration of catheterization, length of ICU stay, advanced age, female gender and disease severity score were identified as risk factors for CA-UTI. Similar findings were reported by various studies from western world.³⁵⁷⁻³⁶⁰ In the ENVIN registry, gram-negative bacteria were responsible for more than half of the cases of UTI (56.7%) with *E. coli* being the commonest organism isolated (26.7%). Fungal infection was second most common (25.4%) with *Candida albicans* as most common fungus isolated.³⁶¹ In a prospective study by Agarwal et al³¹⁴ from Northern India, the organisms causing UTI in ICU included *Acinetobacter* (34.8%), *Pseudomonas* (23.8%) and *E. coli* (15.2%). Length of ICU stay, renal failure and total parenteral nutrition (TPN) were reported as risk factors for UTI. In a prospective observational study by Habibi et al³⁶² including patients with greater than 48 hours of ICU stay, most common causes of UTI were *Candida* spp. (90%) followed by *Pseudomonas* (14%) and *E. coli* (10%). Increased ICU stay and catheterization were identified as risk factors for UTI. Das Gupta et al³⁶³ reported the incidence of UTI in patients admitted in ICU to be 28%. *E. coli* was the most common organism responsible for UTI (30.8%). Longer ICU stay, catheterization and prior antibiotics use were identified as risk factors for UTI. In a retrospective review by Sahu et al,³⁶⁴ incidence of UTI reported was 6.9%. Identified risk factors included longer ICU stay and catheterization.

Evidence Statement

Incidence of CA-UTI ranges from 5-30% of all ICU admissions. The most common organism causing UTI in ICU are gram-negative bacteria (*E. coli*, *Klebsiella*) and fungi (especially *Candida*). Risk factors for UTI in ICU include duration of catheterization, length of ICU stay, prior antibiotic use, higher disease severity score, and female Gender.

What is the Empirical Antimicrobial Agent of Choice for Treating UTI in ICU?

A systemic review and meta-analysis by Vardakas et al³⁶⁵ included 21 studies and 1584 patients with ESBL producing enterobacteriaceae bacteremia. He compared the mortality

associated with carbapenems and alternative antibiotics (beta-lactams/beta-lactamase inhibitors) for the treatment of patients with ESBL-positive enterobacteriaceae bacteremia. No statistically significant differences in mortality was found between carbapenems and beta-lactams/beta-lactamase inhibitors administered as definitive or empirical treatment for UTI.

In an observational study on gram negative UTI in hospitalized patients, all isolates were susceptible to carbapenems, with 70 to 80% susceptible to fluoroquinolones, aminoglycosides and ceftazidime. Organisms were resistant to amoxicillin, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid and co-trimoxazole. Gram-negative enterobacteriaceae was also resistant to the second and third generation cephalosporins.³⁶⁶ Another prospective study reported increase in frequency of gram-negative enterobacteriaceae and *S. aureus* in catheter associated nosocomial UTI over 10 years, with high sensitivities to amikacin, imipenem, and piperacillin-tazobactam (72.0%, 77.5% and 76.1%, respectively). Lower susceptibility to third-generation cephalosporins and ciprofloxacin (55.2% and 45.0% respectively) were reported. Gram-positive organisms showed high susceptibility to teicoplanin and vancomycin (91.1% and 87.9%, respectively) and low susceptibility to ampicillin and ciprofloxacin (24.1% and 25.5%, respectively).³⁶⁷ Habibi et al³⁶² from northern India reported the antibiotics resistance pattern of gram-negative bacteria causing UTI. In this study, the bacteria were resistant to ceftazidime and netilmicin. Cefoperazone-sulbactam resistance was least common among gram-negative organisms. Sahu et al³⁶⁴ reported least resistance to tigecycline, colistin and carbapenems among the gram negative enterobacteriaceae. One study reported antibiotic susceptibility pattern in gram-negative enterobacteriaceae and most of the isolates were susceptible to carbapenems, amikacin and levofloxacin.³⁶⁸ In a RCT, three antibiotics piperacillin-tazobactam, ceftazidime and ertapenem were compared in terms of clinical and microbiological cure rate and 28 days mortality for treatment of ESBL producing *E. coli*. Both cure rates were high for piperacillin-tazobactam and ertapenem. Ceftazidime was found least effective in terms of both cure rate and prevention of mortality.³⁶⁹ In a prospective study, 89.2% of urinary culture isolates were sensitive to fosfomycin; 89.2% of gram negative bacilli including enterobacteriaceae were also susceptible.³⁷⁰ Patel et al³⁷¹ evaluated in-vitro activity of fosfomycin against urinary tract enterobacteriaceae; 79.16% of the isolates were susceptible to fosfomycin with 92% susceptibility in ESBL producing enterobacteriaceae and 72.34% in carbapenem resistant enterobacteriaceae (CRE). MDR enterobacteriaceae with diverse resistance mechanisms, including ESBL and CRE were found to be susceptible to fosfomycin.

Newer antimicrobial agents and combinations have been studied in MDR UTI infections. In a double blind RCT of complicated UTI patients with clinically suspected GNB infection, ceftazidime-sulbactam-EDTA was non-inferior to meropenem for co-primary end points of symptomatic resolution (95.9% vs 89.9%, treatment difference 6%, 95% CI -2.6% to 16%), symptomatic as well as microbiological eradication (94.6% vs 87%; treatment difference, 7.6%; 95% CI, -2.0% to 18.4%), and microbiological eradication (94.6% vs 88.4%; treatment difference, 6.2%; 95% CI, -3.2% to 16.6%). *Escherichia coli* ($n = 113$, 80.7%) was the most

common organism. ESBL producing pathogens were identified in 119 (83.2%) patients, whereas MDR pathogens were identified in 100 (69.9%) patients.³⁷² However, ceftazidime-sulbactam-EDTA did not meet pre-specified efficacy outcome in a RCT of 66 patients with complicated UTI due to Metallo-Beta Lactamase (MBL) producing enterobacteriaceae.³⁷³

Efficacy of Ceftolozane-tazobactam was evaluated in complicated UTI (cUTI) and complicated intra-abdominal infections (cIAI) due to ESBL producing enterobacteriaceae in a recent RCT. Most isolates were sensitive to ceftolozane-tazobactam (81.8%) and meropenem (98.3%) whereas sensitivity was low for levofloxacin (25.3%). Ceftolozane-tazobactam had higher cure rates (97.4%) as compared to meropenem (88.5%) or levofloxacin (82.6%).³⁷⁴ In a multicenter, open label phase 3 trial involving 333 patients with cUTI and cIAI due to ceftazidime resistant enterobacteriaceae or pseudomonas, ceftazidime-avibactam was noninferior to best available therapy in terms of clinical cure (91%; 95% CI 85-6-94-7) with comparable adverse effects (31% vs 39%).³⁷⁵ Meropenem-vaborbactam was compared to piperacillin tazobactam in a phase 3 multinational RCT in 550 patients with cUTI, and was noninferior in terms of overall success (98.4% vs 94%; difference 4.5%, 95% CI, 0.7% -9.1%) and microbial eradication (66.7% vs 57.7%; difference 9.0%; 95% CI, -0.9%-18.7%).³⁷⁶ Plazomicin, an aminoglycoside with bactericidal activity against MDR Enterobacteriaceae, was evaluated in an RCT of cUTI 609 patients and was noninferior to meropenem with respect to composite cure at day 5 (88.0% vs 91.4%; difference, -3.4%; 95%CI -10.0 to 3.1) and at test of cure visit (81.7% vs 70.1%; difference, 11.6%; 95% CI, 2.7-20.3).³⁷⁷ Fosfomycin was noninferior to piperacillin-tazobactam in a phase 2/3 RCT of 465 patients with cUTI and acute pyelonephritis, with comparable overall success rate (64.7% vs 54.5%; difference 10.2%; 95% CI -0.4, 20.8).³⁷⁸

The choice of empirical antibiotic therapy is guided by estimates of the likelihood of a resistant organism (as estimated on the basis of epidemiologic data and individual patient risk factors for resistance) and by an assessment of whether the patient will have an adverse outcome if the treatment is inadequate (temporarily) because of a resistant organism. Clinical worsening or lack of any improvement after 1 to 2 days of antibiotic therapy mandates repeat urine culture and imaging to identify whether an obstruction or other anatomical complication is the reason for the lack of clinical improvement. Data is lacking on the optimal treatment duration in cases with severe disease, delayed treatment response, mechanical interventions (including those for hydronephrosis, stones, abscesses, or necrotizing infection), or other antimicrobial agents.³⁷⁹ In a descriptive study for the management of febrile UTI among the patients of spinal cord injury with neurogenic bladder, the cure rate was similar for single and dual therapy and duration of antibiotics 10 days as compared to more than 10 days.³⁸⁰ Among fungal UTI, candida albicans was the most common organism. Both albicans and non-albicans candida were susceptible to imidazoles and fluconazole is the drug of choice.³⁸¹ IDSA recommends that the patients with CA-UTI who have prompt resolution of symptoms should be treated for 7 days. The patients with delayed response to treatment, regardless of whether the patient remains catheterized or not should be treated for 10-14 days. Levofloxacin should be considered in patients with CA-UTI

who are not severely ill. The regimen of antibiotics for 3 days should be considered for women aged 65 years who develop CA-UTI without upper urinary tract symptoms after an indwelling catheter has been removed.³⁴⁵

Evidence Statement

There has been a trend towards increasing prevalence of extended spectrum beta-lactamase producing gram-negative bacteria in the urinary cultures of catheter associated UTI. Aminoglycosides, beta-lactams along with a beta-lactamase inhibitor as well as carbapenems and fosfomycin have good efficacy in catheter associated UTI. The susceptibility for fluoroquinolones is decreasing over time among organisms isolated from nosocomial UTI. *Candida* species isolated from the patients with UTI show sensitivity to fluconazole, but increasingly fluconazole resistance is being reported.

Recommendations

- Initial choice of antibiotics should cover for ESBL producing gram-negative organisms and includes aminoglycosides, beta-lactam along with a beta-lactamase inhibitor or carbapenems (2A).
- In initial empirical regimen for UTI, antibiotics against gram-positive organisms is not recommended (3A).
- In appropriate clinical settings antifungals should be considered in the empirical regimen. Fluconazole is preferred, amphotericin deoxycholate is an alternative if fluconazole resistance is suspected (3B).
- Catheter removal, if no longer indicated, or intermittent catheterization should be done in patients with catheter associated urinary tract infection (3A).

Acute Infective Diarrhea, Antibiotic Induced Diarrhea, and *Clostridium Difficile* Associated Diarrhea in the ICU

Diarrhea is defined as the passage of more than three liquid stools in a day.³⁸⁶ Nosocomial diarrhea is defined as one which arises after 3 or more days of admission to the hospital.³⁸³ Up to 30% of patients in hospital develop nosocomial diarrhea and majority of which have non-infectious etiology. Among infectious causes, *Clostridium difficile* associated diarrhea is the most common.³⁸⁴ Overall the incidence of diarrhea in intensive care unit varies between 15-40% in different studies where most cases have a non-infectious or multifactorial etiology.³⁸⁵

Etiology of Diarrhea in the ICU

Non-infectious etiologies of diarrhea are commoner in ICU, including enteral feeding, stool impaction and drugs (laxative, prokinetics, histamine antagonists, potassium supplements).³⁸⁶ Other factors such as sepsis, antibiotic therapy, and hypoalbuminemia increase the likelihood of diarrhea.³⁸⁷ *Clostridium difficile* is the most common infectious agent associated with diarrhea in the ICU.³⁸⁸ Infectious etiology is suspected if diarrhea is associated with fever, leukocytosis, vomiting, severe abdominal pain, mucus or blood in stool.³⁸⁹ Clinical presentation may range from mild infection to life threatening illness with pseudo-membrane formation, toxic megacolon, colonic perforation, sepsis or even death.³⁸⁸ The American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) have proposed a severity scoring system for *Clostridium difficile* infection.³⁹⁰

Diagnosis of Acute Infective Diarrhea in the ICU

Clostridium difficile accounts for the majority of infectious diarrhea in the ICU. Most commonly employed screening test is enzyme immunoassay (for Toxin A and B).³⁹¹ Gold standard for diagnosis remains cytotoxin neutralization assay (CCNA) and toxigenic culture, with the latter being more sensitive.³⁹¹ Other diagnostic tests include stool glutamate dehydrogenase and polymerase chain reaction techniques. As per *clostridium difficile* infection (CDI) severity index, CDI is defined as severe and complicated if it is associated with any of the following, i.e., hypotension, fever ($\geq 38.5^\circ\text{C}$), ileus or significant abdominal distension, mental status changes, leucocytosis ($\geq 35,000$ cells/mm³), leucopenia ($< 2,000$ cells/mm³), lactic acidosis (> 2.2 mmol/l) or end organ failure. Severe disease refers to CDI with hypoalbuminemia (< 3 g/dL) alongwith either abdominal tenderness or leucocytosis (WBC $\geq 15,000$ cells/mm³). Mild to moderate disease refers to CDAD not satisfying above criteria.³⁹⁰

What are the Common Organisms Causing Acute Infective Diarrhea in the ICU?

In a large prospective study, it was reported that infectious etiologies accounted for 9.2% cases of acute diarrhea in a mixed general intensive care unit.³⁹² *Clostridium difficile* was the most common infective cause accounting for 97 out of the 112 patients in the above study.³⁹² In Indian studies, incidence of CDI was around 16 – 17%.^{393,394} Other organisms include pseudomonas aeruginosa and staphylococcus which have been associated with sporadic outbreaks of diarrhea in the intensive care unit.^{395,396} Viruses are another important cause of infective diarrhea in ICU. Norovirus was isolated in 5.7% cases in one study.³⁹² Outbreaks of viral diarrhea due to norovirus have also been reported in ICU settings.³⁹⁷

Evidence Statement

The incidence of diarrhea in the ICU ranges from 12.9 to 38%. Majority of the cases of diarrhea in ICU are non-infectious in etiology. *Clostridium difficile* is responsible for majority of infectious cases of diarrhea in ICU.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating Acute Infective Diarrhea in the ICU?

There is a lack of studies that evaluate the use of empirical antibiotics in patients with diarrhea in the ICU setting. In a prospective study evaluating utility of metronidazole in presumptive *clostridium difficile* diarrhea involving 70 patients, 18 (25%) were subsequently proven to have *clostridium difficile* associated diarrhea (CDAD) whereas 49 (68%) patients had no identifiable cause. Patients who had CDAD had significant improvement in symptoms as compared to those without it.³⁹⁸ The American College of Gastroenterology guidelines assert that patients with diarrhea in the ICU who have a strong pre-test suspicion of CDI should receive empirical treatment pending the results of laboratory testing, and even in patients with negative testing, as the negative predictive value of existing tests for CDI are insufficiently high to rule out the infection.³⁹⁰

Evidence Statement

Empirical use of metronidazole in patients with diarrhea suspected due to *Clostridium difficile* in ICU setting results in significant symptomatic improvement.

Recommendation

- We recommend that empiric metronidazole be used for therapy of patients with acute diarrhea in the ICU with suspected *Clostridium difficile* infection (3A).

What are the Risk Factors for the Development of CDI or CDAD?

Various factors associated with increased risk of CDI include prior antibiotic use, advanced age, prolonged ICU or hospital stay, immunosuppression, proton pump inhibitor use and enteral feeding. In a recent meta-analysis, prior antibiotic use of second-generation cephalosporins (OR 2.23, 95% CI 1.47–3.37), third-generation cephalosporins (OR 3.20, 95% CI 1.80–5.71), fourth-generation cephalosporins (OR 2.14, 95% CI 1.30–3.52), carbapenems (OR 1.84, 95% CI 1.26–2.68), clindamycin (OR 2.86, 95% CI 2.04–4.02), co-trimoxazole (OR 1.78, 95% CI 1.04–3.05), fluoroquinolones (OR 1.66, 95% CI 1.17–2.35) and penicillin combinations (OR 1.45, 95% CI 1.05–2.02) increased the risk of CDAD.^{399–409}

Advanced age has been shown to be associated with increased incidence of CDI.^{394,410–412} Other risk factors for CDI/CDAD include longer ICU stay, enteral feeding, prolonged mechanical ventilation, and immunosuppression.^{388–390,393,400,411–416} Proton pump inhibitors (PPI) have been shown to be independent risk factor for CDAD, possibly due to elevated gastric pH accelerating conversion of *C. difficile* spores to vegetative forms.^{394,417–420}

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for development of CDI include prior antibiotic therapy, advanced age, prolonged ICU/hospital stay, immunosuppression, proton pump inhibitors and enteral feeding. Cephalosporins, clindamycin, fluoroquinolones, carbapenems and penicillin derivatives are the commonly implicated antibiotics for CDAD/CDI.

What is the Recommended Treatment for CDI/CDAD: Which Antibiotics and Duration? Should Offending Antibiotics be Stopped? What is the Role of Probiotics in the Treatment of CDAD? How Should Recurrent *Clostridium difficile* Infection be Treated?

While certain antibiotics have a propensity to cause CDI, antimicrobial therapy against *C. difficile* has been found to be successful in treating CDI in a clear majority of cases. In a Cochrane review that included 22 randomized controlled trials with 3215 participants, four RCTs directly compared vancomycin and metronidazole for symptomatic cure of CDI.^{421,422–425} It was found that vancomycin was modestly superior to metronidazole for the treatment of CDI with a moderate quality of evidence. However, metronidazole has a much lower cost and an acceptable efficacy for this indication. Fidaxomicin (a newer oral antibiotic with minimal absorption) was non-inferior to vancomycin for treatment of CDI in a multicenter randomized trial.⁴²⁶ It was more effective than vancomycin in achieving clinical cure when patients were receiving concomitant antibiotics for concurrent infections.⁴²⁷ There are no direct comparisons between fidaxomicin and metronidazole, however, a network meta-analysis including studies that compared fidaxomicin with vancomycin and vancomycin with metronidazole concluded

that fidaxomicin was superior to the other two agents for sustained cure of CDI.⁴²⁸ Clinical cure rate following oral teicoplanin for management of CDI was comparable with oral vancomycin for management of CDI (96.2% vs 100%, $p = 0.56$).⁴²⁹ Similar cure rates were reported on comparing teicoplanin with both metronidazole and vancomycin for management of CDI.⁴²⁵ A pertinent question is whether the offending antibiotic should be stopped during treatment of *C. difficile* infection. A retrospective review of 246 patients found that the use of implicated antibiotics after the completion of CDI treatment was significantly associated with recurrence of CDI compared to no antimicrobial use (odds ratio [OR] 3.02; 95% CI, 1.66–5.52). On the contrary, the use of the implicated antibiotic during the CDI therapy was not associated with recurrent CDI (OR 0.79; 95% CI, 0.40–1.52).⁴³⁰ This suggests that treatment of the primary infection may continue, if necessary, with appropriate antibiotic under the cover of CDI therapy.

Use of probiotics in addition to antibiotics for treatment of CDI showed that probiotics reduced the rate of recurrence in patients with recurrent CDI but not in patients with an initial episode.⁴³¹ In a systematic review use of probiotics in treatment of CDI was not effective.⁴³² Whilst probiotics are unsuccessful in treatment of CDI, they have been found to be beneficial for preventing CDI in patients receiving antibiotics. In a review of 26 RCTs, probiotics (including *Lactobacillus*, *Saccharomyces*, and combinations) significantly reduced the risk of developing CDAD by 60.5% (RR = 0.395; 95% CI 0.294–0.531; $p < 0.001$).⁴³³

Recurrent CDI occurs in up to one-third of the patients and is associated with considerable morbidity and costs. A systemic review that included three studies comparing vancomycin with metronidazole, reported that vancomycin and metronidazole are equally effective in treatment of recurrent CDI.^{434–437} Addition of *saccharomyces boulardii* to vancomycin significantly decreased the recurrence rate (16.7% vs 50%, $p = 0.05$).⁴³⁷ Fidaxomicin was more effective as compared to vancomycin for recurrent CDI (RR 1.86, 95% CI 1.04–3.31, $p = 0.04$).^{426,437} Fecal microbiota transplantation has also been compared to drug therapy for treatment of recurrent CDI. It was found that vancomycin therapy with duodenal infusion of donor feces had relapse free cure rate of 93.8% as compared to 30.8% and 23.1% in vancomycin with bowel lavage and vancomycin therapy alone respectively.⁴³⁹

Evidence Statement

Both metronidazole and oral vancomycin have similar efficacy in clinical and bacteriologic cure of CDI. Use of implicated antibiotic after completing the treatment of CDI is associated with increased risk of recurrence of CDI. There is insufficient evidence to justify the use of probiotics as an adjunct to antibiotics in the treatment of CDAD. In a single RCT, fecal microbiota transplantation was found to be highly efficacious for treatment of recurrent CDI.

Recommendations

- We recommend metronidazole as the first line treatment of mild to moderate CDI/CDAD (1A).
- We recommend oral vancomycin as the first line treatment of microbiologically proven severe CDI/CDAD (1A).
- We recommend oral vancomycin as the treatment of recurrent CDI/CDAD infection (2A).
- We recommend fecal microbiota transplantation as an alternate treatment of recurrent CDI/CDAD infection (2A).
- We recommend that implicated antibiotics should be discontinued as soon as clinically feasible (2A).

- We recommend against the use of probiotics as an adjunct for the treatment of CDI/CDAD (2A).
- We recommend addition of vancomycin to a patient with microbiologically proven CDI/CDAD, if the patient is already on metronidazole or has no clinical response to metronidazole within 3-4 days (UPP).

ABDOMINAL INFECTIONS IN ICU

Acute Pancreatitis and Infected Pancreatic Necrosis

Acute pancreatitis (AP) is the inflammatory condition of the pancreas characterized clinically by abdominal pain and raised serum levels of pancreatic enzymes.⁴⁴⁰ Majority of the cases are caused by cholelithiasis and chronic alcohol consumption.^{441,442} Depending on the severity, AP is divided into mild, moderate and severe. Severity of pancreatitis is based upon the presence of organ failure and complications of acute pancreatitis either local or systemic.⁴⁴³ Local complications include peripancreatic fluid collections and pancreatic or peripancreatic necrosis (sterile or infected) whereas systemic complications include failure of an organ system (respiratory, cardiovascular, or renal) and exacerbation of a pre-existing disorder (e.g., chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, heart failure, or chronic liver disease).⁴⁴⁴ Patients with mild AP have no evidence of organ failure, local or systemic complications. Moderately severe AP is defined by presence of transient organ failure lasting less than 48 hours with or without local and systemic complications. Persistent organ failure for more than 48 hours associated with local and systemic complications defines severe AP (SAP).^{440,443} About 20% to 30% of patients with AP develop acute necrotizing pancreatitis.^{445,446} Pancreatic necrotic tissue may remain sterile (~70%) or may get infected (~30%). The severity of necrotizing pancreatitis is determined on the basis of the extent of parenchymal involvement by necrosis (i.e., <30%, 30%-50% and >50%).⁴⁴⁷ Infected pancreatic necrosis is associated with higher mortality as compared to sterile necrosis.^{448,449} Thus, early recognition and institution of appropriate therapy is necessary. Treatment options include administration of antibiotics and surgical intervention if there is no response to antibiotics.^{450,451}

What is the Incidence, Risk Factors and Microbiology of Pancreatic Infection following Acute Pancreatitis?

Incidence and Risk Factors for Infected Pancreatic Necrosis

Incidence of infected pancreatic necrosis (IPN) in patients with acute pancreatitis varies from 12% to 37% depending upon the patients included (AP vs SAP) and diagnostic modality used for IPN.⁴⁵²⁻⁴⁵⁵ Patients with necrotizing pancreatitis are more prone to develop pancreatic infection and organ failure.^{448,449} Greater the extent of necrosis more likelihood of IPN. In a retrospective review of 300 patients of AP, pancreatic infection and organ failure were directly related to the extent of pancreatic necrosis.⁴⁵⁴ In a prospective single centre study that included 204 patients of AP, pancreatic necrosis of more than 50% was significantly associated with the development of pancreatic infection and multiorgan failure.⁴⁵⁵ In a prospective observational study from India, similar findings were reported.⁴⁵² Patients of AP can develop organ failure either during early phase (<1 week) known as primary organ failure or during later phase of AP (>1 week) known as secondary organ failure.^{456,457} In a prospective observational study in 805 patients of

acute pancreatitis, presence of primary organ failure was associated with mortality of 15.8% and was a risk factor for development of infected pancreatic necrosis in 76% of patients.⁴⁵⁸

Evidence Statement

Incidence of pancreatic infection following acute pancreatitis ranges from 12-37%. Presence of pancreatic necrosis of >50% is a major risk factor for pancreatic infection following acute pancreatitis. Primary organ failure predicts development of infective pancreatic infection in patients with acute pancreatitis.

Microbiology of Pancreatic Infection following Acute Pancreatitis

Enteric gram-negative bacteria including *E.coli*, Klebsiella, Pseudomonas and Enterobacteriaceae are the most common organisms isolated from IPN.^{452,459,460} It has been demonstrated that translocation of enteric bacteria (from the gut) is the main source of infection in necrotizing pancreatitis.^{461,462} A recent prospective observational study from India evaluated 209 patients with AP; 108 (52%) developed infected pancreatic necrosis (IPN). Polymicrobial infection was seen in 51% patients. Most common GNB isolated was *E. coli* (32%), *E. faecium* was the most common gram positive organism (7%), whereas fungi were isolated in 13% cases. Importantly, 42% of isolates were MDR, whereas 25% were XDR.⁴⁶³ Gram-positive bacteria including *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Streptococcus faecalis*, *Enterococcus* as well as anaerobes, and fungi have also been found.^{464,465} There are several studies that reported increase in the incidence of IPN caused by gram-positive organisms especially in patients who received prophylactic antibiotics for the prevention of development of IPN.^{455,466-468} Gram-negative organisms isolated from IPN show varying susceptibility to beta-lactam /beta- lactamase inhibitors, aminoglycosides, quinolones and carbapenems. Garg et al reported that majority of the isolates from IPN were sensitive to third generation cephalosporins and quinolones. A more recent study from India observed that amikacin and imipenem were active against majority of the gram-negative organisms isolated from IPN.^{452,460} Resistance in gram-negative organisms to aminoglycosides, quinolones, beta-lactam /beta-lactamase inhibitors as well as to carbapenems has increased over last few decades. However, they remain sensitive to colistin and tigecycline. Gram-positive organisms remained sensitive to vancomycin, linezolid and teicoplanin.

Evidence Statement

Gram-negative organisms are the most common organisms isolated from infected pancreatic necrosis following acute pancreatitis in Indian patients. Prophylactic antibiotic use in patients of AP to prevent IPN has been associated with increased risk of infection with gram-positive organisms. Resistance to carbapenems, beta-lactam /beta- lactamase inhibitors and quinolones in gram-negative organisms isolated from IPN has increased, however, with maintain sensitivity to colistin and tigecycline.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treatment of Pancreatic Infection following Acute Pancreatitis?

Initial reports on use of prophylactic antibiotics in patients with AP to prevent IPN was associated with reduction in the incidence of IPN and mortality, however, well designed RCTs and meta-analysis

failed to confirm the advantage of prophylactic antibiotics.^{469–471} Antibiotics should be prescribed in patients with evidence of IPN (positive image guided FNA or surgical specimen) or suggested by presence of air within the necrotic pancreatic tissue or persistent fever with leucocytosis and multiorgan failure.^{450,451} Empirical antibiotic regimen is selected based upon the local susceptibility pattern, pharmacokinetic properties of antibiotics and previous antibiotic exposure. Gram-negative organisms isolated from IPN show varying susceptibility to aminoglycosides, cephalosporins, quinolones, piperacillin-tazobactam and carbapenems. Over the past few decades there is an increase in the resistance among GNBs isolated from IPN to cephalosporins, quinolones, piperacillin-tazobactam and carbapenems with maintained sensitivity to colistin.⁴⁷² Various pharmacokinetic studies have demonstrated the existence of blood pancreatic barrier and this barrier is responsible for the selective uptake of antibiotic drugs into the pancreas.^{473,474} These studies demonstrate that carbapenems have the highest while as aminoglycosides have least penetration to pancreatic tissue.⁴⁷⁴

Duration of antibiotic therapy in patients with IPN is not clear. However, Malaysian society of intensive care suggests that duration should be guided by serial assessment of clinical and radiological response.⁴⁷⁵ There are multiple case series, observational studies and meta-analysis which suggest that conservative management with use of antibiotics in patients with IPN is associated with improved outcome and less mortality as compared to surgical debridement.^{476–480} Percutaneous drainage or endoscopic necrosectomy should be considered if the patient fails to improve or deteriorates clinically.^{450,451}

Evidence Statement

Prophylactic use of antibiotics in patients with necrotizing pancreatitis has not been shown to reduce incidence of pancreatic infection and mortality. Presence of persistent fever, leucocytosis, multiorgan failure and presence of air within pancreatic necrosis suggest infected pancreatic necrosis. Cephalosporins, piperacillin-tazobactam, quinolones and carbapenems have the highest whereas aminoglycosides have the lowest penetration into necrotic pancreatic tissue. Response to antibiotic therapy is assessed by clinical and radiological parameters.

Recommendation

- Routine use of prophylactic antibiotics to prevent pancreatic infection following acute pancreatitis of any severity is not recommended (1A).
- Empirical antibiotic regimen in patients with infected pancreatic necrosis should be guided by local microbiological data, susceptibility pattern, pharmacokinetic property of antibiotics and previous antibiotic exposure (UPP).
- In treatment-naïve patients with evidence of infected pancreatic necrosis, we recommend empirical treatment with either carbapenems, piperacillin-tazobactam or cefoperazone-sulbactam (2A).
- In patients not responding or already exposed to the piperacillin-tazobactam, cefoperazone-sulbactam or carbapenems, colistin should be added to the empirical regime (3B).
- Duration of antibiotic therapy should be guided by clinical, radiological and laboratory parameters (UPP).
- Patients not responding to antibiotics should undergo necrosectomy and drainage (3B).

BILIARY SEPSIS

Acute Cholangitis

Acute cholangitis (AC) is a bacterial infection of the biliary tract that commonly occurs in an obstructed system and leads to systemic signs of infection. Choledocholithiasis is the most common cause of acute cholangitis.⁴⁸¹ AC is classified as mild, moderate, and severe based on organ dysfunction and various biochemical abnormalities.⁴⁸² Grade III AC is associated with organ dysfunction that includes any of the following: hypotension requiring either inotropic or vasopressors, confusion, PaO₂:FiO₂ ratio <300, serum creatinine levels >2mg/dL, an international normalized ratio >1.5 or platelet counts <100 × 10⁹/L. Grade II cholangitis is associated with any two of the following conditions: WBC count >12,000/mm³ or <4,000/mm³, high fever (≥39°C), age >75 years, hyperbilirubinemia (>5mg/dL) or hypoalbuminemia. Grade I do not meet any of the grade III or grade II criteria. Management of acute cholangitis depends on the severity of the illness and include administration of antibiotics and biliary drainage to relieve the obstruction. Drainage can be done electively in patients with mild cholangitis, within 24-48 hours in patients with moderate cholangitis and immediately in case of severe cholangitis.⁴⁸³

What are the Incidence, Risk Factors, and Microbiology of Biliary Infection in ICU?

Incidence and Risk Factors

The incidence of acute cholangitis varies with underlying etiology. In patients with cholelithiasis, symptomatic acute cholangitis develops in 0.2%–9% of cases.^{484,485} The incidence of acute cholangitis after endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) ranges from 0.4% to 10%.^{486,487} Risk factors for acute cholangitis include obstruction of the biliary tree (choledocholithiasis, biliary stricture, cholangiocarcinoma, periampullary carcinoma, stent placement for biliary drainage or worm infestation) or biliary intervention (ERCP, post-surgical biliary stricture).^{488–492}

Evidence Statement

Incidence of acute cholangitis varies with underlying etiology and ranges from 0.2 to 10%. Cholelithiasis, choledocholithiasis, benign and malignant common bile duct (CBD) strictures, CBD interventions, and stenting are the most common risk factors for cholangitis.

Microbiology of Acute Cholangitis

Various observational studies among patients with acute cholangitis from India and across the world have reported that gram-negative enteric organisms are the most common pathogens isolated from bile and/or blood.^{490,493–498} In patients with nosocomial acute cholangitis e.g., postoperative state, with indwelling biliary stents or those with malignant biliary obstruction, more resistant organisms such as MRSA, VRE, and pseudomonas are frequently detected as causative microorganisms. Risk factors for MDR organisms causing acute cholangitis include previous hospitalization and antibiotic use within 90 days.⁴⁹² Although the bacteriological profile of acute cholangitis has remained stable over the last few decades, their antibiotic susceptibility pattern has changed. Most of the gram-negative isolates show varying sensitivity to carbapenems, piperacillin-tazobactam, cefoperazone-sulbactam, aminoglycosides, and quinolones, with increased resistance to cephalosporins and penicillins.^{490,492,494–497,499}

Evidence Statement

Gram-negative organisms are the most common organisms isolated from patients with acute cholangitis. Most of the pathogens isolated are susceptible to third-generation cephalosporins (such as cefoperazone-sulbactam), aminoglycosides, quinolones, ureidopenicillins, and carbapenems. Risk factors for multidrug drug resistance organisms causing acute cholangitis include an indwelling biliary stent, malignant biliary obstruction, previous hospitalization, and antibiotic use within 90 days.

What is the Empirical Antibiotic Regimen for Acute Cholangitis?

Empirical antibiotic regimen in patients with acute cholangitis depends on the antimicrobial activity against causative bacteria, the severity of cholangitis, past history of antimicrobial administration to the patient, local susceptibility patterns (antibiogram) of the suspected causative organisms, and biliary penetration of the antimicrobial agents.⁵⁰⁰ Biliary obstruction reduces the antibiotic concentration within the bile and improves after biliary drainage, therefore should be considered in all patients of acute cholangitis.⁴⁸³ Tokyo guidelines for the management of acute cholangitis suggest monotherapy with beta-lactam/ beta lactamase inhibitor (cefoperazone-sulbactam, piperacillin-tazobactam) or carbapenems or fluoroquinolone plus metronidazole to cover anaerobes.⁵⁰¹ IDSA suggests combination of beta-lactam/ beta-lactamase inhibitor (BL/BLI) or carbapenems or quinolones with metronidazole for moderate to severe community-acquired cholangitis. For nosocomial moderate to severe cholangitis combination of BL/BLIs or carbapenems or quinolones with metronidazole plus vancomycin is advised.⁵⁰² IDSA suggests that antimicrobial therapy of established infection should be limited to 4–7 days, unless it is difficult to achieve adequate source control.⁵⁰² Previous Tokyo guidelines recommended antibiotics for 2–3 days in case of mild and 5–7 days in case of moderate to severe cholangitis.⁵⁰¹ However, latest revised Tokyo guidelines for management of acute cholangitis suggest duration of antibiotic to be 4–7 days once the source of infection is controlled.⁵⁰⁰ Duration of antibiotics may be guided by clinical response. Empiric antifungal therapy is usually not warranted.

Evidence Statement

The empirical antibiotic regime in patients with acute cholangitis is guided by the severity of the disease, local antibiotic susceptibility pattern, and biliary penetration of the antibiotics. The duration of antibiotics depends on the severity of cholangitis and adequacy of source control. Biliary drainage (percutaneous or endoscopic) is required in addition to antibiotic use in the management of acute cholangitis.

Recommendation

- Empirical antibiotic therapy should be guided by the severity of the cholangitis, local microbiological susceptibility patterns, biliary penetration of antibiotics, and previous antibiotic exposure (UPP).
- We recommend either beta-lactam/ beta-lactamase inhibitor (such as cefoperazone-sulbactam or piperacillin/tazobactam) or carbapenems (imipenem/meropenem) as monotherapy in patients with moderate to severe cholangitis (3B).
- We recommend antibiotic duration for 4–7 days in patients with acute cholangitis after adequate source control (2B).

- Biliary drainage should be considered in all patients with cholangitis in addition to empirical antibiotic therapy (1A).
- Anti-anaerobic therapy (such as metronidazole, tinidazole, or clindamycin) is required if a biliary-enteric anastomosis is present and the primary antibiotic therapy does not include carbapenems, piperacillin/tazobactam, or cefoperazone/sulbactam as these drugs have sufficient anti-anaerobic activity (3A).

Liver Abscess

A liver abscess is an infectious, space-occupying lesion in the liver. Pyogenic and amoebic liver abscesses are the two most common causes of liver abscess. Appropriate initiation of antibiotics will help to prevent potentially lethal complications like bacteremia and the spread of abscesses to other organs.

Incidence and Risk Factors

The incidence of pyogenic liver abscess varies from as low as 2.3 per lac population to as high as 446 per lac depending upon the presence of risk factors that predispose the person to liver abscess.^{503,504} The various risk factors for pyogenic liver abscess include male gender, older age, diabetes mellitus, biliary diseases, endobiliary procedures, alcoholism, hepatobiliary malignancies, and infected cystic liver lesions.^{504–508}

What are the Most Common Organisms Causing Liver Abscess in ICU?

Microorganisms causing liver abscess have shown varying trends over the years. The earlier studies had shown predominantly gram-positive organisms like streptococcus as common cause of pyogenic liver abscess.⁵⁰⁹ However, recent studies have reported gram-negative organisms (including *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *E. coli*, and *P. aeruginosa*) to be responsible for the majority of cases of pyogenic liver abscess.^{505,506,510–514} Rarely pyogenic liver abscess is caused by organisms like *Burkholderia*, *Prevotella* and anaerobic bacteria including *Eikenella* and *peptostreptococcus*.^{516,517} In Indian setting, amoebic liver abscess is the most common cause of liver abscess caused by infection with *Entamoeba histolytica*.⁵¹⁴ The *Streptococcus milleri* group (including *Streptococcus anginosus*, *Streptococcus constellatus*, and *Streptococcus intermedius*) is also an important cause of liver abscess in western world and usually suggests a disseminated infection.

Evidence Statement

Amoebic liver abscess is the most common cause of liver abscess in Indian setup. The incidence of pyogenic liver abscess varies from 2.3 to 446 per 100000 hospital admissions per year. Gram-negative organisms (*E. coli* and *Klebsiella*) are the most common organisms causing pyogenic liver abscess. Risk factors for pyogenic liver abscess include diabetes mellitus, older age, male gender, biliary diseases, biliary procedures, alcoholism, malignancy, intra-abdominal infection, and cystic lesions in the liver.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating Liver Abscess in ICU?

Amoebic Liver Abscess

Empirical treatment of amoebic liver abscess consists of a combination of a tissue agent and a luminal agent. Metronidazole is the drug of choice for the management of amoebic liver abscess. Metronidazole given for a period of 10 days has been

shown to be effective.⁵¹⁷ Alternatives to metronidazole include tinidazole, ornidazole, and nitazoxanide.^{518,519} The luminal agents used to remove any intraluminal cysts include paromomycin, diiodohydroxyquin or diloxanide furoate, even if the stool microscopy is negative. Routine use of drainage of amoebic liver abscess is not indicated in uncomplicated cases.⁵¹⁷ However, the addition of needle aspiration to metronidazole has shown to hasten clinical improvement, especially in a large abscess (5 cm to 10 cm).⁵¹⁴ Surgical intervention is required if there is no response to medical management.^{517,520}

Evidence Statement

Metronidazole is the drug of choice for the treatment of amoebic liver abscess. The optimum duration of treatment in patients with amoebic liver abscess is 7-10 days. Routine needle aspiration of amoebic liver abscess is controversial. Addition of aspiration to drug therapy in patients with amoebic liver abscess of >5 cm in size hastens clinical improvement.

Recommendation

- We recommend metronidazole as an initial antibiotic of choice in patients with amoebic liver abscess (2A).
- We recommend antibiotic treatment for a period of 7-10 days in patients with amoebic liver abscess (3B).
- Needle aspiration of amoebic liver abscess is recommended in patients with a lack of clinical improvement in 48-72 hours, left lobe abscess, abscess more than 5-10 cm or thin rim of liver tissue around the abscess (<10 mm) (UPP).
- The luminal agents used to remove any intraluminal cysts (paromomycin, diiodohydroxyquin or diloxanide furoate) should be used even if the stool microscopy is negative (UPP).

Pyogenic Liver Abscess

Antibiotics that are effective in the treatment of pyogenic liver abscess include third and fourth-generation cephalosporins (such as ceftriaxone, and cefepime), aminoglycosides, fluoroquinolones, beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitor (piperacillin-tazobactam), carbapenems, and metronidazole.^{511,521-523} Carbapenems are effective for the treatment of liver abscess caused by melioidosis or infection with ESBL producing organism.^{524,525}

The empirical regimen should include a broad-spectrum parenteral antibiotic pending microbiologic analysis of the abscess contents. It should cover enteric gram-negative bacilli, streptococci, and anaerobes. Antibiotic therapy should generally be continued for four to six weeks.⁵¹² However, the optimal duration of therapy is unclear and is guided by the clinical and radiological response. Studies have reported that shorter courses of antibiotics for 2-4 weeks are effective as well.^{512,521,526} In case of abscess cavity with a size less than 5 cm, a needle aspiration is preferred and in case of abscesses more than 5 cm in size, percutaneous catheter drainage is preferred.⁵²⁷⁻⁵²⁹ Surgical drainage is required in cases of abscesses with viscous contents obstructing the catheter, an underlying disease requiring primary surgical management and inadequate response to percutaneous drainage within 7 days.⁵³⁰

Evidence Statement

Beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitors, metronidazole, and carbapenems are effective antibiotics for management of pyogenic liver abscess. Carbapenems are effective in case of suspected infection with ESBL producing organisms or

melioidosis. Antibiotics are required for prolonged periods ranging from 4-6 weeks. Clinical and radiological assessment is required to guide the adequate treatment duration. Initial 2-4 weeks therapy may be parenteral while oral therapy may be given for rest of the duration.

Recommendation

- We recommend beta lactam/beta lactamase inhibitors with metronidazole in patients with pyogenic liver abscess for a duration of 4-6 weeks (2A).
- We recommend carbapenems in case of infection with ESBL-producing organisms or melioidosis (2B).
- The empiric regimen should also cover *E. histolytica* until the causative pathogen is found or amoebic abscess is excluded (UPP).

Peritonitis

Peritonitis is defined as an inflammation of the peritoneum from any cause. Peritonitis occurs due to a variety of etiologies, of which the most common is infections. It is broadly classified as primary, secondary, and tertiary. Primary peritonitis, also known as spontaneous bacterial peritonitis (SBP), has no identifiable anatomical dehiscence. It is usually managed non-surgically. The risk factors for the development of primary peritonitis include advanced cirrhosis, nephrotic syndrome, and peritoneal dialysis.^{531,532} Secondary peritonitis is the infection of peritoneum that occurs in critical ill patients secondary to organ perforation, anastomotic leak or trauma to the gastrointestinal tract. Tertiary peritonitis may be defined as a severe recurrent or persistent intra-abdominal infection after apparently successful and adequate surgical source control of secondary peritonitis.⁵³³ It leads to prolonged systemic inflammation and is usually associated with high mortality (30-64%). Longer ICU stay, emergency abdominal surgery and total parenteral nutrition are risk factors associated with the development of tertiary peritonitis.⁵³⁴⁻⁵³⁹

What are the Most Common Organisms Causing Peritonitis in ICU?

Enteric gram-negative organisms including *E. coli*, klebsiella and enterobacteriaceae are the most common causative agents for primary and secondary peritonitis.^{540,541} Other organisms include gram-positive bacteria (such as enterococcus) as well as anaerobes (i.e. bacteroides).⁵⁴¹ Tertiary peritonitis is usually due to opportunistic and nosocomial drug resistant bacteria and fungi. Various organisms reported are enterococcus, candida, staphylococcus and enterobacter.^{539,542}

Evidence Statement

The risk factors for development of primary peritonitis are decompensated cirrhosis, nephrotic syndrome and peritoneal dialysis. The risk factors for development of secondary peritonitis include intra-abdominal organ perforation, post intra-abdominal surgery, and trauma. Longer ICU stay, urgent operation on hospital admission, total parenteral nutrition, and stomach-duodenum as primary infection site are associated with the development of tertiary peritonitis. Gram-negative enteric organisms (such as *E. coli*, and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*) are the common causes of primary and secondary peritonitis. Other organisms include gram-positive as well as anaerobic bacteria. The organisms commonly isolated in tertiary peritonitis are *Candida*, *Enterococcus faecium* and *Staphylococcus epidermidis*.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating Peritonitis in ICU?

Primary Peritonitis

Cephalosporins and fluoroquinolones are effective against the majority of the cases of primary peritonitis.^{540,543–546} Antibiotics for a period of 5-7 days are effective in SBP.^{540,543,547,548} In difficult to treat SBP, cefepime and imipenem are reported to be effective.⁵⁴⁹

Secondary Peritonitis

The antibiotics effective in secondary peritonitis are beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitors (piperacillin-tazobactam), quinolones, carbapenems (Imipenem with Cilastin), aminoglycosides, and metronidazole.^{541,550,551} When enterococci are considered, the addition of vancomycin or linezolid is required for a spectrum adequacy rate of more than 95%.⁵⁵² Community-acquired infections of mild to moderate severity can be treated with Cefoxitin, Cefotetan, Cefmetazole, Ticarcillin-clavulanic acid.⁵⁵³

The average duration of antibiotic therapy is 10 to 14 days. However, recently the emphasis is on a shorter course of antibiotics after adequate source control. The recent STOP-IT trial has found that in patients after an adequate source control, outcomes after fixed-duration antibiotics (approximately 4 days) were similar to those after a longer course of antibiotics (approximately 8 days).⁵⁵⁴

Evidence Statement

Third-generation Cephalosporins are the most effective antibiotic therapy for primary peritonitis. Antibiotics are usually required for 7-10 days for adequate treatment. Most of the organisms isolated in secondary peritonitis are sensitive to beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitors or carbapenems. For gram-positive organisms, vancomycin and linezolid are effective treatment options. Short duration of antibiotic treatment (4 days) is as effective as a longer duration after adequate source control.

Recommendation

- We recommend third generation cephalosporins (such as cefotaxime and ceftriaxone) for a duration of 7-10 days in patients with primary peritonitis (2A).
- We recommend either beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitor or carbapenems with an anaerobic cover (using metronidazole) for the treatment of secondary peritonitis (2A).
- For secondary peritonitis, antibiotic treatment is required for at least 4 days after an adequate source control; however, longer treatment is required if adequate source control is not achieved (2A).

CNS Infections in ICU

Infections of the central nervous system (CNS), either community or hospital-acquired, are frequent causes of admission to the ICU. Bacterial meningitis and brain abscesses are one of the most common CNS infections and can result in significant morbidity and mortality. CNS infections are markedly different from systemic infections because of closed anatomic space and immunologic isolation of CNS from the rest of the body. They often have nonspecific clinical manifestations posing a diagnostic challenge to the clinician. Early suspicion, rapid diagnosis, and aggressive management are essential for better outcomes and to prevent various complications and neurological sequelae.

What are the Most Common Organisms Causing Acute Bacterial Meningitis in ICU?

Bacterial meningitis, an infection of the meninges and subarachnoid space, is a complex disorder in which injury is caused partly by the causative organism and partly by the host inflammatory response. Bacterial meningitis is a medical emergency, given the associated mortality and neurological sequelae requiring prompt recognition, rapid diagnostic evaluation, and emergent antimicrobial therapy. Hence accurate information regarding the incidence, risk factors, and microbiological profile of bacterial meningitis is necessary to ensure appropriate empirical antibiotic management. Meningitis can be community-acquired or associated with a variety of neurosurgical procedures (e.g., craniotomy, placement of invasive neuro-monitoring techniques, external ventricular drain catheters, or cerebrospinal fluid shunts) and penetrating head injury. The latter group is classified as nosocomial meningitis or healthcare-associated meningitis and ventriculitis. Both groups differ in their pathogenic mechanisms, risk factors, etiological agents microbial susceptibility patterns and hence are discussed separately.

Community-acquired Meningitis

The incidence of bacterial meningitis in the USA was 2 cases per 100,000 population in 1998–1999 that decreased to 1.38 cases per 100,000 population in 2006–2007; the most common organisms were *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (56.8%), *Neisseria meningitidis* (17.2%), group B streptococci (16.7%), *Hemophilus influenzae* (5.8%) and *Listeria monocytogenes* (3.2%).^{555,556} In a retrospective study of 195 culture positive acute bacterial meningitis patients, the most common organism was *streptococcus pneumoniae* followed by *Staphylococcus aureus* and *klebsiella pneumoniae*.⁵⁵⁷ Various large studies have found *S. pneumoniae* as the most common etiological agent followed by *N. meningitidis*, *L. monocytogenes*, *H. influenzae* and group B *Streptococcus*.^{558–562} Though *S. aureus* has also been reported as one of the common etiological agents in some studies.^{559–560} Otitis media, immunocompromised status, elderly population, and prior use of antibiotics have been described as risk factors for bacterial meningitis.^{558,563,564} Various Indian studies have yielded similar results.^{565–568} The prevalence of meningitis in hospitalized and critically-ill patients of all age groups (0–75 years) varies from 8.68% and 78.85% in India. *Streptococcus pneumoniae* is the predominant pathogen causing meningitis across different regions of India, with a frequency ranging from 4% to 61.8%.^{569,570}

Evidence Statement

The incidence of community-acquired pyogenic meningitis ranges from 2 to 7.40 per lakh population and data suggest higher incidence in children. The common causative organisms include *streptococcus pneumoniae*, *neisseria meningitidis*, other streptococci, *Hemophilus influenzae* and *listeria monocytogenes*. Other causative organisms are *staphylococcus* species, gram-negative bacilli, and *Pseudomonas*. Common risk factors for community-acquired bacterial meningitis are otitis media, elderly population, depressed immune status and prior use of antibiotics.

Nosocomial Meningitis

Nosocomial meningitis may result from various invasive procedures including craniotomy, placement of internal or external ventricular catheters, lumbar puncture, intrathecal infusions of medications, spinal anesthesia or complicated head trauma or rarely from metastatic infection in patients with hospital-acquired bacteremia.

Incidence of post-ventricular drain or catheter-related infections have been studied in many retrospective and prospective studies and ranges from 5.6% to 14.2% and 5.5 % to 19% respectively.⁵⁷¹⁻⁵⁷⁶ A systematic review from January 1990 through March 2008 reporting on ventriculostomy and extra-ventricular drain (EVD) related CNS infections described an incidence of 2-27%.⁵⁷⁷ *Staphylococcus epidermidis* (70%) is the most common microbiological agent followed by gram-negative bacilli (15%) and *Staphylococcus aureus* (10%). Risk factors described included EVD duration greater than 11 days, frequency of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) sampling, intraventricular hemorrhage, and surgical technique (subcutaneously tunneled EVD, Rickham reservoir with percutaneous CSF drainage). Post craniotomy or neurosurgery incidence of meningitis ranges from 0.02% to 9.5%.^{573,578-584} Most of the studies have reported staphylococcus to be the most common causative organism.^{573,578,580,582,583} Few studies have also reported acinetobacter and Enterobacteriaceae as the most common organisms.^{579,581} Post-operative CSF leak has been consistently shown to be a risk factor.^{573,578-580,582,583,585} Other risk factors are placement of external shunts, longer duration of drainage, multiple intracranial operations, emergency or prolonged surgery, diabetes, and elderly population.^{573,578-583} The role of prophylactic antibiotics for post-neurosurgery and craniotomy meningitis has been debatable, however, a recent meta-analysis of 7 RCTs including 2365 post-craniotomy patients found that prophylactic antibiotic use reduced the rate of post neurosurgical meningitis.⁵⁸⁶ The incidence of post-spinal blockade meningitis is very low with a large retrospective analysis of 12,60,000 spinal blockades and 450,000 epidural blockades showing incidence to be 1 in 53000 with alpha-hemolytic streptococci as the most common causative organism.⁵⁸⁷ Exogenous inoculation is a risk factor and various measures such as hand disinfection, sterile gloves, face masks and operating caps decrease the risk of development of meningitis.⁵⁸⁸ The incidence of meningitis or ventriculitis in patients with post-traumatic head injury is 1.39%-2%.^{589,590} Common organisms include CONS, gram-negative bacilli, and acinetobacter. Lumbar and ventricular drains are described as the risk factors. A recent Cochrane systematic review has not shown benefit of using prophylactic antibiotics in patients with basilar skull fracture, independent of CSF leakage.⁵⁹¹ Post internal ventricular drain infections incidence has been reported between 5.9% to 15.2% in various prospective and retrospective studies. Most common causative organisms included *Staphylococcus aureus* and CONS.^{592,593} Post-operative CSF leak, use of single gloves and number of times shunt system exposed to breached surgical gloves were described as risk factors.^{594,595} Indian studies suggest a 0.7-8.9% incidence of meningitis in post-neurosurgical patients.⁵⁹⁶ There have been reports of such infections with MDR organisms and newer antibiotics such as Ceftazidime-avibactam have been used for the same.⁵⁹⁷

Evidence Statement

Incidence of post-ventricular drain or catheter meningitis ranges from 2% to 27%. Commonly implicated organisms are CONS (especially *Staphylococcus epidermidis*), *Staphylococcus aureus*, acinetobacter, pseudomonas, and Enterobacteriaceae. Risk factors are repeated catheterization, higher catheter duration, CSF sampling, presence of concomitant systemic infection, and surgical technique i.e., subcutaneously tunneled extraventricular drain (EVD), Rickham reservoir with percutaneous CSF drainage. The incidence of post craniotomy or post neurosurgery meningitis

is 0.02% to 9.5%. Most commonly implicated organisms are *Staphylococcus aureus*, coagulase-negative staphylococci (especially *S. epidermidis*), Enterobacteriaceae, acinetobacter, and pseudomonas. Risk factors include CSF leak, EVD, longer duration of drainage, multiple operations, lack of antibiotic prophylaxis, and emergency surgery. The incidence of post-neuroaxial blockade meningitis is 0.2 per 10000 with viridans streptococci and *Staphylococcus aureus* being common organisms. Exogenous inoculation is the main risk factor. Post-head trauma meningitis incidence ranges from 1.39% to 2% with CONS, acinetobacter, and Enterobacteriaceae as common microbes and prolonged hospitalization, and insertion of a lumbar and ventricular drain as common risk factors. Post-internal ventricular drain infection incidence ranges from 5.9% to 15.2%. The most common causative organisms are CONS, *Staphylococcus aureus*, gram-negative bacilli, group D streptococci, and propionibacterium acnes. CSF leak, single gloves use, and number of times shunt exposed to breached surgical gloves are the risk factors.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating Acute Bacterial Meningitis in ICU? What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment?

Early diagnosis and urgent appropriate antimicrobial therapy along with other adjunctive therapy is necessary to reduce morbidity and mortality associated with bacterial meningitis. As isolation of microorganisms takes time and sometimes it may not be isolated at all, empirical anti-microbial therapy needs to be based on the most likely involved organism as determined by the presence of risk factors for various organisms and local antibiotic susceptibility patterns.

Community-acquired Meningitis

The evidence regarding empirical antibiotic choice in acute bacterial meningitis (ABM) is limited.⁵⁹⁸ A retrospective study found reduced penicillin susceptibility in 23% of patients with meningitis, including 16% in community-acquired meningitis. Ceftriaxone combined with penicillin was found adequate in 97% cases.⁵⁹⁹ Retrospective study by Hakam Erdem et al reported the inadequacy of ceftriaxone alone in the treatment of pneumococcal meningitis in view of increasing penicillin resistance in pneumococci worldwide.⁶⁰⁰ A Cochrane review in 2007 comparing third-generation cephalosporins (ceftriaxone or cefotaxime) with conventional antibiotics (ampicillin-chloramphenicol combination, or chloramphenicol alone) as empirical therapy for ABM in adults and children found no statistically significant difference between the groups in the risk of death, risk of deafness or risk of treatment failure although significantly decreased chances of culture positivity of CSF after 10 to 48 hours with the third generation cephalosporins at the cost of increased risk of diarrhea.⁶⁰¹ A recent Indian study including 266 culture-positive ABM patients (including 142 CAM patients) found that gram-positive pathogens exhibited maximum sensitivity to vancomycin and linezolid whereas most gram-negative pathogens were sensitive to carbapenems.⁶⁰² Seven days antibiotic therapy has been recommended for *N. meningitidis* and *H. influenzae*, 10-14 days for *S. pneumoniae*, 14 to 21 days for *S. agalactiae*, 21 days for aerobic GNB and 21 days or more for *L. monocytogenes*.⁶⁰³

Evidence Statement

Choice of antibiotics depends on the most likely causative microorganisms, local antibiotics sensitivity patterns, mechanism

of infection, and patient's predisposing condition. Most commonly recommended empirical antibiotic regimens include third-generation cephalosporin plus vancomycin, third-generation cephalosporin monotherapy and penicillin monotherapy. Addition of amoxicillin, ampicillin or benzyl-penicillin has been recommended in patients older than 50 years. However, antibiotic therapy should be modified according to the isolated organisms since MDR organisms are being reported from community as well.

Recommendation

- We recommend third-generation cephalosporin (preferably ceftriaxone) plus vancomycin as empirical antibiotics of choice for community-acquired meningitis (3A).
- We recommend adding ampicillin or amoxicillin if the age >50 years (3A).
- If beta-lactams are contraindicated, we recommend chloramphenicol plus vancomycin as the antibiotic of choice, and to add cotrimoxazole if age >50 years (3A).
- We recommend ciprofloxacin or aztreonam plus vancomycin as an alternative regimen and to add cotrimoxazole, if age greater than 50 years (UPP).
- We recommend the duration of antibiotics based on suspected or isolated organisms i.e., 10 to 14 days for *streptococcus pneumoniae*, 14 to 21 days for streptococcus agalactiae, 7 days for neisseria meningitidis or *Hemophilus influenzae*, 21 days for aerobic gram negative bacilli, and 21 days or more for listeria monocytogenes (3A).
- If no microorganism is identified, antibiotics should be given for at least 10 to 14 days (3A).

Nosocomial Meningitis

Treatment recommendations for nosocomial meningitis are largely based upon expert opinion. IDSA guidelines for the management of bacterial meningitis recommend vancomycin plus third generation cephalosporin for post-basilar skull fracture meningitis; vancomycin plus cefepime, ceftazidime or meropenem has been recommended for post neurosurgery nosocomial meningitis or meningitis occurring after CSF shunt or penetrating trauma.⁶⁰³ Meropenem is the preferred option in a setting of infections by extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Enterobacteriales.⁶⁰⁴

A systematic review of intraventricular or intrathecal use of polymyxins in patients with gram-negative meningitis including 31 case reports and case series found limited available evidence to suggest the addition of intraventricular or intrathecal antimicrobials to systemic therapy in gram-negative meningitis. Toxicity was dose-dependent and reversible.⁶⁰⁵ Another review for use of intraventricular use of vancomycin found its use safe and effective.⁶⁰⁶ IDSA guidelines recommend vancomycin plus an anti-pseudomonal beta-lactam (such as cefepime, ceftazidime, or meropenem) as empiric antimicrobial of choice for suspected healthcare-associated ventriculitis and meningitis.⁶⁰⁷ The current IDSA guidelines suggest using adjunct intraventricular or intrathecal antimicrobial administration if the patient did not clinically improve on solely systemic treatment or the disease is caused by a difficult-to-treat resistant microorganisms. The common drugs include Amikacin, colistin and Gentamicin. Regarding optimum duration of antibiotic therapy, IDSA recommends therapy for 10 days if coagulase-negative staphylococcus or *P. acnes* with no or minimal CSF pleocytosis, normal CSF glucose, and few clinical symptoms or systemic features; 10 to 14 day treatment is recommended in case of significant CSF pleocytosis, CSF hypoglycorrhachia,

clinical symptoms or systemic features. Treatment for 21 days is recommended for gram-negative bacilli and *Staphylococcus aureus*. In patients with repeatedly positive CSF cultures on appropriate antimicrobial therapy, IDSA recommends treatment to be continued for 10 to 14 days after the last positive culture.⁶⁰⁷ Currently, a single-dose of an antibiotic as per local susceptibility patterns is recommended for prophylaxis.^{608,609}

Evidence Statement

Vancomycin in combination with cefepime, ceftazidime or meropenem is a commonly recommended empirical antibiotic regimen for nosocomial meningitis. Alternative regimens include third-generation cephalosporin or meropenem monotherapy or ceftriaxone plus flucloxacillin or cloxacillin combination therapy. Limited available evidence shows the efficacy of intraventricular or intrathecal antibiotics in the management of nosocomial meningitis poorly responsive to systemic antibiotics.

Recommendation

- We recommend vancomycin plus cefepime or ceftazidime or meropenem as empirical antibiotics of choice for nosocomial meningitis (3A).
- Colistin may be given if the incidence of CRE or drug-resistant acinetobacter is high in the specific unit (UPP).
- If beta-lactams are contraindicated, we recommend replacing beta-lactam with aztreonam or ciprofloxacin (3A).
- Intraventricular or intrathecal antibiotics should be considered if infection responds poorly to appropriate systemic antibiotics clinically or microbiologically (3A).

What are the Most Common Organisms Causing Brain Abscess in ICU?

Brain abscess is a serious life-threatening emergency with high morbidity and mortality. The management of brain abscess is challenging and needs good clinical and surgical skills for better outcomes. The choice of pharmacological therapy should be based on the most likely organism, patient's predisposing condition or risk factors, mechanisms of infection, antimicrobial susceptibility patterns, and on the ability of the antimicrobial agent to penetrate the abscess.

In a recent single centre retrospective study over 62 years including 620 patients of brain abscess, the incidence of brain abscess (per lakhs population) was 2.5 between 1952–1972, 2.6 in 1980–1991 and 2.2 in 2002–2014.⁶¹⁰ *Staphylococcus aureus* is one of the commonest organism followed by *Proteus* sp. and *Streptococcus*. Chronic ear infection is a common predisposing factor (65% cases).⁶¹¹ *Streptococcus* (34%), followed by *staphylococcus* (18%), gram negative enteric bacilli (15%), *pseudomonas* and *haemophilus* (2% each) were found to be the commonly isolated organisms in a recent meta-analysis. *Peptostreptococcus*, *bacteroides* and *fusobacterium* were isolated in 3%, 6% and 2% respectively and polymicrobial etiology was found in 23% cases.⁶¹² Most common predisposing condition was otitis media followed by sinusitis, heart disease, post traumatic, hematogenous, pulmonary disease, postoperative, odontogenic, immunocompromised and meningitis. Two retrospective studies found *Staphylococcus aureus* to be the most common causative organism followed by *Streptococcus*.^{613,614} Otitis media was the most common risk factor followed by congenital heart disease, paranasal sinus infections, dental causes, trauma and post-operative state.^{613–616} Various prospective Indian studies found streptococci to be most common microbe.^{615,616}

A recent Indian retrospective study reported that 47.14% samples from brain abscess were culture positive in which 50% had single aerobic/facultative anaerobic bacteria, 30.3% had a mixture of more than one aerobic/facultative anaerobic bacteria, 18.18% had single obligate anaerobic bacteria and 1.5% sample had *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* isolated. Among the total isolates, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Staphylococcus aureus* predominated.⁶¹⁷

Evidence Statement

Incidence of brain abscess ranges from 1.3 to 2.6 cases per lakh population. Most commonly involved micro-organisms include streptococcus (especially *S. viridans*), staphylococcus (especially *S. aureus*), gram negative bacilli, anaerobes (bacteroides, peptostreptococcus, fusobacterium), pseudomonas and *H. influenzae*. Polymicrobial aetiology accounts for 23-26% cases. Risk factors include otitis media, sinusitis, head trauma, congenital heart diseases, hematogenous spread, surgery, immunocompromised status, pulmonary disease, meningitis and odontogenic infections.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating Brain Abscess in ICU? What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment?

The data regarding the efficacy of various empirical antibiotic regimens in the management of brain abscess is limited to observational studies and expert opinion. In a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical characteristics and outcomes of brain abscess, 17 studies described how many patients received which regimen.⁶²⁸ The most common empiric treatment consisted of a third-generation cephalosporin combined with metronidazole, which was given in 53% of cases while vancomycin was added in additional 15% cases. Other regimens had combinations of chloramphenicol, metronidazole with penicillin (9%), ampicillin, gentamicin with metronidazole (9%), and imipenem monotherapy (4%).⁶¹² There is insufficient evidence to make specific recommendations but on the basis of limited clinical data, recommendations include cefotaxime plus metronidazole with or without rifampicin for post-trauma abscess, linezolid or vancomycin plus rifampicin plus meropenem or piperacillin/tazobactam for post-surgical abscess, cefotaxime or piperacillin-tazobactam plus metronidazole for post middle ear, paranasal sinuses, dental causes and cefotaxime with or without metronidazole or ampicillin-sulbactam for cryptogenic or metastatic abscess.⁶¹⁸ Four to six weeks of antibiotic therapy is required for surgically treated abscesses and 6-8 weeks for solely medically treated or multiple surgical abscesses with the largest one treated surgically.⁶¹⁹

Evidence Statement

The most common empiric treatment consists of a third-generation cephalosporin combined with metronidazole. Antibiotic duration ranges from 4 to 8 weeks.

Recommendation

- We recommend third-generation cephalosporins plus metronidazole as the empirical antibiotic of choice for brain abscess (3A).
- We recommend adding vancomycin if there is a high likelihood of MRSA (3A)
- We recommend vancomycin plus ciprofloxacin if beta-lactams are contraindicated (3A).

- We recommend aztreonam if ciprofloxacin cannot be given or contraindicated (UPP).
- We recommend a minimum 4 weeks of therapy; however, duration may be extended according to clinic-radiological response irrespective of aspiration or excision of abscess (3A).

Skin and Soft Tissue Infections in ICU

An inflammatory microbial invasion of the epidermis, dermis and subcutaneous tissues is defined as skin and soft tissue infection (SSTI). In ICU, 4.3% to 10.5% of septic episodes may be caused by SSTIs,⁶²⁰ with attributable mortality of 11.7%.⁶²¹ Spectrum of SSTI includes abscess, carbuncle, cellulitis, surgical site infection, diabetic foot and necrotizing fasciitis. SSTI has been classified based on signs of sepsis and comorbidities. SSTI without any signs or symptoms of systemic toxicity or comorbidities is termed Class 1. SSTI in patients with significant comorbidities (diabetes or obesity), but without any evidence of sepsis is termed class 2. Class 3 SSTI refers to SSTI with fever, tachycardia and tachypnea with or without hypotension. Class 4 SSTI refers to life threatening infections like necrotizing fasciitis along with sepsis.⁶²² For treatment decision, it is important to classify SSTIs into purulent (carbuncle, furuncle and abscess) and non-purulent (necrotising fasciitis, cellulitis and erysipela). Non-purulent SSTIs are classified into mild (no focus of purulence), moderate (presence of systemic inflammatory response syndrome, i.e., SIRS) and severe (failed oral antibiotics, SIRS, immunocompromised, deeper infection or organ dysfunction). Purulent SSTIs are classified into mild (no systemic signs of infection), moderate (SIRS present) and severe (SIRS along with treatment failure, or organ dysfunction).⁶²³

What are the Most Common Organisms and Risk Factors for SSTI in ICU?

Staphylococcus aureus (20.9%-38.1%) and gram negative bacilli (29.1%-57.4%) have been commonly implicated in SSTIs in India.⁶²⁴⁻⁶²⁶ *Pseudomonas* (11.8%-57.4%) and *E. coli* (17.3%) are most common GNBs.^{625,626} High proportion of *Staphylococcus aureus* (40%-74%) have been reported to be methicillin resistant,^{625,627} whereas majority of (66.7%-74%) GNBs have been reported to be ESBL producing.⁶²⁵ Necrotising fasciitis is caused mostly by streptococcus pyogenes in monomicrobial form. Clostridial species are also responsible for monomicrobial necrotising fasciitis.⁶²⁸ In polymicrobial necrotising fasciitis, the most commonly implicated pathogens are *E. coli* forms, anaerobic bacteria and staphylococcus.^{629,630} Old age, obesity, diabetes mellitus, malignancy, higher APACHE score, longer ICU stay, end stage renal disease, cirrhosis of liver, intravenous drug abuse and neutropenia are risk factors for SSTI.^{622,631,632}

Evidence Statement

Older age, diabetes mellitus, obesity, malignancy, cirrhosis and longer ICU stay are risk factors for SSTIs. Gram positive organisms (*Staphylococcus aureus*) are the most common organism responsible for the SSTIs. *E. coli* and *pseudomonas* are common pathogens among gram negative organisms. MRSA and ESBL producing gram negative organisms are the most common causative agents for SSTIs in ICU. Monomicrobial necrotizing fasciitis is commonly caused by *Streptococcus Pyogenes*; mixed coliforms, anaerobes and staphylococci are common causes of polymicrobial necrotizing fasciitis.

What are the Empirical Antibiotics of Choice for Treating SSTI in ICU? For Empirical Therapy, should Combination Therapy be Preferred Over Monotherapy?

Studies on SSTIs specific to ICU settings are not available. Meta-analysis performed by Rebecca J et al⁶³³ showed clear superiority of linezolid and vancomycin in treating skin and soft tissue infection caused by *S. aureus*. Teicoplanin is also a good choice for treating severe SSTI caused by MRSA, with similar efficacy and fewer adverse effects as compared to vancomycin.^{634–636} Daptomycin has been shown to have more rapid clinical cure, reduced length of hospital stay and lower cost as compared to vancomycin in a prospective study of SSTIs in ICU.⁶³⁷ Other RCTs have demonstrated non-inferiority of daptomycin to vancomycin.⁶³⁸ MRSA remains sensitive to vancomycin and linezolid, and majority remain sensitive to clindamycin also (79%).⁶²⁷ For gram negative pathogens, piperacillin-tazobactam and imipenem have been reported to be most effective antibiotics.⁶²⁰

Evidence Statement

Vancomycin, teicoplanin, daptomycin and linezolid are effective in SSTIs caused by MRSA. Piperacillin-tazobactam and carbapenems are the most effective antibiotics for ESBL producing gram negative organisms. Penicillin plus clindamycin are most effective antibiotics in monomicrobial necrotising fasciitis, whereas a combination of piperacillin-tazobactam, fluoroquinolone and clindamycin is effective for polymicrobial necrotising fasciitis.

Recommendation

- For moderate non-purulent SSTI, we recommend intravenous penicillin or clindamycin as first choice of antibiotics (2A).
- Severe non-purulent SSTI should be treated with a combination of piperacillin-tazobactam alongwith coverage for MRSA (vancomycin, teicoplanin, daptomycin or linezolid) (2A).
- Concomitant surgical inspection or debridement should be considered for severe non-purulent SSTIs (2A).
- For severe purulent SSTI, incision and drainage followed by empiric antibiotics including piperacillin tazobactam, alongwith MRSA coverage (vancomycin, teicoplanin, daptomycin or linezolid) is recommended (3A).
- Penicillin plus clindamycin is recommended for monomicrobial necrotising infection caused by streptococcus pyogenes or clostridial species. For polymicrobial necrotising fasciitis, a combination of piperacillin-tazobactam, fluoroquinolone and clindamycin is recommended (3A).

What should be the Duration of Antibiotic Treatment for SSTI?

There is limited literature to guide treatment of severe or complicated SSTIs. In uncomplicated SSTI, antimicrobial administration for 5 days was equally effective to 10 day treatment.⁶³⁹ Complicated SSTIs may require longer treatment.

Evidence Statement

Shorter course of antibiotic therapy is adequate for uncomplicated SSTIs while complicated SSTIs require longer duration of antibiotic therapy.

Recommendation

- Severe non purulent SSTIs should be treated with at least 5 days of antibiotics (3A).

- Severe SSTIs with organ dysfunction should be treated with a prolonged course of antibiotics of 2-3 weeks duration (3A).

Sepsis of Unknown Cause in ICU

Mortality from severe sepsis and septic shock remains consistently high.^{640,641} Delay in antimicrobial therapy is associated with increased in-hospital and overall mortality in severe sepsis and septic shock.^{642,643} In view of this data, empiric antimicrobial therapy should be started immediately (preferably within 1 hour) after presumptive clinical diagnosis of septic shock. While every effort should be made to secure site-specific cultures to guide microorganism-specific therapy, this should never delay the administration of empiric antimicrobials.⁶⁴⁴ Intensive efforts, including imaging, should be undertaken in an attempt to evaluate the source of infection. Two sets of blood cultures and other appropriate microbiological specimens should preferably be taken before empirical therapy. Urgent empirical broad-spectrum coverage to include all common pathogens should be administered.⁶⁴⁴

What is the Empirical Treatment for Sepsis of Unknown Cause in ICU?

There is paucity of data on empirical antimicrobial therapy in sepsis of unknown cause in ICU. Combination antimicrobial therapy (using two drugs from different class) improves survival and clinical outcomes in patients with sepsis who are critically ill and in septic shock as compared to monotherapy.⁶⁴⁵ Beta-lactams with aminoglycosides or fluoroquinolones gives a broad empirical coverage. If the patient has risk factors for MRSA, vancomycin should be added to the regimen.⁶⁴⁶ Accordingly if risk factors for MDR pathogens are present in an individual patient, beta-lactam of choice is a carbapenem. In India, empirical therapy should cover for various tropical infections till a definite diagnosis is reached. Third-generation cephalosporins with doxycycline is an appropriate option keeping this fact in mind.

Evidence Statement

Empirical therapy with dual class (with different mechanisms of action) combination antimicrobial therapy for sepsis of unknown cause in ICU is associated with have better clinical outcomes. Empirical therapy with either piperacillin-tazobactam or carbapenems in combination with aminoglycoside or fluoroquinolone has been shown to give appropriate broad coverage leading to better clinical outcomes as compared to monotherapy.

Recommendation

- We recommend empirical antimicrobial therapy with combination of ceftriaxone and doxycycline or macrolide for community acquired sepsis of unknown origin in ICU (UPP).
- We recommend empirical antimicrobial therapy with combination of beta-lactam/beta-lactamase inhibitor and fluoroquinolone or aminoglycoside for nosocomial sepsis of unknown origin in ICU (UPP).
- Empiric therapy should attempt to provide antimicrobial activity against the most likely pathogens based upon clinical features alongwith local patterns of infection and resistance (UPP).
- Duration of therapy is 7 to 10 days, though longer courses may be appropriate in patients with slow response (3B).

Empirical Antifungals for Non-neutropenic Patients in ICU

Invasive fungal infection (IFI) is an important cause of morbidity and mortality among critically ill patients. Early institution of antifungal therapy is pivotal for mortality reduction. Starting targeted antifungal therapy after culture positivity or identification of pathogen requires a long time. Therefore, alternative strategies (defined as untargeted antifungal treatment) for antifungal therapy institution in patients without proven microbiological evidence of fungal infections have been considered.⁶⁴⁷ Untargeted antifungal strategies include prophylactic antifungals, pre-emptive antifungals and empirical antifungals. Prophylaxis refers to use of antifungals without proven or suspected fungal infection but with risk factors for its development. Pre-emptive (diagnosis driven) approach means evidence of fungal infection, without definitive microbiological proof on the basis of surrogate biomarkers like 1-3 β -D-glucan, mannan or anti-mannan antibodies, whereas empirical (fever-driven) approach refers to using antifungals in patients at risk for IFI, with signs and symptoms of infection, in absence of microbiological evidence of infection.⁶⁴⁷

Among fungal pathogens, *Candida* spp. are the most commonly isolated microorganisms, currently being the fourth most commonly identified pathogens in nosocomial BSIs and the third most common pathogens isolated in ICU patients.³⁰⁷ Despite advances in antifungal therapy, the mortality associated with invasive candidiasis remains as high as 40%.⁶⁴⁷ In India, incidence of *C. albicans* ranges from 34% to 45.6% with an attributable mortality of 20% to 35.6%. Incidence of non-*albicans* candida is on the rise with attributable mortality ranging from 23% to 52%, with higher mortality associated with *candida krusei*.⁶⁴⁸ An observational study from Indian ICUs revealed an incidence of 6.5 cases per 1000 ICU admissions. There was a high prevalence of *C. tropicalis* (41.6%) and 46.6% isolates were susceptible to all antifungals. Fluconazole resistance was 5.2% for *C. albicans* while it was 2.6% for *Candida tropicalis*. Risk factors for invasive candidemia were found to be surgery especially abdominal surgery, central venous catheters, invasive mechanical ventilation, urinary catheterization, hemodialysis and total parenteral nutrition.³²⁸

What are the Risk Factors for Invasive Fungal Infections in ICU?

Risk factors for invasive fungal infections (IFIs) in ICU have been studied extensively. A large retrospective study in 301 surgical ICU patients found the risk factors for IFI to be peripheral and central intravenous catheters, bladder catheters, mechanical ventilation, lack of enteral nutrition and TPN.⁶⁴⁹ In a prospective study of 150 cardiothoracic ICU patients, risk factors for IFIs were prolonged mechanical ventilation (>10 days), hospital-acquired bacterial infection, cardiopulmonary bypass duration greater than 120 min, diabetes mellitus and high APACHE II score (>30).⁶⁵⁰ A systematic review demonstrated that major surgery (OR-7.3), TPN (OR-3.8), fungal colonization with colonization index >0.5 (OR-19.1), hemodialysis (OR-3.8), acute renal failure (OR-4.2), severe sepsis, mechanical ventilation >3 days, diabetes (OR-2.8), APACHE 2 score >16 (OR-1.03), cardiopulmonary bypass >120 min (OR-8.1), use of broad spectrum antibiotics (OR-3), red cell transfusion and central or peripheral venous catheters were significantly associated with IFIs.⁶⁵¹

Evidence Statement

Risk factors for invasive fungal infections in non-neutropenic patients in ICU are surgery, total parenteral nutrition, renal replacement therapy, cardiopulmonary bypass >120 minutes, diabetes mellitus, central venous catheters, urinary catheters, candida colonisation with colonization index >0.5, use of broad spectrum antibiotics, acute renal failure, mechanical ventilation >3 days and APACHE II score >16.

What is the Role of Empirical Antifungals in Non-neutropenic Patients in ICU?

The advantage of empirical antifungal treatment has already been established in high-risk patients such as cancer patients and solid organ transplant recipients in various studies.⁶⁵²⁻⁶⁵⁴ However, in non-neutropenic critically ill patients, the definitive evidence for efficacy of untargeted treatment in terms of prevention of IFIs or mortality benefit has been equivocal. Moreover, studies have shown potential detrimental effects of the injudicious use of antifungal agents in the form of emergence of drug resistance, side effects and financial costs.⁶⁵⁵⁻⁶⁵⁷ Several randomized controlled trials have compared empirical antifungals to placebo in non-neutropenic critically ill patients.⁶⁵⁸⁻⁶⁶³ In a RCT including post-surgery patients, fluconazole reduced the occurrence of candidemia (5.8% in fluconazole vs 16% in placebo) though the mortality rates were similar.⁶⁵⁸ Similarly, use of caspofungin was also associated with trend towards decreased IFI without any difference in mortality or length of hospital stay.⁶⁶⁰ A systematic review demonstrated that although empirical antifungals in non-neutropenic patients in ICU reduced the incidence of subsequent IFI, it had no impact on mortality.⁶⁶³ In a randomised controlled trial involving 260 mechanically ventilated patients with candida colonisation, empirical micafungin administration reduced the rate of subsequent proven IFI (12% vs 3%; $p = 0.008$) without any significant mortality benefit.⁶⁶²

Evidence Statement

Empirical antifungals for non-neutropenic patients in ICU routinely has not been associated with decrease in mortality or hospital length of stay. Empirical antifungals in patients at high risk for invasive fungal infections in ICU has been shown to reduce incidence of subsequent proven invasive fungal infections.

Recommendation

- We do not recommend the routine use of empirical antifungals in non-neutropenic patients in ICU (1A).
- Empirical antifungals may be considered in critically ill patients with high risk of invasive fungal infections to reduce the incidence of subsequent invasive fungal infections (1B).

What is the Antifungal Agent of Choice and Duration of Empirical Therapy in Non-neutropenic Patients in ICU?

The options for antifungal therapy include fluconazole, amphotericin-B and echinocandins. In a systematic review, empirical use of fluconazole and caspofungin reduced rates of subsequent IFI while micafungin, nystatin and amphotericin-B did not.⁶⁶³ No direct comparative data of efficacy of different antifungals for empirical therapy in non-neutropenic patients in ICU is available. Indian studies have shown increasing prevalence of non-*albicans* candida with high rates of fluconazole resistance in the range of 5% to 7%.⁶⁶⁴ Regarding duration of empirical antifungal therapy, there are no studies directly comparing different duration

of empirical antifungal therapy. Most of the studies have used at least 2 weeks therapy.⁶⁶³

Evidence Statement

Fluconazole and caspofungin are useful as empirical antifungal therapy in non-neutropenic ICU patients at high risk of Invasive fungal infection. In India, rate of fluconazole resistance is up to 7%, especially in non-albicans candida species.

Recommendation

- We recommend fluconazole or caspofungin as preferred empirical antifungal agents in non- neutropenic ICU patients at risk for invasive fungal infection (1A).
- Caspofungin may be preferred in areas with high prevalence of fluconazole resistance (1B).
- Micafungin or anidulafungin may be used as alternative agents (3A).
- Recommended duration of empirical antifungal therapy is 2 weeks (3A).

Antibiotic Stewardship

Antibiotic stewardship program is defined as “coordinated interventions designed to improve and measure the appropriate use of antibiotic agents by promoting the selection of the optimal drug regimen including dosing, duration of therapy, and route of administration.”⁶⁶⁵ An efficient antibiotic stewardship program results in optimum clinical outcomes while reducing adverse effects of unnecessary antibiotic use. Every additional 10 days of antibiotic therapy conferred a 3% increased risk of an adverse drug event. These adverse effects include emergence of antibiotic resistance, *clostridium difficile* infections and drug toxicity and occurs in 20% of patients.⁶⁶⁶ A structured antibiotic stewardship program requires a multidisciplinary approach. Core elements of antibiotic stewardship program includes committed leadership, accountability, expertise in drugs, action, tracking drug resistance patterns, regular reporting and education to clinicians about optimal prescribing.⁶⁶⁷

Does Antibiotic Stewardship Improve Patient Outcome in ICU?

Antibiotic stewardship programs reduced duration of antibiotic treatment (1.95 days; 95% CI 2.22 to 1.67) and duration of hospital stay (1.12 days, 95%CI 0.7- 1.54) without any significant difference in mortality in a recent systematic review.⁶⁶⁷ In a recent meta- analysis, there was reduced mortality with guideline directed empirical therapy (RR 0.65, 95% CI 0.54- 0.80, $p < 0.0001$) and antibiotic de-escalation (RR 0.44, 0.30- 0.66).⁶⁶⁸ Mortality benefit has also been reported in another systematic review (RR 0.68, 95% CI 0.52- 0.88).⁶⁶⁹ However, a single non blinded randomised study showed significantly higher rate of superinfection with de-escalation of antibiotics as compared to continuation of empirical therapy (27% vs 11%; $p = 0.03$).⁶⁷⁰

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic stewardship programs in hospitalised patients are associated with reduction in number of antibiotic days, duration of hospital stay and all-cause mortality.

Recommendation

All hospitals should have an antibiotic stewardship program including the intensive care units (1A).

What are the Essential Strategies of Antibiotic Stewardship in an ICU Setting?

Prospective audit-feedback and preauthorisation are commonly used strategies of antibiotic stewardship.⁶⁷¹⁻⁶⁷³ In prospective audit and feedback, treating clinicians are provided recommendations regarding appropriateness of antibiotics used. Advantages of this strategy include avoidance of delay in antibiotic administration (as physician is engaged after prescription of antibiotics). Limitations of this strategy include partial compliance (due to voluntary participation of physicians), resource intensive nature, and longer lag period for visible benefits to become apparent. Prospective audit and feedback strategy resulted in reduction in utilisation of antibiotics and significant cost reduction.⁶⁷⁴⁻⁶⁷⁵ In a systematic review, enabling strategies including feedback resulted in greater efficacy of stewardship interventions.⁶⁷¹ Preauthorisation, another strategy of antibiotic stewardship, requires approval by concerned authority before starting antibiotics.⁶⁷² This affects use of restricted antibiotics only and may result in potential delay in antibiotic initiation. Without feedback, this may also result in increased use of other antibiotics and hence lead to selection of different resistance patterns. However, it provides immediate results in terms of recued antibiotic usage. Other potential drawbacks include development of negative professional culture because of breakdown in communication between infectious disease specialists and clinical teams.⁶⁷¹ Enabling and restrictive strategies have been compared in a quasi-experimental crossover trial using days of antibiotic therapy in both strategies.⁶⁷⁶ In this study involving 2686 patients in pre-prescription authorization (PPA) group and 2693 patients in post prescription review with feedback (PPRF) group, initially antibiotic days of treatment (DOT) remained relatively unchanged in the PPA arm. When changed to the PPRF arm, antibiotic use decreased (-2.45 DOT per 1000 patient-days [PD]) hence concluding that PPRF may have more impact on decreasing days of antibiotic therapy.

In another quasi experimental study comparing both strategies in 55336 patients, after the introduction of prospective audit with feedback, both total antimicrobial use (+9.65 DOT/1,000-PD per month; $p < 0.001$) and broad-spectrum anti-gram-negative antimicrobial use (+4.80 DOT/1,000-PD per month; $p < 0.001$) increased significantly as compared to preauthorization in the pre intervention period.⁶⁷⁷ Use of cefepime and piperacillin-tazobactam both significantly increased after the intervention ($p = 0.03$). Hospital LOS and LOS after first antimicrobial dose also significantly increased after the intervention ($p = 0.016$ and 0.004 , respectively).

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic stewardship requires a multidisciplinary approach with integration of infectious disease physician, microbiologist with logistic and financial support from hospital administration. Both enablement and restrictive strategies are useful in improving adherence to antibiotic stewardship programs. Restrictive strategies give immediate results. Enablement practices are more resource intensive. Most studies have used a combination of both the methods and have shown additive effects. Providing feedback to the treating team improves adherence. A single RCT has shown that restrictive strategy alone may cause delay in initiation of antibiotics.

Recommendation

Prospective audit of antibiotic use and/or preauthorization (if feasible) along with feedback to the treating team is recommended as part of antibiotic stewardship program (1A).

What is the Role of Antibiotic Cycling, Intravenous to Oral Switch and De-escalation in the ICU?

Antibiotic cycling refers to withdrawing a specific antibiotic or an antibiotic class from use for a definite period of time and substituting with another antibiotic or antibiotic class having a similar spectrum of activity.⁶⁷² This is postulated to induce different resistance mechanisms in the microorganisms and hence prevent or reverse the development of antibiotic resistance. There is no compelling evidence on the benefit of antibiotic cycling in terms of clinical end points. Several prospective before and after studies without control groups have demonstrated reduction in incidence of ventilator associated pneumonia (6.7% with antibiotic cycling as against 11.6% before the intervention)⁶⁷⁸ as well as reduction in colonization.^{678–680} A newer prospective cohort study⁶⁸¹ comparing antibiotic mixing and antibiotic cycling found no significant differences in infection rates (16.6% and 14.5%, OR 0.9), infection due to target microorganisms (5.9% and 5.2%, OR 0.9), hospital length of stay (median 5 days for both groups) or in hospital mortality (13.9% and 14.3%, OR 1.03).

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic cycling in the intensive care unit has not been adequately studied in randomized controlled trials. Non-randomized studies show significant heterogeneity in terms of site of study, method of cycling and confounders like simultaneous infection control measures being employed. Evidence of benefit of antibiotic cycling is lacking, with few studies demonstrating reduction in colonization though mortality and length of hospital stay remain unchanged.

Recommendation

Antibiotic cycling should not be used as a method of antibiotic stewardship program (2A).

Scheduled Intravenous to Oral Switch

Timely switch from intravenous to oral antibiotics has been shown to reduce cost of health care and length of hospital stay.^{682–687} In case of antibiotics with availability of equivalent oral formulations, the scheduled switch is easier than in case of broad spectrum antibiotics without oral formulations or precise like piperacillin tazobactam or meropenem. A multicenter randomized controlled trial done in CAP which evaluated scheduled switch to oral antibiotics after 2 days of intravenous antibiotics found similar cure rates, survival or resolution of chest radiology with significantly lower total cost of care (2953\$ and 5002\$, $p < 0.05$).⁶⁸⁶ Oosterheert et al⁶⁸⁵ also found similar results when comparing scheduled switch on day 3 and day 7 with similar cure rates and mortality rates in both groups but with significantly reduced duration of intravenous antibiotics and hospital stay, with differences of 3.4 days and 1.9 days respectively.

Evidence Statement

Early intravenous to oral transition of antibiotics reduce hospital length of stay and cost of care. There is no increase in mortality or other adverse events when this is done after assessing as to which patients can be safely transitioned to oral therapy.

Recommendation

Antibiotic stewardship programs should implement strategies to improve timely transition from parenteral to oral antibiotic therapy (2A).

De-escalation in Intensive Care Unit

Antibiotic de-escalation refers to a strategy of switching from broad spectrum antimicrobials to a narrower spectrum of antimicrobials. It is recommended to reduce emergence of multidrug resistant bacteria as well as costs of health care. In a multicenter randomised controlled trial, de-escalation was associated with longer ICU stay but similar in hospital mortality in severe sepsis.⁶⁷⁰ In a recent meta-analysis of 9 studies involving 1873 patients with septic shock, de-escalation of antibiotics was associated with trend towards reduced mortality (RR 0.74, 95% CI 0.54– 1.03).⁶⁸⁸ In another systematic review, de-escalation was associated with lower mortality (RR 0.68; 95%CI 0.52–0.88).⁶⁶⁹

Evidence Statement

Pooled results from observational studies in an ICU setting do not show any increase in mortality with antibiotic de-escalation while significantly reducing antibiotic exposure days and ICU length of stay.

Recommendation

Antibiotic de-escalation in the ICU is recommended as part of antibiotic stewardship program (2A).

What is the Role of Procalcitonin in Antibiotic De-escalation in ICU?

Procalcitonin is a 116 amino acid precursor to calcitonin. Normal serum or plasma levels of procalcitonin in healthy adults are <0.05 ng/ml. It can be produced by a variety of cell types in response to inflammatory stimuli, especially of bacterial origin. It does not usually rise significantly in response to viral or non-infectious inflammation and so has the potential to be used as a marker of bacterial infection. The levels in serum is quantified using immunoassay.²⁸⁴ Procalcitonin use to guide antibiotic therapy in sepsis in intensive care unit resulted in reduction in antibiotic days (MD -3.19 days, 95% CI -5.44- to -0.95) duration of hospital stay (MD -3.85 days, 95% CI -6.78- 0.92) as well as a trend towards reduction in duration of ICU stay (MD -2.03 days, 95% CI -4.19 to 0.13 days).⁶⁸⁹ Procalcitonin guided algorithm for antibiotic discontinuation (decrease by $>80\%$ of peak value, or <0.5 ng/ml) led to reduced antibiotic administration (between-group absolute difference 1.22, 0.65-1.78, $p < 0.0001$), with significant mortality benefit (20% vs 25%; between-group absolute difference 5.4%, 95% CI 1.2-9.5, $p = 0.0122$).¹¹⁵ In a recent Cochrane meta-analysis involving 26 trials, procalcitonin utilisation for antibiotic discontinuation was associated with reduced mortality (adjusted OR 0.83, 95% CI 0.70 to 0.99, $p = 0.037$).¹¹⁸

Evidence Statement

Implementation of antibiotic de-escalation algorithm based on serial procalcitonin measurements has been shown to reduce mortality, length of ICU stay, total duration of antibiotic days and health care costs.

Recommendation

Procalcitonin based algorithms may be used for antibiotic de-escalation (1A).

Antimicrobial Prescription in Critically ill Immunocompromised Patients

Advances in ICU care of immunocompromised patients have resulted in improved and meaningful survival rates.⁶⁹⁰ Early intensive care can be used to treat reversible causes of acute worsening in patients with advanced malignancy.⁶⁹¹ Patients with primary immunodeficiencies are increasingly being recognised. However, more often, patients without a prior diagnosis present with severe sepsis and septic shock in the intensive care unit where careful clinical assessment and high index of suspicion can lead to diagnosis of the underlying immunodeficiency.⁶⁹² This separate yet heterogenous group of immunocompromised patients present different challenges to the intensive care physician due to febrile neutropenia, increased risk of blood stream infections, invasive fungal infections and other complex issues which have led to separate guidelines for this group.^{693–695}

The Febrile Neutropenic Patient

Febrile neutropenia (FN) is defined as an oral temperature of >38.3°C or two consecutive readings of >38.0°C for 2 h and an absolute neutrophil count (ANC) of <0.5 × 10⁹/L or expected to fall below 0.5 × 10⁹/L.⁶⁹³ These guidelines are applicable in a critically ill febrile neutropenic patient presenting to the ICU with any of the following clinical or laboratory parameters of organ failure but not limited to

- Hypotension
- Tachypnoea requiring oxygen therapy more than 4 litres/min to maintain saturation >90%
- Altered mental status (without focal neurological deficit)
- Oliguria or rising serum creatinine

What should be the Empiric Antibiotic Therapy in Critically Ill Febrile Neutropenic Patients with Suspected Blood Stream Infection?

In India, in febrile neutropenic patients, gram negative bacteremia is much more common than gram positive bacteremia (Table 3); in contrast to the western data, where gram positive isolates are more common.^{694,695} The spectrum of bacterial isolates from number of studies in India suggest Enterobacteriaceae (*E. coli* and *Klebsiella* species) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* to be the most common among gram negative organisms. Among gram positive isolates, *Staphylococcus aureus* and Coagulase negative staphylococcus are most common isolates (Table 3).^{696–703}

There is scarce data regarding the choice of empirical antibiotic regimens in critically ill febrile neutropenic presenting to the Indian ICUs. Most of the studies have heterogeneous patient population- leukaemia, lymphoma, solid tumours etc. Choice of antibiotics depends on most likely causative microorganism as per the local isolate patterns, clinical focus of infection, host and disease characteristics, local antimicrobial sensitivity patterns, and mechanism of action of antimicrobials (bacteriostatic/bactericidal). Recent data shows increased prevalence of MDR organisms. Several studies in India have shown that majority of gram-negative bacteria isolated on initial blood cultures from patients were resistant to the non-carbapenem first-line antibiotics.^{704–707} Hence, initial antibiotic choice in a febrile neutropenic patient who is critically ill presenting to the ICU will be carbapenems like Meropenem or Imipenem. The prevalence of carbapenem resistant gram-negative organisms is alarming at present. According to ICMR data on non-neutropenic population, carbapenem resistance among Enterobacteriaceae is 35-50 %, *Pseudomonas* spp 47% and *Acinetobacter* spp 62%.⁷⁰⁷ Based on the epidemiology, current evidence and

Table 3: Isolates from blood of febrile neutropenic patients in India

Author, year	No. of isolates	Gram negative isolates (%)	Common organisms (%)	Gram positive isolates (%)	Common organisms (%)
Prabhaskar K et al. ⁶⁹⁶ 2010	484	68.1	<i>Pseudomonas</i> 30.37, <i>Acinetobacter</i> 11.57 <i>E. coli</i> 10.9 <i>Klebsiella</i> 7.23 Enterococcal spp. 4.13	31.9	<i>Staph Aureus</i> - 12.6(MRSA- 2) CONS-10.5 <i>Streptococcus</i> spp. 4.55 <i>Burkholderia</i> spp. 2.89 <i>Enterobacter</i> spp. 2.27
Karanwal et al. ⁶⁹⁷ 2013	23	78	<i>E. coli</i> 43, <i>Pseudomonas</i> 17.47	22	<i>Staph aureus</i> 22 CONS- 4
Singh et al. ⁶⁹⁸ 2014	693	74.6	<i>E. coli</i> 23.5, <i>Pseudomonas</i> 6.7	25.4	<i>Staph Aureus</i> - 34(MRSA 13) Enterococcus 29
Rajendranath R et al. ⁶⁹⁹ 2014	40	58.3	<i>E. coli</i> 36.7, <i>Pseudomonas</i> 9.2	41.7	<i>Staph aureus</i> - 25 (MRSA- 2.5)
Sengar M et al. ⁷⁰⁰ 2014	739	66	<i>E. coli</i> 19, <i>Pseudomonas</i> 18.7 <i>Acinetobacter</i> 7.1 Enterobacter 4.8	34	CONS-20 <i>Staph aureus</i> - 5.5 <i>Streptococcus</i> 3.9 Enterococcus 3.6
Lakshmaiah KC et al. ⁷⁰¹ 2014	92 (11 positive)	61.7	<i>E. coli</i> 36	38.3	<i>Staph Aureus</i> - 36(MRSA 9)
Vivek B et al. ⁷⁰² 2016	285	63	<i>Pseudomonas</i> 22 <i>E. coli</i> 21.4	37	CONS 12.9 <i>Staph Aureus</i> 8
Sevitha Bhat et al. ⁷⁰³ 2021	306 (blood –46 patients)	69.9	<i>Klebsiella</i> spp-18.3 <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp -17.6 <i>E. coli</i> -14.7%	30.1	<i>Staph aureus</i> -13.7

clinical experience the committee has identified risk factors for carbapenem resistance. Particular subgroups of patients, such as acute leukaemia patients presenting to the ICU, patient already on carbapenem shifted to ICU from ward, previous multi-drug resistant infections in the last 1 month and patients on vasopressors are at risk of harbouring carbapenem resistant organisms.⁷⁰⁸ Hence in these groups of patients, initial empiric antibiotic regimen should include *E. colistin/polymyxin B* along with meropenem.⁷⁰⁷

Vancomycin is not a standard part of empirical antibiotic therapy for febrile neutropenic patient. In the western countries with predominant gram positive bacteraemia and high incidence of MRSA, studies have failed to show any benefit with empiric vancomycin in terms of fever or mortality.⁷⁰⁹ In India, with predominant gram negative sepsis and low incidence of MRSA-35%.⁷⁰⁷ Vancomycin or Teicoplanin is recommended as part of initial antibiotic regimen only in patients with suspected indwelling catheter infection (rigors following infusion, cellulitis at exit site), skin and soft tissue infection, severe mucositis, culture growing gram positive cocci pending identification, previous MRSA colonization/ infection and hemodynamic instability admitted from home/OPD.⁶⁹⁶

Evidence Statement

Gram positive and gram-negative organisms are common causes of febrile neutropenia, with gram negative organisms predominating in India. The commonly isolated GNBs include Enterobacteriaceae (*E. coli* and *Klebsiella* species) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* to be the most common among gram negative organisms. *Staphylococcus aureus* and Coagulase negative staphylococcus are most common gram-positive isolates. Recent studies have reported increasing prevalence of MDR organisms. Choice of antibiotics depends local epidemiology, focus of infection and host and disease characteristics. Current evidence shows carbapenem resistance among Enterobacteriaceae is 35-50 %, *Pseudomonas* spp 47% and *Acinetobacter* spp 62%. Acute leukaemia patients presenting to the ICU, patient already on carbapenem shifted to ICU from ward, previous multi-drug resistant infections in the last 1 month and patients on vasopressors are at risk of harbouring carbapenem resistant organisms. Empiric upfront vancomycin has not been shown to improve clinical outcomes or mortality in febrile neutropenia. Patients at risk of MRSA infections include suspected indwelling catheter infection (rigors following infusion, cellulitis at exit site), skin and soft tissue infection, severe mucositis, culture growing gram positive cocci pending identification, previous MRSA colonization/ infection and hemodynamic instability at admission.

Recommendation

- In a critically ill febrile neutropenic patient presenting to the ICU with organ failure, empiric antibiotic therapy should be initiated with or escalated to a broad spectrum carbapenem like imipenem or meropenem (UPP).
- Empiric combination of Meropenem and Colistin/Polymyxin B should be considered in patients having high risk of infection with resistant gram-negative organisms (3A). Following risk factors should be assessed:
 - Critically ill patients with underlying acute leukaemia (on induction or consolidation therapy) presenting to the ICU
 - Patients of acute leukaemia/lymphomas on beta-lactam/ beta lactamase inhibitor± aminoglycosides, shifted to ICU from ward

- Previous history of infection with multi-drug resistant organism in last 1 month
- Hypotensive patients requiring vasopressor infusions (refractory septic shock)
- Patient shifted to the ICU on carbapenem therapy
- We strongly caution against the use of empiric combination of Meropenem and Colistin/Polymyxin B or Colistin/Polymyxin B alone in patients who are not high risk of infection with carbapenem resistant gram negative organisms as defined above (3A).
- We caution against use of other carbapenems like Doripenem and Ertapenem due to lack of positive evidence and inadequate spectrum respectively (2A).
- Vancomycin/Teicoplanin should be added as empiric therapy in critically ill febrile neutropenic patient with risk factors for MRSA infection (3A). These include:
 - Suspected indwelling vascular catheter infection
 - Skin and soft-tissue infection
 - Previous colonization/infection with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
 - Blood Culture growing Gram-positive cocci awaiting identification
 - Severe mucositis
 - Hemodynamic instability(hypotension) at admission from home or outpatient department (UPP)
- Empiric MRSA coverage should be avoided in absence of risk factors for MRSA and in ICUs with low prevalence of MRSA (UPP).
- After the initiation of empiric therapy based on the factors listed above, the subsequent therapy should be based on the organisms isolated and sensitivity patterns. In patients with no isolates, the treatment should be continued as per the response to ongoing antibiotics and appearance of any new focus of infection (UPP).

What Methods should be Used for Early Identification of Causative Organisms in Febrile Neutropenia Patients?

Blood cultures are an important investigation in all patients with sepsis requiring ICU admission.⁷¹⁰ However, the method of sample collection is associated with improved yield. With the advent of modern point of care tests like multiplex PCR, early isolation of causative organism can lead to early institution of appropriate antimicrobial therapy. Volume of blood is an important variable for detection of bloodstream infection volume of blood. Each ml of blood increased the yield (detection of positive culture). of blood cultures in adults by approximately 3%. Collection of two blood culture sets prior to antibiotic administration provide 30% yield of bloodstream pathogens in critically ill patients.⁷¹¹ In paediatric population, smaller volumes of blood are suggested due to lesser total blood volume. Consensus is not to exceed 1% of a patient's total blood volume. Use of BioFire Blood Culture Identification 2 panel for pathogen identification has shown pooled specificity of >97% and pooled sensitivity was 92.3%-98.2% for the common organisms as compared to the culture-based methods. This could guide early treatment for multi-drug resistant organisms.³⁴¹ Their utility in Indian scenario has not been proven with high quality studies.

Evidence Statement

Two sets of blood cultures drawn prior to antibiotic administration yields microbiologic diagnosis in 30% cases. Addition of multiplex PCR techniques can aid in early diagnosis and has high sensitivity and specificity as compared to culture-based methods.

Recommendation

- We recommend collection of at least 2 sets of blood cultures, with a set collected simultaneously from peripheral site and one central. In case of multi lumen catheter, one set per lumen should be collected (1A).
- Two blood culture sets from separate venepunctures should be sent if no central venous catheter is present (1A).
- One set includes one aerobic and one anaerobic culture bottle. Blood culture volume should be at least 10 ml/bottle (1A).
- The use of molecular methods for identification of multi-drug resistant organisms and their antibiotic sensitivity pattern can be considered in critically ill patients, however, the availability and cost may be a concern along with risk of false negativity and false positivity (2B).

What should be the Approach to Empiric Antifungal Therapy in Febrile Neutropenia in Critically Ill Immunocompromised Patients?

Invasive *Candida* or *Aspergillus* infections have been demonstrated in the autopsy of patients who died of neutropenic fever with no clinical evidence of invasive fungal infection (IFI) except for a continuous fever.⁷¹² It is estimated that approximately 15-45% of patients with prolonged neutropenia have invasive fungal infection (IFI). IFI is difficult to diagnose both in critically ill patients and in patients with febrile neutropenia. Invasive fungal infection is associated with high mortality in both these groups especially if treatment is delayed.⁷¹³⁻⁷¹⁶ Invasive aspergillosis should be suspected in patients with persistent febrile neutropenia with the development of signs of pneumonia including lung infiltrate.⁶⁹⁵ There is limited evidence for antifungal prophylaxis in febrile neutropenia to prevent candida infections.^{714,717-719} High-risk patients who have received intensive cytotoxic chemotherapy are at risk for invasive fungal infection. Yeast (primarily *Candida* species) and moulds typically cause infections, which are manifested by persistent or recurrent fever in patients with prolonged neutropenia, rather than causing initial fever in the course of neutropenia. Empirical antifungal therapy is instituted for the treatment of "occult" fungal infection presenting as persistent neutropenic fever despite 4-7 days of empirical antibiotic therapy, however, early initiation may be needed in critically ill patients with risk factors for the invasive fungal infections.⁷¹⁹ Poor sensitivity of chest radiograph compared to CT scan for detection of pneumonia in this population should be kept in mind.³⁴ The galactomannan assay is highly specific for *Aspergillus* species with some cross-reactivity with *Histoplasma capsulatum* and *Penicillium* species. False positive reaction can occur with concomitant use of b-lactam/b-lactamase combinations, such as piperacillin/tazobactam, however, false positivity rates are considerably lower with newer generation assays.^{720,721} Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) galactomannan had sensitivity of 0.88 and a specificity of 0.81 in immunocompromised patients if standard cut-off of 0.5 optical density (OD) was used, in a recent meta-analysis. Increasing the limit to OD > 1 led to sensitivity of 0.78 and a specificity of 0.93.⁷²² Use of Beta-D Glucan (BDG) alone has limited sensitivity for the diagnosis

of invasive candidiasis.⁷²³ However, BDG had good sensitivity 76.8% (95% CI 67.1%-84.3%), and specificity (85.3, 95%CI 79.6%-89.7%) for differentiating probable or proven IFI from no IFI.⁷³⁴ Pre-emptive antifungal therapy for invasive fungal infections is a strategy which involves serial screening of high risk patients for fungal colonisation using biomarkers like beta-D-glucan, galactomannan and imaging (CT Chest) and initiation of treatment if either imaging or serology shows any evidence of an invasive fungal infection.^{695,725} This approach is useful in patients who develop febrile neutropenia on antifungal prophylaxis with suspicion is for an invasive mould infection. Pre-emptive antifungal therapy was similar in terms of all-cause mortality in febrile patients with mixed population of cancer and post-transplant (HSCT) patients.⁷²⁶ A RCT of 549 AML and MDS patients undergoing induction chemotherapy or allogeneic HCT had similar survival with empiric and pre-emptive caspofungin.⁷²⁷

Amphotericin B has been most commonly prescribed as empiric antifungal therapy in febrile neutropenia. Due to similar efficacy and lesser toxicity, liposomal formulations are preferred over deoxycholate.⁷²⁸ Caspofungin was found to have similar overall success rates when compared to liposomal amphotericin B in an RCT of 1095 patients with febrile neutropenia.⁷²⁹ It is generally agreed upon that individual echinocandins namely caspofungin, micafungin and anidulafungin have similar efficacy and are interchangeable.⁷³⁰ Other echinocandins (Micafungin, anidulafungin, and rezafungin) have limited data for febrile neutropenia. The echinocandins have demonstrated significant fungicidal activity and treatment success against most of the *Candida* species in randomized clinical trials. Availability of intravenous formulation, limited drug interactions, favourable safety and efficacy profile make them the first choice of empirical antifungal in critically ill patients including patients with febrile neutropenia. Caspofungin (loading dose 70mg followed by 50 mg daily) needs dose adjustment for moderate to severe hepatic dysfunction whereas micafungin and anidulafungin do not need dose adjustments in liver or renal failure. Echinocandins do not provide coverage against *Cryptococcus*, *Trichosporon* and non-*Aspergillus* filamentous moulds like *Fusarium*, endemic fungi.⁷³¹ As echinocandins have poor penetration in eye, CNS, and urine, they should not be used for treatment of fungal meningitis, endophthalmitis and urinary tract infection. Echinocandins have shown to be effective in salvage therapy however they are not recommended as monotherapy for the primary treatment of IA due to lack of evidence.⁷¹⁹

Voriconazole could not achieve its primary endpoint of noninferiority when compared to liposomal amphotericin in 837 patients with febrile neutropenia and persistent fever, though voriconazole group had fewer breakthrough fungal infection (2% vs 5%), and had lesser adverse events.⁷³² Voriconazole remains an option in febrile neutropenia due to spectrum of activity against *Candida* and *Aspergillus* species.⁶⁹⁵ Posaconazole has not been studied for febrile neutropenia. Posaconazole is noninferior for treatment of invasive aspergillosis,⁷³³ whereas Isavuconazole is efficacious in treatment of invasive aspergillosis and mucormycosis.⁷³⁴ Isavuconazole was inferior in treatment of invasive candidiasis and candidemia.⁷³⁵ Though itraconazole has been studied in febrile neutropenia, it is not preferred due to lack of common availability of intravenous preparations, variable bioavailability of oral preparations, negative inotropic properties and safety concerns in patients with renal or hepatic dysfunction.⁷³⁶

Lipid formulations of amphotericin B should be used as first-line treatment if Mucormycosis (Zygomycosis) is suspected. Recommended dose is 3–5 mg/kg daily.⁷²⁸ Amphotericin B deoxycholate should be avoided in patients with underlying renal impairment, patients on other nephrotoxic drugs such as cyclosporine or tacrolimus after allogeneic HSCT, or antibiotics, such as aminoglycosides and in patients with previous history of toxicity. Voriconazole can be used for suspected or proven cases of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis. Dose of Voriconazole is 400 mg (6 mg/kg) twice daily for 2 doses, then 4 mg/kg) twice daily. As mentioned above, Echinocandins are recommended for salvage therapy of aspergillosis.⁷¹⁹

Recommended minimum duration of therapy for candidemia without metastatic complications is 2 weeks after documented clearance of *Candida* from the bloodstream, provided neutropenia and symptoms attributable to candidemia have resolved.⁶⁹⁵ Recommended duration of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis is 6–12 weeks based on the resolution of symptoms and neutropenia.⁷²⁵

Combination antifungal treatments are used with the rationale to maximize treatment by targeting multiple sites or metabolic pathways or different steps in the same pathway hence leading to an additive or synergistic effect. While in vitro studies on combination antifungals showed additive or synergistic effect; in vivo studies have given mixed results. Marr et al demonstrated 8.2% absolute reduction in mortality rates with the combination of voriconazole and anidulafungin in adult patients with hematologic malignancies (HMs) and hematopoietic cell transplantation (HCT) having probable or proven Invasive aspergillosis. However, this difference was not statistically significant.⁷³⁷

Evidence Summary

Patients with febrile neutropenia are at risk of developing invasive fungal infections. IFIs have high mortality in patients with febrile neutropenia. Persistent or recurrent febrile neutropenia and development of lung infiltrates may be clues to fungal etiology of febrile neutropenia. Yeast (primarily *Candida* species) and moulds are common etiologic agents. In patients with persisting fever without any localisation, empiric antifungals targeting *Candida* species are initiated. Chest radiograph has poor sensitivity for pneumonia detection in patients with febrile neutropenia, and CT Chest is preferred. Galactomannan assay is highly specific for *Aspergillus* species with some cross-reactivity with *Histoplasma capsulatum* and *Penicillium* species. False positive reaction can occur with concomitant use of b-lactam/b-lactamase combinations, such as piperacillin/ tazobactam. Use of Beta-D Glucan alone has limited sensitivity for the diagnosis of invasive candidiasis. Invasive aspergillosis should be suspected in patients with persistent febrile neutropenia with the development of signs of pneumonia including lung infiltrate.

The echinocandins have demonstrated significant fungicidal activity and treatment success against most of the *Candida* species in randomized clinical trials. Individual echinocandins namely caspofungin, micafungin and anidulafungin have similar efficacy and are interchangeable. Echinocandins have poor penetration in eye, CNS, and urine. Echinocandins are not active against Zygomycosis. Voriconazole is the preferred agent for invasive aspergillosis, whereas liposomal amphotericin B is preferred for zygomycosis. Echinocandins have been useful in salvage therapy of aspergillosis. Guidelines advise to continue

treatment for candidemia for at least two weeks after 2 weeks after documented clearance of *Candida* from the bloodstream, and resolution of neutropenia and symptoms attributable to candidemia. Recommended duration of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis is 6–12 weeks based on the resolution of symptoms and neutropenia. Combination antifungal treatments have limited evidence for added efficacy.

Recommendation

- Following patients should be considered for initiation of antifungal therapy when they present to ICU with shock or respiratory distress especially when they have persistent or recurrent fever or clinical deterioration after >3 days of broad-spectrum antibiotics (2A).
 - Allogeneic HSCT
 - Severe mucositis with diarrhoea
 - Prolonged/anticipated duration of neutropenia >10 days
 - Worsening on broad spectrum antibiotics like BL/BLI and Carbapenems
 - More than 2 weeks of high-dose steroids (more than 15–20 mg of prednisolone or equivalent)
 - History of invasive fungal infection
 - New onset lung infiltrate. (Since chest x ray has low sensitivity, HRCT should be done in these patients)
- We recommend the use of caspofungin (echinocandin group) as initial antifungal therapy. Caspofungin should be avoided in patients with chronic liver disease (Child-Pugh C) (2A).
- Anidulafundin and Micafungin can be considered if there are contraindications to use of caspofungin (3A).
- Voriconazole is the drug of choice for proven, probable or possible aspergillosis. Due to its variable bio-availability voriconazole should be administered IV. In patients with renal dysfunction caspofungin can be given instead of IV voriconazole (1A).
- Liposomal Amphotericin B is the drug of choice for suspected or confirmed Mucormycosis (1A).
- All efforts should be made to confirm presence of invasive fungal infection with the use of tests including CT Chest/suspected site (abdomen for hepatosplenic candidiasis or mucormycosis/ paranasal sinus for mucormycosis), β –D- glucan, serum and BAL Galactomannan, fungal culture. Tissue (lung/other clinically involved sites) biopsy should be performed if required, whenever feasible and safe (1A).
- We do not recommend routine use of combination antifungal therapy for probable or proven Invasive aspergillosis (IA) due to lack of strong evidence (3A).

Which Patients Empiric Treatment Against *Pneumocystis jirovecii* Pneumonia?

Patients considered high risk for PCP infection are allogeneic HSCT recipients, autologous HSCT, high-dose corticosteroid therapy and patients receiving T-cell-depleting agents such as fludarabine, purine analogues and rituximab.^{738–740} Hypoxemia is the most characteristic abnormality in PCP pneumonia. Chest radiograph might be normal in early disease. Though most patients with hematologic malignancies and chemotherapy receive prophylaxis for pneumocystis jirovecii infection,⁷⁴¹ acute onset hypoxemic respiratory failure, or characteristic radiologic infiltrates should prompt empiric initiation of sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim.

Evidence Statement

HSCT, high dose corticosteroids, T-cell depleting agents and rituximab predispose to PCP infection. Hypoxemia and characteristic radiologic abnormalities indicate PCP pneumonia, though chest radiograph might be normal in early disease. Empiric treatment with trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole is indicated in suspected PCP pneumonia.

Recommendations

- Treatment with sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim should be considered in high risk patients such as allogeneic HSCT, high-dose corticosteroid therapy administration of T-cell-depleting agents such as fludarabine/purine analogues and rituximab when such patients present with hypoxemic respiratory failure with or without radiological evidence of *Pneumocystis carinii* pneumonia especially if they are not on PCP prophylaxis (3A).
- Every attempt should be made to confirm PCP infection (3A).

What is the Role of Empiric Antiviral Therapy in Immunocompromised Patients with Febrile Neutropenia?

Respiratory syncytial virus and parainfluenza are important co-pathogens causing upper and lower respiratory tract infections, especially in post hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. These infections lead to increased risk of mortality. Although aerosolized and oral administration of ribavirin has been used, there is no antiviral agent proven to be effective against parainfluenza virus. There is no clear evidence from randomized trials that aerosolized or oral ribavirin or any other antiviral is effective against RSV pneumonia.⁷⁴²⁻⁷⁴⁵

Evidence Statement

Antiviral therapy in febrile neutropenia is given according to treatment guidelines of the etiologic agent. There are no effective agents for treatment of parainfluenza and respiratory syncytial virus infection at present.

Recommendations

- There is no role of empirical antiviral therapy with febrile neutropenia. Active HSV or VZV infections in neutropenic patients indicated by clinical or laboratory evidence should be treated with Acyclovir (3A)
- Immunoglobulin tests should not be used to diagnose VZV or HSV infection (3A).
- Ganciclovir is recommended for the empiric therapy for CMV in patients with high risk of CMV reactivation (3A):
 - Administration of T-cell-depleting agents such as fludarabine/purine analogues, rituximab
 - Patients on high dose steroids who develop diarrhoea
 - Pneumonia not responding to antibiotics & antifungals.
- No specific treatment for infections with RSV and parainfluenza viruses due to lack of specific evidence (3A).

What is the Role for Empiric Antimicrobial Therapy for Tropical Infections like Malaria, Leptospirosis in Patients with Febrile Neutropenia?

There are occasional reports of malaria in patients on chemotherapy with solid tumour and hematolymphoid malignancies with febrile neutropenia. In a series of 99 patients of acute leukaemia on

chemotherapy with febrile neutropenia, malaria was responsible for fever in only 4% of patients.⁷⁴⁶

Febrile Neutropenia patient presenting to ICU often have thrombocytopenia due to disease itself, chemotherapy or sepsis. Presence of fever and thrombocytopenia itself should not warrant empirical anti-malarial therapy even in malaria endemic country like India.

A high-index of suspicion is warranted in a resident or traveller of malaria endemic area who presents with the classic triad of symptoms (fever, chills and sweating). If malaria is suspected, peripheral smear for malaria parasite and rapid malaria antigen (histidine-rich protein II (HRP-II) antigen of *Plasmodium falciparum* and common *Plasmodium* lactate dehydrogenase (pLDH) of *Plasmodium* species should be performed early and antimalarial therapy should be initiated in positive cases. With rapidity (diagnosis in less than an hour) and good negative predictive value of (98.2 %) malaria antigen test, antimalarial therapy is restricted only to positive cases.⁷⁴⁷

There is lack of enough evidence documenting etiological role of other tropical infections like Leptospirosis in subset of patients with febrile neutropenia; hence we believe that until enough evidence is available, suspected or documented tropical infections in neutropenic patients in ICU should be treated similar as they are treated in non-neutropenic patients.

Evidence Statement

There is insufficient evidence regarding tropical infections in patients with hematologic or solid organ malignancies and febrile neutropenia.

Recommendation

- There is no role for empirical antimicrobial therapy against tropical infections like malaria, leptospirosis in febrile neutropenia patients (3A).
- Documented tropical infections in neutropenic patients in ICU should be treated similar as they are treated in non-neutropenic patients (UPP).

What is the Role of Surveillance Cultures in Guiding Therapy in Febrile Neutropenia Patients?

As most of the infections in neutropenic patients occur due to organisms in respiratory or gastrointestinal tract, therefore surveillance culture seems to be a reasonable strategy in deciding the empiric antibiotic therapy in febrile neutropenia. The studies published in 1980's and 90's supported the practice of surveillance culture. However there has been a very poor correlation between blood and faecal isolates in most of the studies.^{748,749}

Widespread antimicrobial treatment may inhibit the growth or distort the proportion of different species found in faecal cultures. A recent study conducted in paediatric allogeneic HSCT patients has demonstrated a positive predictive value of 0.9% to bacterial surveillance cultures, with a sensitivity of 33.3% and a specificity of 47.4%. Surveillance cultures were not cost effective. The sampling and analyses require lots of laboratory and nursing resources.⁷⁵⁰ Another study in adults who got admitted for HSCT concluded that surveillance blood cultures in patients who have undergone HSCT do not identify bloodstream infections. The number of positive blood cultures was not helpful in determining which patients had infection.⁷⁵¹

Evidence Statement

Surveillance cultures have not been shown to correlate with subsequent causative organisms in immunocompromised patients.

Recommendation

- We strongly recommend against repeated surveillance cultures as these do not help to guide antibiotic therapy (3A).

What is the Role of Source Control in the Treatment of a Febrile Neutropenic Patient?

Control of source in the form of drainage of an abscess, debridement of infected necrotic tissue and removal of a potentially infected device is of paramount importance. Foci of infection readily amenable to source control include but not limited to intra-abdominal abscesses, gastrointestinal perforation, ischaemic bowel or volvulus, cholangitis, cholecystitis, pyelonephritis associated with obstruction or abscess, necrotising soft tissue infection, empyema, septic arthritis and implanted device infections. There is general agreement that source control should be done at the earliest to reduce microbiological burden and mere antibiotics and resuscitation would not achieve cure unless adequate source control is done. If Vascular catheters are suspected, its prompt removal should be considered. It is important to note that the classical clinical signs of infection (rubor, calor, dolor etc) be absent due to low neutrophil counts.⁷¹⁰

Evidence Statement

Source control at the earliest possible time reduces microbiologic burden and improves outcomes. Source control includes debridement, drainage of collections, removal of incriminated indwelling catheters and implanted devices.

Recommendations

We recommend that in patients with febrile neutropenia with clinically documented source of infection (as defined below), immediate intervention should be undertaken for source control (3A).

What Should be the Approach to Antibiotic De-escalation in Patients with Febrile Neutropenia?

Data on de-escalation strategies in neutropenic patients after identification of a clinically relevant pathogen is scant but there is no data on de-escalation when no pathogen has been identified. Although antibiotics are required to treat an occult infection during neutropenia, marrow recovery is necessary to protect the patient.¹⁸ Shorter duration of antibiotics have been shown to have equal efficacy to longer courses (7-14 days) in various ICU infections including CAP and VAP.^{167,174} However, most stewardship trials have excluded immunocompromised patients. In leukaemia, discontinuation of empiric antibiotics have been advised in hemodynamically stable patients who remain afebrile for 72 hours.⁷⁰⁸ Early discontinuation (72 hours) of antibiotics was noninferior to extended antibiotic therapy (afebrile for 5 days, of till recovery of neutrophils) in an open label RCT of 281 patients with febrile neutropenia after chemotherapy of hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. However, there was higher adverse events (16% vs 10%) and greater mortality (3% vs 1%), which was due to patients who continued to remain febrile.⁷⁵²

Evidence Statement

Antibiotic de-escalation to definitive therapy is feasible after identification of causative organism or in patients who remain afebrile for >48 hours with evidence of marrow recovery.

Recommendations

Antibiotic de-escalation should be considered in the following situations (3A):

- Once and if a pathogen is identified, we recommend de-escalation to an antibiotic that the organism is susceptible to.
- Treat with appropriate agents based on the site and pathogen until the patient is afebrile for at least 48 hours and there is evidence of marrow recovery (neutrophil count ≥ 500 cells/mm³).
- In patients without microbiologically documented infection continue empirical antimicrobials until the patient is afebrile for at least 48 hours and there is evidence of marrow recovery (neutrophil count ≥ 500 cells/mm³).

Which Antibiotics Should be Used for Febrile Neutropenia due to Multidrug Resistant Bacteria?

If MRSA is suspected or isolated, Vancomycin, teicoplanin, linezolid and daptomycin are the available options. Linezolid and daptomycin are effective against vancomycin resistant enterococci. However, daptomycin cannot be used in cases with pneumonia. For ESBL producing GNBs carbapenems are efficacious. However, carbapenemase producing *Klebsiella* need to be treated with colistin or tigecycline.⁶⁹⁵ Combination therapy of piperacillin tazobactam with tigecycline had high success rate (68% vs 44%) in an open-label trial of 390 high-risk patients with hematologic malignancies. More than 30% of GNB isolates were piperacillin-tazobactam resistant.⁷⁵³ Other antibiotics with efficacy against MDR GNBs include fosfomycin, but have limited evidence.⁷⁵⁴

Evidence Statement

Antibiotics like fosfomycin, tigecycline and minocycline have activity against variety of MDR gram negative organisms. For MRSA, vancomycin, teicoplanin and linezolid have most evidence. Linezolid is effective against vancomycin resistant enterococci. However, good quality RCTs for MDR infections are lacking in immunocompromised patients.

Recommendation

- Antibiotics like Fosfomycin, tigecycline and minocycline may be considered in infection with multidrug resistant bacteria in presence of in-vitro susceptibility after considering the in vivo penetration at source of sepsis, and if alternate agents with proven efficacy are not available or contraindicated (3A).
- Vancomycin or linezolid can be used in cases of MRSA (1A).

Antimicrobial Guidelines in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients

Infectious complications in solid organ transplant (SOT) recipients admitted to intensive care unit (ICU) pose a challenge with respect to both diagnosis and treatment. The epidemiological exposures of the recipient as well as the donor and the net immunological state of the recipients determine the risk of infection in them.^{755,756} The latter incorporates an assessment of several important contributing factors like^{755,757}

- Pretransplant diagnosis or treatment
- Specific organ transplanted (e.g., lung/kidney vs liver transplant)
- Intraoperative events like cold ischemia time, severity of shock or need for blood/ blood product transfusion, duration of surgery
- Choice of induction and maintenance immunosuppression
- Comorbidities (e.g., viral co-infection [hepatitis C virus (HCV), cytomegalovirus (CMV)], malnutrition, end-organ failure [cirrhosis, chronic kidney disease])
- Breach of the mucocutaneous barrier: Indwelling devices, mucositis
- Need for extracorporeal therapies

These patients may not mount typical symptoms and signs of infection like fever or any localising signs, so a high index of suspicion for infection and detailed assessment is required. The infections in SOT patients can be categorized as follows:

C–Community-acquired

R–Reactivation

E–Epidemiologic exposure

D–Donor-derived

I–Iatrogenic

T–Travel related

It is advisable to have a syndrome-based approach (e.g., Nonspecific febrile illness, pneumonia, urinary tract, central nervous system) at first and then narrow the differential diagnoses of possible organisms that could cause the clinical presentation(s).

Microbiological diagnosis is crucial in this patient group. In the context of extensive differential diagnoses, the value of early and specific diagnostics with the use of invasive procedures if necessary (bronchoscopy, tissue biopsy, or aspiration of collections) to obtain specimens cannot be underestimated. After transplantation, serologic techniques are of limited use because transplant recipients may not mount timely serologic responses. Thus, antigen detection or molecular nucleic acid detection assays are preferred over serologic testing.

What are the Common Infections in Post Solid Organ Transplant Patients? What Should be the Preferred Approach to Empiric Therapy and Diagnostic Evaluation?

The timeline of post-transplant infections can be used to establish a differential diagnosis for infectious syndromes at various stages after transplantation (Table 4).^{755–757} Infections occurring outside the usual period or of unusual severity suggest excessive immunosuppression or epidemiologic hazard. Most centres use a variation of standard 'triple immunosuppression' (prednisone, calcineurin inhibitor, antimetabolite such as mycophenolate mofetil).

Incidence of sepsis in SOT recipients ranges between 20% to 60% and is associated with in-hospital mortality ranging between 5% to 40%.⁷⁵⁸ The infections in the first month post transplant are usually of nosocomial origin, opportunistic infections predominantly till around 6 months and after that community acquired infections are the predominant ones. During the first month after SOT, opportunistic infections are generally absent as the full effect of immunosuppression has not yet been established. The common infections in this period are of nosocomial origin, donor or recipient derived, related to surgical/ technical issues and indwelling catheters.^{755,756} Most of these infections are of bacterial followed by fungal etiology. In a study by Ram et al.

in post renal transplant patients, urinary tract infection (UTI) followed by line related infections were the most common in the first month after transplant. Ram et al. reported that 23.6% of the SOT recipients develop UTI during first 4 weeks and *E. coli* was the most common causative agent (12.6%). CMV was the most common (prevalence of CMV 21.8%) between 4 weeks to 3 months after renal transplantation and could cause allograft loss. Tuberculosis reactivation was more common between 3 months to 1-year post-transplant (prevalence of tuberculosis being 10.6%). *Pneumocystis carinii* and *Aspergillus* infection usually occurred after 1 year.⁷⁵⁹

Kumar et al.⁷⁶⁰ and Sriperumbuduri et al.⁷⁶¹ also found UTI to be the most common infection in the post renal transplant patients. Neelima et al studied the microbiological profile of transplant (SOT and haematopoietic stem cell transplant - HSCT) recipients in a south Indian centre and found UTI to be the most common infection (53.3%) followed by blood stream infection (BSI) (21.6%). Of all the bacterial isolates, 81.6% were gram negative, 18.4% gram positive, *E. coli* being the predominant one (52.5%). In 38.77% drug resistance was observed and of them 68.4% were multi-drug resistant (MDR).⁷⁶² Al-Hasan et al. found that the incidence of gram negative BSI was highest in the first month post SOT (210.3/1000 person-years) which sharply declined to 25.7 per 1000 person-years between 2 and 12 months. Most of GNB BSI was nosocomial (27.4%) or healthcare associated (49.8%), remaining being community acquired. For 55.2% of gram negative BSI, urinary tract was the primary source followed by gastro-intestinal tract, respiratory tract, intravascular catheters, skin-soft tissue in that order.⁷⁶³ *Escherichia coli* accounted for 36.8% of gram negative BSI followed by *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (14.3%), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (13.0%), *Enterobacter cloacae* and *Citrobacter freundii* in that order. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was the most common isolate in the first month post SOT, while *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* were more common 12 months post SOT.

In a prospective Swiss Transplant Cohort Study (STCS) studying the burden and timeline of post SOT infections in the first year post-operatively in 3541 patients, the authors reported that 1520 patients (55%) suffered 3520 infections. 63% of the infections were caused by bacteria, Enterobacteriaceae being the predominant ones (54%) as urinary pathogens in heart, lung, and renal transplant recipients, and as digestive tract pathogens in liver transplant recipients. *Enterococcus* was found to be responsible for 20% of infections (as urinary tract pathogens in renal transplant recipients and as digestive tract pathogens in liver transplant recipients) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was the isolated pathogen (9%) in lung transplant recipients. Herpes virus was the predominant viral pathogen among the 1039 viral infections in post renal, cardiac and liver transplant patients. *Candida* species accounted for 60% of the 263 fungal infections. Opportunistic infections including *Aspergillus* and CMV were rare (1.4% and 6% respectively), spread throughout the year.⁷⁶⁴

In a systematic review and meta-analysis conducted by Green et al.,⁷⁶⁵ they reported that 25 to 45% of kidney transplant recipients develop UTI in immediate postoperative period, out of which around 50% were related to urinary catheters. The incidence of UTI increased to up to 70% in first 6 months post-transplant. Enteric gram negative bacteria and Enterococci were the most common pathogens, with the resistant strains (e.g. extended spectrum beta-lactamase-positive *Escherichia coli*, carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae*) becoming more frequent. They reported that the risk for developing sepsis with bacteremia was lowered by 87%, and the risk for developing bacteriuria (symptomatic or asymptomatic)

Table 4: Timeline of infections post solid organ transplant (SOT)

	0-1 month post SOT	1 to 6 months post SOT	>6 months post SOT
Infection characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nosocomial infection- pneumonia/ UTI/ bloodstream infection MDRO infection Post-surgical/surgical site infection Indwelling device related infection- CRBSI/ CAUTI Donor derived infection Recipient colonisation related infection (e.g. Aspergillus, Pseudomonas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunistic infection Re-activation of latent infection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community acquired infection (usually) : pneumonia/ UTI Chronic or recurrent infection with stereotypical organisms in specific subsets Re-activation of latent infection in presence prolonged immunosuppression
<i>Common responsible organisms</i>			
Bacteriae	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MDR organisms MRSA VRE MDR GNB <i>Clostridium difficile</i> associated infection <i>Pseudomonas/Burkholderia</i> spp. in Cystic fibrosis: lung tr 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> <i>Listeria</i> <i>Legionella</i> <i>Nocardia</i> <i>Clostridium difficile</i>, <i>colitis</i> Gram-negative enteric bacilli in Small bowel transplant <i>Pseudomonas/Burkholderia</i> spp. in Cystic fibrosis-lung transplant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing risk of <i>M. tuberculosis</i>, <i>Listeria</i>, <i>Legionella</i>, <i>Nocardia</i> if immunosuppression continued Nontubercular mycobacteria Community-acquired pathogens: <i>S pneumoniae</i>, <i>H influenzae</i>, <i>M catarrhalis</i>, <i>S aureus</i>, <i>Mycoplasma pneumoniae</i>, <i>Chlamydia pneumoniae</i>
Viruses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSV (in absence of anti-HSV prophylaxis) HIV West Nile virus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CMV, EBV, HSV, VZV (if not on prophylaxis) HCV reactivation RSV, Adenovirus BK polyoma virus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recurrent HSV, VZV Adenovirus RSV HCV Reactivation Late-onset CMV (colitis, retinitis), EBV related PTLD
Fungi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Candida</i> (likely to be Fluconazole resistant) Early Aspergillosis (Uncommon, possible due to recipient colonisation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Aspergillus</i> <i>Cryptococcus neoformans</i> <i>Pneumocystis jirovecii</i> (if not on prophylaxis) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During intense immunosuppression: <i>Aspergillus</i> (more so in Lung transplants with chronic rejection) <i>Cryptococcus</i> <i>Mucor</i>, atypical molds <i>Pneumocystis jirovecii</i>
Parasites	Rare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Toxoplasma gondii</i> <i>Strongyloides</i> <i>Leishmania</i> <i>Trypanosoma cruzi</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing risk of <i>Toxoplasma</i>, <i>Strongyloides</i>, <i>Leishmania</i>, <i>Trypanosoma</i>, if immunosuppression intensified

MDRO, multidrug resistant organism; UTI, urinary tract infection; CRBSI, catheter related blood stream infection; CAUTI, catheter associated urinary tract infection; MRSA, methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; VRE, vancomycin resistant enterococcus; GNB, gram negative bacteria; HSV, herpes simplex virus; VZV, varicella zoster virus; CMV, cytomegalovirus; EBV, Epstein Barr virus; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; RSV, respiratory syncytial virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; PTLD, Post-transplant lymphoproliferative disorder

by 60% by initiating prophylaxis in these patients. However they couldn't find any difference in incidence of all cause mortality or graft survival with or without prophylaxis. This study was limited by the small number of trials evaluating the efficacy and outcome related to prophylaxis.

Depending upon the organ transplanted, the local epidemiological factors, and the local antibiogram, the anti-infective surgical prophylaxis should be prescribed. Antimicrobial coverage for skin flora, enterobacteriaceae, biliary enterococcus species, anaerobes is usually prescribed for liver transplant patients. Similarly for lung transplant patients, the prophylaxis is usually targeted against molds, gram negative bacteria or usual coloniser patterns.⁷⁵⁵ For example, the patients undergoing lung transplant for cystic fibrosis often are colonised with MDR bacteria (*Pseudomonas aeruginosa* most commonly, in up to 52% pre-transplant; *Burkholderia*, *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* and

Achromobacter being the less frequent ones in that order) in the pre-transplant period. Early post-operative prophylaxis should be initiated/ modified depending on donor and recipient bronchial cultures.⁷⁶⁶

TMP-SMX as primary prophylaxis for UTI in post-renal transplant patients (given for PJP prophylaxis) has been found to decrease UTI and bacteremia. If TMP-SMX cannot be used as primary prophylaxis, other agents like nitrofurantoin, cephalexin or fluoroquinolone (ciprofloxacin/ ofloxacin) may be used in high risk patients or those having recurrent UTI in the pre-operative period, and in this case limited to first month after transplant.⁷⁶⁷ Fluoroquinolones should only be used with special caution.⁷⁶⁸ Their use for primary prophylaxis has been linked to increase in fluoroquinolone resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.⁷⁶⁷

The incidence of opportunistic infections have decreased owing to anti-infective prophylaxis.^{756,757} The patterns of opportunistic

infections also have altered because of anti-CMV strategies and TMP-SMX prophylaxis. TMP-SMX prophylaxis provides protection not just against *Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia, but also against *Toxoplasma gondii* infection and has been proven to decrease incidence of UTI, *Listeria monocytogenes* meningitis, and *Nocardia* infections.⁷⁵⁵

As the immunosuppression is progressively reduced after 6 months, the prophylaxis against the opportunistic infections should also be withdrawn. However, it can be re-introduced in case of intensified immunosuppression, wherever indicated.⁷⁵⁷

Evidence Statement

Incidence of sepsis in solid organ recipients ranges from 20% to 60% and is associated with in-hospital mortality of 5% to 40%. Nosocomial infections predominate in the first month, opportunistic infections till six months post transplant and subsequently community acquired infections become most common. Most of these infections are of bacterial followed by fungal etiology. Most common site remains urinary tract infection, followed by line related infections, and *E.coli* the most common etiology. CMV is most common infection from 1 month upto 3 months, whereas tuberculosis reactivation is more common from 3 months to 1 year post transplantation. *Pneumocystis* and *aspergillus* infections are common after 1 year. MDR GNB isolates are increasing in prevalence, especially in nosocomial infections. Risk for developing sepsis with bacteremia can be lowered significantly by antibiotic prophylaxis. Prophylaxis is governed by type of transplant and risk of specific infections. Liver transplant patients often receive antibiotics covering skin flora, enterobacteriaceae, enterococci and anaerobes whereas post lung transplant, prophylaxis is against moulds, gram negative bacteria or colonisers. Post kidney transplantation trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole given for PJP prophylaxis reduces UTI and bacteremia. Alternatives include nitrofurantoin and cephalexin. Fluorquinolones increase risk of resistant infections like *Pseudomonas*, and should be used with caution. Opportunistic infections have decreased due to anti-infective prophylaxis for CMV and PJP. TMP-SMX provides protection against toxoplasma, and protects against UTI, listeria meningitis and nocardial infections.

Recommendation

Anti-infective Prophylaxis

- Prophylaxis in first month post transplant should depend upon the nosocomial infections, colonisation of donor and recipient, and the organ transplanted (1A).
- Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) for primary prophylaxis for urinary tract infection (UTI) in renal transplant patients is recommended; TMP-SMX usually given for 6 months for PJP prophylaxis decreases UTI and bacteremia in renal transplant recipients (1A).
- Primary prophylaxis for UTI with agents other than TMP-SMX may be limited to the first month after transplant (3B).

Approach to Diagnosis and Treatment of Infection

- Infections in the first month (0–30 days) of post SOT period should be investigated and treated similarly to those of non-immunocompromised postoperative patient (1A).
- Infections in the first month (0–30 days) of post SOT period should be investigated and treated on the lines of nosocomial infections/ donor derived infections (1A).

- Complete blood count with differential, liver and renal function tests, serum electrolytes should be obtained in all patients with suspected infection (3A).
- We recommend obtaining blood cultures at presentation and preferably prior to initiation of antibiotics in all patients presenting with features suggestive of infection (3A).
- Antimicrobials should be administered considering prior cultures, local antibiogram and susceptibility patterns (1A).
- Asymptomatic bacteriuria (AB) should not be treated (1A) unless same pathogen has been isolated twice consecutively >105 CFU/mL in first 2 months post SOT (2B) or AB is found in post kidney transplant recipients. (1B).
- Multi drug resistant (MDR) urinary tract infection (UTI) with Gram-negative bacteria such as *Pseudomonas spp* and *Klebsiella spp*, newer agents like ceftazidime-avibactam can be considered as alternatives to colistin or aminoglycosides. (1B).

Approach to Diagnosis and Treatment of Respiratory Infection

Acute respiratory failure (ARF) following SOT could be of infectious or non-infectious aetiologies such as pneumonia, pulmonary edema, alveolar haemorrhage, primary graft dysfunction (PGD)/ rejection, acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), pleural effusion.^{757,768} Chest radiograph should be obtained in all patients with ARF as it may help in narrowing down the differential diagnosis.⁷⁶⁹ Consolidation may be observed in bacterial infection or pulmonary haemorrhage, diffuse interstitial infiltrates are usually suggestive of pneumonia (due to CMV, *Pneumocystis jirovecii*, respiratory viruses, EBV, mycoplasma, legionella etc.) or other non-infectious aetiologies like alveolar haemorrhage, pulmonary edema, graft rejection, ARDS.^{757,769,770} Ground glass pattern or ground glassing along with micro nodular infiltrates could suggest PJP or CMV pneumonia.^{769,771}

Bronchopneumonia or peribronchial opacities maybe observed in infection due to *Chlamydia*, *Mycoplasma*, *Haemophilus*, *Neisseria*, respiratory viruses. Nodular infiltrates (single/ multiple) may suggest invasive mold (aspergillosis), *Nocardia*, TB, non-tuberculous mycobacteria infections or possibility of malignancy/ PTLD.^{769,771}

Obtaining appropriate routine microbiologic cultures before starting antimicrobial therapy in patients suspected of having sepsis or septic shock, without causing a delay in start of treatment, was recommended as a best practice statement in Surviving Sepsis Guidelines (SSC) 2016 and remained valid in SSC 2021 guidelines.^{772,773}

In a prospective multi centre study, incidence of pneumonia was found to be 10.1 episodes/1000 recipients/year and in 70.4% of cases it was classified as late-onset pneumonia (>6 months post SOT). In 94.4% of patients, an attempt to obtain a microbiological diagnosis was made and diagnostic yield was reported to be 60.7%.⁷⁷⁴

In an active population-based surveillance for community-acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalisation among adults, the authors found that among 2259 patients who had radiographic evidence of pneumonia and specimens available for both bacterial and viral testing, a pathogen was detected in 853 (38%): one or more viruses in 530 (23%), bacteria in 247 (11%), bacterial and viral pathogens in 59 (3%), and a fungal or mycobacterial pathogen in 17 (1%). They concluded that despite current diagnostic tests, no pathogen was detected in the majority of patients.⁶¹ In another prospective study of 610 kidney transplant recipients, of the 60 episodes of pneumonia in 54 patients (8.8%), 23 (38%) were of nosocomial origin and rest were community-acquired infections. Bacterial infection was the most common, followed by fungal and

viral (44%, 7%, and 3.5% respectively). *P. aeruginosa* was the most common microorganism isolated in nosocomial pneumonia (26%), among which 50% were multi-drug resistant). No microorganism was isolated in 34% episodes. Among community-acquired pneumonias *S. pneumoniae* (11%) was the most common pathogen. No microbiologic confirmation of disease was made in 54% of cases. The overall accuracy of bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) was found to be 72%. The authors concluded that nosocomial pulmonary infections were associated with considerable morbidity and mortality in kidney transplant recipients and that carrying out invasive procedures for the diagnosis of pneumonia is useful.⁷⁷⁵

Performance of BAL in SOT recipients with pneumonia provides a moderate chance to come to a microbiological diagnosis, performed with or without transbronchial biopsy, the microbiological yield of BAL ranging from 39 % to 77% in various studies (highest yield reported in nosocomial pneumonia).⁷⁶⁹ Different studies have studied performance of lung biopsy for diagnosis of lung infiltrates in SOT patients. The diagnostic yield of open lung biopsy was reported to be 85.1% in a single centre study on renal transplant patients with resultant change in therapeutic management in 53% of patients. However, complications were reported in 28.7%.⁷⁷⁶ The diagnostic yield of percutaneous CT guided lung biopsy in a series of 45 biopsies in SOT patients with parenchymal lung nodules was reported to be 53%, with complications in 13% of patients.⁷⁷⁷ The decision for performance of lung biopsy should be left to clinician's discretion and be individualised per patient depending on the risk-benefit ratio.⁷⁶⁹

Empiric antimicrobial therapy for pneumonia in SOT patients would depend upon the net state of immunosuppression, the epidemiological exposures, the clinical and radiological profile of the patient, and the local antibiogram. The usual empiric coverage doesn't include antifungals, or coverage for invasive and opportunistic infections; this gap in antimicrobial coverage should always be borne in mind.

Evidence Statement

Acute respiratory failure (ARF) following SOT can be due to variety of infective and noninfective causes. Patterns of involvement on chest radiograph or CT scan can help to narrow down diagnosis. Ground glass opacities and micronodular infiltrates can suggest PJP or CMV, whereas lobar consolidation suggests bacterial etiology. Nodular infiltrates suggest fungal, tubercular or malignant etiology. Majority of cases of community acquired pneumonia have been seen after 6 months post transplantation. Early initiation of antibiotics after sending blood cultures in patients with septic shock leads to better outcomes. Organisms responsible for CAP include viruses, bacteria, fungal and mycobacteria. *Streptococcus pneumoniae* has been reported to be most common bacteria causing CAP, whereas *P. aeruginosa* was the most common microorganism isolated in nosocomial pneumonia. Bronchoscopic BAL leads to microbiologic diagnosis in upto 77% cases. CT Guided biopsy has been used for diagnosis of patients with lung nodules. Open lung biopsy has been reported to have high yield (85%) but with increased risk of complications. Empiric antimicrobial therapy for pneumonia in SOT patients would depend upon the net state of immunosuppression, the epidemiological exposures, the clinical and radiological profile of the patient, and the local antibiogram.

Recommendation

- We recommend obtaining chest radiograph in all patients with suspected pneumonia (2A).

- We recommend performing a chest computerized tomography (CT) scan in all SOT patients with pneumonia (I,A) and high resolution CT (HRCT) scan in patients with nodular infiltrates with suspected invasive aspergillosis (1A).
- We recommend obtaining nasopharyngeal swab for influenza virus testing by PCR if seasonally appropriate and high suspicion for viral pneumonia(1A).
- Early BAL should be considered in SOT patients with suspected pneumonia admitting to ICU (1A).
- We recommend BAL in patients with pulmonary infiltrates not improving on empiric antimicrobial therapy or in whom there is diagnostic uncertainty on non-invasive testing. (1A)
 - BAL fluid should be tested for:
 - Stains and immunohistochemistry- Gram stain, KOH/ Calcofluor white, Auramine-rhodamine, auramine-o, or ziehl-neelson, Modified acid-fast stain, Silver methenamine stain, Galactomannan assay (<0.5 Negative predictive value, >3 positive predictive value)
 - Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)- Mycobacterium tuberculosis (Cartridge Based Nucleic Acid Amplification Test (CB-NAAT or GeneXpert), Multiplex PCR assay [(Including Respiratory viruses, CMV)(Quantitative or semiquantitative detection- particularly bacterial)].
 - Culture- Aerobic culture for bacteria, mycobacterial growth indicator tube (MGIT) for mycobacterium tuberculosis, fungal culture.
- Following organisms are diagnostic of infections. If identified, they are less likely to be the contaminants/ colonisers and should be treated: *Pneumocystis carinii*, *Toxoplasma gondii*, *Strongyloides stercoralis*, *Legionella pneumophila*, *Cryptococcus neoformans*, *Histoplasma capsulatum*, *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, Influenza a and b viruses, Respiratory syncytial virus. (2A)
- Open/ Video- assisted thoracoscopy (VATS)/ CT guided/ transbronchial biopsy should be done in patients with lung infiltrates where the non-invasive testing/ BAL haven't been able to provide the diagnosis and who have failed to respond to therapy, after risk-benefit assessment on case to case basis (2A).
- Any prior microbial colonisation or antimicrobial resistance pattern of particular organisms should be considered while deciding empiric treatment for pneumonia in SOT patients, particularly so in case of colonisation of airway in lung transplant patients (3A).
- Empiric antibiotic therapy with carbapenem based on local susceptibility patterns for suspected community acquired bacterial pneumonia along with coverage of atypical / intracellular pathogens like *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, Chlamydia pneumonia, and Legionella spp. is recommended (2A). For the coverage of latter, among macrolides, consider using azithromycin instead of clarithromycin or erythromycin because of its relatively less likelihood to interact with immunosuppressants.
- For suspected viral pneumonia, adding antiviral for influenza should be considered (2A).
- We recommend empiric treatment of recipients requiring hospitalisation for pneumonia with broad spectrum antibiotics (carbapenem ± antipseudomonal ± anti MRSA) depending on local flora and resistance patterns, along with coverage for atypical organisms (2A).

- Antipseudomonal agent/ polymyxin should be added if the patient is admitted in the hospital for ≥ 48 hours before symptoms (nosocomial pneumonia) (2A), visited medical care (hemodialysis, wound care, immunosuppressants) within the previous 30 days, or hospitalised in an acute care hospital ≥ 2 days within the prior 90 days (UPP).
- Empiric antifungal therapy may be initiated where there is strong suspicion based on the clinical and radiological profile of the patient (3B).
- Empiric therapy should be initiated/ modified as per clinical, radiological and microbiological findings and response (2A).

CMV MANAGEMENT

It has been recommended to use the standardised definitions of CMV infection and disease in transplant patients.^{778,779}

CMV Infection

presence of CMV replication in tissue, blood, or other bodily fluids regardless of symptomatology detected by (a) nucleic acid testing (NAT), (b) antigen testing, and (c) viral culture.⁷⁸⁰

Asymptomatic CMV Infection

CMV replication without clinical signs and symptoms of disease.⁷⁸¹

CMV Disease

CMV infection that is accompanied by clinical signs and symptoms. (a) CMV syndrome, (b) end-organ CMV disease. CMV has a predilection to invade the transplanted allograft; hence, CMV more commonly causes hepatitis in liver recipients, nephritis in kidney recipients, or pneumonitis in lung recipients.

Refractory CMV Infection

CMV DNAemia or antigenemia increases (ie, >1 log₁₀ increase in CMV DNA levels in blood between peak viral load within the first week and the peak viral load at 2 wk or more) after at least 2 wk of appropriately dosed antiviral therapy.

Refractory CMV Disease

Worsening in signs and symptoms or progression into end-organ disease after at least 2 wk of appropriately dosed antiviral therapy. Resistant CMV - Presence of viral genetic alteration that confer reduced susceptibility to one or more antiviral drugs.⁷⁸¹

It is strongly recommended that CMV-IgG serology be done for all organ donors and transplant recipients in the pre-operative period to evaluate their baseline immune status and both be interpreted together to assess the risk of post transplant CMV risk in the recipient and thus guide the prophylaxis accordingly.⁷⁷⁸ Recipients who are CMV seronegative (R-) and receive organ from a seropositive donor (D+), (that is D+/R-) have the maximum risk of developing CMV disease in the post-transplant period.^{782,783} Severe lymphopenia (decreased number of lymphocytes) or lymphocyte anergy (decreased function of lymphocytes) due to drug induced immunosuppression is associated with higher risk of CMV after SOT.^{800,801}

CMV IgM and IgG serology should not be used for the diagnosis of CMV disease after SOT as these patients might not mount a robust antibody response. The detection of CMV in the post-transplant period may be done by molecular assays (CMV QNAT- quantitative nucleic acid amplification test), pp65 antigenemia, histopathology and viral culture, CMV DNA by QNAT being the preferred one.⁷⁷⁸

A positive correlation between higher viral load and end organ disease has been observed.^{786,787} Detection of CMV by QNAT in BAL fluid and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) can also be done. High viral load in BAL fluid has been found to be associated with CMV pneumonia, however there isn't any standard threshold to define the same.⁷⁸⁸ Positive CMV QNAT in CSF might be indicative of possible CNS CMV disease.⁷⁹⁶ For end organ CMV disease, histopathologic diagnosis remains the gold standard modality, except for CMV retinitis, which is diagnosed based on ophthalmologic examination.^{778,780} In a retrospective study, the response to therapy was assessed using RT-PCR (2262 samples) and antigenemia using pp65 assay (1285 specimens). Both methods had $>90\%$ specificity, but RT-PCR had better sensitivity. The authors concluded that RT-PCR was a more reliable tool to monitor the response to therapy.⁷⁸⁹

For the prevention of CMV disease in SOT recipients, either the antiviral prophylaxis or the pre-emptive therapy may be used, but in lung transplant recipients where only the prophylaxis is recommended. Valganciclovir and intravenous ganciclovir are the antivirals recommended for CMV prophylaxis and CMV disease.^{788,790} Oral ganciclovir should not be used due to poor bioavailability. Limaye et al compared letermovir (a novel viral terminase inhibitor) versus valganciclovir for prophylaxis in high risk kidney transplant recipients (D+/R-) in a randomised control trial and found it to be noninferior to valganciclovir.⁷⁹¹ Asberg et al in a randomized controlled trial compared the outcome of CMV disease after treatment with IV Ganciclovir and oral valganciclovir. Three hundred twenty-one SOT recipients were enrolled and randomized to receive either twice daily intravenous ganciclovir or oral valganciclovir for 21 days followed by once daily valganciclovir until day 49 in all the patients. All patients were followed up for 1 year. The success rate was the same in both the groups with a similar rate of clinical and viral eradication. The clinical recurrence rate was also not statistically different in both the groups.⁷⁹² Valacyclovir in high doses may be used for prophylaxis only in renal transplant patients as an alternative.⁷⁹³ The duration of antiviral prophylaxis has been summarised in Table 5.⁷⁷⁸

Due to the prescription of antiviral prophylaxis initially after transplant, CMV disease tends to occur in CMV D+/R- SOT recipients during 3-6 months after completion of antiviral prophylaxis and is termed as "post-prophylaxis delayed-onset CMV disease" compared from truly late-onset CMV diseases that occur many years after transplantation.⁷⁷⁸ Pre-emptive therapy with oral valganciclovir (900 mg twice daily) or intravenous ganciclovir (5 mg/kg twice daily), which is another way of prevention of CMV disease, is initiated when the viral load reaches the predefined threshold and continued until virologic clearance (undetectable or level below predefined threshold).^{794,795} Various studies have demonstrated the efficacy of intravenous ganciclovir for treatment of CMV disease and also shown comparable efficacy of valganciclovir and intravenous ganciclovir and have suggested that duration of therapy should be individualised as per the clinical response and the viral clearance.^{792,796,797} There is a direct association between viral suppression below the lower limit of quantified test and disease resolution. Rapid resolution of CMV disease is seen with lower pre-treatment viral load (lower than 18,200 IU/mL).⁷⁹⁸ The dose of antivirals should not be reduced for neutropenia.⁷⁵⁵ For patients with suspected resistant CMV disease, high dose ganciclovir (10mg/kg every 12 hours, renally adjusted) or foscarnet as empiric therapy can be initiated, pending the results of genotype testing according to which the therapy should be modified. In patients with resistant

Table 5: Recommendations for antiviral prophylaxis in SOT recipients

Organ transplanted	Duration of antiviral prophylaxis					
	Heart	Lung	Kidney	Liver	Pancreas	Intestinal
CMV serostatus						
CMV D+/R-	3–6 months	6–12 months	6 months	3–6 months	3–6 months	6 months
CMV R+	3 months	6–12 months	3 months	3 months	3 months	3 months
CMV D-/ R-	Not recommended					

CMV, cytomegalovirus; D+, D, donor seropositive and seronegative respectively; R+, R, recipient seropositive and seronegative respectively

or refractory disease, cautious reduction in immunosuppression is recommended and immunoglobulins may be used as adjunct to antiviral therapy.⁷⁷⁸

Evidence Statement

CMV reactivation risk is increased in post SOT patients due to immunosuppression induced lymphopenia and lymphocyte anergy. Preoperative CMV-IgG serology of donor and recipient can be used to assess risk and guide prophylaxis. In post transplant period, CMV DNA using quantitative nucleic acid amplification is the diagnostic modality of choice. Detection of CMV by QNAT in BAL fluid and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) is feasible. For end organ CMV disease, histopathologic diagnosis is the gold standard. CMV retinitis is diagnosed based on ophthalmologic examination. RT-PCR was a more reliable tool to monitor the response to therapy. Pre-emptive therapy is used for most SOT recipients, however, lung transplant patients should receive prophylaxis. Valganciclovir and intravenous ganciclovir have good efficacy and are used for prophylaxis and disease respectively. Letermovir has been shown to be noninferior to valganciclovir for prophylaxis in post renal transplant patients. Post prophylaxis delayed onset CMV disease occurs in donor positive recipient negative SOT recipients three to six months after completion of antiviral prophylaxis and should be treated with pre-emptive therapy. High dose ganciclovir or foscarnet are effective in empiric treatment of refractory disease, alongwith cautious reduction in immunosuppression. Immunoglobulins as adjunct therapy have been used in refractory disease.

Recommendation

Antiviral Prophylaxis

- Antiviral prophylaxis should be initiated within 10 days post SOT in all at-risk recipients for prevention of CMV infection/ disease (1A).
- Valganciclovir (oral 900 mg once daily) or intravenous ganciclovir (5 mg/kg IV once daily) should be used for prophylaxis in all SOT recipients. Only in post kidney transplant patients, high dose oral valacyclovir (2gram qid) may be used as an alternative agent (1A).
- The duration of prophylactic therapy depends upon the CMV serostatus of the donor (D) and recipient (R) pre-transplant and the specific organ transplanted (Table 5).
- For patients receiving lymphocyte-depleting anti-lymphocyte antibodies (e.g. anti-thymocyte globulin ATG) for rejection, antiviral prophylaxis with valganciclovir or intravenous ganciclovir should be initiated (1A).

Pre-emptive Therapy

- Pre-emptive therapy for prevention of CMV disease in asymptomatic CMV infection in SOT patients (tested weekly

post-transplant for up to 12 weeks or longer) with valganciclovir 900mg twice daily or intravenous ganciclovir (5 mg/kg twice daily) should be initiated once the predefined viral load threshold has been achieved, and duration be guided by viral load monitoring (ie, CMV DNAemia or antigenemia below the predefined threshold or not detected) (1A).

- Antiviral prophylaxis is preferred over pre-emptive therapy for prevention of CMV disease heart transplant patients (1A).
- Preemptive therapy is not recommended for prevention of CMV disease in lung transplant patients (1A).

Therapy for CMV Disease

- We recommend CMV DNA by QNAT as the laboratory method of choice for rapid diagnosis of CMV infection in blood after SOT (1A)
- We recommend treatment of CMV disease with intravenous ganciclovir (5mg/kg 12th hourly) or oral valganciclovir (900 mg twice daily) (in renally adjusted dosages) (1A).
- For severe or life-threatening CMV disease, very high viral load, and doubtful gastrointestinal absorption, use of intravenous ganciclovir is recommended (1A).
- Oral valganciclovir is an effective initial therapy for mild to moderate CMV disease (I, A), or as a step down to intravenous ganciclovir after clinical improvement (2B)
- Foscarnet and cidofovir can be used only as second-line agents for SOT recipients (due to high risk of nephrotoxicity associated) who are unable to tolerate intravenous ganciclovir or valganciclovir (2A).
- We recommend against use of acyclovir, valacyclovir, and oral ganciclovir for treatment of CMV disease (1A).
- We recommend a duration of treatment with antiviral for a minimum of two weeks and till there is resolution of clinical signs along with viral clearance as tested by weekly CMV quantitative NAT (QNAT: polymerase chain reaction- PCR). (1A)
- After completion of full-dose antiviral treatment, a 1 to 3 months course of secondary prophylaxis may be considered depending on the clinical situation (2B).
- We recommend monitoring complete blood count with differential and serum creatinine weekly for assessment of potential haematologic and renal toxicity. (1A)
- The drug dosage of antiviral should be adjusted as per the renal function test. (1A)
- The drug dosage of antiviral should not be decreased due to neutropenia or pancytopenia (1A). Haematopoeitic growth factors may be used to counter the myelosuppressive effect of the drugs.
- Cautious reduction in immunosuppression should be considered in SOT patients presenting with CMV disease, especially if the disease is moderate to severe, or with severe lymphopenia or with refractory/ resistant CMV disease (2B).

Table 6: Causes of diarrhoea in solid organ transplant recipients

Infectious			Non- infectious	
Bacterial	Viral	Parasitic	Immunosuppressant drugs	Other drugs and aetiologies
<i>Clostridium difficile</i>	Cytomegalovirus	Giardia	Mycophenolate (most common)	Antibiotics, oral hypoglycaemic agents
Small bowel bacterial growth (SBBO): Escherichia coli, Campylobacter, Shigella, Salmonella	Norovirus Adenovirus Rotavirus, Sapovirus, Enterovirus, Human herpes virus 6	Cryptosporidium Entamoeba Isospora belli Microsporidium	Tacrolimus Cyclosporine Sirolimus	Proton pump inhibitors, laxatives GVHD, PTLD Colon cancer Inflammatory bowel disease

GVHD, graft versus host disease; PTLD, Post-transplant lympho-proliferative disorder

- Empiric treatment of suspected resistant CMV disease include high-dose intravenous ganciclovir (up to 10 mg/kg q12 hours, renally adjusted) or foscarnet. Definitive antiviral treatment should be guided by results of genotypic testing. (2B)
- CMV immunoglobulin or IVIg may be used as an adjunct to antiviral drugs in transplant recipients with life-threatening disease, CMV pneumonitis or resistant CMV disease. (2B).

Tuberculosis (TB) in SOT Recipient

Given that tuberculosis is an immunological disease and with the high prevalence of TB in India, the incidence of active tuberculosis infection is higher among SOT recipients as compared to the general population. The diagnosis of TB in SOT recipients presents challenges that may lead to treatment delay. These include atypical clinical presentations, increased likelihood of negative tuberculin skin tests and/or IGRA, and negative sputum smear results despite active disease makes TB diagnosis in SOT recipients a challenge.⁷⁹⁹⁻⁸⁰⁵ Radiological investigations like CT scan and the invasive modalities like BAL with or without biopsy should be performed early in case of suspicion of TB. One-third to one-half of cases of tuberculosis after transplant are disseminated or extrapulmonary. Lung transplant recipients are most likely to develop pulmonary manifestations of TB. Drug-drug interactions between immunosuppressive and AKT, allograft-related drug toxicities, and inadequate immune responses to TB makes treatment of TB in transplant recipients also very challenging.^{801,805} The standard 4 drug regimen should be used wherever possible⁸⁰³ and if necessary, rifampicin can be replaced by levofloxacin. In the latter case, 4 drugs, that is, isoniazid (INH), ethambutol, pyrazinamide and levofloxacin are given for 2 to 3 months for initiation and then 3 drugs (INH, ethambutol and either pyrazinamide or levofloxacin) continued to complete the therapy duration of 12 months.⁸⁰⁵ Using rifamycin as one of the drugs for the treatment of post-transplant TB would increase the cost significantly because of the high doses of CNIs/mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitors needed to maintain the levels and the requirement for frequent drug monitoring. So, the South Asian Transplant Infectious Disease Guidelines for solid organ transplant candidates, recipients, and donors recommends a rifamycin-free regimen as the standard approach to treating posttransplant TB in this region except in special situations.⁸⁰⁵

Evidence Summary

Incidence of tuberculosis is higher as compared to general population. Upto 50% cases of tuberculosis can be disseminated or extrapulmonary in post SOT patients. Atypical clinical presentations, less sputum positivity and false negative tuberculin and IGRA tests lead to delays in diagnosis. Radiological investigations like CT scan

alongwith bronchoscopy, BAL or histopathologic evaluation from involved site are needed for prompt diagnosis. Rifampin containing regimens reduce serum concentrations of tacrolimus, cyclosporine, sirolimus and everolimus, whereas rifampin free regimens increase the duration of antitubercular therapy.

Recommendation

- The diagnosis of active TB in transplant recipients requires a high index of suspicion. Although the diagnostic modalities and treatment of TB in SOT patients remains the same as that in immunocompetent hosts, these individuals often require an invasive procedure, such as bronchoscopy with BAL or lung biopsy (1A).
- Rifamycins, particularly rifampin, reduce serum concentrations of tacrolimus, cyclosporine, rapamycin (sirolimus), and everolimus via induction of the cytochrome p450 isoenzyme CYP3A4, necessary dose adjustments, and therapeutic drug monitoring are warranted to avoid development of rejection (II, A). When rifampin is not used, a longer than usual duration of treatment is required (2B)

Infective Diarrhoea in SOT Recipient

Diarrhoea of varied etiology is a common occurrence in post-transplant patients, incidence ranging between 17 to 50%. It can be attributed to infectious and non-infectious causes, which have been summarised in Table 6.⁸⁰⁶ As per the DIDACT study from Belgium on etiology of diarrhea in renal transplant recipients, drug-induced diarrhea was most common (70%) followed by infectious etiology (bacterial infection 20% and CMV 7%).⁸⁰⁷ In a study analysing the etiological profile of diarrhea in SOT recipients at a tertiary care center in Southern India, they found that of the 58 episodes of diarrhoea in 55 recipients, 70% were reported in renal transplant recipients. 79% of the patients were >6months post-transplant. Infective diarrhea was the etiology in 46%, drug-related diarrhea in 29.3% and no specific etiology was identified in 22.4% of patients. Of the cases with infective diarrhoea, parasites were responsible for 69%. Stool analysis included wet mount examination for ova, trophozoites, and cysts, modified acid-fast staining for *Cryptosporidium spp*, *Isospora belli*, *Cyclospora cayetanensis*, and modified trichrome stain for *Microsporidia spp.*, *C difficile* toxin assay using ELISA method for detection of glutamate dehydrogenase antigen and toxin A and B; stool culture in selected patients.⁸⁰⁸ In another Indian study on etiological spectrum of infective diarrhoea in renal transplant patients by stool PCR, they found that 86% of the stool samples were positive for infection and 68% had more than one organism identified. The most common pathogen isolated was Norovirus and *Giardia lamblia* with Norovirus was the most common

coinfection.⁸⁰⁹ Due to frequent exposure to antibiotics and repeated hospitalizations SOT patients are a risk of developing intra-abdominal infections (IAI). It is recommended for all SOT patients with diarrhoea to undergo stool testing for *C. Difficile*, CMV, and bacterial pathogens, also considering multiplex PCR testing, testing for parasites and Norovirus (stool PCR).⁸⁰⁶ The medications that the patient is on should be reviewed and any possibly responsible ones should be withheld. Those not responding to therapy, or negative infectious screening or having chronic diarrhoea should be evaluated using colonoscopy with or without biopsy. The initial management of *C difficile* infection (CDI) remains similar to non-transplant patients.⁸⁰⁶ The American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice have recently published updated guidelines to address the prevention and management of CDI in SOT recipients.⁸¹⁰ Vancomycin 125 mg PO QID or fidaxomicin 200mg PO BID 10–14 days is the preferred treatment for initial mild to moderate CDI. FMT should be considered for second further recurrences. For fulminant disease, vancomycin PO 500 mg q.i.d. and vancomycin via rectal administration and metronidazole 500 mg intravenously Q6–Q8 h should be prescribed and surgical consultation should be sought.^{810,811} A series of cases (75 adults and 5 pediatric patients) treated with FMT for recurrent, refractory, and severe and/or overlap of recurrent/refractory and severe CDI had 78% cure rate after first FMT. There were no related infectious complications or adverse events in these high-risk patients.⁸¹²

Evidence Statement

Diarrhoea in post transplant patients can be due to infectious and non-infectious causes. Drug induced diarrhea and infections are most common reported causes. Bacterial infections, parasitic infections (giardiasis) and viral infections (CMV, norovirus) are common infectious causes. Due to frequent exposure to antibiotics and frequent hospitalisation, *clostridium difficile* associated diarrhea is also common. Stool investigations should be performed for all suspected organisms. The initial management of *C difficile* infection (CDI) remains similar to non-transplant patients.

Recommendation

- We recommend empiric management of gastrointestinal infections/ diarrhoea with ceftriaxone iv + ganciclovir 5mg/kg BD IV and vancomycin 125mg PO QID (if the patient is already on antibiotics to cover CDI) till definitive diagnosis is made (1A).
- If the patient is in septic shock, based on local resistance pattern, and previous drug history of patient consider carbapenems (UPP).
- We recommend cessation of the inciting antimicrobial agent whenever possible (2A).
- We recommend using a NAAT alone or a multistep algorithm for testing (ie, GDH plus toxin; or NAAT plus toxin) rather than a toxin test alone for the diagnosis in stool specimens likely to be having *Clostridium difficile* infection CDI (2A).
- For treatment of CDI in adults, either vancomycin (125mg given 4 times daily orally for adults; 40 to 50mg/kg/day divided QID for pediatric patients, not to exceed adult dosing; for 10-14 days) or fidaxomicin (200mg given twice daily orally for 10 days) is recommended over metronidazole (1A). If these agents aren't available, metronidazole 500mg 3 times daily by mouth can be used as an alternative.
- We recommend oral vancomycin up to 500 mg orally QID in adults for the treatment of severe/fulminant CDI (I,A). If ileus,

consider adding rectal instillation of vancomycin 500mg in 100ml normal saline as retention enema 4 times a day (2B).

- Intravenous metronidazole 500 mg intravenously every 8 hours may be administered together with oral or rectal vancomycin (1B).
- In cases of multiple recurrences of CDI, we recommend prolonged courses of oral vancomycin, either in a tapering or pulse dose schedule (2A). Fidaxomicin can be used if available (2B)
- Faecal microbiota transplant (FMT) may be considered in recurrent or relapsing CDI (2B).
- We suggest consideration for surgical intervention in cases of complicated CDI. (2B).

Invasive Fungal Infection in SOT Recipients

The epidemiology of fungal infections in post transplant patients depends upon certain host and environmental factors.⁸¹³ The highest risk of first invasive fungal infection (IFI) among SOT recipients as reported by TRANSNET network (2010) has been found in small bowel transplant followed by lung, liver, heart, pancreas and kidney transplant in that order (the one year cumulative incidences being 11.6%, 8.6%, 4.7%, 4%, 3.4%, and 1.3% respectively). Invasive candidiasis (IC) was the most common IFI (53%) followed by invasive aspergillosis (IA) (19%), cryptococcosis(8%), non aspergillus molds (8%), endemic fungi (5%) and zygomycosis (2%). Median time to onset of IC was 103 days, 184 days for IA and 575 days for cryptococcosis. They observed an increase in cumulative incidence of IFIs during the surveillance period.⁸¹⁴ Emerging candida strains that are drug resistant are a cause for concern and pose challenge in the management. Indian data regarding epidemiology of IFI in SOT is scarce.⁸¹⁵ In a review by Sharma et al., the maximum available data was from renal transplant patients and they found mucormycosis to be the predominant. They reported an increase in IFIs and more renal transplant patients acquiring mucormycosis during the COVID-19 outbreak.⁸¹⁶

As per a review, IC is the most common the IFI in India, followed by mucormycosis, IA, and cryptococcosis; and prevalence of azole and multi-drug resistance among candida infections in South Asia is increasing. They reported that the most common endemic mycoses in Asia-Pacific region are histoplasmosis, talaromycosis and sporotrichosis.⁸¹⁷ Another recent publication showed 67 (9.2%) of 725 renal transplant recipients had IFIs. Invasive candidiasis was the most common IFI followed by mucormycosis, IA, and cryptococcosis.⁸¹⁸ As per TRANSNET 2016 on candida infections, among IFI in SOT patients IC constituted 50–60%. Most of them are bloodstream infections (44%), followed by intra-abdominal (14%), and they occurred mostly in liver (41%) and kidney (35%) transplant. Mortality is higher in liver transplant.⁸¹⁹ Blood cultures are the mainstay of diagnosis. Non-culture based methods such as 1,3 beta-d glucan or T2 Candida assay maybe used in patients suspected of having IC, if culture and/or histopathology of tissue are not available or negative.⁸²⁰

IA infections incidence was higher in lung and heart transplant recipients.⁶⁹ CT scan is able to give diagnosis of IPA in only half of the patients, direct examination of respiratory secretions in 49% and culture in 70%, BAL galactomannan in 39% and serum galactomannan (GM) in 35%.⁸²¹ Serum GM is not recommended for diagnosing IA. A retrospective study involving 362 lung transplant recipients found that 105/335 (31%) patients had evidence of aspergillus infection (colonisation or invasion), 83 (25%) patients had

colonisation and 22 (6%) patients had radiographic or histological evidence of invasive disease. Most of the infections occurred within the first 3 months after transplantation. Invasive aspergillosis (IA) was associated with 58% mortality after 2 years, while colonisation was associated with increased mortality after 5 years compared non-colonised patients ($p < 0.05$).⁸²²

Voriconazole remains the drug of choice for treatment of IA, isavuconazole and lipid formulations AmpB being the alternative agents. Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA),⁷²⁵ the European Society for Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases⁸²³ and American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice (AST-IDCOP)⁸²¹ endorse this recommendation. Echinocandins should be used alone or in combination only as salvage therapy.⁷²⁵ Herbrecht et al.⁸²⁴ compared voriconazole with amphotericin B in a large randomized trial for the treatment of IA in immunocompromised patients. In their study they found that at week 12, there were more successful outcomes 52.8% patients in the voriconazole group (complete response 20.8% and partial response in 31.9%) compared to 31.6% in the amphotericin B group (complete response 16.5% partial response in 15%). The survival rate was better at 12 weeks in voriconazole compared to amphotericin B group. (71% vs 58%) (HR- 0.59; 95% CI- 0.40 to 0.88). Denning et al in their study showed good response in IA treated with voriconazole; 56 out of 60 patients in voriconazole group were treated successfully.⁸²⁵ Voriconazole was successfully used in heart transplant recipients as first-line and salvage therapy for IA.^{826,827}

Isavuconazole was found to be non-inferior to voriconazole for the primary treatment of invasive mold disease caused by *Aspergillus* and other filamentous fungi, in a trial conducted in haematological patients (SECURE RCT). All cause mortality through day 42 was the primary endpoint and was found to be 19% and 20% in isavuconazole and voriconazole group respectively. The former has been found to be associated with lesser visual, skin/subcutaneous tissue, and hepatobiliary side-effects.⁷³⁴

Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) for azole antifungals (especially voriconazole and posaconazole) should be done and all current guidelines recommend the same.^{725,821,823} Plasma drug level monitoring is important when voriconazole is used as the plasma levels achieved are variable and very often do not reach therapeutic levels in the plasma, requiring dose adjustments.⁸²⁸ The fact that clinical efficacy is dependent on the achievement of therapeutic drug levels has been well established.⁸²⁹

For IC or candidemia, echinocandins remain the drug of choice and in a clinically stable patient it can be switched to fluconazole if the *Candida* isolate is susceptible to fluconazole. Antifungal should be continued for minimum 2 weeks after first negative fungal blood culture and till the resolution of features of IC.^{725,820} Antifungal prophylaxis for IFI depending upon the host factors and the organ transplanted has been recommended.^{817,820,821}

Evidence Statement

SOT recipients are at increased risk of fungal infections, highest risk in small bowel transplant, followed by lung, liver, heart, pancreas and kidney transplant. Invasive candidiasis is most common fungal infection, followed by aspergillosis, cryptococcosis, non-aspergillus moulds, endemic fungi and zygomycosis. Emerging candida strains that are drug resistant are a cause for concern and pose challenge in the management. India data is limited, and mucormycosis is the commonest infection. *Candida* infections are most commonly

blood stream infections followed by intraabdominal infections. *Aspergillus* colonisation and infection is associated with increased mortality in lung transplant recipients. Various diagnostic modalities including serum markers such as beta-D glucan, galactomannan, imaging (CT scan), bronchoscopic evaluation or histological evaluation of involved site lead to early diagnosis.

Voriconazole remains the drug of choice for treatment of IA, isavuconazole and lipid formulations AmpB being the alternative agents. Echinocandins can be used as salvage therapy. Isavuconazole is non-inferior to voriconazole for the primary treatment of invasive mold disease caused by *Aspergillus* and other filamentous fungi. Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) for azole antifungals (especially voriconazole and posaconazole) improves clinical efficacy and is preferred. For IC or candidemia, echinocandins remain the drug of choice and in a clinically stable patient it can be switched to fluconazole if the *Candida* isolate is susceptible to fluconazole. Duration is dependent on culture negativity and resolution of features of invasive candidiasis.

Recommendation

Antifungal Prophylaxis

Recommendations for antifungal prophylaxis in different solid organ transplant recipients are enumerated in Table 7 and Table 8.

Invasive Aspergillosis (IA) Treatment

- It is recommended not to use serum galactomannan (GM) to diagnose IA in SOT patients (1A)
- Serum or BAL beta-D-Glucan should not be used to screen or diagnose SOT patients for IA (1B).
- BAL GM is the preferred parameter for diagnosis of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis and a value of ≥ 1.0 in combination with other fungal diagnostic methods is used to diagnose IA in SOT recipients (1A)
- For IA or positive BAL galactomannan, we recommend voriconazole in the dose of 6mg/kg bd for 1 day f/b 3mg/kg bd (1A).
- Isavuconazole and lipid formulations of Amphotericin B (AmB) can be used as alternative agents (1A).
- As a salvage therapy, posaconazole can be used where patients fail to respond or are intolerant to first line agents (1B).
- Echinocandins are not recommended as a primary therapy (1B) and can be used only as a salvage therapy or as a second agent where combination therapy is being considered (3B).
- We recommend therapeutic drug level monitoring (TDM) for voriconazole when using it for the treatment of IA (1A).
- We recommend that treatment be continued for minimum 12 weeks, if tolerated, and guided by clinical and radiological response (1A).

Other Emerging Fungal Infections

- For infection by mucormycetes, lipid formulations of AmB is the drug of choice for induction therapy (1A).
- Posaconazole or isavuconazole can be used as alternative agents for induction and for maintenance therapy (2B).
- Surgical excision or debridement is recommended for all wherever feasible, particularly for mucormycetes infection outside of lungs (2A).
- For trichosporon, azoles are the recommended first line agents (3A), subject to the susceptibility.

Table 7: Anti fungal prophylaxis (for *Candida*) in Solid organ transplant recipients

<i>Candida</i>				
<i>Organ transplanted</i>	<i>Universal prophylaxis</i>	<i>Targeted prophylaxis</i>	<i>Drug</i>	<i>Duration</i>
Liver	May be given (UPP)	Should be given in patients at high risk of invasive candidiasis (1A) e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-transplantation • Renal replacement therapy at the time of or within 7 days of transplantation. • Choledochojejunostomy. • Perioperative <i>Candida</i> colonization • Transfusion of ≥ 40 units of cellular blood products. • MELD score ≥ 30 • Fulminant hepatic failure • Biliary leak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Azoles or echinocandins preferred over amphotericin B lipid formulation (1A). • Fluconazole is the drug of choice (1B). 	2 to 4 weeks (2B)
Small bowel	Recommended (1B)	In high risk patients: graft rejection or dysfunction, enhanced immunosuppression, anastomotic disruption, abdominal reoperation, or multivisceral transplantation	Fluconazole Others if higher prevalence of <i>Candida non albicans</i> or prior azole exposure	4 weeks or until the anastomosis has healed, and no rejection (1A, 1B)
Pancreas	Not recommended	When at least one risk factor associated with candidiasis is present : (2B) Enteric drainage, Vascular thrombosis Post-perfusion pancreatitis	Fluconazole (Others if higher prevalence of <i>Candida non albicans</i>)	Depend on reduction in risk factors
Heart	Not recommended (1B)			
Kidney	Not recommended (1B)			

Table 8: Anti fungal prophylaxis (for *Aspergillus*) in Solid organ transplant recipients

<i>Aspergillus</i>				
<i>Organ transplanted</i>	<i>Universal prophylaxis</i>	<i>Targeted prophylaxis</i>	<i>Drug</i>	<i>Duration</i>
Liver	Not recommended (1A)	In high risk cases: Re-transplantation Renal replacement therapy Reoperation involving thoracic or intra-abdominal cavity	Echinocandin or voriconazole (1A). Lipid formulation of amphotericin B 3-5 mg/kg may be considered (2B)	14 to 21 days (1A)
Lung	Recommended (1A)	Recommended in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-transplant <i>Aspergillus</i> colonization • Post-transplant <i>Aspergillus</i> colonization within a year of transplant • Single-lung transplant • Positive intraoperative <i>Aspergillus</i> culture in patient with cystic fibrosis 	Systemic antifungal for prophylaxis or preemptive therapy : Voriconazole (6 mg/kg for two doses followed by 4 mg/kg every 12 h), itraconazole or posaconazole. Nebulized L-AmB or ABLC for prophylaxis (II,B)	4 to 6 months (1A)
Heart	Not recommended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended in : Isolation of <i>Aspergillus</i> species in respiratory tract cultures without radiological abnormality. • Presence of airborne <i>Aspergillus</i> spores in the ICU • Re-operation(thoracic) Presence of CMV disease • Post-transplant hemodialysis 	Itraconazole or voriconazole OR Echinocandins (1B)	Up to 150 days
Other SOTs	No recommendation			

***Pneumocystis Jirovecii* Infection Management**

The incidence of PCP in SOT recipients is variable. In a retrospective study of 1192 renal transplant patients, it was reported to be 0.6 to 9%. Authors observed that the incidence of PCP with a moderate cyclosporine based immunosuppressive regimen is low and seems to occur only in cases of additional immunosuppressive cofactors.⁸³⁰

In another retrospective study of 601 renal transplant recipients, PCP incidence was 2.2%.⁸³¹ In liver transplant recipients (154 adult patients) PCP occurred in 5.2% and the authors observed that patients who developed PCP had more episodes of rejection ($p < 0.05$), received more OKT3 ($p < 0.05$), a prednisone ($p < 0.05$) than controls.⁸³² Another retrospective study of 43 adult OLT recipients showed that the incidence of PCP was 0.9%. Most of the patients developed PCP at around 1 year of post-OLT, and the risk of PCP was closely related to strong immunosuppressive regimen. Thus they advised that routine PCP prophylaxis for 12 months be continued for 12 months, among patients receiving antirejection treatment.⁸³³

TMP-SMX acts by interfering with folate metabolism and remains the drug of choice for treatment of PCP in SOT patients, HIV patients, and non-HIV patients. TMP-SMX has high efficacy and availability in both oral and IV preparation with good oral bioavailability too.⁸³⁴ Intravenous pentamidine has been found to be equally effective in HIV-infected patients and remains the second line of choice for treatment of PCP in SOT patients.⁸³⁵⁻⁸³⁹ However, the use of pentamidine has been largely limited in view of its numerous toxicities in 71% patients leading to withdrawal in around 18 % patients.⁸³⁶ The optimal duration of therapy is usually 14 days which can be extended to 21 days in severe cases with slow clinical improvement.⁸⁴⁰ Adjunctive glucocorticoids are recommended for HIV- positive patients with moderate to severe PCP, defined as PaO₂ <70 mmHg while breathing ambient room air.⁸⁴¹ The benefit in survival from corticosteroids begins during the first 72 hours of treatment.⁸⁴²

With the provision of PJP prophylaxis, the incidence of PJP is less in the initial 6 to 12 months post transplant. However, in the absence of prophylaxis, risk of PJP is maximum in the first 6 months after SOT. TMP-SMX is the drug of choice for prophylaxis as well as treatment PJP.⁸⁴³

Evidence Statement

Incidence of PJP infections in SOT recipients ranges from 0.6% to 9% in various studies. Risk depends on degree of immunosuppression. PJP infection, in turn, leads to more episodes of rejection and increased need for steroids and immunosuppression. TMP-SMX has high efficacy and availability in both oral and IV preparation with good oral bioavailability. The optimal duration of therapy is usually 14 days which can be extended to 21 days in severe cases with slow clinical improvement. Adjunctive glucocorticoids are recommended for moderate to severe PCP. PJP prophylaxis reduces incidence of PJP in the first year after transplant.

Recommendation

Anti-pneumocystis Prophylaxis

- We recommend anti-pneumocystis prophylaxis to all SOT recipients for 6 to 12 months post transplant, particularly for centres with incidence $\geq 3\%$ -5% among transplant recipients (1A).
- Longer duration of prophylaxis may be considered in patients with prior history of PJP (*Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia) infection, chronic CMV infection, higher intensity of

immunosuppression, lung and small bowel transplant recipients, prolonged neutropenia (1A).

- Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) is the drug of choice for prophylaxis of PJP, in a (adult) dose of either 80mg TMP/400 mg SMX (single strength) daily or 160mg TMP/800 mg SMX (double strength) orally three times weekly (1A).

PJP treatment

- We recommend TMP-SMX as the first-line agent and drug of choice with the Trimethoprim component being 15-20 mg/kg / day in 3 to 4 divided doses (1A).
- In severe infections, if available, intravenous pentamidine probably remains the second-line agent after TMP-SMX (2A). Its usage should be avoided in pancreas transplant recipients (1B).
- Primaquine and clindamycin in combination may be used as alternative in mild to moderate infection. However, primaquine should be avoided in G6PD deficient patients, and association of *Clostridium difficile* associated diarrhoea (CDAD) with long term usage of clindamycin should be considered. (2B)
- In patients with hypoxemia (PaO₂ <70 mmHg on room air), adjunctive corticosteroids should be administered with antimicrobial therapy, ideally within 72 hours of initiating antimicrobial therapy for maximum benefit (2A). The dose of steroids should be 1 mg/kg/day prednisone (or equivalent) given in two divided doses daily for 5 to 7 days (2A). Steroids should be tapered over a period of 7 to 14 days (2B).
- Duration of antimicrobial therapy should be for at least 14 days (1B)

CNS infections in SOT recipients

SOT patients with altered sensorium should be evaluated with detailed workup. Multifactorial etiologies coexist which are often obscured in these group of patients.⁸⁴⁴ Although each imaging modality has unique insight to diagnose pathophysiology, but magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is the preferred modality. It can diagnose infectious as well as non-infectious etiologies like drug toxicities, metabolic disorders as well as the progression of the disease and response to the therapy.^{845,846} Empiric broad-spectrum antimicrobial therapy including viral and fungal infections are preferred. It is preferred to use empirical bactericidal or fungicidal agents having CNS penetration until a diagnosis is achieved.⁸⁴⁴ There has been always a risk of donor-derived infections in SOT recipients thus donors should be screened with standard screening tests.^{847,848}

Common pathogens causing CNS infections in SOT recipients are mentioned in Table 9.^{757,849,850} In a Swiss Transplant Cohort Study (STCS), the incidence rate of CNS infection was 2.06 per 1000 patient-years and was similar across all types of transplantations. Time to CNS infection onset ranged from 0.6 to 97 months after transplant. Of the 4762 patients, 42 episodes of CNS infections were observed and 22/42 (52.4%) cases were viral infections, 11/42 (26.2%) fungal, 5/42 (11.9%) bacterial and 4/42 (9.5%) were of probable viral/bacterial etiology. Viral meningoencephalitis was the most common disease, and fungal infections were associated with a high mortality.⁸⁵⁰

Lipid amphotericin B plus 5-flucytosine is used as initial treatment of meningitis, disseminated infection, and moderate-to-severe pulmonary infection, followed by fluconazole as consolidation therapy.⁸⁵¹ Cryptococcosis is a significant opportunistic infection in SOT recipients following aspergillosis and candidiasis. CSF analysis is highly recommended to diagnose underlying CNS disease in

Table 9: Common organisms causing central nervous system infection in solid organ transplant recipients

Intracerebral abscess	Meningoencephalitis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bacterial: Embolic or contiguous disease from the local site Nocardia Listeria monocytogenes Fungal: Aspergillus; Zygomycetes; Cryptococcus EBV associated post-transplant lymphoproliferative disorder (PTLD) Mycobacterium tuberculosis Toxoplasmosis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bacterial: S. pneumoniae, Neisseria meningitides, Listeria, gram negative bacilli Viral: CMV, EBV, HSV, VZV, HHV, Enterovirus, JC virus Fungal: Cryptococcus, Coccidioides, Histoplasma capsulatum Mycobacterium tuberculosis Treponema pallidum Borrelia burgdorferi

suspected cases.⁸⁵² *Cryptococcus* can colonize the airways of lung transplant recipients and can cause endobronchial fungal infection. It can present with skin manifestations and Immune reconstitution syndrome (IRIS) as well.^{853,854}

Their main components in management of cryptococcosis in SOT recipients include (a) performing lumbar puncture (for diagnostic purpose and for therapeutic purpose, that is, manage meant of intracranial pressure, which is often high in cryptococcal meningitis); (b) antifungal therapy (as described above); and (c) a gradual immunosuppression reduction (a rapid reduction can lead to development of IRIS).⁸⁵¹

Evidence Statement

SOT patients with altered sensorium have multifactorial causes and need extensive work up, with MRI being the initial preferred imaging modality. Empirical regimens with bactericidal or fungicidal agents having CNS penetration are initiated at admission, until definitive diagnosis. Common pathogens causing CNS infections in SOT are viral followed by fungal and bacterial agents. Viral meningoencephalitis is most common CNS disease in large prospective studies. Thus, antibiotics covering both gram positive and gram negative pathogens alongwith Acyclovir is part of initial empiric regimen. Amphotericin B plus 5-flucytosine is used as initial treatment of cryptococcal meningitis.

Recommendation

- We recommend initial workup for suspected CNS infections should include (1A)
 - MRI over CT scan
 - CSF analysis including India ink preparation
 - Rapid multiplex PCR on CSF
 - Serum cryptococcal antigen
- We recommend empiric treatment to be started with Ceftriaxone + Vancomycin + Acyclovir (1A)
- We recommend liposomal Amphotericin B or AmB lipid complex (ABLC) plus flucytosine as the initial treatment for *Cryptococcus* for minimum 2 weeks for CNS disease, disseminated disease, or moderate-to-severe pulmonary disease (1A). Alternatively, liposomal AmB or ABLC can be used for minimum duration of 4 to 6 weeks (1B).

Nocardia in SOT Recipients

SOT recipients are at risk of developing nocardia infection which is an opportunistic event.^{855,856} The risk of developing nocardiosis after SOT varies with the type of organ transplanted, e.g., the highest incidence in recipients of a lung transplant. A review of 5126 organ transplant recipients has demonstrated that highest nocardial infection rate among lung transplant recipients (3.5%).^{855,857}

TMP-SMX is the treatment of choice for nocardial infections as it has demonstrated clinical efficacy and achieves high tissue concentrations in lung, brain, skin, and bone. Combination therapy is recommended in critically ill patients with pulmonary nocardia, cerebral nocardia, and disseminated nocardia.⁸⁵⁸ Linezolid has shown good activity against all species of nocardia.⁸⁵⁹

Evidence Statement

Nocardia infection can occur post solid organ transplants. Lung transplant patients seem to be at highest risk. TMP-SMX, carbapenems and linezolid have efficacy against nocardia. Combination therapy is recommended in critically ill patients with pulmonary, cerebral and disseminated nocardial infection.

Recommendation

We recommend the following regimens for treatment of post-transplant nocardia infections

Pulmonary: TMP-SMX (1A) (TMP-SMX 15 mg/kg in 3-4 divided doses, for 6 to 12 months)

Disseminated or CNS, Critically ill: Imipenem plus TMP-SMX or Amikacin (2A)

Alternative: Linezolid, Meropenem (1A)

Multidrug Resistant (MDR) Infections in SOT Recipients

MDR Gram negative bacteria (GNB) infections- these recommendations have been adapted from AST-IDCOP⁸⁶⁰ guidelines and the more recently published IDSA guidelines⁸⁶¹ for MDR-GNB infections.

For ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae, carbapenems are the drug of choice. For Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE), ceftazidime/avibactam is preferred, and ceftazidime/avibactam plus aztreonam or cefiderocol as monotherapy for metallo- β -lactamase producing CRE is recommended for systemic infections. Tigecycline may be used as an alternative agent in non-urinary tract infections. For infections due to MDR *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, high-dose continuous or extended-infusion antipseudomonal β -lactam or Ceftolozane/tazobactam or Ceftazidime/avibactam is recommended. For treatment of Carbapenem-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* infections, combination therapy with at least two agents, at least until clinical improvement is seen. High-dose ampicillin-sulbactam (total daily dose of 6-9 grams of the sulbactam component) is suggested as a component of combination therapy for CRAB, regardless of whether susceptibility has been demonstrated. Possible options to combine with it include: tetracycline derivatives (minocycline/ tigecycline), polymyxin B, or cefiderocol.

For management of MDR *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*, either of the 2 approaches is recommended: 1) the use of two of the

following agents: TMP- SMX, minocycline/ tigecycline, cefiderocol, or levofloxacin. 2) ceftazidime-avibactam plus aztreonam (when critical illness is evident or intolerance or inactivity of other agents is observed). Nadales et al. in their narrative review also focussed on the contribution provided by INCREMENT-SOT project which is a large international retrospective cohort that includes nearly 800 consecutive SOT recipients diagnosed with bloodstream infection (BSI) due to ESBL-E and CRE between 2004 and 2016.⁸⁶²

For methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) bacteremia and pneumonia, vancomycin remains the preferred initial drug of choice and the dose should be adjusted as per the serum trough levels or AUC/MIC ratio. For bacteremia, infective endocarditis, pneumonia, and osteomyelitis target trough should be between 15 and 20 µg/ mL or AUC/MIC >400. Teicoplanin has been found to be as effective as vancomycin. Daptomycin can be used as an alternative agent where there is vancomycin intolerance or persistent bacteremia. It shouldn't be used for pneumonia as it is degraded by surfactant. Linezolid may be used for skin and soft tissue infection (SSTI) and nosocomial pneumonia. Ceftaroline, a fifth generation cephalosporin, has been approved for SSTIs, pneumonia (community acquired, nosocomial), but not particularly due to MRSA and is not approved for bacteremia. A lipoglycopeptide, dalbavancin has bactericidal activity against MRSA but is currently not approved for treatment of MRSA bacteremia.⁸⁶³

Evidence Statement

Carbapenems are effective for treatment of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae. For Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE), preferred antibiotics are ceftazidime/avibactam is preferred, whereas ceftazidime/avibactam plus aztreonam or cefiderocol monotherapy are useful in metallo-β-lactamase producing CRE. Tigecycline is useful in treatment of CRE infections outside the urinary tract, and in absence of bacteremia, as combination therapy. For MDR pseudomonas, effective drugs are antipseudomonal β-lactam or Ceftolozane/tazobactam or Ceftazidime/avibactam. For carbapenem resistant acinetobacter, high dose ampicillin-sulbactam, tetracycline derivatives (minocycline/ tigecycline), polymyxin B, or cefiderocol are options for combination therapy. For MDR *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*, combination therapy with two agents (TMP- SMX, minocycline/ tigecycline, cefiderocol, or levofloxacin) is effective. However, critically ill patients can be treated with ceftazidime-avibactam plus aztreonam. For MRSA, vancomycin with therapeutic drug monitoring has most evidence. Linezolid can be used for skin and soft tissue infection (SSTI) and nosocomial pneumonia. Teicoplanin is another efficacious alternative.

Recommendation

Empiric antibiotics for MDR pathogens should be chosen to cover the suspected pathogen spectrum and local microbiology (2A)

The Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Positive Patient in the Intensive Care Unit

AIDS in adults is defined by Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-confirmed HIV-positivity plus World Health Organization (WHO) stage IV disease (i.e., esophageal or bronchial candidiasis, wasting syndrome, central nervous system toxoplasmosis, *Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia (PCP), recurrent severe bacterial pneumonia, chronic herpes simplex infection, Kaposi's sarcoma, Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection, chronic cryptosporidiosis or isosporiasis, extrapulmonary cryptococcosis, disseminated

endemic mycosis [coccidiomycosis or histoplasmosis] or non-tuberculous mycobacterial infection, extrapulmonary tuberculosis (TB), HIV encephalopathy, cerebral B-Non-Hodgkin-Lymphoma, progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy (PML), symptomatic HIV-associated nephropathy, or cardiomyopathy) or immunological diagnosis with HIV-infection or first documented CD4+ cell count <200/µL.⁸⁶⁴ Since the first case report of HIV in 1981, we have come a long way. The HIV infected patients now have a normal life expectancy when treated with combination ART (cART). Successful HIV treatment can result in full suppression of the virus. cART is now started within 2 weeks of diagnosis as opposed to previous practice of delaying till the CD4 counts fell. Low CD4 cell counts predisposes patients to certain infections but in critical illness, the circulating CD4 count may be even lower as they are redistributed to the activated tissue.⁸⁶⁵⁻⁸⁶⁹

There is an increased risk of chronic conditions in HIV patients such as atherosclerosis, ischaemic heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, malignancy, renal and hepatic failure.⁸⁷⁰⁻⁸⁷² Improved Survival of this cohort in ICU has resulted from better treatment of HIV and better critical care practises. Fewer than 30% of the admissions to ICU are due to opportunistic infections.⁸⁶⁵ Acute respiratory failure, reduced conscious level and bacterial sepsis are the most common causes of admission to ICU, be it HIV infected or non-infected patient. Risk factors for increased mortality in critically ill HIV patients include cART naivity, CD4 lymphocyte counts < 200 mm³, viral loads ≥ 50 mm³, HIV-unrelated comorbid disease, malignancies, chronic liver disease and hepatitis C virus infection; high critical illness severity indexes; admission for medical rather than surgical reasons; and a need for invasive mechanical ventilation, vasopressor infusion, renal replacement therapy, thrombocytopenia, length of ICU stay, and severity of illness (high APACHE II or SOFA scores).⁸⁷³⁻⁸⁷⁶

The HIV Patient in ICU with Acute Respiratory Failure

Respiratory failure is the most important cause of ICU admission among HIV patients.

Recurrent pneumonia in a HIV patient is an AIDS defining condition. The incidence rate of serious bacterial infections was 0.87 per 100 person-years In the Strategic Timing of Anti Retroviral Treatment (START) study, and two-thirds of these infections were due to bacterial pneumonia.⁸⁷⁷ The causes of community acquired pneumonia are like non- HIV patients. The most common pathogens are viral infections, *Pneumocystis jirovecii*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, H. Influenzae, M. tuberculosis, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Escherichia coli* (Table 10).⁸⁷⁸⁻⁸⁸¹

The viral infections such as influenza and covid-19 are associated with higher mortality in HIV patients than non-HIV patients.⁸⁸² Antibiotics need to be given for a minimum of 5 days of treatment and may be stopped in case patients remain afebrile for 48 to 72 hours and are clinically stable. TB and PCP are the most common cause of respiratory failure in HIV patients, both accounting for 20% each as causes of respiratory failure in HIV patients. Individuals with HIV remain at higher risk for tuberculosis even with high CD4 counts. Table 11 enumerates risk factors for pseudomonas and staphylococcal infections in HIV infected patients.

Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia sets in slowly over weeks with increasing dyspnoea, dry cough and fever. It is treated with 3 weeks of cotrimoxazole (TMP (15–20 mg/kg/day) plus SMX (75–100 mg/kg/day) IV) . Alternative treatment is Pentamidine IV 4 mg/kg/day. Moderate to severe cases (PaO₂ 9.3 kPa [70 mmHg] or

Table 10: Etiology of acute respiratory failure in patients with HIV

Author/Country	Design	Study Population	Microbiology
Pecego et al, Brazil 2020 ⁸⁷⁸	Prospective observational study	49 patients People living with HIV With without SARI	Respiratory virus (9 SARI vs 13 non-SARI), bacteria (5 SARI vs 4 non-SARI), Mycobacterium tuberculosis (6 SARI group vs 7 non-SARI group), Pneumocystis jirovecii (4 SARI vs 1 non-SARI), Cryptococcus neoformans (1 SARI vs 3 non-SARI), and influenza A (1 SARI vs 2 non-SARI)
Maartens et al, South Africa, 2020 ⁸⁷⁹	Prospective cohort study	284 HIV-infected inpatients with World Health Organization danger signs and cough	148 culture-positive tuberculosis, 100 had community-acquired pneumonia (CAP), 26 had PCP <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i> and <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> were the commonest bacterial pathogens
Elabbadi et al, France, 2020 ⁸⁸⁰	Bicenter retrospective study	123 episodes of HIV infection in ICU	Rhinovirus was predominant, followed by Influenza and Respiratory Syncytial Viruses. non-viral copathogen in two-thirds of cases.
Hao et al, China 2023 ⁸⁸¹	Retrospective study	231 AIDS adult patients with respiratory failure who were admitted to the ICU	<i>Pneumocystis jirovecii</i> pneumonia (80.1%)

Table 11: Risk factors for Pseudomonas and Methicillin resistant Staphylococcal infections

Risk factors for <i>P. aeruginosa</i>	Risk factors for methicillin-resistant <i>S. aureus</i>
Advanced immunosuppression/ full blown AIDS (CD4 count ≤ 50 cells/mm ³)	Recent influenza infection;
underlying structural lung disease such as bronchiectasis	IV drug abusers
Profound neutropenia	Severe, bilateral, necrotizing pneumonia
Treatment with long term corticosteroids	Recent head injury
Severely malnourished patients	Patients on chronic hemodialysis
Those residing in nursing homes/ health care facilities or who had recent hospitalizations in the last 3 months.	
Patients on chronic hemodialysis	

SpO₂ 92%) should be given steroids within 72 hours for mortality benefit and reduction of duration of mechanical ventilation i.e. Prednisone PO 40 mg bid (D1–D5), 40 mg daily (D6–D10) then 20 mg daily (D11–D21), or methylprednisolone IV (75% of prednisone dose). Radiological findings include patchy or diffuse ground-glass opacities and alveolar consolidation with peripheral sparing, reticular infiltrates, intra-parenchymal cysts, without pleural effusion or mediastinal lymphadenopathy.^{871,883} Other rare pulmonary opportunistic infections include Kaposi sarcoma (HHV-8 human herpes virus -8), cytomegalovirus, toxoplasmosis, Mycobacterium avium complex, nocardiosis, aspergillosis, rhodococcosis, histoplasmosis, cryptococcosis, legionella, mycoplasma, chlamydia, etc. These are AIDS defining illness which occur when CD4 count falls below 200. Pulmonary TB presents typically as cavitary lesions but in immunocompromised patients may also present as diffuse millary patterns or in extrapulmonary sites. The treatment remains standard antitubercular drug therapy for 6-12 months i.e. Intensive phase (2 months): isoniazid + rifampin or rifabutin + pyrazinamide + ethambutol and Continuation phase: isoniazid + rifampin or rifabutin.⁸⁷¹ Disseminated Mycobacterium avium complex (MAC) disease may present as respiratory failure with diffuse reticulonodular pulmonary infiltrates. This should be treated with clarithromycin (500 mg PO two times daily) or azithromycin (500–600 mg) + ethambutol (15 mg/kg PO daily) for 12 months. Cytomegalovirus (CMV) reactivation is seen in severely immunocompromised patients with HIV (CD4 count < 50 cells mm³) It is characterized by diffuse interstitial pulmonary infiltrates.

It is treated with Ganciclovir 5 mg/kg IV q12h. The incidence of bacteremia accompanying pneumonia is greater than in individuals without HIV, especially when infection is due to *S. pneumoniae*. Predictors of mortality include CD4 count < 100 cells/mm³, radiographic progression of disease, and presence of shock.⁸⁷¹

Evidence Statement

Respiratory failure is the most important cause of ICU admission among HIV patients. Causes of community acquired pneumonia are similar to non-HIV patients. However, tuberculosis, and opportunistic infections (like Pneumocystis Jirovecii, cryptococcus, CMV) are also common, and can present with respiratory failure. Viral infections like influenza and covid-19 are other important causes. Increasing age, comorbidities, severity of illness, extent of organ dysfunction and cART naivety are predictors of increased mortality.

Recommendation

- Patients with severe pneumonia who require intensive care and without risk of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* should be empirically treated with an IV β -lactam plus IV macrolide (2A). Preferred β -lactams are ceftriaxone, cefotaxime, or amoxicillin-clavulanic acid. In patients who are allergic to penicillin, aztreonam plus azithromycin should be used (3A).
- If patients with HIV/AIDS develop acute respiratory failure and they have any of the risk factors (Table 1) for Pseudomonas infection we recommend dual antipseudomonal coverage such



as anti-pseudomonal β -lactam plus aminoglycoside (examples of anti-pseudomonal β -lactams include ceftazidime, ceftoperazone, ceftoperazone-sulbactam, piperacillin-tazobactam, imipenem-cilastatin, or meropenem (3A).

- In patients who are allergic to penicillin, aztreonam can be used in place of the β -lactam. Combination therapy may be considered with the addition of aminoglycosides or antipseudomonal fluoroquinolones (e.g., levofloxacin, ciprofloxacin) (3A).
- We recommend continuing Azithromycin along with anti-pseudomonal therapy for coverage of atypical pathogens (2B).
- We recommend against using fluoroquinolones empirically to avoid development of drug-resistant TB. Patients should also undergo sputum testing for acid-fast *bacilli* simultaneously if fluoroquinolones are being used (3A).
- In patients who have risk factors for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infection—empiric treatment should include vancomycin or linezolid (3A).
- Empiric therapy should cover *P. aeruginosa* or MRSA if previously isolated from sputum cultures (3A).
- Steroids are not indicated except in cases of refractory shock (2A).
- We suggest the addition of clindamycin (to vancomycin, but not to linezolid) in cases of severe necrotizing pneumonia to minimize bacterial toxin production (3B).
- Those with CD4 counts $<200/\text{mm}^3$ and without signs of focal consolidation may be suspected to have PCP (2A).
- All diagnosed cases of HIV should receive cART and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) for PCP prophylaxis to reduce the risk of pneumonia (1A).
- A switch to oral therapy should be considered in patients with community acquired pneumonia (CAP) on IV antibiotic therapy who have improved clinically, can swallow, and tolerate oral medications, and have intact gastrointestinal function (2A).
- cART should be initiated promptly within 2 weeks of initiating therapy for the pneumonia if not started (2A).
- Diagnostic work up of acute respiratory failure in HIV patient should consist of: (3A)
 - Complete blood count with CD4 cell count
 - Sputum microscopy and culture especially for acid fast bacilli (AFB), Nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) for TB.
 - Chest imaging, lung ultrasound
 - Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) for culture, staining with Gomori-Grocott or Giemsa or direct fluorescence antibody for PCP, PCR
 - Blood culture
 - BAL 1, 3 beta-D-glucan (BDG)
 - Urine antigen for *L. pneumophila* and *S. pneumoniae*
 - Serum LDH, BDG
- Rule out non-infectious causes of respiratory failure- COPD, Bronchiectasis, lung cancer, heart failure, lung fibrosis, interstitial pneumonitis, drug toxicity, asthma, pulmonary embolism (3A).

HIV Positive Patient Presenting with Signs of CNS Infection in ICU

Low CD4 counts predispose these patients to infections and development of tumours. The most common focal lesion is toxoplasmosis. In severely immunosuppressed patients with CD4 cell counts $<200/\text{mm}^3$, CNS mass lesions are most common. Common CNS opportunistic infections (OI) are toxoplasmosis,

tuberculosis, cryptococcosis Rare CNS OI are CMV, nocardiosis, aspergillosis, PML, HIV encephalitis, NHL, neurosyphilis.

In addition, multiple etiologies can coexist in an immunosuppressed individual.^{884–886}

TB meningitis typically presents with fever, focal neurological deficits, progressive cognitive decline and new-onset seizures. CSF suggests lymphocytosis, low glucose and increased protein. NAATs are highly specific. Treatment is as per national guidelines with four or more CNS penetrating drugs along with adjuvant steroid therapy (dexamethasone (0.3–0.4 mg/kg/day for 2–4 weeks, then tapering over 8–10 weeks).⁸⁷⁶

Cerebral toxoplasmosis presents as motor deficit, altered cognition and seizures. It is seen as ring enhancing lesions in brain, mostly in basal ganglia. Evaluation includes PCR for *T. gondii* in CSF sampling and a positive IgG test. Treatment is with a combination of pyrimethamine and sulfadiazine for 6 weeks or longer, with regular clinical and radiological review to monitor treatment response. Pyrimethamine 200 mg PO once then pyrimethamine 50–75 mg PO daily + sulfadiazine 1000–1500 mg PO q6h + leucovorin 10–25 mg PO daily. Corticosteroids are added to alleviate mass effect. Initial therapy is followed by chronic maintenance therapy by Pyrimethamine 25–50 mg PO daily plus sulfadiazine 2,000–4,000 mg PO daily (in 2–4 divided doses) plus leucovorin 10–25 mg PO daily.

Cryptococcal meningitis usually presents with low-grade fever, worsening headache, seizures, visual symptoms and a progressive cognitive deficit. Diagnosis includes India ink staining for cryptococcus and a positive CSF cryptococcal antigen test. MRI of the brain may reveal characteristic encephalitis, hydrocephalus and/or signs of raised intracranial pressure. Treatment includes induction therapy (>2 weeks): AmB-L 3–4 mg/kg IV daily plus flucytosine 25 mg/kg qid followed by Consolidation therapy (8 weeks from negative CSF): fluconazole 400 mg daily. For clinically stable patients with negative CSF cultures, dose can be reduced to 400 mg PO once daily and if CSF remains positive after 2 weeks, fluconazole increased to 1200 mg daily. Steroids are not indicated and are associated with worse outcomes. Maintenance therapy is with Fluconazole 200mg PO daily for ≥ 1 year from initiation of antifungal therapy.

Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS) is a concern when cART is started in undiagnosed or partially treated opportunistic infection and its incidence is 13%. Paradoxical worsening of treated OIs is called paradoxical IRIS and unmasking of previously subclinical untreated infections is called unmasking IRIS. IRIS is diagnosed when there is a temporal association between starting of cART and development of symptoms within 3 months, evidence of an inflammatory process through clinical signs and symptoms and evidence of immune restoration (virologic and immunologic response). In CNS infections, there may be neurological deterioration after starting cART because of IRIS. Except for the life threatening conditions, cART provides mortality benefit in setting of IRIS and should be continued.^{876,883,887}

Steroids should be given in patients with tuberculosis and *Mycobacterium avium* complex IRIS, but not in IRIS associated with Kaposi sarcoma.⁸⁸⁸ Progressive multifocal encephalopathy (PML) is caused by JC virus confirmed with Positive JCV PCR on CSF and presents with demyelinating white matter lesions. The treatment is to initiate or optimize cART. By all means, cART should be continued in the intensive care. Hurdles to implementation of the same are

availability of only enteral medicines, disturbances in gastric pH, renal hepatic dose modifications, drug interactions, etc.^{889,890}

Evidence Statement

Patients with HIV and low CD4 counts are prone to opportunistic CNS infections like toxoplasmosis, tuberculosis, cryptococcosis. Less common opportunistic CNS infections are CMV, nocardiosis, aspergillosis, and neurosyphilis. CNS mass lesions and lymphoma are also common with low CD4 counts, Multiple etiologies can often co-exist. Clinical and laboratory evaluation and prompt management is associated with improved outcomes.

Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS) is another differential if cART is started in undiagnosed or partially treated opportunistic infections.

cART should be continued in the HIV patients admitted to intensive care unit as much as possible.

Recommendation

- For a patient coming to ICU with altered CNS function and suspicion of meningitis, we recommend a third-generation cephalosporin- known to penetrate the blood-brain barrier - at higher doses, e.g., Ceftriaxone 2 gm BD intravenously (1A).
- We suggest the addition of vancomycin empirically to the initial treatment regime (1B).
- We recommend de-escalating antibiotics after culture reports are available (1A).
- In patients above 50 years of age, we suggest the use of additional ampicillin at high doses of 2 gm every 6th hourly (1B).
- In very young infants of age <1 month, we suggest Ampicillin plus cefotaxime or ampicillin plus an aminoglycoside as the initial management (1B).
- Diagnostic work up for CNS infection in HIV patient should consist of: (3A)
 - Complete blood count with CD4 cell count
 - Lumbar puncture, CSF (Cerebrospinal fluid) for cell count, glucose, protein, ADA (Adenosine deaminase), lactate, culture, PCR
 - For immunocompromised host- Toxoplasma gondi IgG antigen and antibodies, cryptococcal antigen (serum and CSF)
 - Brain imaging preferably MRI (Magnetic resonance Imaging)

HIV Positive Patients Presenting with Suspected Bloodstream Infections or Sepsis of Unknown Origin

Lack of cART, low CD4 count, alcohol abuse, smoking, and comorbidities such as liver disease are risk factors associated with bacteremia.⁸⁹¹ The common organisms seem to be nontyphoid Salmonellae, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and coagulase-negative Staphylococci (Table 12).^{889,892–897} Undifferentiated fever in patients with low CD4 counts may be due to viral syndromes such as CMV, Disseminated mycobacterial disease, disseminated fungal disease (cryptococcal disease, etc. Non-infectious etiologies should also be kept in mind such as drug reactions, malignancy, hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis (HLH) or IRIS, etc. Septic shock and multiorgan failure may occur during the course of disseminated OIs like toxoplasmosis, tuberculosis, and histoplasmosis. These infections commonly trigger hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis. Drug-resistant organisms are also seen more commonly in HIV patients. In the absence of any localizing symptoms, the diagnostic work up should include bacterial blood cultures, a serum cryptococcal antigen, fungal markers, such as a BDG, serum or urine *Histoplasma* antigen, *Coccidioides*-specific antigen testing, CMV viral load, mycobacterial isolator blood cultures.⁸⁶⁸ HIV patient with high CD4 count, undetectable viral load and adherence to cART, the differential diagnosis of any critical illness will be similar to non-HIV patient as both are immunologically similar. There is evidence that in-hospital mortality in HIV patients depends on age, underlying comorbidities and extent of organ dysfunctions and not HIV related parameters such as viral load, CD4 cell count, admission for AIDS-related diagnoses, and prior cART use.⁸⁷¹

Evidence Statement

Lack of cART, low CD4 count, alcohol abuse, smoking, and comorbidities such as liver disease are risk factors associated with bacteremia in HIV patients, Common organisms seem to be nontyphoid Salmonellae, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and coagulase-negative Staphylococci. Undifferentiated fever in patients with low CD4 counts may be due to viral syndromes such as CMV, Disseminated mycobacterial disease, disseminated fungal disease or noninfectious etiology. Disseminated opportunistic infections may trigger hemophagocytic

Table 12: Common organisms isolated from the bloodstream in patients with HIV

Author/Country	Design	Study Population	Microbiology
Michaëla et al, Netherland 2014 ⁸⁹²	Systematic literature review.	Hospitalized patients	Nontyphoid salmonellae (NTS), <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> , <i>Escherichia coli</i> , and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
Nadjm et al, Rural Tanzania 2012 ⁸⁹³	Prospective observational study and cohort study	Fever and 1 severity criterion	NTS 3 (25), <i>S. pneumoniae</i> 3 (25), <i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> 2 (17)
Kiertiburanakul et al, Thailand 2012 ⁸⁹⁴	Retrospective observational study	BSI in HIV patients	<i>Salmonella</i> spp 21 (26), <i>E. coli</i> 14 (18), <i>S. aureus</i> 12 (15)
Phe et al, Cambodia 2013 ⁸⁹⁵	Retrospective study using prospectively collected data	435 patients community acquired BSI	<i>E. coli</i> 27 (31), <i>S. aureus</i> 17 (19), NTS 16 (18)
Barr et al, 2020 ⁸⁹⁶	Meta-analysis, 23 datasets	5751 seriously ill patients	M tuberculosis BSI is a frequent manifestation of tuberculosis and predicts mortality (adjusted hazard ratio 2.48)
Qi et al, China 2016 ⁸⁹⁷	Retrospective cross-sectional study	2442 Chinese HIV-seropositive inpatients, 229 (9.38 %) experienced BSIs	<i>Cryptococcus neoformans</i> (22.7 %), <i>Penicillium marneffeii</i> (18.8 %), <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> (15.3 %), and non-tuberculous mycobacterium (14.8 %)

lymphohistiocytosis. Drug-resistant organisms are also seen more commonly in HIV patients. Extensive diagnostic work up is needed in HIV patients with sepsis of unknown origin. In-hospital mortality in HIV patients depends on age, underlying comorbidities and extent of organ dysfunctions and not HIV related parameters such as viral load, CD4 cell count, admission for AIDS-related diagnoses, and prior cART use.

Recommendation

- In the presence of sepsis or septic shock, we recommend following the surviving sepsis guidelines like the management of other patients with sepsis (UPP).
- In the absence of septic shock or absence of risk factors for *Pseudomonas* a monotherapy with a third-generation cephalosporin or a cephalosporin, the b-lactamase inhibitor is sufficient (2A).
- In more severe disease states, such as in the presence of organ dysfunction or septic shock—a combination of broad-spectrum antibiotics may be used for initial empiric therapy (3A).
- Empiric gram-positive coverage is suggested for those who have risk factors for MRSA (UPP).
- Anti-fungal agents may be considered only if there is no clinical improvement or there is clinical deterioration even after 72 hours of appropriate empirical antibiotics therapy and CD4 counts <200/mm³ (2A).
- We recommend against the use of routine empirical antifungal therapy (2A).

Congenital and Acquired Hyposplenism and Asplenia

Spleen is secondary lymphoid organ which filters organisms from the blood and also regulates immune response. Patients with congenital and acquired hyposplenism/asplenia are prone for specific infections, particularly by encapsulated bacteria (namely, *Neisseria meningitidis*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Hemophilus influenzae* type b). These patients are at increased risk of severe sepsis. Asplenia is predominantly due to splenectomy for either traumatic events or onco-hematological conditions. Although the incidence of sepsis remains low, the risk for overwhelming post-splenectomy infection (OPSI) is higher than in the general population.⁸⁹⁸ Even if most post-splenectomy infections (OPSI) are caused by encapsulated bacteria, other infections can also occur.^{899,900} The infection starts as a minor flu-like illness and rapidly evolves into a fulminant course of hypoglycemia, metabolic acidosis, dyselectrolytemia, disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC), shock, coma and death within 24 to 48h.⁹⁰¹ OPSI usually occurs within the first two years after splenectomy but may also occur later and has a mortality rate of 50%-70% despite aggressive therapy.⁸⁹⁹ In view of the severe progression and high mortality of OPSI, stress has been given for early aggressive treatment as well as immunization of patients with splenectomy and thereby preventing OPSI.

What Should be the Approach to Empiric Therapy in Patients with Hyposplenism or Asplenia who Develop Sepsis?

Splenectomy is often performed in patients with an underlying malignant or nonmalignant hematologic disease or in patients with splenic rupture after trauma or infection. Rarely there may be congenital absence of spleen. Other causes of hyposplenism include

auto infarction in subjects with sickle cell anemia and chronic graft-versus-host disease after stem-cell transplantation, severe celiac disease, and untreated human immunodeficiency virus infection.⁹⁰²

Overwhelming post-splenectomy infection (OPSI) is defined as an infection, occurring more commonly after splenectomy (or in hyposplenic host) which evolves over a short time and produces severe symptoms, often with hypotension and a high mortality rate.⁹⁰³

Patients with hyposplenism due to splenectomy or hyposplenism are at an increased risk for invasive infections with encapsulated bacteria as *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Haemophilus influenzae* type b, *Neisseria meningitidis*.^{899,904} Some splenic function may be preserved in post-splenectomy patients due to seeding of the peritoneum due to rupture or intentional implantation of splenic tissue performed during elective surgery. These infections progress rapidly from a mild flu-like illness to fulminant sepsis and are associated with a high mortality rate of up to 50% despite maximal treatment. The lifetime risk of OPSI is assumed to be 5%, and the highest frequency of these OPSI is during the first 2 years after splenectomy.^{903,905,906} Patients with sickle cell anaemia, thalassemia major or malignancies such as Hodgkin's lymphomas and non-Hodgkin's lymphomas have a higher risk for OPSI. Asplenic patients have a higher incidence of parasitemia, a delayed clearance of parasites after treatment or a severe or even fatal infection due to malaria. These patients are also at high risk for Babesiosis and this might be confused with *Plasmodium falciparum*.⁸⁹⁹ These patients are at an increased risk of OPSI with *Capnocytophaga canimorsus*, if bitten by dogs and other animals and should receive adequate antibiotic coverage following such bites.⁹⁰⁷ Otherwise rare, Ehrlichiosis is also more severe in patients with asplenia/hyposplenism.⁸⁹⁹

OPSI should be considered as a medical emergency and mandates early recognition and aggressive management. These patients should be managed aggressively including immediate cultures and administration of a combination of antibiotics to cover all possible etiological agents. In areas where penicillin-resistant pneumococci are prevalent, other agents such as vancomycin, teicoplanin or rifampicin should be added to ceftriaxone as the initial empiric therapy. Gram stain of the peripheral blood or buffy coat will give an idea regarding the presence or absence of intraleukocytic bacteria. Anti-pseudomonal coverage should be added in case of high risk for pseudomonas infection or peripheral blood growing GNB. The presence of intracellular bacteria within leukocytes should alert the clinician towards ehrlichiosis while the presence of parasites in RBC should alert for malaria or babesiosis. Once the blood cultures are positive antibiotics can be modified accordingly.

Evidence Statement

Patients with congenital and acquired hyposplenism/ asplenia are at high risk for encapsulated bacterial infections like *Neisseria meningitidis*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Hemophilus influenzae* type b. These patients are more likely to have severe sepsis, and overwhelming post-splenectomy infection (OPSI). OPSI can present with flu-like illness at onset, and rapidly progress to septic shock and death, and therefore needs prompt institution of antibiotics covering for both gram positive and gram negative organisms under close observation in high dependency or intensive care units.

Recommendation

- If an asplenic or hyposplenic patient is suspected to have sepsis we recommend administration of IV ceftriaxone before transferring the patient to a higher centre (2A).
- We recommend that all patients with Overwhelming Post-Splenectomy Infection (OPSI) be treated in the ICU (UPP).
- We recommend empiric antibiotic therapy for asplenic patients with a combination of ceftriaxone and vancomycin. (1A).
- In case of allergy to β -lactams, we recommend vancomycin with aztreonam or fluoroquinolones in adults. Do not delay administration of antibiotics, be prepared to treat reaction (UPP).
- We recommend to add clarithromycin or erythromycin in case of respiratory symptoms (3A).
- We recommend empiric therapy with IV Cefotaxime + vancomycin+ ampicillin, if the patient age <2 months (3A).
- All febrile asplenic patients should be screened for malaria with peripheral smears. Start artesunate based antimalarial therapy, if the history is suggestive of Malaria (UPP).
- If gram staining of peripheral blood smear shows gram negative bacilli, we recommend addition of antipseudomonal coverage to the therapy (3A).
- We recommend that urine be checked for urinary antigen for streptococcus pneumonia. (2A).
- We suggest RT-PCR test for simultaneous identification of 3 main encapsulated bacteria (Str pneumonia, H. influenzae type B and N. meningitidis) (3B).
- We recommend that all asplenic patients should receive immunization against encapsulated bacteria (S. pneumoniae, H. influenzae, and N. meningitidis) (1A).
- Immunization against seasonal flu is recommended for patients over 6 months of age (1A).
- Vaccination programs should be started no sooner than 14 days after splenectomy (1A).
- If the patient is discharged before 15 days after splenectomy or angioembolization, where the risk to miss vaccination is deemed high, we suggest that patient be vaccinate before discharge (1B).
- Antibiotic prophylaxis is indicated in patients for 1-2 years after splenectomy and lifelong for patient had an episode of overwhelming infection or immunocompromised (2B).
- We recommend self-administration of one dose of, in stock "pill in pocket", prescribed antibiotics in the event of any sudden onset of unexplained fever, malaise, chills or other constitutional symptoms, when medical consultation not readily accessible within 2 hours (2A).
- We suggest that any patient with sepsis having risk factor for hyposplenia, the peripheral smear should be checked for Howell-Jolly bodies. (2B)
- We recommend formulation of Spleen registry. (UPP).

Patients with Primary Immune Deficiency in the ICU

Primary immunodeficiencies is group of disorders that affect the development, function or both of the immune system. There are more than 300 disorders defined till date. The prevalence is approximately 1 in 10,000 live births.^{692,908,909} Any patient admitted to ICU could be a potential PID patient.

Diagnosis of PID

Diagnosis is often delayed since signs and symptoms such as bronchitis, pneumonia, sinusitis, diarrhea are considered infection related without suspecting immunological process.

Table 13: Absolute Lymphocyte count (ALC) nomogram

Age	Lymphocytes (per mm ³)	Range (per mm ³)
Neonatal	4.8	0.7-7.3
1 month- 2 month	6.7	3.5-13.1
2- 5 months	5.9	3.7-9.6
5-9 months	6.0	3.8-9.9
9-15 months	5.5	2.6-10.4
15-24 months	5.6	2.7-11.9
2- 5 years	3.3	1.7-6.9
5- 10 years	2.8	1.1-5.9
10-16 years	2.2	1.0-5.3
>16 years	1.8	1.0-2.8

Any value below the reference range should raise suspicion of PID

The absence of adenoid tissue in the nasopharynx or absence of the thymus should prompt suspicion of primary immunodeficiency (antibody or cellular/combined).

The presence of lymphocytopenia on complete blood count suggests a T-cell disorder, whereas a finding of neutropenia suggests a phagocytic disorder. Abnormal serum immunoglobulin levels suggest a B-cell disorder. Abnormalities on assay of the classic or alternative complement pathways suggest a complement disorder.⁹¹⁰ Abnormal values of lymphocyte count should also raise suspicion of PID (Table 13).

Patients with PID commonly present with recurrent infections and invasive infections, atypical pathogens, partial response to antibiotics, failure to thrive, chronic diarrhoea, fungal infections, unexplained skin rash and a family history. Infections such as Pneumonia and bronchiolitis, acute gastroenteritis, otitis media, and bacteraemia in patients with antibody, combined, and cellular deficiencies. Whereas viral infections meningitis, osteomyelitis, gastroenteritis is commonly seen in CVID. Children tend to have bacterial or fungal infections with unusual organisms, or unusually severe and recurrent infections with common organisms. A family history of primary immunodeficiency disease is the strongest predictor of a person having this type of disease.⁹¹¹

The typical presentations of various PIDs by age of presentation and spectrum of infections.

1. Combined T-cell and B-cell immunodeficiency (Presents early in life)
 - a) Bacteria: Campylobacter, Listeria, Pyogenic bacteria, Mycobacteria
 - b) Viruses: RSV, EBV, Parainfluenza Virus
 - c) Fungi: Candida, Aspergillus
 - d) Protozoa: Pneumocystis jiroveci, Toxoplasma Gondii, Cryptosporidium parvum
2. B cell immunodeficiency (Presents when weaning is started and breast feeding stops)
 - a) Bacteria: S. pneumonia, H. influenza, M. catarrhalis, P. aeruginosa, S. aureus, N. meningitidis, M. pneumonia
 - b) Viruses: Enteroviruses
 - c) Protozoa: Giardia lamblia
3. Congenital defects of phagocyte number and function (Can present at any age based on severity of the defect)
 - a) Bacteria: S.aureus, P. aeruginosa, Nocardia, S. typhi

Table 14: The types of clinical patterns of presentation and infections in PIDs

<i>Immunodeficiency</i>	<i>Infections</i>	<i>Example</i>
Antibody deficiency	Bronchiectasis, rhino sinusitis	HIV, Wiskott-Aldrich Syndrome
Phagocyte deficiency		
Complement deficiency		
T-lymphocyte deficiency	Chronic diarrhoea, Candida/ PCP, Mycobacteria	SCID /HIV
Neutrophil defects	Recurrent pyogenic infections, Invasive Aspergillus, Burkholderia	Chronic granulomatous disease (CGD)
Defects of innate immunity (TLR3)	Invasive pneumococcal disease	SCID/ HIV
T-lymphocyte deficiency	Herpes Simplex Encephalitis	Wiskott-Aldrich Syndrome
T-lymphocyte/macrophage deficiency	Meningococci, encapsulated bacteria or Candida/ Mycobacteria	
Common variable immunodeficiency (CVID)	Autoimmune or chronic inflammatory disease	Haemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis (HLH)

In ICU setting in patients with PID; following organisms are likely to cause infections

- b) Fungi: Candida, Aspergillus
- c) Mycobacteria: Nontuberculous including BCG
- 4. Complement deficiencies (Can present as early as within 6 months of life)
 - a) Bacteria: Streptococci, H. influenza, Neisseria,
 - b) Viruses: CMV, HSV

The European Society for Immunodeficiency (ESID) clinical guidelines⁹¹² proposed the grouping of immunodeficiency, syndromes and likely infections as follows (Table 14).

1. B cell deficiency
 - a) Pneumococcus
 - b) H. influenza
 - c) Staph Aureus
 - d) Giardia Lamblia
 - e) Viruses Enterovirus/echovirus
2. T cell deficiency
 - a) Mycobacteria
 - b) Viruses- CMV/EBV/HSV/RSV/VZ/ Parainfluenza
 - c) Fungi- P.carini, Histoplasma, cryptosporidium, Toxoplasma
3. Phagocytic disorder
 - a) Gram Negative: *E.coli*/ Klebsiella/ *B.cepacia*/ *Pseudomonas*/ *Serratia*
 - b) Gram positive: Staph/Nocardia/ Listeria
 - c) Fungus: Aspergillus and candida
4. Defects in the complement system: Streptococcus pneumonia and Neisseria
5. Mendelian susceptibility to mycobacterium (MSMD) : Mycobacteria, salmonella typhi and nontyphii, listeria, viral and other intracellular pathogens (e.g., Histoplasma, leishmania)^{913–918}

The data regarding the use of Antibiotics in Immunodeficiency states is scarce. The experts recommend using antibiotic as per organism isolated or expected. Generally the management depends upon the type of PID.

Therapy includes:

1. IV Immunoglobulin (IVIG) infusion mainly for B cell deficiency^{919–921}
2. Antibiotics as per suspected source of infection and suspected organism
3. Rituximab in PID with Epstein Barr virus reactivation

Stem cell transplant is the most curative option for majority of the PID. Paradoxically Rituximab treatment has known to aggravate primary immunodeficiency or hypogammaglobulinemia in certain group of patients and appropriate care has to be taken in these patients. In PID such as X-linked Lymphoproliferative disorder, Rituximab can be given once in 4 weeks to decrease the EBV Viral load.^{692,908,910}

Evidence Statement

A diagnosis of primary immunodeficiency should be considered in patients with serious infections. Significant family history, hematologic abnormalities like neutropenia, lymphopenia, recurrent infections, or infections with uncommon organisms can lead to evaluation for primary immunodeficiency. Recurrent sinopulmonary infections are seen with humoral immunodeficiencies. Recurrent infections with organisms like tuberculosis or endemic fungi should lead to evaluation for cell mediated immunodeficiency. Microbiologic diagnosis is important in patients with suspected immunodeficiency due to higher incidence of co-infections and drug resistant infections. In patients with primary immunodeficiency with serious infections, empiric coverage for causative organisms, including viruses and invasive fungal infections is practiced. Treatment for underlying immunodeficiency (e.g., intravenous immunoglobulin therapy) and comorbid autoimmune conditions improves outcomes.

Recommendations

- PID should be suspected when the following history/symptoms or signs are present: (UPP)
 - Family history of sibling death
 - Four or more ear infections within 1 year
 - Two or more serious sinus infections or pneumonias within 1 year
 - Two or more months on antibiotics with little effect
 - Two or more deep seated infections including septicemia
 - Persistent thrush in mouth or fungal infection on skin
 - Infections in multiple anatomic locations
 - Increasing frequency and severity of infections with age
 - Recurrent serious infections with common pathogens
 - Serious infections with unusual pathogens

- We recommend that when PID is suspected, HIV infection should also be considered, and testing should be performed for HIV (UPP).
- We recommend that patient should be investigated for PID when: (3A)
 - In neonates, Absolute Lymphocyte count (ALC) of $<2000/\text{mm}^3$ in cord blood or in an infant an ALC of $<4000/\text{mm}^3$
 - Severe hypogammaglobulinemia with IgG $<1\text{ 50mg/dL}$.
 - Absolute Lymphocyte count $<4000/\text{mm}^3$ (In non-chemotherapy setting)
 - Unusual organism picked up on microbiology
 - Unexplained neutropenia
- We recommend that Initial laboratory screening should include a complete blood count with differential counts (including Absolute Lymphocyte Count, Absolute Neutrophil Count, Absolute Monocyte Count) and measurement of serum immunoglobulin and complement levels (UPP).
- We recommend Severe Combined Immune deficiency (SCID) be considered as a pediatric emergency and attention be paid to Absolute Lymphocyte Count, at all time in ICU. If the Absolute Lymphocyte Count is less than normal for the age, we recommend to take immunology reference, use irradiated blood products, and avoid live vaccines till diagnosis is confirmed or ruled out (UPP).
- We recommend that patient be investigated for Combined Variable Immuno-deficiency (CVID) when patient has any of the following: (UPP)
 - Recurrent bacterial infections.
 - Serum IgG, IgM, IgA levels (at least two of the three) with a marked decrease (at least 2 SD below the mean for age)
 - Onset of immunodeficiency at more than 2 years of age.
 - Absence of isohemagglutinins and or poor response to vaccines.
- We recommend that immunology consult be obtained for these patients and the patient be investigated to diagnose specific form of immunodeficiency (UPP)
 - Lymphocyte subpopulations by Flow cytometry (CD3, CD4, CD8, CD19, CD20, CD16 & CD56).
 - Naive T cells, Memory B cells, Memory T cells
 - T-cell response to mitogens.
 - Nitroblue Tetrazolium-NBT test
 - Complement levels
 - Bone Marrow and Genetic tests
- We recommend for all critically ill patients with suspicion of PID the empirical antimicrobial treatment with IV Carbapenems with IV Vancomycin/Teicoplanin for broad spectrum coverage.(UPP, A). Voriconazole is the preferred antifungal in case of proven, possible or probable invasive fungal infection with aspergillus (IA).
- In critically ill patients diagnosed with Combined B and T cell deficiency the antimicrobial drug of choice is IV Carbapenems with Vancomycin/Teicoplanin and Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole (UPP).
- In critically ill patients diagnosed with Combined B and T cell deficiency with suspicion of viral infections, we recommend: (UPP)
 - IV Acyclovir if herpes group of infection is suspected
 - Oral Oseltamavir if Influenza virus is suspected
 - IV Ganciclovir if CMV is suspected radiologically or by laboratory tests
- In critically ill patients diagnosed with B cell deficiency, based on the organisms expected (Capsulated), we recommend IV ceftriaxone with IV Vancomycin/ Teicoplanin (UPP).
- We recommend IV Immunoglobulin (IVIg) at dose of 1 gm/kg weekly in cases of severe infections especially ECHO/Enterovirus/ Polio virus induced encephalitis (UPP).
- In critically ill patients diagnosed with Phagocyte disorder we recommend
 - antimicrobial drug of choice to be IV Carbapenems with IV Vancomycin/ Teicoplanin and Voriconazole (UPP)
 - We Recommend the use of Granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF) in patients of congenital Neutropenia (UPP).
- In critically ill patients diagnosed with complement deficiency the antimicrobial drug of choice is IV Cephalosporin (UPP).
- We recommend appropriate cultures, and PCRs; for organisms likely to cause infections pertinent to the conditions they are suffering from (UPP).
- Attempt should be made to identify the microorganisms directly or on PCRs as serological tests in infectious diseases could give false-negative results if there is an antibody defect (UPP).
- We recommend the use of Multiplex PCR to help diagnose infections (UPP).
- We recommend intravenous Immunoglobulin for treatment of all antibody deficiency diseases, at doses of 400 mg/kg/doses every 4 weekly. We recommend 2 gm/kg single dose (Severe Infections) or 1 gm/kg weekly till infection subsides (UPP).
- We recommend to maintain serum IgG trough levels above 500mg/dl and above 700 mg/dL in bronchiectasis (3A).
- We recommend thoracic computed axial tomography, lung function tests with spirometry and DLCO every 6 months after discharge (UPP).
- We recommend hematopoietic stem cell transplantation in cellular and macrophage immunodeficiency (UPP).
- We recommend monoclonal antibodies such as rituximab only in autoimmune complications related to CVID (UPP).
- We recommend Rituximab be given in PID complicated with EBV viremia (UPP).

What Should be the Approach to Vaccinations and Antimicrobial Prophylaxis at Discharge for Patients with Primary Immunodeficiency Requiring Intensive Care?

Vaccine recommendations should be earmarked only for patients certain PID. Live vaccines are avoided in patients with severe B- and T-cell dysfunction due to the risk of dissemination and the futility of immune response. All vaccines are safe and effective in the patients with complement deficiency(susceptibility to encapsulated organisms).⁹²²⁻⁹²⁴

Evidence Statement

Live vaccines are contraindicated in SCID whereas all vaccines are safe and effective in complement deficiency. Antifungal prophylaxis and PCP prophylaxis are important to prevent invasive life-threatening infections in patients with PID.

Recommendations

- All forms of live vaccines, viral and bacterial, are contraindicated in patients with SCID (UPP).
- We recommend vaccination for diagnosed patients with complement deficiency at time of discharge (UPP).

- We recommend avoiding BCG vaccination in Chronic Granulomatous Disease /MSMD patient (UPP).
- We recommend antifungal and anti PCP prophylaxis for all patients diagnosed with PID shifted from ICU (UPP).
- PID patients with chronic granulomatous disease should be treated with Itraconazole (IA) and Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole (2A).
- PCP prophylaxis should be given to all patients with Combined B and T or T cell deficiency with drug of choice being Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole (1A).
- We recommend antifungal prophylaxis in all patients with T cell defects (3A).

ORCID

Gopi C Khilnani <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0820-0624>
 Pawan Tiwari <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5136-4221>
 Saurabh Mittal <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7979-6405>
 Atul P Kulkarni <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5172-7619>
 Dhruva Chaudhry <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5138-2908>
 Kapil G Zirpe <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8140-727X>
 Subhash K Todi <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2306-6080>
 Anant Mohan <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2383-9437>
 Ashit Hegde <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4342-122X>
 Bharat G Jagiasi <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3068-1201>
 Bhuvana Krishna <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0003-6797>
 Camila Rodrigues <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6105-6660>
 Deepak Govil <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4624-1614>
 Divya Pal <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1607-3816>
 Jigeeshu V Divatia <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7384-4886>
 Manju Sengar <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3509-5682>
 Mansi Gupta <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-1911>
 Mukesh Desai <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9253-7934>
 Narendra Rungta <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9836-9466>
 Parikshit S Prayag <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2102-7627>
 Pradip k bhattacharya <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0219-385X>
 Srinivas Samavedam <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6737-8663>
 Subhal B Dixit <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1441-0807>
 Sudivya Sharma <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0608-8819>
 Susruta Bandopadhyay <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5732-5461>
 Venkat Raman Kola <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6971-1236>
 Vikas Deswal <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5758-2262>
 Yatin Mehta <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0888-4774>
 Yogendra P Singh <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5026-9978>
 Sheila N Myatra <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6761-163X>

REFERENCES

1. Khilnani G, Zirpe K, Hadda V, Mehta Y, Madan K, Kulkarni A, et al. Guidelines for antibiotic prescription in intensive care unit. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2019;23(Suppl 1):S1–S63. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23101.
2. Kulkarni AP, Chinnaswamy G, Desai M. Indian antimicrobial prescription guidelines in critically ill immunocompromised patients. *Indian J Crit Care Med* 2018;23(S1):64–96. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23102..
3. Álvarez-Lerma F, Grau S. Management of antimicrobial use in the intensive care unit. *Drugs* 2012;72(4):447–470. DOI: 10.2165/11599520-000000000-00000..

4. Abdul-Aziz MH, Sulaiman H, Mat-Nor MB, Rai V, Wong KK, Hasan MS, et al. Beta-lactam infusion in severe sepsis (BLISS): A prospective, two-centre, open-labelled randomised controlled trial of continuous versus intermittent beta-lactam infusion in critically ill patients with severe sepsis. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42(10):1535–1545. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-015-4188-0.
5. Dulhunty JM, Roberts JA, Davis JS, Webb SAR, Bellomo R, Gomersall C, et al. A multicenter randomized trial of continuous versus intermittent β -lactam infusion in severe sepsis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2015;192(11):1298–1305. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.201505-0857OC.
6. Roberts JA, Abdul-Aziz MH, Davis JS, Dulhunty JM, Cotta MO, Myburgh J, et al. Continuous versus intermittent β -lactam infusion in severe sepsis. A meta-analysis of individual patient data from randomized trials. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2016;194(6):681–691. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.201601-0024OC.
7. Vardakas KZ, Voulgaris GL, Maliaros A, Samonis G, Falagas ME. Prolonged versus short-term intravenous infusion of antipseudomonal β -lactams for patients with sepsis: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2018;18(1):108–120. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30615-1.
8. Hao JJ, Chen H, Zhou JX. Continuous versus intermittent infusion of vancomycin in adult patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2016;47(1):28–35. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2015.10.019.
9. [Internet]. Severe acute respiratory infections treatment centre [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/10665-331603>.
10. Huang G, Guo F. Loss of life expectancy due to respiratory infectious diseases: Findings from the global burden of disease study in 195 countries and territories 1990–2017. *J Popul Res Canberra ACT* 2022;39(1):1–43. DOI: 10.1007/s12546-021-09271-3.
11. Metlay JP, Waterer GW, Long AC, Anzueto A, Brozek J, Crothers K, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of adults with community-acquired pneumonia. An official clinical practice guideline of the American thoracic society and infectious diseases society of America. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med American Thoracic Society – AJRCCM* 2019;200(7):e45–e67. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.201908-1581ST.
12. Calderaro A, Buttrini M, Farina B, Montecchini S, De Conto F, Chezzi C. Respiratory tract infections and laboratory diagnostic methods: A review with a focus on syndromic panel-based assays. *Microorganisms* 2022;10(9):1856. DOI: 10.3390/microorganisms10091856.
13. Bartlow AW, Stromberg ZR, Gleasner CD, Hu B, Davenport KW, Jakhar S, et al. Comparing variability in diagnosis of upper respiratory tract infections in patients using syndromic, next generation sequencing, and PCR-based methods. *PLOS Glob Public Health. Public Library of Science* 2022;2(7):e0000811. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pgph.0000811.
14. Stojanovic Z, Gonçalves-Carvalho F, Marin A, Abad Capa J, Domínguez J, Latorre I, et al. Advances in diagnostic tools for respiratory tract infections: From tuberculosis to COVID-19 – changing paradigms? *ERJ Open Res* 2022;8(3):00113–2022. DOI: 10.1183/23120541.00113-2022.
15. Murdoch DR, Werno AM, Jennings LC. Microbiological diagnosis of respiratory illness. *KendigsDisord Respir Tract Child* 2019;396–405. e3. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-323-44887-1.00022-5.
16. Hanson KE, Azar MM, Banerjee R, Chou A, Colgrove RC, Ginocchio CC, et al. Molecular testing for acute respiratory tract infections: Clinical and diagnostic recommendations from the IDSA's diagnostics committee. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2020;71(10):2744–2751. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa508.
17. Nelson PP, Rath BA, Fragkou PC, Antalis E, Tsiodras S, Skevaki C. Current and future point-of-care tests for emerging and new respiratory viruses and future perspectives. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2020;10:181. DOI: 10.3389/fcimb.2020.00181.
18. Cheng GS, Crothers K, Aliberti S, Bergeron A, Boeckh M, Chien JW, et al. Immunocompromised host pneumonia: Definitions and diagnostic criteria: an official American thoracic society workshop report. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 20(3):341–353. DOI: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202212-10195T.

19. Fang W, Wu J, Cheng M, Zhu X, Du M, Chen C, et al. Diagnosis of invasive fungal infections: Challenges and recent developments. *J Biomed Sci* 2023;30(1):42. DOI: 10.1186/s12929-023-00926-2.
20. Stelrecht KA. Molecular testing for respiratory viruses. *Diagn Mol Pathol* 2017;123-137. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-800886-7.00011-X.
21. Greninger AL. The challenge of diagnostic metagenomics. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn* 2018;18(7):605-615. DOI: 10.1080/14737159.2018.1487292.
22. Wabe N, Li L, Lindeman R, Yimsung R, Dahm MR, McLennan S, et al. Impact of rapid molecular diagnostic testing of respiratory viruses on outcomes of adults hospitalized with respiratory illness: A multicenter quasi-experimental study. *J Clin Microbiol* 2019;57(4):e01727-18. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.01727-18.
23. Campbell AP, Guthrie KA, Englund JA, Farney RM, Minerich EL, Kuypers J, et al. Clinical outcomes associated with respiratory virus detection before allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2015;61(2):192-202. DOI: 10.1093/cid/civ272.
24. Dignan FL, Clark A, Aitken C, Gilleece M, Jayakar V, Krishnamurthy P, et al. BCSH/BSBMT/UK clinical virology network guideline: Diagnosis and management of common respiratory viral infections in patients undergoing treatment for haematological malignancies or stem cell transplantation. *Br J Haematol* 2016;173(3):380-393. DOI: 10.1111/bjh.14027.
25. Manuel O, Estabrook M, American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. RNA respiratory viral infections in solid organ transplant recipients: Guidelines from the American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13511. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13511.
26. Das S, Dunbar S, Tang YW. Laboratory diagnosis of respiratory tract infections in children - The state of the art. *Front Microbiol* 2018;9:2478. DOI: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.02478.
27. Vos LM, Bruning AHL, Reitsma JB, Schuurman R, Riezebos-Brilman A, Hoepelman AIM, et al. Rapid molecular tests for influenza, respiratory syncytial virus, and other respiratory viruses: A systematic review of diagnostic accuracy and clinical impact studies. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;69(7):1243-1253. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz056.
28. Ramanan P, Bryson AL, Binnicker MJ, Pritt BS, Patel R. Syndromic panel-based testing in clinical microbiology. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2017;31(1):e00024-17. DOI: 10.1128/CMR.00024-17.
29. Azar MM, Landry ML. Detection of influenza A and B viruses and respiratory syncytial virus by use of clinical laboratory improvement amendments of 1988 (CLIA)-Waived point-of-care assays: A paradigm shift to molecular tests. *J Clin Microbiol* 2018;56(7):e00367-18. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.00367-18.
30. Jullien S, Fitzgerald F, Keddie S, Baerenbold O, Bassat Q, Bradley J, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multiplex respiratory pathogen panels for influenza or respiratory syncytial virus infections: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Infect Dis* 2022;22(1):785. DOI: 10.1186/s12879-022-07766-9.
31. Gadsby NJ, Russell CD, McHugh MP, Mark H, Conway Morris A, Laurenson IF, et al. Comprehensive molecular testing for respiratory pathogens in community-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2016;62(7):817-823. DOI: 10.1093/cid/civ1214.
32. Lee SH, Ruan SY, Pan SC, Lee TF, Chien JY, Hsueh PR. Performance of a multiplex PCR pneumonia panel for the identification of respiratory pathogens and the main determinants of resistance from the lower respiratory tract specimens of adult patients in intensive care units. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect Wei Mian Yu Gan Ran Za Zhi* 2019;52(6):920-928. DOI: 10.1016/j.jmii.2019.10.009.
33. BioFire Diagnostics [Internet]. The BioFire® FilmArray® Pneumonia Panel [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from: <https://www.biofire.com/products/the-filmarray-panels/filmarray-pneumonia/>.
34. Skevaki CL, Papadopoulos NG, Tsakris A, Johnston SL. Microbiologic diagnosis of respiratory illness. *Kendig ChernicksDisord Respir Tract Child* 2012;399-423. DOI: 10.1016/B978-1-4377-1984-0.00024-3.
35. Cassidy H, Van Genne M, Lizarazo-Forero E, Gard L, Niesters HGM. A discussion of syndromic molecular testing for clinical care. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2021;76(Supplement_3):iii58-66. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkab243.
36. Dien Bard J, McElvania E. Panels and syndromic testing in clinical microbiology. *Clin Lab Med* 2020;40(4):393-420. DOI: 10.1016/j.cll.2020.08.001.
37. Kelly BT, Pennington KM, Limper AH. Advances in the diagnosis of fungal pneumonias. *Expert Rev Respir Med* 2020;14(7):703-714. DOI: 10.1080/17476348.2020.1753506.
38. Richardson M, Page I. Role of serological tests in the diagnosis of mold infections. *Curr Fungal Infect Rep* 2018;12(3):127-136. DOI: 10.1007/s12281-018-0321-1.
39. Haydour Q, Hage CA, Carmona EM, Epelbaum O, Evans SE, Gabe LM, et al. Diagnosis of fungal infections. A systematic review and meta-analysis supporting American Thoracic Society Practice Guideline. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2019;16(9):1179-1188. DOI: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201811-766OC.
40. Brendish NJ, Malachira AK, Armstrong L, Houghton R, Aitken S, Nyimbili E, et al. Routine molecular point-of-care testing for respiratory viruses in adults presenting to hospital with acute respiratory illness (ResPOC): A pragmatic, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2017;5(5):401-411. DOI: 10.1016/S2213-2600(17)30120-0.
41. Rappo U, Schuetz AN, Jenkins SG, Calfee DP, Walsh TJ, Wells MT, et al. Impact of early detection of respiratory viruses by multiplex pcr assay on clinical outcomes in adult patients. *J Clin Microbiol* 2016;54(8):2096-2103. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.00549-16.
42. Green DA, Hitoalij L, Kotansky B, Campbell SM, Peaper DR. Clinical utility of on-demand multiplex respiratory pathogen testing among adult outpatients. *J Clin Microbiol* 2016;54(12):2950-2955. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.01579-16.
43. Kitagawa K, Shigemura K, Onuma K, Nishida M, Fujiwara M, Kobayashi S, et al. Improved bacterial identification directly from urine samples with matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *J Clin Lab Anal* 2017;32(3):e22301. DOI: 10.1002/jcla.22301.
44. Huang B, Zhang L, Zhang W, Liao K, Zhang S, Zhang Z, et al. Direct detection and identification of bacterial pathogens from urine with optimized specimen processing and enhanced testing algorithm. *J Clin Microbiol* 2017;55(5):1488-1495. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.02549-16.
45. Lehmann LE, Hauser S, Malinka T, Klaschik S, Weber SU, Schewe JC, et al. Rapid qualitative urinary tract infection pathogen identification by SeptiFast® Real-Time PCR. *PLOS ONE. Public Library of Science* 2011;6(2):e17146. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0017146.
46. van der Zee A, Roorda L, Bosman G, Ossewaarde JM. Molecular Diagnosis of urinary tract infections by semi-quantitative detection of uropathogens in a routine clinical hospital setting. *PLoS One* 2016;11(3):e0150755. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0150755.
47. Wojno KJ, Baunoch D, Luke N, Opel M, Korman H, Kelly C, et al. Multiplex PCR based urinary tract infection (UTI) analysis compared to traditional urine culture in identifying significant pathogens in symptomatic patients. *Urology* 2020;136:119-126. DOI: 10.1016/j.urology.2019.10.018.
48. Robledo XG, Arcila KVO, Riascos SHM, García-Perdomo HA. Accuracy of molecular diagnostic techniques in patients with a confirmed urine culture: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Can Urol Assoc J J Assoc Urol Can* 2022;16(9):E484-E489. DOI: 10.5489/auj.7677.
49. Sabat AJ, van Zanten E, Akkerboom V, Wisselink G, van Slochteren K, de Boer RF, et al. Targeted next-generation sequencing of the 16S-23S rRNA region for culture-independent bacterial identification - increased discrimination of closely related species. *Sci Rep Nature Publishing Group* 2017;7(1):3434. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-017-03458-6.
50. Szlachta-McGinn A, Douglass KM, Chung UYR, Jackson NJ, Nickel JC, Ackerman AL. Molecular diagnostic methods versus conventional urine culture for diagnosis and treatment of urinary tract infection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EurUrol Open Sci* 2022;44:113-124. DOI: 10.1016/j.euro.2022.08.009.
51. Malik YS, Verma AK, Kumar N, Touil N, Karthik K, Tiwari R, et al. Advances in diagnostic approaches for viral etiologies of diarrhea: From the lab to the field. *Front Microbiol* 2019;10:1957. DOI: 10.3389/fmicb.2019.01957.

52. Iker BC, Bright KR, Pepper IL, Gerba CP, Kitajima M. Evaluation of commercial kits for the extraction and purification of viral nucleic acids from environmental and fecal samples. *J Virol Methods* 2013;191(1):24–30. DOI: 10.1016/j.jviromet.2013.03.011.
53. Wongboot W, Okada K, Chantaroj S, Kamjumphol W, Hamada S. Simultaneous detection and quantification of 19 diarrhea-related pathogens with a quantitative real-time PCR panel assay. *J Microbiol Methods* 2018;151:76–82. DOI: 10.1016/j.jmimet.2018.06.006.
54. Brendish NJ, Beard KR, Malachira AK, Tanner AR, Sanga-Nyirongo L, Gwiggner M, et al. Clinical impact of syndromic molecular point-of-care testing for gastrointestinal pathogens in adults hospitalised with suspected gastroenteritis (GastroPOC): A pragmatic, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis Elsevier* 2023;23(8):945–55. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00066-X.
55. Meltzer AC, Newton S, Lange J, Hall NC, Vargas NM, Huang Y, et al. A randomized control trial of a multiplex gastrointestinal PCR panel versus usual testing to assess antibiotics use for patients with infectious diarrhea in the emergency department. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open* 2022;3(1):e12616. DOI: 10.1002/emp2.12616.
56. Gupta D, Agarwal R, Aggarwal AN, Singh N, Mishra N, Khilnani GC, et al. Guidelines for diagnosis and management of community- and hospital-acquired pneumonia in adults: Joint ICS/NCCP(I) recommendations. *Lung India* 2012;29(6):27. DOI: 10.4103/0970-2113.99248.
57. Lim WS, Baudouin SV, George RC, Hill AT, Jamieson C, Jeune IL, et al. BTS guidelines for the management of community acquired pneumonia in adults: update 2009. *Thorax* 2009;64(Suppl 3):iii1–iii55. DOI: 10.1136/thx.2009.121434.
58. Eccles S, Pincus C, Higgins B, Woodhead M; Guideline Development Group. Diagnosis and management of community and hospital acquired pneumonia in adults: Summary of NICE guidance. *BMJ* 2014;349:g6722. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.g6722.
59. Burk M, El-Kersh K, Saad M, Wiemken T, Ramirez J, Cavallazzi R. Viral infection in community-acquired pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Respir Rev European Respiratory Society* 2016;25(140):178–188. DOI: 10.1183/16000617.0076-2015.
60. Woodhead M, Blasi F, Ewig S, Garau J, Huchon G, Ieven M, et al. Guidelines for the management of adult lower respiratory tract infections - Full version. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2011;17:E1–E59. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03672.x.
61. Jain S, Self WH, Wunderink RG, Fakhran S, Balk R, Bramley AM, et al. Community-acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalization among U.S. adults. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373(5):415–427. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1500245.
62. Carugati M, Aliberti S, Sotgiu G, Blasi F, Gori A, Menendez R, et al. Bacterial etiology of community-acquired pneumonia in immunocompetent hospitalized patients and appropriateness of empirical treatment recommendations: An international point-prevalence study. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Nature Publishing Group* 2020;39(8):1513. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-020-03870-3.
63. Vardakas KZ, Matthaïou DK, Falagas ME. Incidence, characteristics and outcomes of patients with severe community acquired-MRSA pneumonia. *Eur Respir J* 2009;34(5):1148–1158. DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00041009.
64. Gillet Y, Issartel B, Vanhems P, Fournet JC, Lina G, Bes M, et al. Association between *Staphylococcus aureus* strains carrying gene for Panton-Valentine leukocidin and highly lethal necrotising pneumonia in young immunocompetent patients. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2002;359(9308):753–759. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(02)07877-7.
65. Lobo LJ, Reed KD, Wunderink RG. Expanded clinical presentation of community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* pneumonia. *CHEST* 2010;138(1):130–136. DOI: 10.1378/chest.09-1562.
66. Self WH, Wunderink RG, Williams DJ, Zhu Y, Anderson EJ, Balk RA, et al. *Staphylococcus aureus* community-acquired pneumonia: Prevalence, clinical characteristics, and outcomes. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2016;63(3):300–309. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciw300.
67. Peto L, Nadjim B, Horby P, Ngan TTD, van Doorn R, Van Kinh N, et al. The bacterial aetiology of adult community-acquired pneumonia in Asia: A systematic review. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 2014;108(6):326–337. DOI: 10.1093/trstmh/tru058.
68. Vanlalruati RSC, Mamta Devi KSH, Singh NB, Singh NT. A study of bacteriological profile (aerobic) and antimicrobial susceptibility of community acquired pneumonia cases in the RIMS hospital. *J Commun Dis* 2012;44(1):47–49. PMID: 24455915.
69. Peto L, Nadjim B, Horby P, Ngan TTD, van Doorn R, Kinh NV, et al. The bacterial aetiology of adult community-acquired pneumonia in Asia: A systematic review. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 2014;108(6):326–337. DOI: 10.1093/trstmh/tru058.
70. Chawla R, Kansal S, Jain A, Jibhkatte B, Chauhan M. Predictors of mortality and length of stay in hospitalized cases of 2009 influenza A (H1N1): Experiences of a tertiary care center. *Indian J Crit Care Med* 2013;17(5):275. DOI: 10.4103/0972-5229.120318.
71. Krishnappa L, Marie M, John J, Dabwan K, Shashidhar P. Serological and molecular capsular typing, antibiotic susceptibility of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* isolates from invasive and non-invasive infections. *Acta Microbiol Immunol Hung* 2014;61(2):173–179. DOI: 10.1556/AMicr.61.2014.2.7.
72. Suryam V, Bhatti VK, Kulkarni A, Mahen A, Nair V. Outbreak control of community acquired pneumonia in a large military training institution. *Med J Armed Forces India* 2015;71(1):33–37. DOI: 10.1016/j.mjafi.2014.09.015.
73. Thomas K. Prospective multicentre hospital surveillance of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* disease in India. *The Lancet* 1999;353(9160):1216–1221. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(98)07228-6.
74. Thomas K, Mukkai Kesavan L, Veeraraghavan B, Jasmine S, Jude J, Shubankar M, et al. Invasive pneumococcal disease associated with high case fatality in India. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66(1):36–43. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.04.006.
75. Chudasama R, Patel U, Verma P, Amin C, Savaria D, Ninama R, et al. Clinico-epidemiological features of the hospitalized patients with 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1) virus infection in Saurashtra region, India (September, 2009 to February, 2010). *Lung India* 2011;28(1):11. DOI: 10.4103/0970-2113.76294.
76. Menon R, Menon U, George A. Etiology and anti-microbial sensitivity of organisms causing community acquired pneumonia: A single hospital study. *J Fam Med Prim Care* 2013;2(3):244. DOI: 10.4103/2249-4863.120728.
77. Song JH, Oh WS, Kang CI, Chung DR, Peck KR, Ko KS, et al. Epidemiology and clinical outcomes of community-acquired pneumonia in adult patients in Asian countries: A prospective study by the Asian network for surveillance of resistant pathogens. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2008;31(2):107–114. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2007.09.014.
78. Hageman JC, Uyeki TM, Francis JS, Jernigan DB, Wheeler JG, Bridges CB, et al. Severe community-acquired pneumonia due to *Staphylococcus aureus*, 2003–2004 influenza season. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2006;12(6):894–899. DOI: 10.3201/eid1206.051141.
79. Tong SY, Kearns AM. Community-associated MRSA from the Indian subcontinent. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2013;13(9):734–735. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(13)70231-7.
80. Khadanga S, Thatoi P, Behera S, Karuna T. Changing bacteriological profile and mortality trends in community acquired pneumonia. *J Glob Infect Dis* 2014;6(4):186. DOI: 10.4103/0974-777X.145251.
81. Bansal S, Kashyap S, Pal LS, Goel A. Clinical and bacteriological profile of community acquired pneumonia in Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. *Indian J Chest Dis Allied Sci* 2004;46(1):17–22. PMID: 14870864.
82. Naik M, Dhobi G, Shah B, Singh G. Bacteriological and clinical profile of Community acquired pneumonia in hospitalized patients. *Lung India* 2010;27(2):54. DOI: 10.4103/0970-2113.63606.
83. Madan R, Kairo AK, Sharma A, Roy S, Singh S, Singh L, et al. Aspiration pneumonia related deaths in head and neck cancer patients: A retrospective analysis of risk factors from a tertiary care centre in North India. *J Laryngol Otol* 2015;129(07):710–714. DOI: 10.1017/S0022215115001450.
84. Lakshmaiah KC, Sirsath NT, Subramanyam JR, Govind BK, Lokanatha D, Shenoy AM. Aspiration in head and neck cancer patients: A single centre experience of clinical profile, bacterial isolates and

- antibiotic sensitivity pattern. *Indian J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2013;65(51):144–149. DOI: 10.1007/s12070-013-0645-7.
85. Mathai AS, Oberoi A, Madhavan S, Kaur P. Acinetobacter infections in a tertiary level intensive care unit in northern India: Epidemiology, clinical profiles and outcomes. *J Infect Public Health* 2012;5(2):145–152. DOI: 10.1016/j.jiph.2011.12.002.
 86. Prasad P, Bhat S. Clinicomicrobiological study of community-acquired pneumonia. *Lung India* 2017;34(5):491–492. DOI: 10.4103/lungindia.lungindia_89_17.
 87. Deva A, Prasad SR, Madappa BP, Junjgowda K, Bachu RPN. Pneumococcal infections at a rural tertiary care hospital: A seven year study on isolation rate, clinical spectrum and antibiogram. *J Clin Diagn Res JCDR* 2014;8(2):50–52. DOI: 10.7860/JCDR/2014/7243.4005.
 88. Molander V, Elisson C, Balaji V, Backhaus E, John J, Vargheese R, et al. Invasive pneumococcal infections in Vellore, India: Clinical characteristics and distribution of serotypes. *BMC Infect Dis* 2013;13(1):532. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2334-13-532.
 89. Bharadwaj R, Bal AM, Joshi SA, Kagal A, Pol SS, Garad G, et al. An urban outbreak of leptospirosis in Mumbai, India. *Jpn J Infect Dis* 2002;55(6):194.
 90. Yende S, van der Poll T, Lee M, Huang DT, Newman AB, Kong L, et al. The influence of pre-existing diabetes mellitus on the host immune response and outcome of pneumonia: Analysis of two multicentre cohort studies. *Thorax* 2010;65(10):870–877. DOI: 10.1136/thx.2010.136317.
 91. Para RA, Fomda BA, Jan RA, Shah S, Koul PA. Microbial etiology in hospitalized North Indian adults with community-acquired pneumonia. *Lung India Off Organ Indian Chest Soc* 2018;35(2):108–115. DOI: 10.4103/lungindia.lungindia_288_17.
 92. Montull B, Menéndez R, Torres A, Reyes S, Méndez R, Zalacain R, et al. Predictors of severe sepsis among patients hospitalized for community-acquired pneumonia. *PLOS ONE Public Library of Science* 2016;11(1):e0145929. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0145929.
 93. Liu C, Bayer A, Cosgrove SE, Daum RS, Fridkin SK, Gorwitz RJ, et al. Clinical practice guidelines by the infectious diseases society of america for the treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in adults and children. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2011;52(3):e18–e55. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciq146.
 94. Bassetti M, Labate L, Melchio M, Robba C, Battaglini D, Ball L, et al. Current pharmacotherapy for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) pneumonia. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* 2022;23(3):361–375. DOI: 10.1080/14656566.2021.2010706.
 95. Brown NM, Goodman AL, Horner C, Jenkins A, Brown EM. Treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA): Updated guidelines from the UK. *JAC-Antimicrob Resist* 2021;3(1):dlaa114. DOI: 10.1093/jacamr/dlaa114.
 96. Mahjabeen F, Saha U, Mostafa MN, Siddique F, Ahsan E, Fathma S, et al. An update on treatment options for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) bacteremia: A systematic review. *Cureus* 2021;13(11):e31486. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.31486.
 97. Timbrook TT, McKay L, Sutton JD, Spivak ES. Disproportionality analysis of safety with nafcillin and oxacillin with the fda adverse event reporting system (FAERS). *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2020;64(3):e01818-19. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.01818-19.
 98. Wunderink RG, Niederman MS, Kollef MH, Shorr AF, Kunkel MJ, Baruch A, et al. Linezolid in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* nosocomial pneumonia: A randomized, controlled study. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2012;54(5):621–629. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cir895.
 99. Kato H, Hagihara M, Asai N, Shibata Y, Koizumi Y, Yamagishi Y, et al. Meta-analysis of vancomycin versus linezolid in pneumonia with proven methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist* 2021;24:98–105. DOI: 10.1016/j.jgar.2020.12.009.
 100. Stets R, Popescu M, Gonong JR, Mitha I, Nseir W, Madej A, et al. Omadacycline for community-acquired bacterial pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380(6):517–527. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1800201.
 101. Ramirez JA, Tzanis E, Curran M, Noble R, Chitra S, Manley A, et al. Early clinical response in community-acquired bacterial pneumonia: From clinical endpoint to clinical practice. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;69(Suppl 1):S33–S39. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz397.
 102. Alexander E, Goldberg L, Das AF, Moran GJ, Sandrock C, Gasink LB, et al. Oral lefamulin vs moxifloxacin for early clinical response among adults with community-acquired bacterial pneumonia: The leap 2 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2019;322(17):1661–1671. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2019.15468.
 103. File TM, Goldberg L, Das A, Sweeney C, Saviski J, Gelone SP, et al. Efficacy and safety of intravenous-to-oral lefamulin, a pleuromutilin antibiotic, for the treatment of community-acquired bacterial pneumonia: The phase iii lefamulin evaluation against pneumonia (leap 1) trial. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;69(11):1856–1867. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz090.
 104. Horcajada JP, Salata RA, Álvarez-Sala R, Nitu FM, Lawrence L, Quintas M, et al. A phase 3 study to compare delafloxacin with moxifloxacin for the treatment of adults with community-acquired bacterial pneumonia (DEFINE-CABP). *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2020;7(1):ofz514. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofz514.
 105. Saravolatz LD, Stein GE. Delafloxacin: A New anti-methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus fluoroquinolone. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;68(6):1058–1062. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy600.
 106. Webb BJ, Dascomb K, Stenehjem E, Dean N. Predicting risk of drug-resistant organisms in pneumonia: Moving beyond the HCAP model. *Respir Med* 2015;109(1):1–10. DOI: 10.1016/j.rmed.2014.10.017.
 107. Aliberti S, Reyes LF, Faverio P, Sotgiu G, Dore S, Rodriguez AH, et al. Global initiative for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* pneumonia (GLIMP): An international, observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2016;16(12):1364–1376. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30267-5.
 108. Restrepo MI, Babu BL, Reyes LF, Chalmers JD, Soni NJ, Sibila O, et al. Burden and risk factors for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* community-acquired pneumonia: A multinational point prevalence study of hospitalised patients. *Eur Respir J* 2018;52(2):1701190. DOI: 10.1183/13993003.01190-2017.
 109. Prina E, Ranzani OT, Polverino E, Cillóniz C, Ferrer M, Fernandez L, et al. Risk factors associated with potentially antibiotic-resistant pathogens in community-acquired pneumonia. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2015;12(2):153–160. DOI: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201407-305OC.
 110. Sibila O, Laserna E, Maselli DJ, Fernandez JF, Mortensen EM, Anzueto A, et al. Risk factors and antibiotic therapy in *P. aeruginosa* community-acquired pneumonia. *Respirol Carlton Vic* 2015;20(4):660–666. DOI: 10.1111/resp.12506.
 111. Falguera M, Carratalà J, Ruiz-Gonzalez A, Garcia-Vidal C, Gazquez I, Dorca J, et al. Risk factors and outcome of community-acquired pneumonia due to gram-negative bacilli. *Respirol Carlton Vic* 2009;14(1):105–111. DOI: 10.1111/j.1440-1843.2008.01371.x.
 112. Cilloniz C, Martin-Loeches I, Garcia-Vidal C, San Jose A, Torres A. Microbial etiology of pneumonia: Epidemiology, diagnosis and resistance patterns. *Int J Mol Sci* 2016;17(12). DOI: 10.3390/ijms17122120.
 113. Khilnani GC, Tiwari P, Zirpe KG, Chaudhry D, Govil D, Dixit S, et al. Guidelines for the use of procalcitonin for rational use of antibiotics. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2022;26(Suppl 2):S77–S94. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-24326.
 114. Huang DT, Yealy DM, Filbin MR, Brown AM, Chang C-CH, Doi Y, et al. Procalcitonin-guided use of antibiotics for lower respiratory tract infection. *N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society* 2018;379(3):236–249. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1802670.
 115. de Jong E, van Oers JA, Beishuizen A, Vos P, Vermeijden WJ, Haas LE, et al. Efficacy and safety of procalcitonin guidance in reducing the duration of antibiotic treatment in critically ill patients: A randomised, controlled, open-label trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2016;16(7):819–827. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(16)00053-0.
 116. Self WH, Balk RA, Grijalva CG, Williams DJ, Zhu Y, Anderson EJ, et al. Procalcitonin as a marker of etiology in adults hospitalized with community-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2017;65(2):183–190. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cix317.

117. Kamat IS, Ramachandran V, Eswaran H, Guffey D, Musher DM. Procalcitonin to distinguish viral from bacterial pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2020;70(3):538–542. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz545.
118. Schuetz P, Wirz Y, Sager R, Christ-Crain M, Stolz D, Tamm M, et al. Procalcitonin to initiate or discontinue antibiotics in acute respiratory tract infections. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017;10:CD007498. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007498.pub3.
119. Yu KT, Wyr PC. Evidence behind the 4-hour rule for initiation of antibiotic therapy in community-acquired pneumonia. *Ann Emerg Med* 2008;51(5):651–662.e2. DOI: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2007.10.022.
120. Sterling SA, Miller WR, Pryor J, Puskarich MA, Jones AE. The impact of timing of antibiotics on outcomes in severe sepsis and septic shock: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care Med* 2015;43(9):1907–1915. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001142.
121. Liu VX, Fielding-Singh V, Greene JD, Baker JM, Iwashyna TJ, Bhattacharya J, et al. The timing of early antibiotics and hospital mortality in sepsis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017;196(7):856–863. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.201609-1848OC.
122. Falguera M, Ruiz-González A, Schoenenberger JA, Touzón C, Gázquez I, Galindo C, et al. Prospective, randomised study to compare empirical treatment versus targeted treatment on the basis of the urine antigen results in hospitalised patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *Thorax* 2010;65(2):101–106. DOI: 10.1136/thx.2009.118588.
123. Eerden MM van der, Vlaspoelder F, Graaff CS de, Groot T, Bronsveld W, Jansen HM, et al. Comparison between pathogen directed antibiotic treatment and empirical broad spectrum antibiotic treatment in patients with community acquired pneumonia: A prospective randomised study. *Thorax* 2005;60(8):672–678. DOI: 10.1136/thx.2004.030411.
124. Uematsu H, Hashimoto H, Iwamoto T, Horiguchi H, Yasunaga H. Impact of guideline-concordant microbiological testing on outcomes of pneumonia. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2014;26(1):100–107. DOI: 10.1093/intqhc/mzt078.
125. Lidman C, Burman LG, Lagergren Å, Örtqvist Å. Limited value of routine microbiological diagnostics in patients hospitalized for community-acquired pneumonia. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2002;34:873–879. DOI: 10.1080/0036554021000026967.
126. Meehan TP, Fine MJ, Krumholz HM, Scinto JD, Galusha DH, Mockalis JT, et al. Quality of care, process, and outcomes in elderly patients with pneumonia. *JAMA* 1997;278(23):2080–2084. PMID: 9403422.
127. Darie AM, Khanna N, Jahn K, Osthoff M, Bassetti S, Osthoff M, et al. Fast multiplex bacterial PCR of bronchoalveolar lavage for antibiotic stewardship in hospitalised patients with pneumonia at risk of Gram-negative bacterial infection (Flagship II): A multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med*. Elsevier 2022;10(9):877–887. DOI: 10.1016/S2213-2600(22)00086-8.
128. Cartuliales MB, Rosenvinge FS, Mogensen CB, Skovsted TA, Andersen SL, Østergaard C, et al. Evaluation of point-of-care multiplex polymerase chain reaction in guiding antibiotic treatment of patients acutely admitted with suspected community-acquired pneumonia in Denmark: A multicentre randomised controlled trial. *PLOS Med Public Library of Science* 2023;20(11):e1004314. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1004314.
129. Buchan BW, Windham S, Balada-Llasat JM, Leber A, Harrington A, Relich R, et al. Practical comparison of the biofirefilmarray pneumonia panel to routine diagnostic methods and potential impact on antimicrobial stewardship in adult hospitalized patients with lower respiratory tract infections. *J Clin Microbiol American Society for Microbiology* 2020;58(7):e00135-20. DOI: 10.1128/jcm.00135-20.
130. Sistani SS, Parooie F. Diagnostic performance of ultrasonography in patients with pneumonia: An updated comparative systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Diagn Med Sonogr SAGE Publications Inc STM* 2021;37(4):371–381. DOI: 10.1177/8756479321992348.
131. Alzahrani SA, Al-Salamah MA, Al-Madani WH, Elbarbary MA. Systematic review and meta-analysis for the use of ultrasound versus radiology in diagnosing of pneumonia. *Crit Ultrasound J* 2017;9:6. DOI: 10.1186/s13089-017-0059-y.
132. Javudin F, Marjanovic N, de Carvalho H, Gaborit B, Le Bastard Q, Boucher E, et al. Contribution of lung ultrasound in diagnosis of community-acquired pneumonia in the emergency department: A prospective multicentre study. *BMJ Open* 2021;11(9):e046849. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046849.
133. Claessens YE, Debray MP, Tubach F, Brun AL, Rammaert B, Hausfater P, et al. Early chest computed tomography scan to assist diagnosis and guide treatment decision for suspected community-acquired pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2015;192(8):974–982. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.201501-0017OC.
134. Prendki V, Scheffler M, Huttner B, Garin N, Herrmann F, Janssens JP, et al. Low-dose computed tomography for the diagnosis of pneumonia in elderly patients: A prospective, interventional cohort study. *Eur Respir J* 2018;51(5):1702375. DOI: 10.1183/13993003.02375-2017.
135. Sligl WI, Asadi L, Eurich DT, Tjosvold L, Marrie TJ, Majumdar SR. Macrolides and mortality in critically ill patients with community-acquired pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care Med* 2014;42(2):420–432. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3182a66b9b.
136. Adrie C, Schwebel C, Garrouste-Orgeas M, Vignoud L, Planquette B, Azoulay E, et al. Initial use of one or two antibiotics for critically ill patients with community-acquired pneumonia: Impact on survival and bacterial resistance. *Crit Care* 2013;17:R265. DOI: 10.1186/cc13095.
137. Gattarello S, Borgatta B, Solé-Violán J, Vallés J, Vidaur L, Zaragoza R, et al. Decrease in mortality in severe community-acquired pneumococcal pneumonia. *Chest* 2014;146(1):22–31. DOI: 10.1378/chest.13-1531.
138. Lee JH, Kim HJ, Kim YH. Is β -lactam plus macrolide more effective than β -lactam plus fluoroquinolone among patients with severe community-acquired pneumonia? A systemic review and meta-analysis. *J Korean Med Sci* 2017;32(1):77–84. DOI: 10.3346/jkms.2017.32.1.77.
139. Reyes LF, Garcia E, Ibáñez-Prada ED, Serrano-Mayorga CC, Fuentes YV, Rodríguez A, et al. Impact of macrolide treatment on long-term mortality in patients admitted to the ICU due to CAP: A targeted maximum likelihood estimation and survival analysis. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 2023;27(1):212. DOI: 10.1186/s13054-023-04466-x.
140. Chang KC, Leung CC, Yew WW, Lau TY, Leung WM, Tam CM, et al. Newer fluoroquinolones for treating respiratory infection: Do they mask tuberculosis? *Eur Respir J* 2010;35(3):606–613. DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00104209.
141. von Baum H, Welte T, Marre R, Suttorp N, Ewig S, CAPNETZ study group. Community-acquired pneumonia through Enterobacteriaceae and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: Diagnosis, incidence and predictors. *Eur Respir J* 2010;35(3):598–605. DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00091809.
142. Arancibia F, Bauer TT, Ewig S, Mensa J, Gonzalez J, Niederman MS, et al. Community-acquired pneumonia due to gram-negative bacteria and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: Incidence, risk, and prognosis. *Arch Intern Med* 2002;162(16):1849–1858. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.162.16.1849.
143. Cillóniz C, Gabarrús A, Ferrer M, Puig de la Bellacasa J, Rinaudo M, Mensa J, et al. Community-acquired pneumonia due to multidrug- and non-multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Chest* 2016;150(2):415–425. DOI: 10.1016/j.chest.2016.03.042.
144. Rello J, Rodríguez A, Torres A, Roig J, Sole-Violan J, Garnacho-Montero J, et al. Implications of COPD in patients admitted to the intensive care unit by community-acquired pneumonia. *Eur Respir J* 2006;27(6):1210–1216. DOI: 10.1183/09031936.06.00139305.
145. Vila-Corcoles A, Ochoa-Gondar O, Rodríguez-Blanco T, Raga-Luria X, Gomez-Bertomeu F, EPIVAC Study Group. Epidemiology of community-acquired pneumonia in older adults: A population-based study. *Respir Med* 2009;103(2):309–316. DOI: 10.1016/j.rmed.2008.08.006.
146. Reynolds D, Kollef M. The epidemiology and pathogenesis and treatment of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infections: An update. *Drugs* 2021;81(18):2117–2131. DOI: 10.1007/s40265-021-01635-6.

147. Carballo N, De Antonio-Cuscó M, Echeverría-Esnal D, Luque S, Salas E, Grau S. Community-acquired pneumonia caused by methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in critically-ill patients: Systematic review. *Farm Hosp Organo Of ExpresionCient Soc Espanola Farm Hosp* 2017;41(2):187–203. DOI: 10.7399/fh.2017.41.2.10591.
148. Mandell LA, Wunderink RG, Anzueto A, Bartlett JG, Campbell GD, Dean NC, et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America/American Thoracic Society consensus guidelines on the management of community-acquired pneumonia in adults. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2007;44 Suppl 2:S27–S72. DOI: 10.1086/511159.
149. Lorber B, Swenson RM. Bacteriology of aspiration pneumonia. A prospective study of community- and hospital-acquired cases. *Ann Intern Med* 1974;81(3):329–331. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-81-3-329.
150. Cesar L, Gonzalez C, Calia FM. Bacteriologic flora of aspiration-induced pulmonary infections. *Arch Intern Med* 1975;135(5):711–714. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.135.5.711.
151. Brook I, Frazier EH. Aerobic and anaerobic microbiology of empyema. A retrospective review in two military hospitals. *Chest* 1993;103(5):1502–1507. DOI: 10.1378/chest.103.5.1502.
152. Bartlett JG. Anaerobic bacterial infections of the lung and pleural space. *Clin Infect Dis* 1993;16(Supplement_4):S248–S255. DOI: 10.1093/clinids/16.Supplement_4.S248.
153. Tahon-Castel MM, Beerens H. Anaerobiosis of bucco-dental origin. *Rev Stomatodontol Nord Fr* 1965;20(77):13–22. PMID: 5849460.
154. Gudiol F, Manresa F, Pallares R, Dorca J, Rufi G, Boada J, et al. Clindamycin vs penicillin for anaerobic lung infections. High rate of penicillin failures associated with penicillin-resistant *Bacteroides melaninogenicus*. *Arch Intern Med* 1990;150(12):2525–2529. PMID: 1978771.
155. Bartlett JG. The role of anaerobic bacteria in lung abscess. *Clin infect dis* 2005;40(7):923–925. DOI: 10.1086/428586.
156. Mori T, Ebe T, Takahashi M, Isonuma H, Ikemoto H, Oguri T. Lung abscess: Analysis of 66 cases from 1979 to 1991. *Intern Med* 1993;32(4):278–284. DOI: 10.2169/internalmedicine.32.278.
157. Wang JL, Chen KY, Fang CT, Hsueh PR, Yang PC, Chang SC. Changing bacteriology of adult community-acquired lung abscess in Taiwan: *Klebsiella pneumoniae* versus anaerobes. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2005;40(7):915–922. DOI: 10.1086/428574.
158. Yamasaki K, Kawanami T, Yatera K, Fukuda K, Noguchi S, Nagata S, et al. Significance of anaerobes and oral bacteria in community-acquired pneumonia. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8(5). DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0063103.
159. Griffith DE, Aksamit T, Brown-Elliott BA, Catanzaro A, Daley C, Gordin F, et al. An official ATS/IDSA statement: Diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of nontuberculous mycobacterial diseases. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2007;175(4):367–416. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.200604-571ST.
160. Marin-Corral J, Pascual-Guardia S, Amati F, Aliberti S, Masclans JR, Soni N, et al. Aspiration risk factors, microbiology, and empiric antibiotics for patients hospitalized with community-acquired pneumonia. *Chest* 2021;159(1):58–72. DOI: 10.1016/j.chest.2020.06.079.
161. Levison ME, Mangura CT, Lorber B, Abrutyn E, Pesanti EL, Levy RS, et al. Clindamycin compared with penicillin for the treatment of anaerobic lung abscess. *Ann Intern Med* 1983;98(4):466–471. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-98-4-466.
162. Kadowaki M, Demura Y, Mizuno S, Uesaka D, Ameshima S, Miyamori I, et al. Reappraisal of clindamycin IV monotherapy for treatment of mild-to-moderate aspiration pneumonia in elderly patients. *Chest* 2005;127(4):1276–1282. DOI: 10.1378/chest.127.4.1276.
163. Allewelt M, Schüller P, Bölskei PL, Mauch H, Lode H, Study Group on Aspiration Pneumonia. Ampicillin + sulbactam vs clindamycin +/- cephalosporin for the treatment of aspiration pneumonia and primary lung abscess. *Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2004;10(2):163–170. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2004.00774.x.
164. Ott SR, Allewelt M, Lorenz J, Reimnitz P, Lode H, German Lung Abscess Study Group. Moxifloxacin vs ampicillin/sulbactam in aspiration pneumonia and primary lung abscess. *Infection* 2008;36(1):23–30. DOI: 10.1007/s15010-007-7043-6.
165. Sun T, Sun L, Wang R, Ren X, Sui DJ, Pu C, et al. Clinical efficacy and safety of moxifloxacin versus levofloxacin plus metronidazole for community-acquired pneumonia with aspiration factors. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2014;127(7):1201–1205. PMID: 24709166.
166. Dunbar LM, Wunderink RG, Habib MP, Smith LG, Tennenberg AM, Khashab MM, et al. High-dose, short-course levofloxacin for community-acquired pneumonia: A new treatment paradigm. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2003;37(6):752–760. DOI: 10.1086/377539.
167. Choudhury G, Mandal P, Singanayagam A, Akram AR, Chalmers JD, Hill AT. Seven-day antibiotic courses have similar efficacy to prolonged courses in severe community-acquired pneumonia – A propensity-adjusted analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2011;17(12):1852–1858. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03542.x.
168. Wan YD, Sun TW, Liu ZQ, Zhang SG, Wang LX, Kan QC. Efficacy and safety of corticosteroids for community-acquired pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Chest* 2016;149(1):209–219. DOI: 10.1378/chest.15-1733.
169. Meduri GU, Shih MC, Bridges L, Martin TJ, El-Solh A, Seam N, et al. Low-dose methylprednisolone treatment in critically ill patients with severe community-acquired pneumonia. *Intensive Care Med* 2022;48(8):1009–1023. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-022-06684-3.
170. Saleem N, Kulkarni A, Snow TAC, Ambler G, Singer M, Arulkumaran N. Effect of corticosteroids on mortality and clinical cure in community-acquired pneumonia: A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression of randomized control trials. *CHEST Elsevier* 2023;163(3):484–497. DOI: 10.1016/j.chest.2022.08.2229.
171. Dequin PF, Meziani F, Quenot JP, Kamel T, Ricard JD, Badie J, et al. Hydrocortisone in severe community-acquired pneumonia. *N Engl J Med Massachusetts Medical Society* 2023;388(21):1931–1941. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2215145.
172. Ito A, Ishida T, Tokumasu H, Washio Y, Yamazaki A, Ito Y, et al. Impact of procalcitonin-guided therapy for hospitalized community-acquired pneumonia on reducing antibiotic consumption and costs in Japan. *J Infect Chemother Off J Jpn Soc Chemother* 2017;23(3):142–147. DOI: 10.1016/j.jiac.2016.11.006.
173. Montassier E, Javaudin F, Moustafa F, Nandjou D, Maignan M, Hardouin JB, et al. Guideline-based clinical assessment versus procalcitonin-guided antibiotic use in pneumonia: A pragmatic randomized trial. *Ann Emerg Med* 2019;74(4):580–591. DOI: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2019.02.025.
174. Kalil AC, Metersky ML, Klompas M, Muscedere J, Sweeney DA, Palmer LB, et al. Management of adults with hospital-acquired and ventilator-associated pneumonia: 2016 Clinical Practice Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the American Thoracic Society. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2016;63(5):e61–111. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciw353.
175. Hayashi Y, Morisawa K, Klompas M, Jones M, Bandeshe H, Boots R, et al. Toward improved surveillance: The impact of ventilator-associated complications on length of stay and antibiotic use in patients in intensive care units. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2013;56(4):471–477. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cis926.
176. Craven DE, De Rosa FG, Thornton D. Nosocomial pneumonia: Emerging concepts in diagnosis, management, and prophylaxis. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2002;8(5):421–429. DOI: 10.1097/00075198-200210000-00009.
177. Torres A, Serra-Batlles J, Ros E, Píera C, Puig de la Bellacasa J, Cobos A, et al. Pulmonary aspiration of gastric contents in patients receiving mechanical ventilation: The effect of body position. *Ann Intern Med* 1992;116(7):540–543. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-116-7-540.
178. Melsen WG, Rovers MM, Groenwold RH, Bergmans DC, Camus C, Bauer TT, et al. Attributable mortality of ventilator-associated pneumonia: A meta-analysis of individual patient data from randomised prevention studies. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2013;13(8):665–671. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(13)70081-1.
179. Safdar N, Dezfulian C, Collard HR, Saint S. Clinical and economic consequences of ventilator-associated pneumonia: A systematic

- review. *Crit Care Med* 2005;33(10):2184–2193. DOI: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000181731.53912.d9.
180. Kollef MH, Shorr A, Tabak YP, Gupta V, Liu LZ, Johannes RS. Epidemiology and outcomes of health-care-associated pneumonia: Results from a large US database of culture-positive pneumonia. *Chest* 2005;128(6):3854–3862. DOI: 10.1378/chest.128.6.3854.
 181. Sievert DM, Ricks P, Edwards JR, Schneider A, Patel J, Srinivasan A, et al. Antimicrobial-resistant pathogens associated with healthcare-associated infections: Summary of data reported to the National Healthcare Safety Network at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009–2010. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2013;34(1):1–14. DOI: 10.1086/668770.
 182. Chung DR, Song JH, Kim SH, Thamlikitkul V, Huang SG, Wang H, et al. High prevalence of multidrug-resistant nonfermenters in hospital-acquired pneumonia in Asia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2011;184(12):1409–1417. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.201102-0349OC.
 183. Inchai J, Liwsrisakun C, Theerakittikul T, Chaiwarith R, Khositsakulchai W, Pothirat C. Risk factors of multidrug-resistant, extensively drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* ventilator-associated pneumonia in a Medical Intensive Care Unit of University Hospital in Thailand. *J Infect Chemother* 2015;21(8):570–574. DOI: 10.1016/j.jiac.2015.04.010.
 184. Ranjan N, Chaudhary U, Chaudhry D, Ranjan K. Ventilator-associated pneumonia in a tertiary care intensive care unit: Analysis of incidence, risk factors and mortality. *Indian J Crit Care Med* 2014;18(4):200. DOI: 10.4103/0972-5229.130570.
 185. Mathur P, Tak V, Gunjijal J, Nair SA, Lalwani S, Kumar S, et al. Device-associated infections at a level-1 trauma centre of a developing Nation: Impact of automated surveillance, training and feedbacks. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2015;33(1):51. DOI: 10.4103/0255-0857.148378.
 186. Ahmed NH, Hussain T, Biswal I. Antimicrobial resistance of bacterial isolates from respiratory secretions of ventilated patients in a multi-specialty hospital. *Avicenna J Med* 2015;5(3):74–78. DOI: 10.4103/2231-0770.160233.
 187. Joseph NM, Sistla S, Dutta TK, Badhe AS, Parija SC. Ventilator-associated pneumonia in a tertiary care hospital in India: Incidence and risk factors. *J Infect Dev Ctries* 2009;3(10):771–777. DOI: 10.3855/jidc.396.
 188. Goel V, Hogade SA, Karadesai SG. Ventilator associated pneumonia in a medical intensive care unit: Microbial aetiology, susceptibility patterns of isolated microorganisms and outcome. *Indian J Anaesth* 2012;56(6):558. DOI: 10.4103/0019-5049.104575.
 189. Gurjar M, Saigal S, Baronia AK, Rao BP, Azim A, Poddar B, et al. Carbapenem-resistant *Acinetobacter* ventilator-associated pneumonia: Clinical characteristics and outcome. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2013;17(3):129–34. DOI: 10.4103/0972-5229.117036.
 190. AMR Surveillance Network, Indian Council of Medical Research, 2022. Available from: AMRSN_Annual_Report_2022.pdf.
 191. Berton DC, Kalil AC, Teixeira PJZ. Quantitative versus qualitative cultures of respiratory secretions for clinical outcomes in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014;(10):CD006482. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006482.pub4.
 192. Suratt PM, Smiddy JF, Gruber B. Deaths and complications associated with fiberoptic bronchoscopy. *Chest* 1976;69(6):747–751. DOI: 10.1378/chest.69.6.747.
 193. Li C, Zhu T, Ma D, Chen Y, Bo L. Complications and safety analysis of diagnostic bronchoscopy in COPD: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Expert Rev Respir Med* 2022;16(5):555–565. DOI: 10.1080/17476348.2022.2056023.
 194. Cracco C, Fartoukh M, Prodanovic H, Azoulay E, Chenivesse C, Lorut C, et al. Safety of performing fiberoptic bronchoscopy in critically ill hypoxemic patients with acute respiratory failure. *Intensive Care Med* 2013;39(1):45–52. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-012-2687-9.
 195. Pickens CO, Gao CA, Cuttica MJ, Smith SB, Pesce LL, Grant RA, et al. Bacterial superinfection pneumonia in patients mechanically ventilated for covid-19 pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2021;204(8):921–932. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.202106-1354OC.
 196. Saha BK, Saha S, Chong WH, Beegle S. Indications, clinical utility, and safety of bronchoscopy in COVID-19. *Respir Care Respiratory Care* 2022;67(2):241–251. DOI: 10.4187/respcare.09405.
 197. Al-Omari B, McMeekin P, Allen AJ, Akram AR, Graziadio S, Suklan J, et al. Systematic review of studies investigating ventilator associated pneumonia diagnostics in intensive care. *BMC Pulm Med* 2021;21(1):196. DOI: 10.1186/s12890-021-01560-0.
 198. Fernando SM, Tran A, Cheng W, Klompas M, Kyeremanteng K, Mehta S, et al. Diagnosis of ventilator-associated pneumonia in critically ill adult patients – A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med* 2020;46(6):1170–1179. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-020-06036-z.
 199. Tepper J, Johnson S, Parker C, Collins J, Menard L, Hinkle L. Comparing the accuracy of mini-bal to bronchoscopic bal in the diagnosis of pneumonia among ventilated patients: A systematic literature review. *J Intensive Care Med*. SAGE Publications Inc STM 2023;38(12):1099–1107. DOI: 10.1177/08850666231193379.
 200. Enne VI, Aydin A, Baldan R, Owen DR, Richardson H, Ricciardi F, et al. Multicentre evaluation of two multiplex PCR platforms for the rapid microbiological investigation of nosocomial pneumonia in UK ICUs: The INHALE WP1 study. *Thorax* 2022;77(12):1220–1228. DOI: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2021-216990.
 201. Monard C, Pehlivan J, Auger G, Alviset S, Tran Dinh A, Duquaire P, et al. Multicenter evaluation of a syndromic rapid multiplex PCR test for early adaptation of antimicrobial therapy in adult patients with pneumonia. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 2020;24(1):434. DOI: 10.1186/s13054-020-03114-y.
 202. Song YY, Zhang B, Gu JW, Zhang YJ, Wang Y. The predictive value of procalcitonin in ventilator-associated pneumonia after cardiac valve replacement. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest* 2020;80(5):423–426. DOI: 10.1080/00365513.2020.1762242.
 203. Sotillo-Díaz JC, Bermejo-López E, García-Olivares P, Peral-Gutiérrez JA, Sancho-González M, Guerrero-Sanz JE. Role of plasma procalcitonin in the diagnosis of ventilator-associated pneumonia: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Med Intensiva* 2014;38(6):337–346. DOI: 10.1016/j.medint.2013.07.001.
 204. Coelho L, Rabello L, Salluh J, Martin-Loeches I, Rodriguez A, Nseir S, et al. C-reactive protein and procalcitonin profile in ventilator-associated lower respiratory infections. *J Crit Care* 2018;48:385–389. DOI: 10.1016/j.jccr.2018.09.036.
 205. Torres A, Niederman MS, Chastre J, Ewig S, Fernandez-Vandellos P, Hanberger H, et al. International ERS/ESICM/ESCMID/ALAT guidelines for the management of hospital-acquired pneumonia and ventilator-associated pneumonia: Guidelines for the management of hospital-acquired pneumonia (HAP)/ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) of the European Respiratory Society (ERS), European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM), European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID) and Asociación Latinoamericana del Tórax (ALAT). *Eur Respir J. European Respiratory Society* 2017;50(3). DOI: 10.1183/13993003.00582-2017.
 206. Stolz D, Smyrniotis N, Eggimann P, Pargger H, Thakkar N, Siegmund M, et al. Procalcitonin for reduced antibiotic exposure in ventilator-associated pneumonia: A randomised study. *Eur Respir J* 2009;34(6):1364–1375. DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00053209.
 207. Mazlan MZ, Ismail MAH, Ali S, Salmuna ZN, Shukeri WFWM, Omar M. Efficacy and safety of the point-of-care procalcitonin test for determining the antibiotic treatment duration in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia in the intensive care unit: A randomised controlled trial. *Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther Termedia* 2021;53(3):207–214. DOI: 10.5114/ait.2021.104300.
 208. Pontet J, Bazzano F, Miraballes R, Bentancourt S, Cancela M. Procalcitonin (PCT) guided antibiotic treatment in ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP). Multi-centre, clinical prospective, randomized-controlled study. *Index Infectológico* 2008;175:63.
 209. Langer M, Cigada M, Mandelli M, Mosconi P, Tognoni G. Early onset pneumonia: A multicenter study in intensive care units. *Intensive Care Med* 1987;13(5):342–346. DOI: 10.1007/BF00255791.
 210. Giantsou E, Liratzopoulos N, Efraimidou E, Panopoulou M, Alepopoulou E, Kartali-Ktenidou S, et al. Both early-onset and

- late-onset ventilator-associated pneumonia are caused mainly by potentially multiresistant bacteria. *Intensive Care Med* 2005;31(11):1488–1494. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-005-2697-y.
211. Gastmeier P, Sohr D, Geffers C, Rüdén H, Vonberg RP, Welte T. Early- and late-onset pneumonia: Is this still a useful classification? *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2009;53(7):2714–2718. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.01070-08.
 212. Trouillet JL, Chastre J, Vuagnat A, Joly-Guillou ML, Combaux D, Dombret MC, et al. Ventilator-associated pneumonia caused by potentially drug-resistant bacteria. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1998;157(2):531–539. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm.157.2.9705064.
 213. Depuydt PO, Vandijck DM, Bekaert MA, Decruyenaere JM, Blot SI, Vogelaers DP, et al. Determinants and impact of multidrug antibiotic resistance in pathogens causing ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 2008;12(6):R142. DOI: 10.1186/cc7119.
 214. Bouza E, Giannella M, Bunsow E, Torres MV, Pérez Granda MJ, Martín-Rabadán P, et al. Ventilator-associated pneumonia due to methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: Risk factors and outcome in a large general hospital. *J Hosp Infect* 2012;80(2):150–155. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhin.2011.11.013.
 215. Wooten DA, Winston LG. Risk factors for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in patients with community-onset and hospital-onset pneumonia. *Respir Med* 2013;107(8):1266–1270. DOI: 10.1016/j.rmed.2013.05.006.
 216. Moreira MR, Filho PPG. Multidrug-resistant pathogens causing ventilator-associated pneumonia: Risk factors, empirical antimicrobial therapy and outcome of patients in an intensive care unit (ICU) of a Brazilian university hospital. *Int J Med Med Sci* 2012;4(9):204–210. DOI: 10.5897/IJMM512.084.
 217. Hu JN, Hu SQ, Li ZL, Bao C, Liu Q, Liu C, et al. Risk factors of multidrug-resistant bacteria infection in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect Chemother Off J Jpn Soc Chemother* 2023;29(10):942–947. DOI: 10.1016/j.jiac.2023.06.008.
 218. Dominedò C, Ceccato A, Niederman M, Cillóniz C, Gabarrús A, Martín-Loeches I, et al. Predictive performance of risk factors for multidrug-resistant pathogens in nosocomial pneumonia. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2021;18(5):807–814. DOI: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202002-181OC.
 219. Kuti EL, Patel AA, Coleman CI. Impact of inappropriate antibiotic therapy on mortality in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia and blood stream infection: A meta-analysis. *J Crit Care* 2008;23(1):91–100. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2007.08.007.
 220. Arthur LE, Kizor RS, Selim AG, van Driel ML, Seoane L. Antibiotics for ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;10:CD004267. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004267.pub4.
 221. Schmid A, Wolfensberger A, Nemeth J, Schreiber PW, Sax H, Kuster SP. Monotherapy versus combination therapy for multidrug-resistant Gram-negative infections: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sci Rep* 2019;9:15290. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-019-51711-x.
 222. Harris PNA, Tambyah PA, Lye DC, Mo Y, Lee TH, Yilmaz M, et al. Effect of Piperacillin-Tazobactam vs Meropenem on 30-day mortality for patients with *e coli* or *Klebsiella pneumoniae* bloodstream infection and ceftriaxone resistance: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2018;320(10):984–994. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2018.12163.
 223. Howatt M, Klompas M, Kalil AC, Metersky ML, Muscedere J. Carbapenem antibiotics for the empiric treatment of nosocomial pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Chest* 2021;159(3):1041–1054. DOI: 10.1016/j.chest.2020.10.039.
 224. Shuto H, Komiya K, Tone K, Matsumoto H, Moro H, Shime N. Carbapenem vs. non-carbapenem antibiotics for ventilator-associated pneumonia: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Respir Investig* 2024;62(2):200–205. DOI: 10.1016/j.resinv.2023.12.006.
 225. Walkey AJ, O'Donnell MR, Wiener RS. Linezolid vs glycopeptide antibiotics for the treatment of suspected methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* nosocomial pneumonia: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Chest* 2011;139(5):1148–1155. DOI: 10.1378/chest.10-1556.
 226. Kalil AC, Klompas M, Haynatzki G, Rupp ME. Treatment of hospital-acquired pneumonia with linezolid or vancomycin: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2013;3(10):e003912. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003912.
 227. Bento Talizin T, Dantas de Maio Carrilho CM, Magalhães Carvalho Grion C, Tibery Queiroz Cardoso L, Toshiyuki Tanita M, Boll KM, et al. Polymyxin for treatment of ventilator-associated pneumonia in a setting of high carbapenem resistance. *PLoS ONE* 2020;15(8):e0237880. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0237880.
 228. Vardakas KZ, Falagas ME. Colistin versus polymyxin B for the treatment of patients with multidrug-resistant gram-negative infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2017;49(2):233–238. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2016.07.023.
 229. Zha L, Zhang X, Cheng Y, Xu Q, Liu L, Chen S, et al. Intravenous Polymyxin B as adjunctive therapy to high-dose tigecycline for the treatment of nosocomial pneumonia due to carbapenem-resistant *acinetobacter baumannii* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*: A propensity score-matched cohort study. *Antibiotics*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute 2023;12(2):273. DOI: 10.3390/antibiotics12020273.
 230. Samal S, Samir SB, Patra SK, Rath A, Dash A, Nayak B, et al. Polymyxin monotherapy vs. combination therapy for the treatment of multidrug-resistant infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2021;25(2):199–206. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23720.
 231. Maruyama T, Fujisawa T, Okuno M, Toyoshima H, Tsutsui K, Maeda H, et al. A new strategy for healthcare-associated pneumonia: A 2-year prospective multicenter cohort study using risk factors for multidrug-resistant pathogens to select initial empiric therapy. *Clin Infect Dis* 2013;57(10):1373–1383. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cit571.
 232. Peiffer-Smadja N, Bouadma L, Mathy V, Allouche K, Patrier J, Rebol M, et al. Performance and impact of a multiplex PCR in ICU patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia or ventilated hospital-acquired pneumonia. *Crit Care* 2020;24:366. DOI: 10.1186/s13054-020-03067-2.
 233. Murphy CN, Fowler R, Balada-Llasat JM, Carroll A, Stone H, Akerele O, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the biofirefilmarray pneumonia/pneumonia plus panel for detection and quantification of agents of lower respiratory tract infection. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;58(7):e00128-20. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.00128-20.
 234. Dessajan J, Timsit JF. Impact of multiplex PCR in the therapeutic management of severe bacterial pneumonia. *Antibiotics*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute 2024;13(1):95. DOI: 10.3390/antibiotics13010095.
 235. Yoshimura J, Yamakawa K, Ohta Y, Nakamura K, Hashimoto H, Kawada M, et al. Effect of gram stain-guided initial antibiotic therapy on clinical response in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia: The grace-vap randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2022;5(4):e226136. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.6136.
 236. Torres A, Zhong N, Pacht J, Timsit JF, Kollef M, Chen Z, et al. Ceftazidime-avibactam versus meropenem in nosocomial pneumonia, including ventilator-associated pneumonia (REPROVE): A randomised, double-blind, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2018;18(3):285–295. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30747-8.
 237. Tumbarello M, Treccarichi EM, Corona A, De Rosa FG, Bassetti M, Mussini C, et al. Efficacy of Ceftazidime-Avibactam salvage therapy in patients with infections caused by *Klebsiella pneumoniae* carbapenemase-producing *K. pneumoniae*. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;68(3):355–364. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy492.
 238. Wilson GM, Fitzpatrick M, Walding K, Gonzalez B, Schweizer ML, Suda KJ, et al. Meta-analysis of clinical outcomes using ceftazidime/avibactam, ceftolozane/tazobactam, and meropenem/vaborbactam for the treatment of multidrug-resistant gram-negative infections. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2021;8(2):ofaa651. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofaa651.
 239. Kollef MH, Nováček M, Kivistik Ü, Réa-Neto Á, Shime N, Martín-Loeches I, et al. Ceftolozane-tazobactam versus meropenem for treatment of nosocomial pneumonia (ASPECT-NP): A randomised, controlled, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2019;19(12):1299–1311. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(19)30403-7.

240. Mogyoródi B, Cséko AB, Hermann C, Gál J, Iványi ZD. Ceftolozane/tazobactam versus colistin in the treatment of ventilator-associated pneumonia due to extensively drug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Sci Rep. Nature Publishing Group* 2022;12(1):4455. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-08307-9.
241. Pogue JM, Kaye KS, Veve MP, Patel TS, Gerlach AT, Davis SL, et al. Ceftolozane/Tazobactam vs Polymyxin or Aminoglycoside-based regimens for the treatment of drug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2020;71(2):304–310. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz816.
242. Humphries RM, Hindler JA, Wong-Beringer A, Miller SA. Activity of ceftolozane-tazobactam and ceftazidime-avibactam against beta-lactam-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolates. *antimicrob agents chemother* 2017;61(12):e01858-17. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.01858-17.
243. Titov I, Wunderink RG, Roquilly A, Rodríguez Gonzalez D, David-Wang A, Boucher HW, et al. A randomized, double-blind, multicenter trial comparing efficacy and safety of imipenem/cilastatin/relebactam versus piperacillin/tazobactam in adults with hospital-acquired or ventilator-associated bacterial pneumonia (RESTORE-IMI 2 Study). *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2021;73(11):e4539–e4548. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa803.
244. Motsch J, Murta de Oliveira C, Stus V, Köksal I, Lyulko O, Boucher HW, et al. RESTORE-IMI 1: A multicenter, randomized, double-blind trial comparing efficacy and safety of imipenem/relebactam vs colistin plus imipenem in patients with imipenem-nonsusceptible bacterial infections. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2020;70(9):1799–1808. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz530.
245. Wunderink RG, Giamarellos-Bourboulis EJ, Rahav G, Mathers AJ, Bassetti M, Vazquez J, et al. Effect and safety of meropenem-vaborbactam versus best-available therapy in patients with carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae infections: the tango ii randomized clinical trial. *Infect Dis Ther* 2018;7(4):439–455. DOI: 10.1007/s40121-018-0214-1.
246. Ackley R, Roshdy D, Meredith J, Minor S, Anderson WE, Capraro GA, et al. Meropenem-vaborbactam versus ceftazidime-avibactam for treatment of carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae infections. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2020;64(5):e02313-19. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.02313-19.
247. Kwa A, Kasiakou SK, Tam VH, Falagas ME. Polymyxin B: Similarities to and differences from colistin (polymyxin E). *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther* 2007;5(5):811–821. DOI: 10.1586/14787210.5.5.811.
248. Sandri AM, Landersdorfer CB, Jacob J, Boniatti MM, Dalarosa MG, Falci DR, et al. Population pharmacokinetics of intravenous polymyxin B in critically ill patients: Implications for selection of dosage regimens. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2013;57(4):524–531. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cit334.
249. Cisneros JM, Rosso-Fernández CM, Roca-Oporto C, De Pascale G, Jiménez-Jorge S, Fernández-Hinojosa E, et al. Colistin versus meropenem in the empirical treatment of ventilator-associated pneumonia (Magic Bullet study): an investigator-driven, open-label, randomized, noninferiority controlled trial. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 2019;23(1):383. DOI: 10.1186/s13054-019-2627-y.
250. Tsuji BT, Pogue JM, Zavascki AP, Paul M, Daikos GL, Forrest A, et al. International Consensus Guidelines for the Optimal Use of the Polymyxins: Endorsed by the American College of Clinical Pharmacy (ACCP), European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID), Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA), International Society for Anti-infective Pharmacology (ISAP), Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM), and Society of Infectious Diseases Pharmacists (SIDP). *Pharmacother J Hum Pharmacol Drug Ther* 2019;39(1):10–39. DOI: 10.1002/phar.2209.
251. Mauri C, Maraolo AE, Di Bella S, Luzzaro F, Principe L. The revival of aztreonam in combination with avibactam against metallo- β -lactamase-producing gram-negatives: A systematic review of in vitro studies and clinical cases. *Antibiotics. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute* 2021;10(8):1012. DOI: 10.3390/antibiotics10081012.
252. Dijkmans AC, Ortiz Zacarías NV, Burggraaf J, Mouton JW, Wilms EB, van Nieuwkoop C, et al. Fosfomycin: Pharmacological, clinical and future perspectives. *Antibiotics* 2017;6(4):24. DOI: 10.3390/antibiotics6040024.
253. Chen TT, Chang YF, Wu YC. Clinical use of intravenous fosfomycin in critical care patients in Taiwan. *Pathogens* 2023;12(6):841. DOI: 10.3390/pathogens12060841.
254. Veeraraghavan B, Pragasam AK, Bakthavatchalam YD, Anandan S, Swaminathan S, Sundaram B. Colistin-sparing approaches with newer antimicrobials to treat carbapenem-resistant organisms: Current evidence and future prospects. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2019;37(1):72–90. DOI: 10.4103/ijmm.IJMM_19_215.
255. Fragkou PC, Poulakou G, Blizou A, Blizou M, Rapti V, Karageorgopoulos DE, et al. The role of minocycline in the treatment of nosocomial infections caused by multidrug, extensively drug and pandrug resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii*: a systematic review of clinical evidence. *Microorganisms* 2019;7(6):159. DOI: 10.3390/microorganisms7060159.
256. Sierra-Hoffman M, Redell M, Benefield R, Caruso P, Estrada S, Leuthner K, et al. Minocycline intravenous for the treatment of serious infections due to gram-negative nonpseudomonal bacteria, including *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*, *Acinetobacter baumannii*, and *Burkholderia cepacia*. *Infect Dis Clin Pract* 2020;28(4):209. DOI: 10.1097/IPC.0000000000000854.
257. Yahav D, Lador A, Paul M, Leibovici L. Efficacy and safety of tigecycline: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2011;66(9):1963–1971. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkr242.
258. Ramirez J, Dartois N, Gandjini H, Yan JL, Korth-Bradley J, McGovern PC. Randomized phase 2 trial to evaluate the clinical efficacy of two high-dosage tigecycline regimens versus imipenem-cilastatin for treatment of hospital-acquired pneumonia. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2013;57(4):1756–1762. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.01232-12.
259. Zha L, Pan L, Guo J, French N, Villanueva EV, Tefsen B. Effectiveness and safety of high dose tigecycline for the treatment of severe infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Adv Ther* 2020;37(3):1049–1064. DOI: 10.1007/s12325-020-01235-y.
260. Mei H, Yang T, Wang J, Wang R, Cai Y. Efficacy and safety of tigecycline in treatment of pneumonia caused by MDR *Acinetobacter baumannii*: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2019;74(12):3423–3431. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkz337.
261. Solomkin JS, Gardovskis J, Lawrence K, Montravers P, Sway A, Evans D, et al. IGNITE4: Results of a phase 3, randomized, multicenter, prospective trial of eravacycline vs meropenem in the treatment of complicated intraabdominal infections. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;69(6):921–929. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy1029.
262. Scott CJ, Zhu E, Jayakumar RA, Shan G, Viswesh V. Efficacy of eravacycline versus best previously available therapy for adults with pneumonia due to difficult-to-treat resistant (DTR) *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *Ann Pharmacother* 2022;56(12):1299–1307. DOI: 10.1177/10600280221085551.
263. Pfaller MA, Huband MD, Shorridge D, Flamm RK. Surveillance of omadacycline activity tested against clinical isolates from the United States and Europe: Report from the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program, 2016 to 2018. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2020;64(5):e02488-19. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.02488-19.
264. Dong D, Zheng Y, Chen Q, Guo Y, Yang Y, Wu S, et al. In vitro activity of omadacycline against pathogens isolated from Mainland China during 2017–2018. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol* 2020;39(8):1559–1572. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-020-03877-w.
265. Niederman MS, Alder J, Bassetti M, Boaventura F, Cao B, Corkery K, et al. Inhaled amikacin adjunctive to intravenous standard-of-care antibiotics in mechanically ventilated patients with Gram-negative pneumonia (INHALE): A double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3, superiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis. Elsevier* 2020;20(3):330–340. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(19)30574-2.
266. Tang R, Luo R, Wu B, Wang F, Song H, Chen X. Effectiveness and safety of adjunctive inhaled antibiotics for ventilator-associated pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Crit Care* 2021;65:133–139. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2021.06.004.

267. Zhang X, Cui X, Jiang M, Huang S, Yang M. Nebulized colistin as the adjunctive treatment for ventilator-associated pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Crit Care* 2023;77:154315. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2023.154315.
268. Liu J, Shao M, Xu Q, Liu F, Pan X, Wu J, et al. Low-dose intravenous plus inhaled versus intravenous polymyxin B for the treatment of extensive drug-resistant Gram-negative ventilator-associated pneumonia in the critical illnesses: A multi-center matched case-control study. *Ann Intensive Care* 2022;12(1):72. DOI: 10.1186/s13613-022-01033-5.
269. Kaye KS, Udeani G, Cole P, Friedland HD. Ceftarolinefosamil for the treatment of hospital-acquired pneumonia and ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Hosp Pract* 1995 2015;43(3):144–149. DOI: 10.1080/21548331.2015.1037228.
270. Wunderink RG, Roquilly A, Croce M, Rodriguez Gonzalez D, Fujimi S, Butterson JR, et al. A phase 3, randomized, double-blind study comparing tedizolid phosphate and linezolid for treatment of ventilated gram-positive hospital-acquired or ventilator-associated bacterial pneumonia. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2021;73(3):e710–e718. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciab032.
271. Rubinstein E, Lalani T, Corey GR, Kanafani ZA, Nannini EC, Rocha MG, et al. Telavancin versus vancomycin for hospital-acquired pneumonia due to gram-positive pathogens. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2011;52(1):31–40. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciq031.
272. Corey GR, Kollef MH, Shorr AF, Rubinstein E, Stryjewski ME, Hopkins A, et al. Telavancin for hospital-acquired pneumonia: Clinical response and 28-day survival. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2014;58(4):2030–2037. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.02330-13.
273. Awad SS, Rodriguez AH, Chuang YC, Marjanek Z, Pareigis AJ, Reis G, et al. A phase 3 randomized double-blind comparison of ceftobiprole medocartil versus ceftazidime plus linezolid for the treatment of hospital-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2014;59(1):51–61. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciu219.
274. Research C for DE and. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA warns of increased risk of death with IV antibacterial Tygacil (tigecycline) and approves new Boxed Warning. FDA [Internet]. FDA; 2019 [cited 2024 Feb 11]; Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-drug-safety-communication-fda-warns-increased-risk-death-iv-antibacterial-tygacil-tigecycline>.
275. Kollef MH, Chastre J, Fagon JY, François B, Niederman MS, Rello J, et al. Global prospective epidemiologic and surveillance study of ventilator-associated pneumonia due to *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Crit Care Med* 2014;42(10):2178–2187. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000000510.
276. Parker CM, Kutsogiannis J, Muscedere J, Cook D, Dodek P, Day AG, et al. Ventilator-associated pneumonia caused by multidrug-resistant organisms or *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: Prevalence, incidence, risk factors, and outcomes. *J Crit Care* 2008;23(1):18–26. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2008.02.001.
277. Rello J, Ausina V, Ricart M, Puzo C, Quintana E, Net A, et al. Risk factors for infection by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Intensive Care Med* 1994;20(3):193–198. DOI: 10.1007/BF01704699.
278. Montero M, Sala M, Riu M, Belvis F, Salvado M, Grau S, et al. Risk factors for multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* acquisition. Impact of antibiotic use in a double case-control study. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol* 2010;29(3):335–339. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-009-0850-1.
279. Capellier G, Mockly H, Charpentier C, Annane D, Blasco G, Desmettre T, et al. Early-onset ventilator-associated pneumonia in adults randomized clinical trial: Comparison of 8 versus 15 days of antibiotic treatment. *PLoS One* 2012;7(8):e41290. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0041290.
280. Micek ST, Ward S, Fraser VJ, Kollef MH. A randomized controlled trial of an antibiotic discontinuation policy for clinically suspected ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Chest* 2004;125(5):1791–1799. DOI: 10.1378/chest.125.5.1791.
281. Dimopoulos G, Poulakou G, Pneumatikos IA, Armaganidis A, Kollef MH, Matthaïou DK. Short- vs long-duration antibiotic regimens for ventilator-associated pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Chest* 2013;144(6):1759–1767. DOI: 10.1378/chest.13-0076.
282. Daghmouri MA, Dudoignon E, Chaouch MA, Baekgaard J, Bougle A, Leone M, et al. Comparison of a short versus long-course antibiotic therapy for ventilator-associated pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *eClinicalMedicine Elsevier* 2023;58:1–11. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2023.101880.
283. Doré P, Robert R, Grollier G, Rouffineau J, Lanquetot H, Charrière J-M, et al. Incidence of anaerobes in ventilator-associated pneumonia with use of a protected specimen brush. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1996;153(4):1292–1298. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm.153.4.8616556.
284. Marik PE, Careau P. The role of anaerobes in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia and aspiration pneumonia: A prospective study. *CHEST J* 1999;115(1):178–183. DOI: 10.1378/chest.115.1.178.
285. Robertu R, Grollier G, Doré P, Hira M, Ferrand E, Fauchère JL. Nosocomial pneumonia with isolation of anaerobic bacteria in ICU patients: Therapeutic considerations and outcome. *J Crit Care* 1999;14(3):114–119. DOI: 10.1016/s0883-9441(99)90023-0.
286. Mokhless NA-S, El-Mofty MF, Hanafi NF, Muhammad A, Asser SL. Atypical bacteria in ventilator associated pneumonia; An Egyptian University Hospital experience. *J Am Sci* 2010;6(12):1074–1079. ISSN: 1545-1003.
287. el-Ebiary M, Torres A, González J, de la Bellacasa JP, García C, Jiménez de Anta MT, et al. Quantitative cultures of endotracheal aspirates for the diagnosis of ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1993;148(6 Pt 1):1552–1557. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm/148.6_Pt_1.1552.
288. Apfalter P, Stoiser B, Barousch W, Nehr M, Kramer L, Burgmann H. Community-acquired bacteria frequently detected by means of quantitative polymerase chain reaction in nosocomial early-onset ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Crit Care Med* 2005;33(7):1492–1498. DOI: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000169879.97129.7b.
289. Carratala J, Gudiol F, Pallares R, Dorca J, Verdaguier R, Ariza J, et al. Risk factors for nosocomial *Legionella pneumophila* pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1994;149(3 Pt 1):625–629. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm.149.3.8118629.
290. American Thoracic Society, Infectious Diseases Society of America. Guidelines for the management of adults with hospital-acquired, ventilator-associated, and healthcare-associated pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2005;171(4):388–416. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.200405-6445T.
291. Schneider HG, Lam QT. Procalcitonin for the clinical laboratory: A review. *Pathology (Phila)* 2007;39(4):383–390. DOI: 10.1080/00313020701444564.
292. Bouadma L, Luyt CE, Tubach F, Cracco C, Alvarez A, Schwebel C, et al. Use of procalcitonin to reduce patients' exposure to antibiotics in intensive care units (PRORATA trial): A multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2010;375(9713):463–474. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61879-1.
293. Pugh R, Grant C, Cooke RPD, Dempsey G. Short-course versus prolonged-course antibiotic therapy for hospital-acquired pneumonia in critically ill adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;(8):CD007577. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007577.pub3.
294. Schuetz P, Briel M, Christ-Crain M, Stolz D, Bouadma L, Wolff M, et al. Procalcitonin to guide initiation and duration of antibiotic treatment in acute respiratory infections: An individual patient data meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2012;55(5):651–662. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cis464.
295. A Iannella H, M Luna C. Treatment failure in ventilator associated pneumonia. *Curr Respir Med Rev* 2012;8(3):239–244. DOI: 10.1055/s-2006-933678.
296. Luna CM, Blanzaco D, Niederman MS, Matarucco W, Baredes NC, Desmery P, et al. Resolution of ventilator-associated pneumonia: Prospective evaluation of the clinical pulmonary infection score as an early clinical predictor of outcome. *Crit Care Med* 2003;31(3):676–682. DOI: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000055380.86458.1E.

297. Dennesen PJ, van der Ven AJ, Kessels AG, Ramsay G, Bonten MJ. Resolution of infectious parameters after antimicrobial therapy in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2001;163(6):1371–1375. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm.163.6.2007020.
298. Montravers P, Fagon JY, Chastre J, Lecso M, Dombret MC, Trouillet JL, et al. Follow-up protected specimen brushes to assess treatment in nosocomial pneumonia. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1993;147(1):38–44. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm/147.1.38.
299. Ioanas M, Ferrer M, Cavalcanti M, Ferrer R, Ewig S, Filella X, et al. Causes and predictors of nonresponse to treatment of intensive care unit-acquired pneumonia. *Crit Care Med* 2004;32(4):938–945. DOI: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000114580.98396.91.
300. Luna CM, Aruj P, Niederman MS, Garzón J, Violi D, Prignoni A, et al. Appropriateness and delay to initiate therapy in ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Eur Respir J* 2006;27(1):158–164. DOI: 10.1183/09031936.06.00049105.
301. Deb M, Mittal G, Gaiand R, Verma PK. Central venous catheter related blood stream infections in an intensive care unit from a tertiary care teaching hospital. *International Journal of Infection Control* 2016;12(1):1–6. DOI: 10.3396/ijic.v12i1.15542.
302. Gahlot R, Nigam C, Kumar V, Yadav G, Anupurba S. Catheter-related bloodstream infections. *Int J Crit Illn Inj Sci* 2014;4(2):161. DOI: 10.4103/2229-5151.134184.
303. Mermel LA, Allon M, Bouza E, Craven DE, Flynn P, O'Grady NP, et al. Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Intravascular Catheter-Related Infection: 2009 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;49(1):1–45. DOI: 10.1086/599376.
304. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System Report, Data Summary from January 1990–May 1999, Issued June 1999. *Am J Infect Control* 1999;27(6):520–532. DOI: 10.1016/S0196-6553(99)70031-3.
305. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance System. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) system report, data summary from January 1992 through June 2004, issued October 2004. *Am J Infect Control* 2004;32(8):470–485. DOI: 10.1016/S0196655304005425.
306. Chitnis AS, Edwards JR, Ricks PM, Sievert DM, Fridkin SK, Gould CV. Device-associated infection rates, device utilization, and antimicrobial resistance in long-term acute care hospitals reporting to the national healthcare safety network, 2010. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33(10):993–1000. DOI: 10.1086/667745.
307. Vincent J-L. International study of the prevalence and outcomes of infection in intensive care units. *JAMA* 2009;302(21):2323. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2009.1754.
308. Vincent J-L, Sakr Y, Singer M, Martin-Loeches I, Machado FR, Marshall JC, et al. Prevalence and outcomes of infection among patients in intensive care units in 2017. *JAMA* 2020;323(15):1478–1487. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.2717.
309. Lorente L, Henry C, Martín MM, Jiménez A, Mora ML. Central venous catheter-related infection in a prospective and observational study of 2,595 catheters. *Crit Care* 2005;9(6):R631–35. DOI: 10.1186/cc3824.
310. Hajje Z, Nasri M, Sellami W, Gharsallah H, Labben I, Ferjani M. Incidence, risk factors and microbiology of central vascular catheter-related bloodstream infection in an intensive care unit. *J Infect Chemother* 2014;20(3):163–168. DOI: 10.1016/j.jiac.2013.08.001.
311. Rosenthal VD. Device-associated nosocomial infections in 55 intensive care units of 8 developing countries. *Ann Intern Med* 2006;145(8):582. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-145-8-200610170-00007.
312. Tarpatzi A, Avlami A, Papaparaskevas J, Daikos GL, Stefanou I, Katsandri A, et al. Incidence and risk factors for central vascular catheter-related bloodstream infections in a tertiary care hospital. *New Microbiol* 2012;35(4):429–437. PMID: 23109010.
313. Chen HS, Wang FD, Lin M, Lin YC, Huang LJ, Liu CY. Risk factors for central venous catheter-related infections in general surgery. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect Wei Mian Yu Gan Ran Za Zhi* 2006;39(3):231–236. DOI: 10.1017/9781107153165.016.
314. Agarwal R, Gupta D, Ray P, Aggarwal A, Jindal S. Epidemiology, Risk factors and outcome of nosocomial infections in a respiratory intensive care unit in North India. *J Infect* 2006;53(2):98–105. DOI: 10.1016/j.jinf.2005.10.021.
315. Haq J, Fatema K, Faruq M, Mansur F, Barai L, Karim M. Intravascular catheter related infections and antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of isolated bacteria in a tertiary care hospital of Bangladesh. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2014;32(1):68. DOI: 10.4103/0255-0857.124321.
316. Chin BS, Han SH, Lee HS, Jeong SJ, Choi H, Kim CO, et al. Risk factors for recurrent catheter-related infections after catheter-related bloodstream infections. *Int J Infect Dis* 2010;14(1):e16–21. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2009.01.016.
317. Peng S, Lu Y. Clinical epidemiology of central venous catheter-related bloodstream infections in an intensive care unit in China. *J Crit Care* 2013;28(3):277–283. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2012.09.007.
318. Bicudo D, Batista R, Furtado GH, Sola A, Medeiros EAS de. Risk factors for catheter-related bloodstream infection: A prospective multicenter study in Brazilian intensive care units. *Braz J Infect Dis* 2011;15(4):328–331. DOI: 10.1016/S1413-8670(11)70200-8.
319. Öncü S, Özsüt H, Yildirim A, Ay P, Cakar N, Eraksoy H, et al. Central venous catheter related infections: Risk factors and the effect of glycopeptide antibiotics. *Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob* 2003;2(3):1–6. DOI: 10.1186/1476-0711-2-3.
320. Parameswaran R, Sherchan JB, Varma D M, Mukhopadhyay C, Vidyasagar S. Intravascular catheter-related infections in an Indian tertiary care hospital. *J Infect Dev Ctries* 2011;5(6):452–458. DOI: 10.3855/jidc.1261.
321. Çaylan HR, Yılmaz G, Sözen EE, Aydın K, Köksal İ. Incidence and risk factors for bloodstream infections stemming from temporary hemodialysis catheters. *Turk J Med Sci* 2010;40(6):835–841. DOI: 10.3906/sag-0908-236.
322. A report from the NNIS System. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) system report, data summary from January 1992 through June 2004, issued October 2004. *Am J Infect Control* 2004;32(8):470–485. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaic.2004.10.001.
323. Kaur M, Gupta V, Gombar S, Chander J, Sahoo T. Incidence, risk factors, microbiology of venous catheter associated bloodstream infections - A prospective study from a tertiary care hospital. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2015;33(2):248. DOI: 10.4103/0255-0857.153572.
324. Datta P, Rani H, Chauhan R, Gombar S, Chander J. Health-care-associated infections: Risk factors and epidemiology from an intensive care unit in Northern India. *Indian J Anaesth* 2014;58(1):30. DOI: 10.4103/0019-5049.126785.
325. Chen Y, Huang H-B, Peng J-M, Weng L, Du B. Efficacy and safety of ceftazidime-avibactam for the treatment of carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriales bloodstream infection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Microbiol Spectr*. American Society for Microbiology; 2022;10(2):e02603-21. DOI: 10.1128/spectrum.02603-21.
326. Khanna V, Mukhopadhyay C, K E V, Verma M, Dabke P. Evaluation of central venous catheter associated blood stream infections: A microbiological observational study. *J Pathog* 2013;2013:936864. DOI: 10.1155/2013/936864.
327. SD SR, Joseph MP, Lavi R, Macaden R. Infections related to vascular catheters in a pediatric intensive care unit. *INDIAN Pediatr* 2005;42:6. PMID: 16085967.
328. Chakrabarti A, Sood P, Rudramurthy SM, Chen S, Kaur H, Capoor M, et al. Incidence, characteristics and outcome of ICU-acquired candidemia in India. *Intensive Care Med* 2015;41(2):285–295. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-014-3603-2. PMID: 28975963.
329. Li J, Zhao Q-H, Huang K-C, Li Z-Q, Zhang L-Y, Qin D-Y, et al. Linezolid vs. vancomycin in treatment of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus infections: A meta-analysis. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci* 2017;21(17):3974–3979. PMID: 28975963.
330. Wilcox MH, Tack KJ, Bouza E, Herr DL, Ruf BR, Ijzerman MM, et al. Complicated skin and skin-structure infections and catheter-related bloodstream infections: Noninferiority of linezolid in a phase 3 study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;48(2):203–212. DOI: 10.1086/595686.

331. Yoon YK, Park DW, Sohn JW, Kim HY, Kim Y-S, Lee C-S, et al. Multicenter prospective observational study of the comparative efficacy and safety of vancomycin versus teicoplanin in patients with health care-associated methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus bacteremia. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2014;58(1):317–324. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.00520-13.
332. Raad I, Bompard F, Hachem R. Prospective, randomized dose-ranging open phase II pilot study of quinupristin/dalfopristin versus vancomycin in the treatment of catheter-related staphylococcal bacteremia. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol*. 1999;18(3):199–202. DOI: 10.1007/s100960050258.
333. Fowler VG, Boucher HW, Corey GR, Abrutyn E, Karchmer AW, Rupp ME, et al. Daptomycin versus standard therapy for bacteremia and endocarditis caused by *Staphylococcus aureus*. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355(7):653–665. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa053783.
334. Raad I, Darouiche R, Vazquez J, Lentnek A, Hachem R, Hanna H, et al. Efficacy and safety of weekly dalbavancin therapy for catheter-related bloodstream infection caused by gram-positive pathogens. *Clin Infect Dis* 2005;40(3):374–480. DOI: 10.1086/427283.
335. Chong YP, Lee S-O, Song EH, Lee EJ, Jang E-Y, Kim S-H, et al. Quinupristin-dalfopristin versus linezolid for the treatment of vancomycin-resistant enterococcus faecium bacteraemia: efficacy and development of resistance. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2010;42(6–7):491–499. DOI: 10.3109/00365541003699623.
336. Mora-Duarte J, Betts R, Rotstein C, Colombo AL, Thompson-Moya L, Smietana J, et al. Comparison of caspofungin and amphotericin B for invasive candidiasis. *N Engl J Med* 2002;347(25):2020–2029. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa021585.
337. Rex JH, Bennett JE, Sugar AM, Pappas PG, van der Horst CM, Edwards JE, et al. A randomized trial comparing fluconazole with amphotericin B for the treatment of candidemia in patients without neutropenia. Candidemia Study Group and the National Institute. *N Engl J Med* 1994;331(20):1325–1330. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199411173312001.
338. Kotey FC, Dayie NT, Tetteh-Uarcoo PB, Donkor ES. *Candida* bloodstream infections: Changes in epidemiology and increase in drug resistance. *Infect Dis Res Treat*. SAGE Publications Ltd STM; 2021;14:11786337211026927. DOI: 10.1177/11786337211026927.
339. Lee I, Zaoutis TE, Fishman NO, Morales KH, Nachamkin I, Lautenbach E. Risk factors for fluconazole resistance in patients with *Candida glabrata* bloodstream infection: Potential impact of control group selection on characterizing the association between previous fluconazole use and fluconazole resistance. *Am J Infect Control*. Elsevier; 2010;38(6):456–460. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajic.2009.12.011.
340. Pappas PG, Kauffman CA, Andes DR, Clancy CJ, Marr KA, Ostrosky-Zeichner L, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the management of candidiasis: 2016 update by the infectious diseases society of america. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2016;62(4):e1–50. DOI: 10.1093/cid/civ933.
341. Peri AM, Bauer MJ, Bergh H, Butkiewicz D, Paterson DL, Harris PN. Performance of the BioFire Blood Culture Identification 2 panel for the diagnosis of bloodstream infections. *Heliyon* 2022;8(7):e09983. DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09983.
342. Caméléna F, Péan de Ponfily G, Pailhoriès H, Bonzon L, Alanio A, Poncin T, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the filmarray blood culture identification 2 panel for pathogen detection in bloodstream infections. *Microbiol Spectr* 2023;11(1):e0254722. DOI: 10.1128/spectrum.02547-22.
343. Havey TC, Fowler RA, Daneman N. Duration of antibiotic therapy for bacteremia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care* 2011;15(6):R267. DOI: 10.1186/cc10545.
344. Muff S, Tabah A, Que Y-A, Timsit J-F, Mermel L, Harbarth S, et al. Short-course versus long-course systemic antibiotic treatment for uncomplicated intravascular catheter-related bloodstream infections due to gram-negative bacteria, enterococci or coagulase-negative staphylococci: A systematic review. *Infect Dis Ther* 2021;10(3):1591–1605. DOI: 10.1007/s40121-021-00464-0.
345. Hooton TM, Bradley SF, Cardenas DD, Colgan R, Geerlings SE, Rice JC, et al. Diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of catheter-associated urinary tract infection in adults: 2009 international clinical practice guidelines from the infectious diseases society of America. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2010;50(5):625–663. DOI: 10.1086/650482.
346. Dudeck MA, Horan TC, Peterson KD, Allen-Bridson K, Morrell G, Pollock DA, et al. National healthcare safety network (nhsn) report, data summary for 2010, device-associated module. *Am J Infect Control* 2011;39(10):798–816. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajic.2011.10.001.
347. Centers for disease control. urinary tract infection (Catheter-associated urinary tract infection [CAUTI] and non-catheter-associated Urinary tract infection [UTI]) and other urinary system infection [USI]) events. Device-Assoc Module UTI 2018;17.
348. Laupland KB, Bagshaw SM, Gregson DB, Kirkpatrick AW, Ross T, Church DL. Intensive care unit-acquired urinary tract infections in a regional critical care system. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 2005;9(2):R60–65. DOI: 10.1186/cc3023.
349. Rosser CJ, Bare RL, Meredith JW. Urinary tract infections in the critically ill patient with a urinary catheter. *Am J Surg*. 1999;177(4):287–290. DOI: 10.1016/s0002-9610(99)00048-3.
350. van der Kooij TII, de Boer AS, Manniën J, Wille JC, Beaumont MT, Mooi BW, et al. Incidence and risk factors of device-associated infections and associated mortality at the intensive care in the Dutch surveillance system. *Intensive Care Med* 2007;33(2):271–278. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-006-0464-3.
351. Alvarez-Lerma F, Palomar M, Olaechea P, Otal JJ, Insausti J, Cerdá E. [National Study of Control of Nosocomial Infection in Intensive Care Units. Evolutive report of the years 2003–2005]. *Med Intensiva* 2007;31(1):6–17. DOI: 10.1016/S0210-5691(07)74764-2.
352. Chant C, Smith OM, Marshall JC, Friedrich JO. Relationship of catheter-associated urinary tract infection to mortality and length of stay in critically ill patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Crit Care Med* 2011;39(5):1167–1173. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e31820a8581.
353. Laupland KB, Zygun DA, Davies HD, Church DL, Louie TJ, Doig CJ. Incidence and risk factors for acquiring nosocomial urinary tract infection in the critically ill. *J Crit Care* 2002;17(1):50–57. DOI: 10.1053/j.jccr.2002.33029.
354. Tay MKX, Lee JYC, Wee IYJ, Oh HML. Evaluation of intensive care unit-acquired urinary tract infections in Singapore. *Ann Acad Med Singapore* 2010;39(6):460–465. PMID: 20625622.
355. Xie D, Fu X, Wang H, Wang L, Li R, Luo Q, et al. Annual point-prevalence of healthcare-associated infection surveys in a university hospital in China, 2007–2011. *J Infect Public Health* 2013;6(6):416–422. DOI: 10.1016/j.jiph.2013.04.009.
356. Leone M, Albanèse J, Garnier F, Sapin C, Barrau K, Bimar M-C, et al. Risk factors of nosocomial catheter-associated urinary tract infection in a polyvalent intensive care unit. *Intensive Care Med* 2003;29(6):929–932. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-003-1741-z.
357. Parlak E, Erol S, Kizilkaya M, Altoparlak U, Parlak M. [Nosocomial urinary tract infections in the intensive care unit patients]. *Mikrobiyol Bul* 2007;41(1):39–49. PMID: 17427551.
358. Karlowsky JA, Lagacé-Wiens PRS, Simner PJ, DeCorby MR, Adam HJ, Walkty A, et al. Antimicrobial resistance in urinary tract pathogens in Canada from 2007 to 2009: CANWARD surveillance study. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2011;55(7):3169–3175. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.00066-11.
359. Temiz E, Piskin N, Aydemir H, Oztoprak N, Akduman D, Celebi G, et al. Factors associated with catheter-associated urinary tract infections and the effects of other concomitant nosocomial infections in intensive care units. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2012;44(5):344–349. DOI: 10.3109/00365548.2011.639031.
360. Lewis SS, Knelson LP, Moehring RW, Chen LF, Sexton DJ, Anderson DJ. Comparison of non-intensive care unit (ICU) versus ICU rates of catheter-associated urinary tract infection in community hospitals. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2013;34(7):744–747. DOI: 10.1086/671000.
361. Alvarez-Lerma F, Gracia-Arnillas MP, Palomar M, Olaechea P, Insausti J, López-Pueyo MJ, et al. Urethral catheter-related urinary infection in critical patients admitted to the ICU. Descriptive data of the

- ENVIN-UCI study. *Med Intensiva* 2013;37(2):75–82. DOI: 10.1016/j.medin.2012.02.013.
362. Habibi S, Wig N, Agarwal S, Sharma SK, Lodha R, Pandey RM, et al. Epidemiology of nosocomial infections in medicine intensive care unit at a tertiary care hospital in northern India. *Trop Doct* 2008;38(4):233–235. DOI: 10.1258/td.2008.070395.
363. Dasgupta S, Das S, Chawan NS, Hazra A. Nosocomial infections in the intensive care unit: Incidence, risk factors, outcome and associated pathogens in a public tertiary teaching hospital of Eastern India. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2015;19(1):14–20. DOI: 10.4103/0972-5229.148633.
364. Sahu MK, Siddharth B, Choudhury A, Vishnubhatla S, Singh SP, Menon R, et al. Incidence, microbiological profile of nosocomial infections, and their antibiotic resistance patterns in a high volume Cardiac Surgical Intensive Care Unit. *Ann Card Anaesth* 2016;19(2):281–287. DOI: 10.4103/0971-9784.179625.
365. Vardakas KZ, Tansarli GS, Rafailidis PI, Falagas ME. Carbapenems versus alternative antibiotics for the treatment of bacteraemia due to Enterobacteriaceae producing extended-spectrum β -lactamases: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2012;67(12):2793–2803. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dks301.
366. Savas L, Guvel S, Onlen Y, Savas N, Duran N. Nosocomial urinary tract infections: Micro-organisms, antibiotic sensitivities and risk factors. *West Indian Med J* 2006;55(3):188–193. DOI: 10.1590/s0043-31442006000300011.
367. Yoon BI, Kim HS, Kim SD, Cho KJ, Kim SW, Ha U-S, et al. Changes in bacterial species and antibiotic sensitivity in intensive care unit: Acquired urinary tract infection during 10 years interval (2001–2011). *Urol J* 2014;11(2):1478–1484. PMID: 24807764.
368. Karlowsky JA, Hoban DJ, Hackel MA, Lob SH, Sahn DF. Resistance among Gram-negative ESKAPE pathogens isolated from hospitalized patients with intra-abdominal and urinary tract infections in Latin American countries: SMART 2013–2015. *Braz J Infect Dis Off Publ Braz Soc Infect Dis* 2017;21(3):343–348. DOI: 10.1016/j.bjid.2017.03.006.
369. Seo YB, Lee J, Kim YK, Lee SS, Lee J-A, Kim HY, et al. Randomized controlled trial of piperacillin-tazobactam, cefepime and ertapenem for the treatment of urinary tract infection caused by extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli*. *BMC Infect Dis* 2017;17(1):404. DOI: 10.1186/s12879-017-2502-x.
370. Maraki S, Samonis G, Rafailidis PI, Vouloumanou EK, Mavromanolakis E, Falagas ME. Susceptibility of urinary tract bacteria to fosfomycin. *antimicrob agents chemother* 2009;53(10):4508–4510. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.00721-09.
371. Patel B, Patel K, Shetty A, Soman R, Rodrigues C. Fosfomycin susceptibility in urinary tract enterobacteriaceae. *J Assoc Physicians India* 2017;65(9):14–16. PMID: 29313570.
372. Mir MA, Chaudhary S, Payasi A, Sood R, Mavuduru RS, Shameem M. Ceftriaxone+sulbactam+disodium EDTA versus meropenem for the treatment of complicated urinary tract infections, including acute pyelonephritis: Plea, a double-blind, randomized noninferiority trial. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2019;6(10):ofz373. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofz373.
373. Samantaray S, Kumar D, Bohra GK, Meena DS, Agarwal A, Chaudhary GR, et al. 381. Effect of Ceftriaxone+sulbactam+disodium EDTA combination in treatment of complicated urinary tract infections caused by metallo beta-lactamase producing enterobacteriales: An open label randomized controlled trial. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2023;10(Supplement_2):ofad500.451. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofad500.451.
374. Popejoy MW, Paterson DL, Cloutier D, Huntington JA, Miller B, Bliss CA, et al. Efficacy of ceftolozane/tazobactam against urinary tract and intra-abdominal infections caused by ESBL-producing *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*: A pooled analysis of Phase 3 clinical trials. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2017;72(1):268–272. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkw374.
375. Carmeli Y, Armstrong J, Laud PJ, Newell P, Stone G, Wardman A, et al. Ceftazidime-avibactam or best available therapy in patients with ceftazidime-resistant Enterobacteriaceae and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* complicated urinary tract infections or complicated intra-abdominal infections (REPRISE): A randomised, pathogen-directed, phase 3 study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2016;16(6):661–673. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30004-4.
376. Kaye KS, Bhowmick T, Metallidis S, Bleasdale SC, Sagan OS, Stus V, et al. Effect of meropenem-vaborbactam vs piperacillin-tazobactam on clinical cure or improvement and microbial eradication in complicated urinary tract infection: The tango i randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2018;319(8):788–799. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2018.0438.
377. Wagenlehner FME, Cloutier DJ, Komirenko AS, Cebrik DS, Krause KM, Keepers TR, et al. Once-daily plazomicin for complicated urinary tract infections. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380(8):729–740. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1801467.
378. Sojo-Dorado J, López-Hernández I, Rosso-Fernandez C, Morales IM, Palacios-Baena ZR, Hernández-Torres A, et al. Effectiveness of Fosfomycin for the Treatment of Multidrug-Resistant *Escherichia coli* Bacteremic Urinary Tract Infections: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2022;5(1):e2137277. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.37277.
379. Johnson JR, Russo TA. Acute pyelonephritis in adults. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378(1):48–59. PMID: 29298155.
380. Dinh A, Toumi A, Blanc C, Descatha A, Bouchand F, Salomon J, et al. Management of febrile urinary tract infection among spinal cord injured patients. *BMC Infect Dis* 2016;16:156. DOI: 10.1186/s12879-016-1484-4.
381. Osawa K, Shigemura K, Yoshida H, Fujisawa M, Arakawa S. Candida urinary tract infection and Candida species susceptibilities to antifungal agents. *J Antibiot (Tokyo)* 2013;66(11):651–654. DOI: 10.1038/ja.2013.68.
382. World Health Organization. The treatment of diarrhoea. a manual of physicians and other senior health workers. geneva: World health organization; 1990. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9241593180>.
383. McFarland LV. Epidemiology of infectious and iatrogenic nosocomial diarrhea in a cohort of general medicine patients. *Am J Infect Control*. 1995;23(5):295–305. DOI: 10.1016/0196-6553(95)90060-8.
384. Polage CR, Solnick JV, Cohen SH. Nosocomial diarrhea: Evaluation and treatment of causes other than clostridium difficile. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2012;55(7):982–989. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cis551.
385. Thibault R, Graf S, Clerc A, Delieuvain N, Heidegger CP, Pichard C. Diarrhoea in the ICU: Respective contribution of feeding and antibiotics. *Crit Care* 2013;17(4):R153. DOI: 10.1186/cc12832.
386. Elpern EH, Stutz L, Peterson S, Gurka DP, Skipper A. Outcomes associated with enteral tube feedings in a medical intensive care unit. *Am J Crit Care Off Publ Am Assoc Crit-Care Nurses* 2004;13(3):221–227. PMID: 15149056.
387. Wiesen P, Van Gossum A, Preiser J-C. Diarrhoea in the critically ill. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2006;12(2):149–154. DOI: 10.1097/01.ccx.0000216583.64804.46.
388. Bouza E, Muñoz P, Alonso R. Clinical manifestations, treatment and control of infections caused by *Clostridium difficile*. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2005;11:57–64. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2005.01165.x.
389. Bobo LD, Dubberke ER. Recognition and prevention of hospital-associated enteric infections in the intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med* 2010;38(8):S324–334. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181e69f05.
390. Surawicz CM, Brandt LJ, Binion DG, Ananthkrishnan AN, Curry SR, Gilligan PH, et al. Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of *Clostridium difficile* infections. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108(4):478–498; quiz 499. DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2013.4.
391. Planche T, Wilcox M. Reference assays for *Clostridium difficile* infection: One or two gold standards? *J Clin Pathol* 2011;64(1):1–5. DOI: 10.1136/jcp.2010.080135.
392. Tirlapur N, Puthuchery ZA, Cooper JA, Sanders J, Coen PG, Moonesinghe SR, et al. Diarrhoea in the critically ill is common, associated with poor outcome, and rarely due to *Clostridium difficile*. *Sci Rep* 2016;6:24691. DOI: 10.1038/srep24691.
393. Ingle M, Deshmukh A, Desai D, Abraham P, Joshi A, Rodrigues C, et al. Prevalence and clinical course of *Clostridium difficile* infection in a tertiary-care hospital: A retrospective analysis. *Indian J Gastroenterol*

- Off J Indian Soc Gastroenterol 2011;30(2):89–93. DOI: 10.1007/s12664-011-0097-5.
394. Vishwanath S, Singhal A, D'Souza A, Mukhopadhyay C, Varma M, Bairy I. Clostridium difficile infection at a tertiary care hospital in south India. *J Assoc Physicians India* 2013;61(11):804–806. PMID: 24974492.
395. Marcon AP, Gamba MA, Vianna LAC. Nosocomial diarrhea in the intensive care unit. *Braz J Infect Dis Off Publ Braz Soc Infect Dis* 2006;10(6):384–389. DOI: 10.1590/s1413-86702006000600005.
396. Guallar C, Ariza J, Dominguez MA, Peña C, Grau I, Verdaguer R, et al. An insidious nosocomial outbreak due to Salmonella enteritidis. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2004;25(1):10–15. DOI: 10.1086/502284.
397. Johnston CP, Qiu H, Ticehurst JR, Dickson C, Rosenbaum P, Lawson P, et al. Outbreak management and implications of a nosocomial norovirus outbreak. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2007;45(5):534–540. DOI: 10.1086/520666.
398. Vasa CV, Glatt AE. Effectiveness and appropriateness of empiric metronidazole for Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2003;98(2):354–358. DOI: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2003.07227.x.
399. Minson Q, Mok S. Relationship between antibiotic exposure and subsequent clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea. *Hosp Pharm* 2007;42(5):430–434. DOI: 10.1310/hpj4205-430.
400. Muto CA, Pokrywka M, Shutt K, Mendelsohn AB, Nouri K, Posey K, et al. A large outbreak of Clostridium difficile-associated disease with an unexpected proportion of deaths and colectomies at a teaching hospital following increased fluoroquinolone use. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2005;26(3):273–280. DOI: 10.1086/502539.
401. Polgreen PM, Chen YY, Cavanaugh JE, Ward M, Coffman S, Hornick DB, et al. An outbreak of severe Clostridium difficile-associated disease possibly related to inappropriate antimicrobial therapy for community-acquired pneumonia. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2007;28(2):212–214. DOI: 10.1086/512174.
402. Sundram F, Guyot A, Carboo I, Green S, Lilaonitkul M, Scourfield A. Clostridium difficile ribotypes 027 and 106: clinical outcomes and risk factors. *J Hosp Infect* 2009;72(2):111–118. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhin.2009.02.020.
403. Baxter R, Ray GT, Fireman BH. Case-control study of antibiotic use and subsequent Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea in hospitalized patients. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2008;29(1):44–50. DOI: 10.1086/524320.
404. Hensgens MPM, Goorhuis A, Dekkers OM, Kuijper EJ. Time interval of increased risk for Clostridium difficile infection after exposure to antibiotics. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2012;67(3):742–748. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkr508.
405. Kallen AJ, Thompson A, Ristaino P, Chapman L, Nicholson A, Sim B-T, et al. Complete restriction of fluoroquinolone use to control an outbreak of Clostridium difficile infection at a community hospital. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2009;30(3):264–272. DOI: 10.1086/595694.
406. Loo VG, Poirier L, Miller MA, Oughton M, Libman MD, Michaud S, et al. A predominantly clonal multi-institutional outbreak of Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea with high morbidity and mortality. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353(23):2442–2449. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa051639.
407. McCusker ME, Harris AD, Perencevich E, Roghmann M-C. Fluoroquinolone use and clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2003;9(6):730–733. DOI: 10.3201/eid906.020385.
408. Slimings C, Riley TV. Antibiotics and hospital-acquired Clostridium difficile infection: Update of systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2014;69(4):881–891. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkt477.
409. Thomas C, Stevenson M, Williamson DJ, Riley TV. Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea: Epidemiological data from western australia associated with a modified antibiotic policy. *Clin Infect Dis* 2002;35(12):1457–1462. DOI: 10.1086/342691.
410. Musa SA, Robertshaw H, Thomson SJ, Cowan ML, Rahman TM. Clostridium difficile-associated disease acquired in the neurocritical care unit. *Neurocrit Care* 2010;13(1):87–92. DOI: 10.1007/s12028-010-9374-x.
411. Tripathy S, Nair P, Rothburn M. Clostridium difficile associated disease in a neurointensive Care Unit. *Front Neurol* 2013;4. DOI: 10.3389/fneur.2013.00082.
412. Alvarez-Lerma F, Palomar M, Villasboa A, Amador J, Almirall J, Posada MP, et al. Epidemiological study of Clostridium difficile infection in critical patients admitted to the Intensive Care Unit. *Med Intensiva* 2014;38(9):558–566. DOI: 10.1016/j.medin.2013.11.007.
413. Ingle M, Deshmukh A, Desai D, Abraham P, Joshi A, Gupta T, et al. Clostridium difficile as a cause of acute diarrhea: A prospective study in a tertiary care center. *Indian J Gastroenterol Off J Indian Soc Gastroenterol* 2013;32(3):179–183. DOI: 10.1007/s12664-013-0303-8.
414. Ibrahim EH, Mehringer L, Prentice D, Sherman G, Schaiff R, Fraser V, et al. Early versus late enteral feeding of mechanically ventilated patients: Results of a clinical trial. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2002;26(3):174–181. DOI: 10.1177/0148607102026003174.
415. Lawrence SJ, Puzniak LA, Shadel BN, Gillespie KN, Kollef MH, Mundy LM. Clostridium difficile in the Intensive Care Unit: Epidemiology, Costs, and Colonization Pressure. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2007;28(02):123–130. DOI: 10.1086/511793.
416. Lübbert C, Johann C, Kekulé AS, Worlitzsch D, Weis S, Mössner J, et al. [Immunosuppressive treatment as a risk factor for the occurrence of clostridium difficile infection (CDI)]. *Z Gastroenterol* 2013;51(11):1251–1258. DOI: 10.1055/s-0033-1335505.
417. Wang X, Cai L, Yu R, Huang W, Zong Z. McDowell A, editor. Icu-onset Clostridium difficile infection in a university hospital in china: A prospective cohort study. *PLoS ONE* 2014;9(11):e111735. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0111735.
418. Kaneria MV, Paul S. Incidence of Clostridium difficile associated diarrhoea in a tertiary care hospital. *J Assoc Physicians India* 2012;60:26–28. PMID: 23767199.
419. Buendgens L, Bruensing J, Matthes M, Dückers H, Luedde T, Trautwein C, et al. Administration of proton pump inhibitors in critically ill medical patients is associated with increased risk of developing Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea. *J Crit Care* 2014;29(4):696.e11-15. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2014.03.002.
420. Barletta JF, Sclar DA. Proton pump inhibitors increase the risk for hospital-acquired Clostridium difficile infection in critically ill patients. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 2014;18(6):714. DOI: 10.1186/s13054-014-0714-7.
421. Nelson RL, Suda KJ, Evans CT. Antibiotic treatment for Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhoea in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017;3:CD004610. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004610.pub5.
422. Johnson S, Louie TJ, Gerding DN, Cornely OA, Chasan-Taber S, Fitts D, et al. Vancomycin, metronidazole, or tolevamer for Clostridium difficile infection: Results from two multinational, randomized, controlled trials. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2014;59(3):345–354. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciu313.
423. Zar FA, Bakkanagari SR, Moorthi KMLST, Davis MB. A comparison of vancomycin and metronidazole for the treatment of Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea, stratified by disease severity. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2007;45(3):302–307. DOI: 10.1086/519265.
424. Teasley DG, Gerding DN, Olson MM, Peterson LR, Gebhard RL, Schwartz MJ, et al. Prospective randomised trial of metronidazole versus vancomycin for Clostridium-difficile-associated diarrhoea and colitis. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 1983;2(8358):1043–1046. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(83)91036-x.
425. Wenisch C, Parschalk B, Hasenhüdl M, Hirschl AM, Graninger W. Comparison of vancomycin, teicoplanin, metronidazole, and fusidic acid for the treatment of Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am*. 1996;22(5):813–818. DOI: 10.1093/clinids/22.5.813.
426. Louie TJ, Miller MA, Mullane KM, Weiss K, Lentnek A, Golan Y, et al. Fidaxomicin versus vancomycin for Clostridium difficile infection. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364(5):422–431. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa0910812.
427. Mullane KM, Miller MA, Weiss K, Lentnek A, Golan Y, Sears PS, et al. Efficacy of fidaxomicin versus vancomycin as therapy for Clostridium

- difficile infection in individuals taking concomitant antibiotics for other concurrent infections. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2011;53(5):440–447. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cir404.
428. Cornely OA, Nathwani D, Ivanescu C, Odufowora-Sita O, Retsa P, Odeyemi IAO. Clinical efficacy of fidaxomicin compared with vancomycin and metronidazole in *Clostridium difficile* infections: A meta-analysis and indirect treatment comparison. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2014;69(11):2892–2900. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dku261.
429. de Lalla F, Nicolini R, Rinaldi E, Scarpellini P, Rigoli R, Manfrin V, et al. Prospective study of oral teicoplanin versus oral vancomycin for therapy of pseudomembranous colitis and *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1992;36(10):2192–2196. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.36.10.2192.
430. Drekonja DM, Amundson WH, Decarolis DD, Kuskowski MA, Lederle FA, Johnson JR. Antimicrobial use and risk for recurrent *Clostridium difficile* infection. *Am J Med* 2011;124(11):1081.e1-7. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2011.05.032.
431. McFarland LV, Surawicz CM, Greenberg RN, Fekety R, Elmer GW, Moyer KA, et al. A randomized placebo-controlled trial of *Saccharomyces boulardii* in combination with standard antibiotics for *Clostridium difficile* disease. *JAMA*. 1994;271(24):1913–1918. PMID: 8201735.
432. Pillai A, Nelson R. Probiotics for treatment of *Clostridium difficile*-associated colitis in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008;(1):CD004611. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004611.pub2.
433. Lau CS, Chamberlain RS. Probiotics are effective at preventing *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Gen Med* 2016;9:27–37. DOI: 10.2147/IJGM.S98280.
434. O'Horo JC, Jindai K, Kunzer B, Safdar N. Treatment of recurrent *Clostridium difficile* infection: a systematic review. *Infection* 2014;42(1):43–59. DOI: 10.1007/s15010-013-0496-x.
435. McFarland LV, Elmer GW, Surawicz CM. Breaking the cycle: Treatment strategies for 163 cases of recurrent *Clostridium difficile* disease. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002;97(7):1769–1775. DOI: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2002.05839.x.
436. Pépin J, Routhier S, Gagnon S, Brazeau I. Management and outcomes of a first recurrence of *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease in Quebec, Canada. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2006;42(6):758–764. DOI: 10.1086/501126.
437. Surawicz CM, McFarland LV, Greenberg RN, Rubin M, Fekety R, Mulligan ME, et al. The search for a better treatment for recurrent *Clostridium difficile* disease: Use of high-dose vancomycin combined with *Saccharomyces boulardii*. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2000;31(4):1012–1017. DOI: 10.1086/318130.
438. Cornely OA, Miller MA, Louie TJ, Crook DW, Gorbach SL. Treatment of first recurrence of *Clostridium difficile* infection: Fidaxomicin versus vancomycin. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2012;55 Suppl 2:S154–161. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cis462.
439. Friedman-Korn T, Livovsky DM, Maharshak N, Aviv Cohen N, Paz K, Bar-Gil Shitrit A, et al. Fecal transplantation for treatment of *Clostridium difficile* infection in elderly and debilitated patients. *Dig Dis Sci* 2018;63(1):198–203. DOI: 10.1007/s10620-017-4833-2.
440. Banks PA, Bollen TL, Dervenis C, Gooszen HG, Johnson CD, Sarr MG, et al. Classification of acute pancreatitis—2012: Revision of the Atlanta classification and definitions by international consensus. *Gut* 2013;62(1):102–111. DOI: 10.1136/gutjnl-2012-302779.
441. Yadav D, Lowenfels AB. Trends in the epidemiology of the first attack of acute pancreatitis: A systematic review. *Pancreas* 2006;33(4):323–330. DOI: 10.1097/01.mpa.0000236733.31617.52.
442. Coté GA, Yadav D, Slivka A, Hawes RH, Anderson MA, Burton FR, et al. Alcohol and smoking as risk factors in an epidemiology study of patients with chronic pancreatitis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol Off Clin Pract J Am Gastroenterol Assoc* 2011;9(3):266–273; quiz e27. DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2010.10.015.
443. Marshall JC, Cook DJ, Christou NV, Bernard GR, Sprung CL, Sibbald WJ. Multiple organ dysfunction score: A reliable descriptor of a complex clinical outcome. *Crit Care Med*. 1995;23(10):1638–1652. DOI: 10.1097/00003246-199510000-00007.
444. de-Madaria E, Pamies-Guilabert J, García G, Benito JL de, Hinojosa-Guadix J, Álamo FFG del, et al. Su1890 local and systemic complications of acute pancreatitis according to the revised atlanta classification: A nation-wide multicenter prospective study. *Gastroenterology* 2015;148(4):S-545. DOI: 10.1016/S0016-5085(15)31826-6.
445. Baron TH, Morgan DE. Acute necrotizing pancreatitis. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;340(18):1412–1417. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199905063401807.
446. Beger HG, Rau B, Mayer J, Pralle U. Natural course of acute pancreatitis. *World J Surg*. 1997;21(2):130–135. DOI: 10.1007/s002689900204.
447. Balthazar EJ, Robinson DL, Megibow AJ, Ranson JH. Acute pancreatitis: Value of CT in establishing prognosis. *Radiology*. 1990;174(2):331–336. DOI: 10.1148/radiology.174.2.2296641.
448. Werge M, Novovic S, Schmidt PN, Gluud LL. Infection increases mortality in necrotizing pancreatitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pancreatol Off J Int Assoc Pancreatol IAP AI* 2016;16(5):698–707. DOI: 10.1016/j.pan.2016.07.004.
449. Beger HG, Rau B, Isenmann R. Natural history of necrotizing pancreatitis. *Pancreatol Off J Int Assoc Pancreatol IAP AI* 2003;3(2):93–101. DOI: 10.1159/000070076.
450. Tenner S, Baillie J, DeWitt J, Vege SS. American college of gastroenterology guideline: management of acute pancreatitis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108(9):1400–1415. DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2013.218.
451. Yokoe M, Takada T, Mayumi T, Yoshida M, Isaji S, Wada K, et al. Japanese guidelines for the management of acute pancreatitis: Japanese Guidelines 2015. *J Hepato-Biliary-Pancreat Sci* 2015;22(6):405–432. DOI: 10.1002/jhbp.259.
452. Garg PK, Khanna S, Bohidar NP, Kapil A, Tandon RK. Incidence, spectrum and antibiotic sensitivity pattern of bacterial infections among patients with acute pancreatitis. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2001;16(9):1055–1059. DOI: 10.1046/j.1440-1746.2001.02589.x.
453. Dellinger EP, Tellado JM, Soto NE, Ashley SW, Barie PS, Dugernier T, et al. Early antibiotic treatment for severe acute necrotizing pancreatitis: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Ann Surg* 2007;245(5):674. DOI: 10.1097/01.sla.0000250414.09255.84.
454. Isenmann R, Rau B, Beger HG. Bacterial infection and extent of necrosis are determinants of organ failure in patients with acute necrotizing pancreatitis. *BJS*. 1999;86(8):1020–1024. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2168.1999.01176.x.
455. Büchler MW, Gloor B, Müller CA, Friess H, Seiler CA, Uhl W. Acute necrotizing pancreatitis: Treatment strategy according to the status of infection. *Ann Surg* 2000;232(5):619–626. DOI: 10.1097/0000658-200011000-00001.
456. Mutinga M, Rosenbluth A, Tenner SM, Odze RR, Sica GT, Banks PA. Does mortality occur early or late in acute pancreatitis? *Int J Pancreatol* 2000;28(2):91–95. DOI: 10.1385/IJGC.28.2:091.
457. Mann DV, Hershman MJ, Hittinger R, Glazer G. Multicentre audit of death from acute pancreatitis. *BJS*. 1994;81(6):890–893. DOI: 10.1002/bjs.1800810632.
458. Padhan RK, Jain S, Agarwal S, Harikrishnan S, Vadiraja P, Behera S, et al. Primary and secondary organ failures cause mortality differentially in acute pancreatitis and should be distinguished. *Pancreas* 2018;47(3):302–307. DOI: 10.1097/MPA.0000000000000998.
459. Gerzof SG, Banks PA, Robbins AH, Johnson WC, Spechler SJ, Wetzner SM, et al. Early diagnosis of pancreatic infection by computed tomography-guided aspiration. *Gastroenterology*. 1987;93(6):1315–1320. DOI: 10.1016/0016-5085(87)90261-7.
460. Noor MT, Radhakrishna Y, Kochhar R, Ray P, Wig JD, Sinha SK, et al. Bacteriology of infection in severe acute pancreatitis. *JOP J Pancreas* 2011;12(1):19–25. PMID: 21206096.
461. Runkel N. Bacterial translocation in acute pancreatitis. *Dig Surg*. 1996;13(4–5):269–272. DOI: 10.1159/000172445.
462. Moody FG, Haley-Russell D, Muncy DM. Intestinal transit and bacterial translocation in obstructive pancreatitis. *Dig Dis Sci*. 1995;40(8):1798–1804. DOI: 10.1007/BF02212705.
463. Jain S, Mahapatra SJ, Gupta S, Shalimar, Garg PK. Infected pancreatic necrosis due to multidrug-resistant organisms and persistent organ failure predict mortality in acute pancreatitis. *Clin Transl Gastroenterol* 2018;9(10):190. DOI: 10.1038/s41424-018-0056-x.

464. Bassi C, Falconi M, Girelli R, Nifosi F, Elio A, Martini N, et al. Microbiological findings in severe pancreatitis. *Surg Res Commun*. 1989;5(1):1–4. DOI: 10.1159/000070076.
465. Widdison AL, Karanjia ND. Pancreatic infection complicating acute pancreatitis. *Br J Surg*. 1993;80(2):148–154. DOI: 10.1002/bjs.1800800208.
466. Talukdar R, Nechutova H, Clemens M, Vege SS. Could rising BUN predict the future development of infected pancreatic necrosis? *Pancreatol Off J Int Assoc Pancreatol IAP AI* 2013;13(4):355–359. DOI: 10.1016/j.pan.2013.05.003.
467. Howard TJ, Temple MB. Prophylactic antibiotics alter the bacteriology of infected necrosis in severe acute pancreatitis. *J Am Coll Surg* 2002;195(6):759–767. DOI: 10.1016/s1072-7515(02)01494-1.
468. Ji L, Lv J-C, Song Z-F, Jiang M-T, Li L, Sun B. Risk factors of infected pancreatic necrosis secondary to severe acute pancreatitis. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2016;15(4):428–433. DOI: 10.1016/S1499-3872(15)60043-1.
469. Ding N, Sun Y-H, Wen L-M, Wang J-H, Yang J-H, Cheng K, et al. Assessment of prophylactic antibiotics administration for acute pancreatitis: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2020;133(2):212. DOI: 10.1097/CM9.0000000000000603.
470. Poropat G, Goričanec K, Lacković A, Kresović A, Lončarić A, Marušić M. Systematic review with trial sequential analysis of prophylactic antibiotics for acute pancreatitis. *Antibiot Basel Switz* 2022;11(9):1191. DOI: 10.3390/antibiotics11091191.
471. Guo D, Dai W, Shen J, Zhang M, Shi Y, Jiang K, et al. Assessment of prophylactic carbapenem antibiotics administration for severe acute pancreatitis: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Digestion* 2022;103(3):183–191. DOI: 10.1159/000520892.
472. Li F, Zhang F, Wan X, Wu K, Liu Q, Qiu C, et al. Infections in acute pancreatitis: Organisms, resistance-patterns and effect on mortality. *Dig Dis Sci* 2023;68(2):630–643. DOI: 10.1007/s10620-022-07793-1.
473. Bassi C, Pederzoli P, Vesentini S, Falconi M, Bonora A, Abbas H, et al. Behavior of antibiotics during human necrotizing pancreatitis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1994;38(4):830–836. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.38.4.830.
474. Büchler M, Malfertheiner P, Frieß H, Isenmann R, Vanek E, Grimm H, et al. Human pancreatic tissue concentration of bactericidal antibiotics. *Gastroenterology*. 1992;103(6):1902–1908. DOI: 10.1016/0016-5085(92)91450-i.
475. Ibrahim, Noor & Chan, Louisa & Ling, Tai & Mat Nor, Mohd Basri. (2017). *Guide to Antimicrobial Therapy* 2017.
476. Runzi M, Niebel W, Goebell H, Gerken G, Layer P. Severe acute pancreatitis: Nonsurgical treatment of infected necroses. *Pancreas* 2005;30(3):195–199. DOI: 10.1097/01.mpa.0000153613.17643.b3.
477. Hartwig W, Maksan S-M, Foitzik T, Schmidt J, Herfarth C, Klar E. Reduction in mortality with delayed surgical therapy of severe pancreatitis. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2002;6(3):481–487. DOI: 10.1016/s1091-255x(02)00008-2.
478. Garg PK, Sharma M, Madan K, Sahni P, Banerjee D, Goyal R. Primary conservative treatment results in mortality comparable to surgery in patients with infected pancreatic necrosis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2010;8(12):1089–1094. DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2010.04.011.
479. Mouli VP, Sreenivas V, Garg PK. Efficacy of conservative treatment, without necrosectomy, for infected pancreatic necrosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* 2013;144(2):333–340. DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2012.10.004.
480. Adler DG, Chari ST, Dahl TJ, Farnell MB, Pearson RK. Conservative management of infected necrosis complicating severe acute pancreatitis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2003;98(1):98. DOI: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2003.07162.x.
481. Leung JW, Ling TK, Chan RC, Cheung SW, Lai CW, Sung JJ, et al. Antibiotics, biliary sepsis, and bile duct stones. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 1994;40(6):716–721. PMID: 7859970.
482. Kiriya S, Takada T, Strasberg SM, Solomkin JS, Mayumi T, Pitt HA, et al. New diagnostic criteria and severity assessment of acute cholangitis in revised Tokyo Guidelines. *J Hepato-Biliary-Pancreat Sci* 2012;19(5):548–556. DOI: 10.1007/s00534-012-0537-3.
483. Williams EJ, Green J, Beckingham I, Parks R, Martin D, Lombard M. Guidelines on the management of common bile duct stones (CBDS). *Gut* 2008;57(7):1004–1021. DOI: 10.1136/gut.2007.121657.
484. Friedman GD. Natural history of asymptomatic and symptomatic gallstones. *Am J Surg*. 1993;165(4):399–404. DOI: 10.1016/s0002-9610(05)80930-4.
485. McSherry CK, Ferstenberg H, Calhoun WF, Lahman E, Virshup M. The natural history of diagnosed gallstone disease in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients. *Ann Surg*. 1985;202(1):59. DOI: 10.1097/0000658-198507000-00009.
486. Andriulli A, Loperfido S, Napolitano G, Niro G, Valvano MR, Spirito F, et al. Incidence rates of post-ERCP complications: A systematic survey of prospective studies. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2007;102(8):1781. DOI: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2007.01279.x.
487. Anderson DJ, Shimpi RA, McDonald JR, Branch MS, Kanafani ZA, Harger J, et al. Infectious complications following endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography: An automated surveillance system for detecting postprocedure bacteremia. *Am J Infect Control* 2008;36(8):592–594. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajic.2007.10.023.
488. Lipsett PA, Pitt HA. Acute cholangitis. *Surg Clin North Am*. 1990;70(6):1297–1312. DOI: 10.1016/s0039-6109(16)45285-0.
489. Gigot JF, Leese T, Dereme T, Coutinho J, Castaing D, Bismuth H. Acute cholangitis. Multivariate analysis of risk factors. *Ann Surg*. 1989;209(4):435. DOI: 10.1097/0000658-198904000-00008.
490. Melzer M, Toner R, Lacey S, Bettany E, Rait G. Biliary tract infection and bacteraemia: Presentation, structural abnormalities, causative organisms and clinical outcomes. *Postgrad Med J* 2007;83(986):773–776. DOI: 10.1136/pgmj.2007.064683.
491. Saharia PC, Zuidema GD, Cameron JL. Primary common duct stones. *Ann Surg*. 1977;185(5):598. DOI: 10.1097/0000658-197705000-00013.
492. Sung YK, Lee JK, Lee KH, Lee KT, Kang C-I. The clinical epidemiology and outcomes of bacteremic biliary tract infections caused by antimicrobial-resistant pathogens. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2012;107(3):473. DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2011.387.
493. Bapat RD, Supe AN, Patwardhan A, Kocher HM, Parab S, Sathe MJ. Biliary sepsis: An ascending infection. *Indian J Gastroenterol Off J Indian Soc Gastroenterol*. 1996;15(4):126–128. PMID: 8916575.
494. Shenoy SM, Shenoy S, Gopal S, Tantry BV, Baliga S, Jain A. Clinicomicrobiological analysis of patients with cholangitis. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2014;32(2):157. DOI: 10.4103/0255-0857.129802.
495. Ortega M, Marco F, Soriano A, Almela M, Martinez JA, Lopez J, et al. Epidemiology and prognostic determinants of bacteraemic biliary tract infection. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2012;67(6):1508–1513. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dks062.
496. Sahu MK, Chacko A, Dutta AK, Prakash JAJ. Microbial profile and antibiotic sensitivity pattern in acute bacterial cholangitis. *Indian J Gastroenterol* 2011;30(5):204. DOI: 10.1007/s12664-011-0135-3.
497. Englesbe MJ, Dawes LG. Resistant pathogens in biliary obstruction: Importance of cultures to guide antibiotic therapy. *Hpb* 2005;7(2):144–148. DOI: 10.1080/13651820510028792.
498. Laillegrand J-R, Mercier-Des-Rochettes E, Baron E, Pène F, Contou D, Favory R, et al. Acute cholangitis in intensive care units: Clinical, biological, microbiological spectrum and risk factors for mortality: A multicenter study. *Crit Care* 2021;25(1):49. DOI: 10.1186/s13054-021-03480-1.
499. Kruis T, Güse-Jaschuck S, Siegmund B, Adam T, Epple H-J. Use of microbiological and patient data for choice of empirical antibiotic therapy in acute cholangitis. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2020;20:65. DOI: 10.1186/s12876-020-01201-6.
500. Miura F, Okamoto K, Takada T, Strasberg SM, Asbun HJ, Pitt HA, et al. Tokyo Guidelines 2018: Initial management of acute biliary infection and flowchart for acute cholangitis. *J Hepato-Biliary-Pancreat Sci* 2018;25(1):31–40. DOI: 10.1002/jhbp.509.
501. Tanaka A, Takada T, Kawarada Y, Nimura Y, Yoshida M, Miura F, et al. Antimicrobial therapy for acute cholangitis: Tokyo guidelines. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg* 2007;14(1):59–67. DOI: 10.1007/s00534-006-1157-6.

502. Solomkin JS, Mazuski JE, Bradley JS, Rodvold KA, Goldstein EJ, Baron EJ, et al. Diagnosis and management of complicated intra-abdominal infection in adults and children: Guidelines by the Surgical Infection Society and the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2010;50(2):133–164. DOI: 10.1089/sur.2009.9930.
503. Kaplan G, Gregson D, Laupland K. Population-based study of the epidemiology of and the risk factors for pyogenic liver abscess. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2004;2(11):1032–1038. DOI: 10.1016/S1542-3565(04)00459-8.
504. Chan K-S, Chen C-M, Cheng K-C, Hou C-C, Lin H-J, Yu W-L. Pyogenic liver abscess: A retrospective analysis of 107 patients during a 3-year period. *Jpn J Infect Dis* 2005;58(6):366–368. PMID: 16377869.
505. Tsai F-C, Huang Y-T, Chang L-Y, Wang J-T. Pyogenic liver abscess as endemic disease, taiwan. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2008;14(10):1592–1600. DOI: 10.3201/eid1410.071254.
506. Abbas MT, Khan FY, Muhsin SA, Al-Dehwe B, Abukamar M, Elzouki A-N. Epidemiology, clinical features and outcome of liver abscess: A single reference center experience in Qatar. *Oman Med J* 2014;29(4):260–263. DOI: 10.5001/omj.2014.69.
507. Jain V, Manjavkar S, Kapur P, Durfishan, Rajput D, Mir T. Clinical and biochemical profile of liver abscess patients. *Int J Res Med Sci* 2017;5(6):2596. DOI: 10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20172454.
508. Lok K-H, Li K-F, Li K-K, Szeto M-L. Pyogenic liver abscess: Clinical profile, microbiological characteristics, and management in a Hong Kong hospital. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect Wei Mian Yu Gan Ran Za Zhi* 2008;41(6):483–490. PMID: 19255692.
509. Huang C-J, Pitt HA, Lipsett PA, Osterman FA, Lillemoie KD, Cameron JL, et al. Pyogenic hepatic abscess: Changing trends over 42 years. *Ann Surg*. 1996;223(5):600–9. DOI: 10.1097/0000658-199605000-00016.
510. Mohsen AH. Liver abscess in adults: Ten years experience in a UK centre. *QJM* 2002;95(12):797–802. DOI: 10.1093/qjmed/95.12.797.
511. Ng FH, Wong WM, Wong BCY, Kng C, Wong SY, Lai KC, et al. Sequential intravenous/oral antibiotic vs. continuous intravenous antibiotic in the treatment of pyogenic liver abscess. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2002;16(6):1083–90. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2036.2002.01266.x.
512. Rahimian J, Wilson T, Oram V, Holzman RS. Pyogenic liver abscess: Recent trends in etiology and mortality. *Clin Infect Dis* 2004;39(11):1654–9. DOI: 10.1086/425616.
513. Luo M, Yang X-X, Tan B, Zhou X-P, Xia H-M, Xue J, et al. Distribution of common pathogens in patients with pyogenic liver abscess in China: A meta-analysis. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2016;35(10):1557–1565. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-016-2712-y.
514. Ghosh S, Sharma S, Gadpayle AK, Gupta HK, Mahajan RK, Sahoo R, et al. Clinical, laboratory, and management profile in patients of liver abscess from Northern India. *J Trop Med* 2014;2014:1–8. DOI: 10.1155/2014/142382.
515. Poovorawan K, Pan-ngum W, Soonthornworasiri N, Kulrat C, Kittittrakul C, Wilairatana P, et al. Burden of liver abscess and survival risk score in thailand: A population-based study. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2016;95(3):683–688. DOI: 10.4269/ajtmh.16-0228.
516. Peris J, Bellot P, Roig P, Reus S, Carrascosa S, González-Alcaide G, et al. Clinical and epidemiological characteristics of pyogenic liver abscess in people 65 years or older versus people under 65: A retrospective study. *BMC Geriatr* 2017;17(1):161. DOI: 10.1186/s12877-017-0545-x.
517. Sharma MP, Rai RR, Acharya SK, Ray JC, Tandon BN. Needle aspiration of amoebic liver abscess. *BMJ*. 1989;299(6711):1308–1309. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.299.6711.1308.
518. Lasserre R, Jaroovnesama N, Kurathong S, Soh C-T. Single-day drug treatment of amoebic liver abscess. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 1983;32(4):723–726. DOI: 10.4269/ajtmh.1983.32.723.
519. Bhatia S, Karnad DR, Oak JL. Randomized double-blind trial of metronidazole versus secnidazole in amoebic liver abscess. *Indian J Gastroenterol Off J Indian Soc Gastroenterol*. 1998;17(2):53–54. PMID: 9563220.
520. McGarr PL, Madiba TE, Thomson SR, Corr P. Amoebic liver abscess — results of a conservative management policy 2003;93(2):5. PMID: 12640885.
521. Cheng H-P, Siu LK, Chang F-Y. Extended-spectrum cephalosporin compared to cefazolin for treatment of klebsiella pneumoniae-caused liver abscess. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2003;47(7):2088–2092. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.47.7.2088-2092.2003.
522. Liu Y, Wang J, Jiang W. An increasing prominent disease of klebsiella pneumoniae liver abscess: Etiology, diagnosis, and treatment. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2013;2013:1–12. DOI: 10.1155/2013/258514.
523. Lübbert C, Wiegand J, Karlas T. Therapy of liver abscesses. *Viszeralmedizin* 2014;30(5):3–3. DOI: 10.1159/000366579.
524. Pal P, Ray S, Moulick A, Dey S, Jana A, Banerjee K. Liver abscess caused by *Burkholderia pseudomallei* in a young man: A case report and review of literature. *World J Clin Cases WJCC* 2014;2(10):604. DOI: 10.12998/wjcc.v2.i10.604.
525. Sentochnik DE, Eliopoulos GM, Ferraro MJ, Moellering RC, Jr. Comparative in vitro activity of SM7338, a new carbapenem antimicrobial agent. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1989;33(8):1232. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.33.8.1232.
526. Pastagia M, Arumugam V. Klebsiella pneumoniae liver abscesses in a public hospital in Queens, New York. *Travel Med Infect Dis* 2008;6(4):228–233. DOI: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2008.02.005.
527. Yu SCH, Ho SSM, Lau WY, Yeung DTK, Yuen EHY, Lee PSF, et al. Treatment of pyogenic liver abscess: Prospective randomized comparison of catheter drainage and needle aspiration. *Hepatol Baltim Md* 2004;39(4):932–938. DOI: 10.1002/hep.20133.
528. Zerem E, Hadzic A. Sonographically guided percutaneous catheter drainage versus needle aspiration in the management of pyogenic liver abscess. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007;189(3):W138-142. DOI: 10.2214/AJR.07.2173.
529. Cai Y-L, Xiong X-Z, Lu J, Cheng Y, Yang C, Lin Y-X, et al. Percutaneous needle aspiration versus catheter drainage in the management of liver abscess: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *HPB* 2015;17(3):195–201. DOI: 10.1111/hpb.12332.
530. Heneghan HM, Healy NA, Martin ST, Ryan RS, Nolan N, Traynor O, et al. Modern management of pyogenic hepatic abscess: A case series and review of the literature. *BMC Res Notes* 2011;4:80. DOI: 10.1186/1756-0500-4-80.
531. Andreu M, Sola R, Sitges-Serra A, Alia C, Gallen M, Vila MC, et al. Risk factors for spontaneous bacterial peritonitis in cirrhotic patients with ascites. *Gastroenterology*. 1993;104(4):1133–1138. DOI: 10.1016/0016-5085(93)90284-j.
532. Uncu N, Bülbül M, Yildiz N, Noyan A, Koşan C, Kavukçu S, et al. Primary peritonitis in children with nephrotic syndrome: Results of a 5-year multicenter study. *Eur J Pediatr* 2010;169(1):73–76. DOI: 10.1007/s00431-009-0989-x.
533. Mishra SP, Tiwary SK, Mishra M, Gupta SK. An introduction of tertiary peritonitis. *J Emerg Trauma Shock* 2014;7(2):121. DOI: 10.4103/0974-2700.130883.
534. Weiss G, Steffanie W, Lippert H. [Peritonitis: main reason of severe sepsis in surgical intensive care]. *Zentralbl Chir* 2007;132(2):130–137. DOI: 10.1055/s-2006-960478.
535. Calandra T, Cohen J. International sepsis forum definition of infection in the ICU consensus conference. The international sepsis forum consensus conference on definitions of infection in the intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med* 2005;33(7):1538–1548. DOI: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000168253.91200.83.
536. Reemst PH, van Goor H, Goris RJ. SIRS, MODS and tertiary peritonitis. *Eur J Surg Suppl* 1996;(576):47–49. PMID: 8908471.
537. Buijk SE, Bruining HA. Future directions in the management of tertiary peritonitis. *Intensive Care Med* 2002;28(8):1024–1029. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-002-1383-6.
538. Evans HL, Raymond DP, Pelletier SJ, Crabtree TD, Pruett TL, Sawyer RG. Diagnosis of intra-abdominal infection in the critically ill patient. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2001;7(2):117–121. DOI: 10.1097/00075198-200104000-00010.
539. Ballus J, Lopez-Delgado JC, Sabater-Riera J, Perez-Fernandez XL, Betbese AJ, Roncal JA. Factors associated with the development of tertiary peritonitis in critically ill patients. *Surg Infect* 2017;18(5):588–595. DOI: 10.1089/sur.2016.018.

540. França A, Giordano HM, Sevá-Pereira T, Soares EC. Five days of ceftriaxone to treat spontaneous bacterial peritonitis in cirrhotic patients. *J Gastroenterol* 2002;37(2):119–122. DOI: 10.1007/s005350200006.
541. Marshall JC, Innes M. Intensive care unit management of intra-abdominal infection. *Crit Care Med* 2003;31(8):2228–2237. DOI: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000087326.59341.51.
542. Nathens AB, Rotstein OD, Marshall JC. Tertiary peritonitis: Clinical features of a complex nosocomial infection. *World J Surg.* 1998;22(2):158–163. DOI: 10.1007/s002689900364.
543. Rimola A, Salmerón JM, Clemente G, Rodrigo L, Obrador A, Miranda ML, et al. Two different dosages of cefotaxime in the treatment of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis in cirrhosis: Results of a prospective, randomized, multicenter study. *Hepatology* 1995;21(3):674–679. PMID: 7875666.
544. European Association for the Study of the Liver. EASL clinical practice guidelines on the management of ascites, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, and hepatorenal syndrome in cirrhosis. *J Hepatol* 2010;53(3):397–417. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2010.05.004.
545. Navasa M, Follo A, Llovet JM, Clemente G, Vargas V, Rimola A, et al. Randomized, comparative study of oral ofloxacin versus intravenous cefotaxime in spontaneous bacterial peritonitis. *Gastroenterology*. 1996;111(4):1011–1017. DOI: 10.1016/S0016-5085(96)70069-0.
546. Terg R, Cobas S, Fassio E, Landeira G, Ríos B, Vasen W, et al. Oral ciprofloxacin after a short course of intravenous ciprofloxacin in the treatment of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis: Results of a multicenter, randomized study. *J Hepatol* 2000;33(4):564–569. DOI: 10.1034/j.1600-0641.2000.033004564.x.
547. Biggins SW, Angeli P, Garcia-Tsao G, Ginès P, Ling SC, Nadim MK, et al. Diagnosis, evaluation, and management of ascites, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis and hepatorenal syndrome: 2021 practice guidance by the american association for the study of liver diseases. *Hepatology* 2021;74(2):1014–1048. DOI: 10.1002/hep.31884.
548. Fernández J, Bert F, Nicolas-Chanoine M-H. The challenges of multi-drug-resistance in hepatology. *J Hepatol* 2016;65(5):1043–1054. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2016.08.006.
549. Jindal A, Kumar M, Bhadoria AS, Maiwall R, Sarin SK. A randomized open label study of “imipenem vs. cefepime” in spontaneous bacterial peritonitis. *Liver Int Off J Int Assoc Study Liver* 2016;36(5):677–687. DOI: 10.1111/liv.12985.
550. Brismar B, Malmberg AS, Tunevall G, Wretling B, Bergman L, Mentzing LO, et al. Piperacillin-tazobactam versus imipenem-cilastatin for treatment of intra-abdominal infections. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 1992;36(12):2766–2773. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.36.12.2766.
551. Montravers P, Lepape A, Dubreuil L, Gauzit R, Pean Y, Benchimol D, et al. Clinical and microbiological profiles of community-acquired and nosocomial intra-abdominal infections: Results of the French prospective, observational EBIA study. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2009;63(4):785–794. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkp005.
552. Steinbach CL, Töpfer C, Adam T, Kees MG. Spectrum adequacy of antibiotic regimens for secondary peritonitis: A retrospective analysis in intermediate and intensive care unit patients. *Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob* 2015;14:48. DOI: 10.1186/s12941-015-0110-4.
553. Montravers P, Blot S, Dimopoulos G, Eckmann C, Eggimann P, Guirao X, et al. Therapeutic management of peritonitis: A comprehensive guide for intensivists. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42(8):1234–1247. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-016-4307-6.
554. Sawyer RG, Claridge JA, Nathens AB, Rotstein OD, Duane TM, Evans HL, et al. Trial of short-course antimicrobial therapy for intraabdominal infection. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372(21):1996–2005. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1411162.
555. Thigpen MC, Whitney CG, Messonnier NE, Zell ER, Lynfield R, Hadler JL, et al. Bacterial meningitis in the United States, 1998–2007. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364(21):2016–2025. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1005384.
556. Ghia CJ, Rambhad GS. Meningococcal disease burden in india: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Microbiol Insights* 2021;14:11786361211053344. DOI: 10.1177/11786361211053344.
557. Moon S-Y, Chung DR, Kim S-W, Chang HH, Lee H, Jung DS, et al. Changing etiology of community-acquired bacterial meningitis in adults: A nationwide multicenter study in Korea. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2010;29(7):793–800. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-010-0929-8.
558. Durand ML, Calderwood SB, Weber DJ, Miller SI, Southwick FS, Caviness VS, et al. Acute bacterial meningitis in adults – a review of 493 episodes. *N Engl J Med.* 1993;328(1):21–28. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199301073280104.
559. Faustini A, Arca’ M, Fusco D, Perucci CA. Prognostic factors and determinants of fatal outcome due to bacterial meningitis in the Lazio region of Italy, 1996–2000. *Int J Infect Dis* 2007;11(2):137–144. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2005.12.004.
560. Dzupova O, Rozsypal H, Prochazka B, Benes J. Acute bacterial meningitis in adults: Predictors of outcome. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2009;41(5):348–354. DOI: 10.1080/00365540902849391.
561. Glimaker M, Johansson B, Grindborg O, Bottai M, Lindquist L, Sjolín J. Adult bacterial meningitis: Earlier treatment and improved outcome following guideline revision promoting prompt lumbar puncture. *Clin Infect Dis* 2015;60(8):1162–1169. DOI: 10.1093/cid/civ011.
562. Grindborg ö., Naucler P, Sjölin J, Glimåker M. Adult bacterial meningitis—a quality registry study: Earlier treatment and favourable outcome if initial management by infectious diseases physicians. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2015;21(6):560–566. DOI: 10.1016/j.cmi.2015.02.023.
563. Armstrong D, Ashworth M, Dregan A, White P. The relationship between prior antimicrobial prescription and meningitis: A case-control study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2016;66(645):e228–233. DOI: 10.3399/bjgp16X684313.
564. Domingo P, Pomar V, de Benito N, Coll P. The spectrum of acute bacterial meningitis in elderly patients. *BMC Infect Dis* 2013;13:108. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2334-13-108.
565. Tankhiwale SS, Jagtap P M, Khadse RK, Jalgaonkar S V. Bacteriological study of pyogenic meningitis with special reference to C-reactive protein. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2001;19(3):159. PMID: 17664824.
566. Chandramuki A, Mani R, Pradhan S, Nagarathna S, Wasiulla R. Bacteriological profile of community acquired acute bacterial meningitis: A ten-year retrospective study in a tertiary neurocare centre in South India. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2007;25(2):108. DOI: 10.4103/0255-0857.32715.
567. Madhumita P, Gupta N. Clinical and bacteriological spectrum of community-acquired acute bacterial meningitis in adults at a tertiary care hospital in northern India. *Int J Nutr Pharmacol Neurol Dis* 2011;1(2):194. DOI: 10.4103/2231-0738.84214.
568. Vibha D, Bhatia R, Prasad K, Srivastava MVP, Tripathi M, Singh MB. Clinical features and independent prognostic factors for acute bacterial meningitis in adults. *Neurocrit Care* 2010;13(2):199–204. DOI: 10.1007/s12028-010-9396-4.
569. Ghia CJ, Rambhad GS. A systematic literature review on the prevalence and etiology of meningitis among critically ill and hospitalized patients in India. *Ther Adv Infect Dis* 2021;8:20499361211046453. DOI: 10.1177/20499361211046453.
570. Jayaraman Y, Veeraraghavan B, Chethrapilly Purushothaman GK, Sukumar B, Kangusamy B, Nair Kapoor A, et al. Burden of bacterial meningitis in India: Preliminary data from a hospital based sentinel surveillance network. *PloS One* 2018;13(5):e0197198. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0197198.
571. Williamson RA, Phillips-Bute BG, McDonagh DL, Gray MC, Zomorodi AR, Olson DM, et al. Predictors of extraventricular drain-associated bacterial ventriculitis. *J Crit Care* 2014;29(1):77–82. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2013.08.012.
572. Chi H, Chang K-Y, Chang H-C, Chiu N-C, Huang F-Y. Infections associated with indwelling ventriculostomy catheters in a teaching hospital. *Int J Infect Dis* 2010;14(3):e216–219. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2009.04.006.
573. Chen C-H, Chang C-Y, Lin L-J, Chen WL, Chang Y-J, Wang S-H, et al. Risk factors associated with postcraniotomy meningitis: A retrospective study. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2016;95(31):e4329. DOI: 10.1097/MD.0000000000004329.

574. Murthy SB, Moradiya Y, Shah J, Hanley DF, Ziai WC. Incidence, predictors, and outcomes of ventriculostomy-associated infections in spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage. *Neurocrit Care* 2016;24(3):389–396. DOI: 10.1007/s12028-015-0199-5.
575. Citerio G, Signorini L, Bronco A, Vargiolu A, Rota M, Latronico N. External ventricular and lumbar drain device infections in icu patients: A prospective multicenter Italian study. *Crit Care Med* 2015;43(8):1630–1637. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001019.
576. Arabi Y, Memish ZA, Balkhy HH, Francis C, Ferayan A, Al Shimemeri A, et al. Ventriculostomy-associated infections: Incidence and risk factors. *Am J Infect Control* 2005;33(3):137–143. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajic.2004.11.008.
577. Beer R, Lackner P, Pfausler B, Schmutzhard E. Nosocomial ventriculitis and meningitis in neurocritical care patients. *J Neurol* 2008;255(11):1617–1624. DOI: 10.1007/s00415-008-0059-8.
578. Korinek A-M, Korinek A-M, Laisne M-J, Achou C, Bromberg N, Dagneou F, et al. Risk factors for neurosurgical site infections after craniotomy: A prospective multicenter study of 2944 patients. *Neurosurgery*. 1997;41(5):1073–1081. DOI: 10.1097/00006123-199711000-00010.
579. Kourbeti IS, Vakis AF, Ziakas P, Karabetos D, Potolidis E, Christou S, et al. Infections in patients undergoing craniotomy: Risk factors associated with post-craniotomy meningitis. *J Neurosurg* 2014;122(5):1113–1119. DOI: 10.3171/2014.8.JNS132557.
580. Inoue T, Shimizu H, Fujimura M, Sato K, Endo H, Niizuma K, et al. Risk factors for meningitis after craniotomy in patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage due to anterior circulation aneurysms rupture. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg* 2015;139:302–306. DOI: 10.1016/j.clineuro.2015.10.029.
581. Chen C, Zhang B, Yu S, Sun F, Ruan Q, Zhang W, et al. The incidence and risk factors of meningitis after major craniotomy in china: A retrospective cohort study. *PLOS ONE* 2014;9(7):e101961. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0101961.
582. Patir R, Mahapatra AK, Banerji AK. Risk factors in postoperative neurosurgical infection: A prospective study. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. 1992;119(1–4):80–84. DOI: 10.1007/BF01541786.
583. Lietard C, Thébaud V, Besson G, Lejeune B. Risk factors for neurosurgical site infections: An 18-month prospective survey: Clinical article. *J Neurosurg* 2008;109(4):729–734. DOI: 10.3171/JNS/2008/109/10/0729.
584. De Bels D, Korinek A-M, Bismuth R, Trystram D, Coriat P, Puybasset L. Empirical treatment of adult postsurgical nosocomial meningitis. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2002;144(10):989–995. DOI: 10.1007/s00701-002-1001-y.
585. Chidambaram S, Nair MN, Krishnan SS, Cai L, Gu W, Vasudevan MC. Postoperative central nervous system infection after neurosurgery in a modernized, resource-limited tertiary neurosurgical center in South Asia. *World Neurosurg* 2015;84(6):1668–1673. DOI: 10.1016/j.wneu.2015.07.006.
586. Alotaibi AF, Hulou MM, Vestal M, Alkholif F, Asgarzadeh M, Cote DJ, et al. The efficacy of antibacterial prophylaxis against the development of meningitis after craniotomy: A meta-analysis. *World Neurosurg* 2016;90:597–603.e1. DOI: 10.1016/j.wneu.2016.02.048.
587. Moen V, Dahlgren N, Irestedt L. Severe neurological complications after central neuraxial blockades in Sweden 1990–1999. *Anesthesiol J Am Soc Anesthesiol* 2004;101(4):950–959. DOI: 10.1097/00000542-200410000-00021.
588. Baer ET. Post-dural puncture bacterial meningitis. *Anesthesiology* 2006;105(2):381–393. DOI: 10.1097/00000542-200608000-00022.
589. Baltas I, Tsoulfa S, Sakellariou P, Vogas V, Fylaktakis M, Kondodimou A. Posttraumatic meningitis: Bacteriology, hydrocephalus, and outcome. *Neurosurgery*. 1994;35(3):422–427. DOI: 10.1227/00006123-199409000-00009.
590. Kourbeti IS, Vakis AF, Papadakis JA, Karabetos DA, Bertias G, Filippou M, et al. Infections in traumatic brain injury patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2012;18(4):359–364. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03625.x.
591. Ratilal BO, Costa J, Pappamikail L, Sampaio C. Antibiotic prophylaxis for preventing meningitis in patients with basilar skull fractures. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;(4):CD004884. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004884.pub4.
592. Vinchon M, Dhellemmes P. Cerebrospinal fluid shunt infection: Risk factors and long-term follow-up. *Childs Nerv Syst* 2006;22(7):692–697. DOI: 10.1007/s00381-005-0037-8.
593. Kulkarni AV, Drake JM, Lamberti-Pasculli M. Cerebrospinal fluid shunt infection: A prospective study of risk factors. *J Neurosurg* 2001;94(2):195–201. DOI: 10.3171/jns.2001.94.2.0195.
594. Tulipan N, Cleves MA. Effect of an intraoperative double-gloving strategy on the incidence of cerebrospinal fluid shunt infection. *J Neurosurg* 2006;104(1 Suppl):5–8. DOI: 10.3171/ped.2006.104.1.5.
595. Kar M, Jamwal A, Dubey A, Sahu C, Patel SS. Bacterial meningitis among intracranial surgery patients at a university hospital in Northern India. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2022;26(12):1244–1252. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-24363.
596. Srinivas D, Veena Kumari HB, Somanna S, Bhagavatula I, Anandappa CB. The incidence of postoperative meningitis in neurosurgery: An institutional experience. *Neurol India* 2011;59(2):195–198. DOI: 10.4103/0028-3886.79136.
597. Valiente De Santis LB, Márquez Gómez I, Sobrino Díaz B, Pérez Camacho I, Mediavilla Gradolph C, Caballero Martínez LF, et al. Nosocomial meningitis caused by ESBL- and OXA-48-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and treated with ceftazidime-avibactam. Report of one case and review of the literature. *Rev Espanola Quimioter Publicacion Of Soc Espanola Quimioter* 2022;35(6):572–576. DOI: 10.37201/req/043.2022.
598. Sapra H, Singhal V. Managing meningoencephalitis in Indian ICU. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2019;23(Suppl 2):S124–128. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23189.
599. Meyer CN, Samuelsson IS, Galle M, Bangsberg JM. Adult bacterial meningitis: Aetiology, penicillin susceptibility, risk factors, prognostic factors and guidelines for empirical antibiotic treatment. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2004;10(8):709–717. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0961.2004.00925.x.
600. Erdem H, Elaldi N, Öztoprak N, Sengoz G, Ak O, Kaya S, et al. Mortality indicators in pneumococcal meningitis: Therapeutic implications. *Int J Infect Dis* 2014;19:13–19. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2013.09.012.
601. Prasad K, Kumar A, Singhal T, Gupta PK. Third generation cephalosporins versus conventional antibiotics for treating acute bacterial meningitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007;(4):CD001832. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001832.pub3.
602. Sarvepalli AK, Dharana PK. Clinical profile, bacterial profile and outcomes of acute bacterial meningitis in a tertiary care hospital—one year study. *Int J Adv Med* 2017;4(2):502. DOI: 10.18203/2349-3933.ijam20171050.
603. Tunkel AR, Hartman BJ, Kaplan SL, Kaufman BA, Roos KL, Scheld WM, et al. Practice guidelines for the management of bacterial meningitis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2004;39(9):1267–1284. DOI: 10.1086/425368.
604. Zheng G, Cao Y, Liu C, Qian L, Cai Y, Cui M, et al. Phenotype, molecular characterisation and risk factors for postoperative meningitis caused by ESBL-producing-Enterobacteriaceae: A six years multi-Centre comparative cohort study. *BMC Infect Dis* 2021;21(1):85. DOI: 10.1186/s12879-021-05784-7.
605. Falagas ME, Bliziotis IA, Tam VH. Intraventricular or intrathecal use of polymyxins in patients with Gram-negative meningitis: A systematic review of the available evidence. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2007;29(1):9–25. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2006.08.024.
606. Ng K, Mabasa VH, Chow I, Ensom MHH. Systematic review of efficacy, pharmacokinetics, and administration of intraventricular vancomycin in adults. *Neurocrit Care* 2014;20(1):158–171. DOI: 10.1007/s12028-012-9784-z.
607. Tunkel AR, Hasbun R, Bhimraj A, Byers K, Kaplan SL, Scheld WM, et al. 2017 infectious diseases society of America's clinical practice guidelines for healthcare-associated ventriculitis and meningitis*. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017;64(6):e34–65. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciw861.
608. Karvouniaris M, Brotis A, Tsiakos K, Palli E, Koulenti D. Current perspectives on the diagnosis and management of healthcare-associated

- ventriculitis and meningitis. *Infect Drug Resist* 2022;15:697–721. DOI: 10.2147/IDR.S326456.
609. Fried HI, Nathan BR, Rowe AS, Zabramski JM, Andaluz N, Bhimraj A, et al. The insertion and management of external ventricular drains: An evidence-based consensus statement : A statement for healthcare professionals from the neurocritical care society. *Neurocrit Care* 2016;24(1):61–81. DOI: 10.1007/s12028-015-0224-8.
610. Zhang Z, Cai X, Li J, Kang X, Wang H, Zhang L, et al. Retrospective analysis of 620 cases of brain abscess in Chinese patients in a single center over a 62-year period. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2016;158(4):733–739. DOI: 10.1007/s00701-016-2741-4.
611. Yang SY. Brain abscess: A review of 400 cases. *J Neurosurg* 1981;55(5):794–799. DOI: 10.3171/jns.1981.55.5.0794.
612. Brouwer MC, Coutinho JM, van de Beek D. Clinical characteristics and outcome of brain abscess: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurology* 2014;82(9):806–813. DOI: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000000172.
613. Lakshmi V, Rao RR, Dinakar I. Bacteriology of brain abscess - observations on 50 cases. *J Med Microbiol* 1993;38(3):187–190. DOI: 10.1099/00222615-38-3-187.
614. Lakshmi V, Umabala P, Anuradha K, Padmaja K, Padmasree C, Rajesh A, et al. Microbiological spectrum of brain abscess at a tertiary care hospital in south india: 24-Year Data and Review. *Pathol Res Int* 2011;2011:1–12. DOI: 10.4061/2011/583139.
615. Prasad KN, Mishra AM, Gupta D, Husain N, Husain M, Gupta RK. Analysis of microbial etiology and mortality in patients with brain abscess. *J Infect* 2006;53(4):221–227. DOI: 10.1016/j.jinf.2005.12.002.
616. Menon S, Bharadwaj R, Chowdhary A, Kaundinya DV, Palande DA. Current epidemiology of intracranial abscesses: A prospective 5 year study. *J Med Microbiol* 2008;57(10):1259–1268. DOI: 10.1099/jmm.0.47814-0.
617. Chetty M, Rakhi B, Rachana K, Sujatha S, Srinivasan GM. An eight year clinico-microbiological retrospective study on brain abscesses in India. *Microbiol Insights* 2022;15:11786361221106111. DOI: 10.1177/11786361221106111.
618. Bodilsen J, D'Alessandris QG, Humphreys H, Iro MA, Klein M, Last K, et al. "European society of clinical microbiology and infectious diseases guidelines on diagnosis and treatment of brain abscess in children and adults" Author's reply. *Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2024;30(1):149–150. DOI: 10.1016/j.cmi.2023.10.012.
619. Arlotti M, Grossi P, Pea F, Tomei G, Vullo V, De Rosa FG, et al. Consensus document on controversial issues for the treatment of infections of the central nervous system: bacterial brain abscesses. *Int J Infect Dis* 2010;14:S79–S92. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2010.05.010.
620. Angus DC, Linde-Zwirble WT, Lidicker J, Clermont G, Carcillo J, Pinsky MR. Epidemiology of severe sepsis in the United States: Analysis of incidence, outcome, and associated costs of care. *Crit Care Med* 2001;29(7):1303–1310. DOI: 10.1097/00003246-200107000-00002.
621. Mayr FB, Yende S, Angus DC. Epidemiology of severe sepsis. *Virulence* 2014;5(1):4–11. DOI: 10.4161/viru.27372.
622. Eron LJ. Managing skin and soft tissue infections: Expert panel recommendations on key decision points. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2003;52(90001):3i–17. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkg466.
623. Stevens DL, Bisno AL, Chambers HF, Dellinger EP, Goldstein EJC, Gorbach SL, et al. Practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of skin and soft tissue infections: 2014 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2014;59(2):e10–e52. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciu296.
624. Mohanty A, Mohapatra K, Pal B. Isolation and identification of *Staphylococcus aureus* from skin and soft tissue infection in sepsis cases, Odisha. *J Pure Appl Microbiol* 2018;12(1):419–424. DOI: 10.22207/JPAM.12.1.49.
625. Afroz Z, Metri BC, Jyothi P. Bacteriological profile and antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of skin and soft tissue infections among gram negative bacilli in a tertiary care hospital of South India. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research* 2015;7(7):397. Available from: <https://www.jpsr.pharmainfo.in/Documents/Volumes/vol7Issue07/jpsr07071502.pdf>.
626. Mohanty S, Kapil A, Dhawan B, Das BK. Bacteriological and antimicrobial susceptibility profile of soft tissue infections from Northern India. *Indian J Med Sci* 2004;58(1):10–15. PMID: 14960796.
627. Joshi S, Ray P, Manchanda V, Bajaj J, Chitnis DS, Gautam V, et al. Methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in India: Prevalence & susceptibility pattern. *Indian J Med Res* 2013;137(2):363–369. PMID: 23563381.
628. Giuliano A, Lewis F, Hadley K, Blaisdell FW. Bacteriology of necrotizing fasciitis. *Am J Surg* 1977;134(1):52–57. DOI: 10.1016/0002-9610(77)90283-5.
629. Wang J-M, Lim H-K. Necrotizing fasciitis: eight-year experience and literature review. *Braz J Infect Dis Off Publ Braz Soc Infect Dis* 2014;18(2):137–143. DOI: 10.1016/j.bjid.2013.08.003.
630. Singh G, Ray P, Sinha SK, Adhikary S, Khanna SK. Bacteriology of necrotizing infections of soft tissues. *Aust N Z J Surg* 1996;66(11):747–750. DOI: 10.1111/j.1445-2197.1996.tb00735.x.
631. Arabi YM, Dara SI, Tamim HM, Rishu AH, Bouchama A, Khedr MK, et al. Clinical characteristics, sepsis interventions and outcomes in the obese patients with septic shock: An international multicenter cohort study. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 2013;17(2):R72. DOI: 10.1186/cc12680.
632. Shen H-N, Lu C-L. Skin and soft tissue infections in hospitalized and critically ill patients: A nationwide population-based study. *BMC Infect Dis* 2010;10:151. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2334-10-151.
633. McClaine RJ, Husted TL, Hebbeler-Clark RS, Solomkin JS. Meta-analysis of trials evaluating parenteral antimicrobial therapy for skin and soft tissue infections. *Clin Infect Dis* 2010;50(8):1120–1126. DOI: 10.1086/651264.
634. Neville LO, Brumfitt W, Hamilton-Miller JMT, Harding I. Teicoplanin vs vancomycin for the treatment of serious infections: A randomised trial. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 1995;5(3):187–193. DOI: 10.1016/0924-8579(95)00002-P.
635. Liu C-Y, Lee W-S, Fung C-P, Cheng N-C, Liu C-L, Yang S-P, et al. comparative study of teicoplanin vs vancomycin for the treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia. *Clin Drug Invest* 1996;12(2):80–87. DOI: 10.2165/00044011-199612020-00003.
636. Peng Y, Ye X, Li Y, Bu T, Chen X, Bi J, et al. Teicoplanin as an effective alternative to vancomycin for treatment of mrsa infection in chinese population: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8(11):e79782. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0079782.
637. Davis SL, McKinnon PS, Hall LM, Delgado G, Rose W, Wilson RF, et al. Daptomycin versus vancomycin for complicated skin and skin structure infections: clinical and economic outcomes. *Pharmacotherapy* 2007;27(12):1611–1618. DOI: 10.1592/phco.27.12.1611.
638. White B, Seaton RA. Complicated skin and soft tissue infections: literature review of evidence for and experience with daptomycin. *Infect Drug Resist* 2011;4:115–127. DOI: 10.2147/IDR.S13808.
639. Hepburn MJ, Dooley DP, Skidmore PJ, Ellis MW, Starnes WF, Hasewinkle WC. Comparison of short-course (5 days) and standard (10 days) treatment for uncomplicated cellulitis. *Arch Intern Med* 2004;164(15):1669–1674. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.164.15.1669.
640. Shankar-Hari M, Phillips GS, Levy ML, Seymour CW, Liu VX, Deutschman CS, et al. Developing a new definition and assessing new clinical criteria for septic shock: For the third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (Sepsis-3). *JAMA* 2016;315(8):775–787. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2016.0289.
641. Hatfield KM, Dantes RB, Baggs J, Sapiano MRP, Fiore AE, Jernigan JA, et al. assessing variability in hospital-level mortality among U.S. Medicare Beneficiaries with hospitalizations for severe sepsis and septic shock*. *Crit Care Med* 2018;46(11):1753. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000003324.
642. Kaukonen K-M, Bailey M, Suzuki S, Pilcher D, Bellomo R. Mortality related to severe sepsis and septic shock among critically ill patients in Australia and New Zealand, 2000–2012. *JAMA* 2014;311(13):1308. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2014.2637.
643. Ferrer R, Martin-Loeches I, Phillips G, Osborn TM, Townsend S, Dellinger RP, et al. Empiric antibiotic treatment reduces mortality

- in severe sepsis and septic shock from the first hour: results from a guideline-based performance improvement program*. *Crit Care Med* 2014;42(8):1749–1755. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000000330.
644. Dellinger RP, Schorr CA, Levy MM. A users' guide to the 2016 surviving sepsis guidelines: *Crit Care Med* 2017;45(3):381–385. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000002257.
645. Kumar A, Zarychanski R, Light B, Parrillo J, Maki D, Simon D, et al. Early combination antibiotic therapy yields improved survival compared with monotherapy in septic shock: A propensity-matched analysis*. *Crit Care Med* 2010;38(9):1773–1785. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181eb3ccd.
646. Kumar A, Safdar N, Kethireddy S, Chateau D. A survival benefit of combination antibiotic therapy for serious infections associated with sepsis and septic shock is contingent only on the risk of death: A meta-analytic/meta-regression study: *Crit Care Med* 2010;38(8):1651–1664. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181e96b91.
647. Kullberg BJ, Arendrup MC, Champion EW, et al. Invasive candidiasis. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373(15):1445–1456. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra1315399.
648. Horn DL, Neofytos D, Anaissie EJ, Fishman JA, Steinbach WJ, Olyaei AJ, et al. Epidemiology and Outcomes of Candidemia in 2019 Patients: Data from the Prospective Antifungal Therapy Alliance Registry. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;48(12):1695–1703. DOI: 10.1086/599039.
649. McKinnon PS. Temporal assessment of candida risk factors in the surgical intensive care unit. *Arch Surg* 2001;136(12):1401. DOI: 10.1001/archsurg.136.12.1401.
650. Michalopoulos AS, Geroulanos S, Mentzelopoulos SD. Determinants of candidemia and candidemia-related death in cardiothoracic ICU patients. *Chest* 2003;124(6):2244–2255. DOI: 10.1378/chest.124.6.2244.
651. Muskett H, Shahin J, Eyres G, Harvey S, Rowan K, Harrison D. Risk factors for invasive fungal disease in critically ill adult patients: A systematic review. *Crit Care* 2011;15(6):R287. DOI: 10.1186/cc10574.
652. Gøtzsche PC, Johansen HK. Routine versus selective antifungal administration for control of fungal infections in patients with cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014(9):CD000026. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000026.pub2.
653. Cruciani M, de Lalla F, Mengoli C. Prophylaxis of candida infections in adult trauma and surgical intensive care patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med* 2005;31(11):1479–1487. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-005-2794-y.
654. Patel TS, Eschenauer GA, Stuckey LJ, Carver PL. Antifungal prophylaxis in lung transplant recipients: *Transplantation* 2016;100(9):1815–1826. DOI: 10.1097/TP.0000000000001050.
655. Fekkar A, Dannaoui E, Meyer I, Imbert S, Brossas JY, Uzunov M, et al. Emergence of echinocandin-resistant *Candida* spp. in a hospital setting: A consequence of 10 years of increasing use of antifungal therapy? *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2014;33(9):1489–1496. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-014-2096-9.
656. Lortholary O, Desnos-Ollivier M, Sitbon K, Fontanet A, Bretagne S, Dromer F. Recent exposure to caspofungin or fluconazole influences the epidemiology of candidemia: A prospective multicenter study involving 2,441 patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2011;55(2):532–538. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.01128-10.
657. Pfaller MA. Antifungal drug resistance: mechanisms, epidemiology, and consequences for treatment. *Am J Med* 2012;125(1):S3–S13. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2011.11.001.
658. Garbino J, Lew D, Jacques-AR, Hugonnet S, Auckenthaler R, Pittet D. Prevention of severe candida infections in nonneutropenic, high-risk, critically ill patients: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in patients treated by selective digestive decontamination. *Intensive Care Med* 2002;28(12):1708–1717. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-002-1540-y.
659. Rex JH, Pappas PG, Karchmer AW, Sobel J, Edwards JE, Hadley S, et al. A randomized and blinded multicenter trial of high-dose fluconazole plus placebo versus fluconazole plus Amphotericin B as therapy for candidemia and its consequences in nonneutropenic subjects. *Clin Infect Dis* 2003;36(10):1221–1228. DOI: 10.1086/374850.
660. Ostrosky-Zeichner L, Al-Obaidi M. Invasive fungal infections in the intensive care unit. *Infect Dis Clin North Am* 2017;31(3):475–487. DOI: 10.1016/j.idc.2017.05.005.
661. Namikawa T, Kitagawa H, Yamatsuji T, Naomoto Y, Kobayashi M, Hanazaki K. Pre-emptive treatment of fungal infection based on plasma β -D-glucan levels after gastric surgery for gastric cancer in elderly patients: Pre-emptive therapy for fungal infection. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2013;28(9):1457–1461. DOI: 10.1111/jgh.12219.
662. Timsit J-F, Azoulay E, Schwebel C, Charles PE, Cornet M, Souweine B, et al. Empirical micafungin treatment and survival without invasive fungal infection in adults with ICU-acquired sepsis, *Candida* colonization, and multiple organ failure: The EMPIRICUS randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2016;316(15):1555. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2016.14655.
663. Cortegiani A, Russotto V, Maggiore A, Attanasio M, Naro AR, Raineri SM, et al. Antifungal agents for preventing fungal infections in non-neutropenic critically ill patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;(1):CD004920. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004920.pub3.
664. Mathur P, Gunjiyal J, Tak V, Varghese P, Xess I, Misra M. The epidemiological profile of candidemia at an Indian trauma care center. *J Lab Physicians* 2014;6(2):96. DOI: 10.4103/0974-2727.141506.
665. Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, Infectious Diseases Society of America, Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society. Policy statement on antimicrobial stewardship by the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA), the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA), and the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society (PIDS). *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33(4):322–327. DOI: 10.1086/665010.
666. Tamma PD, Avdic E, Li DX, Dzintars K, Cosgrove SE. Association of adverse events with antibiotic use in hospitalized patients. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177(9):1308–1315. DOI: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.1938.
667. Centers for Disease Control. Core Elements of Hospital Antibiotic Stewardship Programs Antibiotic Use 2017.
668. Schuts EC, Hulscher MEJL, Mouton JW, Verduin CM, Stuart JWTC, Overdiek HWPM, et al. Current evidence on hospital antimicrobial stewardship objectives: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2016;16(7):847–856. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(16)00065-7.
669. Tabah A, Cotta MO, Garnacho-Montero J, Schouten J, Roberts JA, Lipman J, et al. A systematic review of the definitions, determinants, and clinical outcomes of antimicrobial de-escalation in the intensive care unit. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2016;62(8):1009–1017. DOI: 10.1093/cid/civ1199.
670. Leone M, Bechis C, Baumstarck K, Lefrant J-Y, Albanèse J, Jaber S, et al. De-escalation versus continuation of empirical antimicrobial treatment in severe sepsis: A multicenter non-blinded randomized noninferiority trial. *Intensive Care Med* 2014;40(10):1399–1408. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-014-3411-8.
671. Davey P, Marwick CA, Scott CL, Charani E, McNeil K, Brown E, et al. Interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing practices for hospital inpatients. In: *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2017. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003543.pub4.
672. Barlam TF, Cosgrove SE, Abbo LM, MacDougall C, Schuetz AN, Septimus EJ, et al. Implementing an Antibiotic Stewardship Program: Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2016;62(10):e51–e77. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciw118.
673. Dellit TH, Owens RC, McGowan JE, Gerding DN, Weinstein RA, Burke JP, et al. Infectious diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America Guidelines for developing an Institutional Program to Enhance Antimicrobial Stewardship. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007;44(2):159–177. DOI: 10.1086/510393.
674. Cosgrove SE, Seo SK, Bolon MK, Sepkowitz KA, Climo MW, Diekema DJ, et al. Evaluation of postprescription review and feedback as a method of promoting rational antimicrobial use: A multicenter intervention. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33(4):374–380. DOI: 10.1086/664771.
675. Vettese N, Hendershot J, Irvine M, Wimer S, Chamberlain D, Massoud N. Outcomes associated with a thrice-weekly antimicrobial

- stewardship programme in a 253-bed community hospital. *J Clin Pharm Ther* 2013;38(5):401–404. DOI: 10.1111/jcpt.12079.
676. Tamma PD, Avdic E, Keenan JF, Zhao Y, Anand G, Cooper J, et al. what is the more effective antibiotic stewardship intervention: preprescription authorization or postprescription review with feedback? *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2017;64(5):537–543. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciw780.
677. Mehta JM, Haynes K, Wileyto EP, Gerber JS, Timko DR, Morgan SC, et al. Comparison of prior authorization and prospective audit with feedback for antimicrobial stewardship. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;35(9):1092–1099. DOI: 10.1086/677624.
678. Kollef MH, Vlasnik J, Sharpless L, Pasque C, Murphy D, Fraser V. Scheduled change of antibiotic classes: A strategy to decrease the incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1997;156(4 Pt 1):1040–1048. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm.156.4.9701046.
679. Gruson D, Hilbert G, Vargas F, Valentino R, Bebear C, Allery A, et al. Rotation and restricted use of antibiotics in a medical intensive care unit. Impact on the incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia caused by antibiotic-resistant gram-negative bacteria. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2000;162(3 Pt 1):837–843. DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm.162.3.9905050.
680. Raymond DP, Pelletier SJ, Crabtree TD, Gleason TG, Hamm LL, Pruett TL, et al. Impact of a rotating empiric antibiotic schedule on infectious mortality in an intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med* 2001;29(6):1101–1108. DOI: 10.1097/00003246-200106000-00001.
681. Cobos-Trigueros N, Solé M, Castro P, Torres JL, Rinaudo M, De Lazzari E, et al. Evaluation of a mixing versus a cycling strategy of antibiotic use in critically-ill medical patients: Impact on acquisition of resistant microorganisms and clinical outcomes. *PloS One* 2016;11(3):e0150274. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0150274.
682. Jones M, Huttner B, Madaras-Kelly K, Nechodom K, Nielson C, Goetz MB, et al. Parenteral to oral conversion of fluoroquinolones: low-hanging fruit for antimicrobial stewardship programs? *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33(04):362–367. DOI: 10.1086/664767.
683. Sevinç F, Prins JM, Koopmans RP, Langendijk PN, Bossuyt PM, Dankert J, et al. Early switch from intravenous to oral antibiotics: guidelines and implementation in a large teaching hospital. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 1999;43(4):601–606. DOI: 10.1093/jac/43.4.601.
684. Mertz D, Koller M, Haller P, Lampert ML, Plagge H, Hug B, et al. Outcomes of early switching from intravenous to oral antibiotics on medical wards. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2009;64(1):188–199. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkp131.
685. Oosterheert JJ, Bonten MJM, Schneider MME, Buskens E, Lammers J-WJ, Hustinx WMN, et al. Effectiveness of early switch from intravenous to oral antibiotics in severe community acquired pneumonia: Multicentre randomised trial. *BMJ* 2006;333(7580):1193. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.38993.560984.BE.
686. Omidvari K, de Boisblanc BP, Karam G, Nelson S, Haponik E, Sumner W. Early transition to oral antibiotic therapy for community-acquired pneumonia: Duration of therapy, clinical outcomes, and cost analysis. *Respir Med* 1998;92(8):1032–1039. DOI: 10.1016/s0954-6111(98)90351-1.
687. van Niekerk AC, Venter DJL, Boschmans S-A. Implementation of intravenous to oral antibiotic switch therapy guidelines in the general medical wards of a tertiary-level hospital in South Africa. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2012;67(3):756–762. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkr526.
688. Guo Y, Gao W, Yang H, Ma C'en, Sui S. De-escalation of empiric antibiotics in patients with severe sepsis or septic shock: A meta-analysis. *Heart Lung J Crit Care* 2016;45(5):454–459. DOI: 10.1016/j.hrtlng.2016.06.001.
689. Westwood M, Ramaekers B, Whiting P, Tomini F, Joore M, Armstrong N, et al. Procalcitonin testing to guide antibiotic therapy for the treatment of sepsis in intensive care settings and for suspected bacterial infection in emergency department settings: A systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. *Health Technol Assess Winch Engl* 2015;19(96):5–25, 1–236. DOI: 10.3310/hta19960.
690. Darmon M, Azoulay E. Critical care management of cancer patients: cause for optimism and need for objectivity. *Curr Opin Oncol* 2009;21(4):318–326. DOI: 10.1097/CCO.0b013e32832b68b6.
691. Namendys-Silva SA, Plata-Menchaca EP, Rivero-Sigarroa E, Herrera-Gómez A. Opening the doors of the intensive care unit to cancer patients: A current perspective. *World J Crit Care Med* 2015;4(3):159–162. DOI: 10.5492/wjccm.v4.i3.159.
692. Jindal AK, Paliana RK, Rawat A, Singh S. Primary immunodeficiency disorders in India—A situational review. *Front Immunol* 2017;8:714. DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2017.00714.
693. Klasterky J, de Naurois J, Rolston K, Rapoport B, Maschmeyer G, Aapro M, et al. Management of febrile neutropenia: ESMO clinical practice guidelines. *Ann Oncol Off J Eur Soc Med Oncol* 2016;27(suppl 5):v111–v118. DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdw325.
694. Wisplinghoff H, Seifert H, Wenzel RP, Edmond MB. Current trends in the epidemiology of nosocomial bloodstream infections in patients with hematological malignancies and solid neoplasms in hospitals in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2003;36(9):1103–1110. DOI: 10.1086/374339.
695. Freifeld AG, Bow EJ, Sepkowitz KA, Boeckh MJ, Ito JI, Mullen CA, et al. clinical practice guideline for the use of antimicrobial agents in neutropenic patients with cancer: 2010 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2011;52(4):e56–e93. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cir073.
696. Prabhaskar K, Medhekar A, Ghadyalpatil N, Noronha V, Biswas S, Kurkure P, et al. Blood stream infections in cancer patients: A single center experience of isolates and sensitivity pattern. *Indian J Cancer* 2010;47(2):184–188. DOI: 10.4103/0019-509X.63019.
697. Karanwal AB, Parikh BJ, Goswami P, Panchal HP, Parekh BB, Patel KB. Review of clinical profile and bacterial spectrum and sensitivity patterns of pathogens in febrile neutropenic patients in hematological malignancies: A retrospective analysis from a single center. *Indian J Med Paediatr Oncol Off J Indian Soc Med Paediatr Oncol* 2013;34(2):85–88. DOI: 10.4103/0971-5851.116184.
698. Singh R, Jain S, Chhabra R, Naithani R, Upadhyay A, Walia M. Characterization and anti-microbial susceptibility of bacterial isolates: Experience from a tertiary care cancer center in Delhi. *Indian J Cancer* 2014;51(4):477–480. DOI: 10.4103/0019-509X.175305.
699. Rajendranath R, Balasubramaniam VKK, Vijayakumar V, Ganesan P, Tenali GS. Factors predicting outcome in high risk febrile neutropenia in patients receiving intensive chemotherapy for acute leukemia: A prospective, observational study from South India. *Indian J Cancer* 2014;51(4):481–486. DOI: 10.4103/0019-509X.175303.
700. Sengar M, Kelkar R, Jain H, Biswas S, Pawaskar P, Karpe A. Frequency of bacterial isolates and pattern of antimicrobial resistance in patients with hematological malignancies: A snapshot from tertiary cancer center. *Indian J Cancer* 2014;51(4):456–458. DOI: 10.4103/0019-509X.175387.
701. Lakshmaiah KC, Abhayakumar SM, Shetty R, Loknath D, Jayashree RS, Govindbabu K. Management of febrile neutropenia in solid organ malignancies following chemotherapy. *J Cancer Res Ther* 2014;10(3):540–543. DOI: 10.4103/0973-1482.137908.
702. Bhat V, Gupta S, Kelkar R, Biswas S, Khattry N, Moiyadi A, et al. Bacteriological profile and antibiotic susceptibility patterns of clinical isolates in a tertiary care cancer center. *Indian J Med Paediatr Oncol Off J Indian Soc Med Paediatr Oncol* 2016;37(1):20–24. DOI: 10.4103/0971-5851.177010.
703. Bhat S, Muthunatarajan S, Mulki SS, Archana Bhat K, Kotian KH. Bacterial infection among cancer patients: Analysis of isolates and antibiotic sensitivity pattern. *Int J Microbiol. Hindawi*; 2021;2021:e8883700. DOI: 10.1155/2021/8883700.
704. Laxminarayan R, Chaudhury RR. Antibiotic resistance in India: Drivers and opportunities for action. *PLoS Med* 2016;13(3):e1001974. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001974.
705. Sood S, Gupta R. Antibiotic resistance pattern of community acquired uropathogens at a tertiary care hospital in Jaipur, Rajasthan. *Indian J Community Med Off Publ Indian Assoc Prev Soc Med. Wolters*

- Kluwer -- Medknow Publications; 2012;37(1):39. DOI: 10.4103/0970-0218.94023.
706. Kakkar M, Walia K, Vong S, Chatterjee P, Sharma A. Antibiotic resistance and its containment in India. *BMJ* 2017;358:j2687. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.j2687.
707. Aggarwal S, Walia K, J M, Gopalkrishnan R, Ohri V, Gangakhedkar R. Treatment guidelines for antimicrobial use in common syndromes 2019 New Delhi, India i ICMR, New Delhi treatment guidelines for antimicrobial use in common syndromes. 2nd edition. 2019. Available from: https://main.icmr.nic.in/sites/default/files/guidelines/Treatment_Guidelines_2019_Final.pdf.
708. Averbuch D, Orasch C, Cordonnier C, Livermore DM, Mikulska M, Viscoli C, et al. European guidelines for empirical antibacterial therapy for febrile neutropenic patients in the era of growing resistance: summary of the 2011 4th European Conference on Infections in Leukemia. *Haematologica*. *Haematologica* 2013;98(12):1826–1835. DOI: 10.3324/haematol.2013.091025.
709. Beyar-Katz O, Dickstein Y, Borok S, Vidal L, Leibovici L, Paul M. Empirical antibiotics targeting gram-positive bacteria for the treatment of febrile neutropenic patients with cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017;6(6):CD003914. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003914.pub4.
710. L E, A R, W A, M A, Cm C, C F, et al. Surviving sepsis campaign: International guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock 2021. *Intensive Care Med* 2021;47(11). DOI: 10.1007/s00134-021-06506-y.
711. Cheng MP, Stenstrom R, Paquette K, Stabler SN, Akhter M, Davidson AC, et al. Blood culture results before and after antimicrobial administration in patients with severe manifestations of sepsis: A diagnostic study. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;171(8):547–554. DOI: 10.7326/M19-1696.
712. Bodey G, Bueltmann B, Duguid W, Gibbs D, Hanak H, Hotchi M, et al. Fungal infections in cancer patients: An international autopsy survey. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol* 1992;11(2):99–109. DOI: 10.1007/BF01967060.
713. Kibbler CC. Empirical antifungal therapy in febrile neutropenic patients: current status. *Curr Top Med Mycol* 1997;8(1–2):5–14. PMID: 9504062.
714. Wingard JR, Leather HL. Empiric antifungal therapy for the neutropenic patient. *Oncol Williston Park N* 2001;15(3):351–363; discussion 363–364, 367–9. PMID: 11301832.
715. Cho SY, Choi HY. Opportunistic fungal infection among cancer patients. A ten-year autopsy study. *Am J Clin Pathol* 1979;72(4):617–621. DOI: 10.1093/ajcp/72.4.617.
716. Pagano L, Cairra M, Candoni A, Offidani M, Fianchi L, Martino B, et al. The epidemiology of fungal infections in patients with hematologic malignancies: the SEIFEM-2004 study. *Haematologica* 2006;91(8):1068–1075. PMID: 16885047.
717. Goodman JL, Winston DJ, Greenfield RA, Chandrasekar PH, Fox B, Kaizer H, et al. A controlled trial of fluconazole to prevent fungal infections in patients undergoing bone marrow transplantation. *N Engl J Med* 1992;326(13):845–851. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199203263261301.
718. Gerson SL, Talbot GH, Hurwitz S, Strom BL, Lusk EJ, Cassileth PA. Prolonged granulocytopenia: The major risk factor for invasive pulmonary aspergillosis in patients with acute leukemia. *Ann Intern Med* 1984;100(3):345–531. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-100-3-345.
719. Goldberg E, Gafter-Gvili A, Robenshtok E, Leibovici L, Paul M. Empirical antifungal therapy for patients with neutropenia and persistent fever: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cancer Oxf Engl* 1990 2008;44(15):2192–2203. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejca.2008.06.040.
720. Leeflang MM, Debets-Ossenkopp YJ, Wang J, Visser CE, Scholten RJ, Hooff L, et al. Galactomannan detection for invasive aspergillosis in immunocompromised patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;2015(12):CD007394. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007394.pub2.
721. Maertens J, Theunissen K, Verhoef G, Verschakelen J, Lagrou K, Verbeken E, et al. Galactomannan and computed tomography-based preemptive antifungal therapy in neutropenic patients at high risk for invasive fungal infection: A prospective feasibility study. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2005;41(9):1242–1250. DOI: 10.1086/496927.
722. de Heer K, Gerritsen MG, Visser CE, Leeflang MM. Galactomannan detection in broncho-alveolar lavage fluid for invasive aspergillosis in immunocompromised patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2019;5(5):CD012399. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD012399.pub2.
723. Senn L, Robinson JO, Schmidt S, Knaup M, Asahi N, Satomura S, et al. 1,3-Beta-D-glucan antigenemia for early diagnosis of invasive fungal infections in neutropenic patients with acute leukemia. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2008;46(6):878–885. DOI: 10.1086/527382.
724. Karageorgopoulos DE, Vouloumanou EK, Ntziora F, Michalopoulos A, Rafailidis PI, Falagas ME. β -D-glucan assay for the diagnosis of invasive fungal infections: A meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2011;52(6):750–770. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciq206.
725. Patterson TF, Thompson GR, Denning DW, Fishman JA, Hadley S, Herbrecht R, et al. Practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of aspergillosis: 2016 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2016;63(4):e1–e60. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciw326.
726. Uneno Y, Imura H, Makuuchi Y, Tochitani K, Watanabe N. Pre-emptive antifungal therapy versus empirical antifungal therapy for febrile neutropenia in people with cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2022;11(11):CD013604. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD013604.pub2.
727. Maertens J, Lodewyck T, Donnelly JP, Chantepie S, Robin C, Blijlevens N, et al. Empiric vs Preemptive Antifungal Strategy in High-Risk Neutropenic Patients on Fluconazole Prophylaxis: A Randomized Trial of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2023;76(4):674–682. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciac623.
728. Walsh TJ, Finberg RW, Arndt C, Hiemenz J, Schwartz C, Bodensteiner D, et al. Liposomal amphotericin B for empirical therapy in patients with persistent fever and neutropenia. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Mycoses Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340(10):764–771. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199903113401004.
729. Walsh TJ, Tepler H, Donowitz GR, Maertens JA, Baden LR, Dmoszynska A, et al. Caspofungin versus liposomal amphotericin B for empirical antifungal therapy in patients with persistent fever and neutropenia. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351(14):1391–1402. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa040446.
730. Lee D-G, Kim S-H, Kim SY, Kim C-J, Park WB, Song YG, et al. Evidence-based guidelines for empirical therapy of neutropenic fever in Korea. *Korean J Intern Med* 2011;26(2):220–252. DOI: 10.3904/kjim.2011.26.2.220.
731. Eschenauer G, Depestel DD, Carver PL. Comparison of echinocandin antifungals. *Ther Clin Risk Manag* 2007;3(1):71–97. DOI: 10.2147/TCRM.2007.3.1.71.
732. Walsh TJ, Pappas P, Winston DJ, Lazarus HM, Petersen F, Raffalli J, et al. Voriconazole compared with liposomal amphotericin B for empirical antifungal therapy in patients with neutropenia and persistent fever. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346(4):225–234. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM200201243460403.
733. Maertens JA, Rahav G, Lee D-G, Ponce-de-León A, Ramírez Sánchez IC, Klimko N, et al. Posaconazole versus voriconazole for primary treatment of invasive aspergillosis: A phase 3, randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2021;397(10273):499–509. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00219-1.
734. Maertens JA, Raad II, Marr KA, Patterson TF, Kontoyiannis DP, Cornely OA, et al. Isavuconazole versus voriconazole for primary treatment of invasive mould disease caused by aspergillus and other filamentous fungi (SECURE): A phase 3, randomised-controlled, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2016;387(10020):760–769. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)01159-9.
735. Kullberg BJ, Viscoli C, Pappas PG, Vazquez J, Ostrosky-Zeichner L, Rotstein C, et al. Isavuconazole versus caspofungin in the treatment of candidemia and other invasive candida infections: The ACTIVE trial. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;68(12):1981–1989. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy827.

736. Boogaerts M, Winston DJ, Bow EJ, Garber G, Reboli AC, Schwarzer AP, et al. Intravenous and oral itraconazole versus intravenous amphotericin B deoxycholate as empirical antifungal therapy for persistent fever in neutropenic patients with cancer who are receiving broad-spectrum antibacterial therapy. A randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2001;135(6):412–422. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-135-6-200109180-00010.
737. Marr KA, Schlamm HT, Herbrecht R, Rottinghaus ST, Bow EJ, Cornely OA, et al. Combination antifungal therapy for invasive aspergillosis: A randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;162(2):81–89. DOI: 10.7326/M13-2508.
738. Martin-Garrido I, Carmona EM, Specks U, Limper AH. Pneumocystis pneumonia in patients treated with rituximab. *Chest* 2013;144(1):258–265. DOI: 10.1378/chest.12-0477.
739. Byrd JC, Hargis JB, Kester KE, Hospenhal DR, Knutson SW, Diehl LF. Opportunistic pulmonary infections with fludarabine in previously treated patients with low-grade lymphoid malignancies: A role for pneumocystis carinii pneumonia prophylaxis. *Am J Hematol* 1995;49(2):135–142. DOI: 10.1002/ajh.2830490207.
740. Roblot F, Imbert S, Godet C, Kauffmann C, Ragot S, Le Moal G, et al. Risk factors analysis for Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia (PCP) in patients with haematological malignancies and pneumonia. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2004;36(11–12):848–854. DOI: 10.1080/00365540410021180.
741. Classen AY, Henze L, von Lilienfeld-Toal M, Maschmeyer G, Sandherr M, Graeff LD, et al. Primary prophylaxis of bacterial infections and Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia in patients with hematologic malignancies and solid tumors: 2020 updated guidelines of the Infectious Diseases Working Party of the German Society of Hematology and Medical Oncology (AGIHO/DGHO). *Ann Hematol* 2021;100(6):1603–1620. DOI: 10.1007/s00277-021-04452-9.
742. Anderson NW, Buchan BW, Ledebner NA. Light microscopy, culture, molecular, and serologic methods for detection of herpes simplex virus. *J Clin Microbiol* 2014;52(1):2–8. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.01966-13.
743. Leland DS, Ginocchio CC. Role of cell culture for virus detection in the age of technology. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2007;20(1):49–78. DOI: 10.1128/CMR.00002-06.
744. Nichols WG, Corey L, Gooley T, Davis C, Boeckh M. Parainfluenza virus infections after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation: risk factors, response to antiviral therapy, and effect on transplant outcome. *Blood* 2001;98(3):573–578. DOI: 10.1182/blood.v98.3.573.
745. Small TN, Casson A, Malak SF, Boulad F, Kiehn TE, Stiles J, et al. Respiratory syncytial virus infection following hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 2002;29(4):321–327. DOI: 10.1038/sj.bmt.1703365.
746. Noronha V, Goyal G, Joshi A, Gupta S, Ghosh J, Bajpai J, et al. Presentation, complications, and impact of concurrent malaria infection on anticancer therapy. *Indian J Cancer* 2013;50(3):254–260. DOI: 10.4103/0019-509X.118734.
747. Advani SH, Banavali SD. Pattern of infection in hematologic malignancies: An Indian experience. *Rev Infect Dis* 1989;11 Suppl 7:S1621-1628. DOI: 10.1093/clinids/11.supplement_7.s1621.
748. Wells CL, Ferrieri P, Weisdorf DJ, Rhame FS. The importance of surveillance stool cultures during periods of severe neutropenia. *Infect Control IC* 1987;8(8):317–319. DOI: 10.1017/s0195941700066406.
749. Cohen ML, Murphy MT, Counts GW, Buckner CD, Clift RA, Meyers JD. Prediction by surveillance cultures of bacteremia among neutropenic patients treated in a protective environment. *J Infect Dis* 1983;147(5):789–793. DOI: 10.1093/infdis/147.5.789.
750. Simojoki S-T, Kirjavainen V, Rahiala J, Kanerva J. Surveillance cultures in pediatric allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Pediatr Transplant* 2014;18(1):87–93. DOI: 10.1111/ptr.12177.
751. Ghazal SS, Stevens MP, Bearman GM, Edmond MB. Utility of surveillance blood cultures in patients undergoing hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2014;3(1):20. DOI: 10.1186/2047-2994-3-20.
752. de Jonge NA, Sikkens JJ, Zweegman S, Beeker A, Ypma P, Herbers AH, et al. Short versus extended treatment with a carbapenem in patients with high-risk fever of unknown origin during neutropenia: A non-inferiority, open-label, multicentre, randomised trial. *Lancet Haematol* 2022;9(8):e563–e72. DOI: 10.1016/S2352-3026(22)00145-4.
753. Bucaneve G, Micozzi A, Picardi M, Ballanti S, Cascavilla N, Salutati P, et al. Results of a multicenter, controlled, randomized clinical trial evaluating the combination of piperacillin/tazobactam and tigecycline in high-risk hematologic patients with cancer with febrile neutropenia. *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2014;32(14):1463–1471. DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2013.51.6963.
754. Putensen C, Ellger B, Sakka SG, Weyland A, Schmidt K, Zoller M, et al. Current clinical use of intravenous fosfomycin in ICU patients in two European countries. *Infection* 2019;47(5):827–836. DOI: 10.1007/s15010-019-01323-4.
755. Fishman JA. Infection in solid-organ transplant recipients. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357(25):2601–2614. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMr064928.
756. Fishman JA. Infection in organ transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2017;17(4):856–879. DOI: 10.1111/ajt.14208.
757. Timsit J-F, Sonneville R, Kalil AC, Bassetti M, Ferrer R, Jaber S, et al. Diagnostic and therapeutic approach to infectious diseases in solid organ transplant recipients. *Intensive Care Med* 2019;45(5):573–591. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-019-05597-y.
758. Florescu DF, Sandkovsky U, Kalil AC. Sepsis and challenging infections in the immunosuppressed patient in the intensive care unit. *Infect Dis Clin North Am* 2017;31(3):415–434. DOI: 10.1016/j.idc.2017.05.009.
759. Ram R, Dakshina Murthy KV, Prasad N. Time table of infections after renal transplantation—South Indian experience. *Indian J Nephrol* 2005;15(Suppl 2):S14-S21.
760. Kumar A, Agarwal C, Hooda AK, Ojha A, Dhillion M, Hari Kumar KVS. Profile of infections in renal transplant recipients from India. *J Fam Med Prim Care* 2016;5(3):611–614. DOI: 10.4103/2249-4863.197320.
761. Sriperumbuduri S, Kalidindi K, Guditi S, Taduri G. Declining trend of infections in renal transplant recipients in a tertiary care hospital from India. *Indian J Transplant* 2017;11(3):143. DOI: 10.4103/ijot.ijot_21_17.
762. Neelima A, Umabala P, Patil MA, Padmaja K, Sukanya S, Teja DV. Microbiological profile of transplant recipients in a tertiary care hospital in South India. *Trop J Pathol Microbiol* 2019;5(2):107–111. DOI: 10.17511/jopm.2019.i02.10.
763. Al-Hasan MN, Razonable RR, Eckel-Passow JE, Baddour LM. Incidence rate and outcome of gram-negative bloodstream infection in solid organ transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2009;9(4):835–843. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2009.02559.x.
764. van Delden C, Stampf S, Hirsch HH, Manuel O, Meylan P, Cusini A, et al. Burden and timeline of infectious diseases in the first year after solid organ transplantation in the swiss transplant cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2020;71(7):e159–e169. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz1113.
765. Green H, Rahamimov R, Gafter U, Leibovitch L, Paul M. Antibiotic prophylaxis for urinary tract infections in renal transplant recipients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transpl Infect Dis Off J Transplant Soc* 2011;13(5):441–447. DOI: 10.1111/j.1399-3062.2011.00644.x.
766. van Duin D, van Delden C. AST Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. Multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacteria infections in solid organ transplantation. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2013;13 Suppl 4:31–S41. DOI: 10.1111/ajt.12096.
767. Goldman JD, Julian K. Urinary tract infections in solid organ transplant recipients: Guidelines from the American Society of transplantation infectious diseases community of practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13507. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13507.
768. Fluoroquinolone and quinolone antibiotics: PRAC recommends new restrictions on use following review of disabling and potentially long-lasting side effects | European Medicines Agency [cited 2024 Feb 13]. Available from: <https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/fluoroquinolone-and-quinolone-antibiotics-prac-recommends-new-restrictions-use-following-review-disabling-and-potentially-long-lasting-side-effects>.

769. Dulek DE, Mueller NJ. AST infectious diseases community of practice. Pneumonia in solid organ transplantation: Guidelines from the American Society of transplantation infectious diseases community of practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13545. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13545.
770. Danés C, González-Martín J, Pumarola T, Rañó A, Benito N, Torres A, et al. Pulmonary infiltrates in immunosuppressed patients: Analysis of a diagnostic protocol. *J Clin Microbiol* 2002;40(6):2134–2140. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.40.6.2134-2140.2002.
771. Knollmann FD, Mäurer J, Bechstein WO, Vogl TJ, Neuhaus P, Felix R. Pulmonary disease in liver transplant recipients. Spectrum of CT features. *Acta Radiol Stockh Swed* 1987 2000;41(3):230–236. DOI: 10.1080/028418500127345406.
772. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, Levy MM, Antonelli M, Ferrer R, et al. Surviving sepsis campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock: 2016. *Intensive Care Med* 2017;43(3):304–377. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-017-4683-6.
773. Evans L, Rhodes A, Alhazzani W, Antonelli M, Coopersmith CM, French C, et al. Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock 2021. *Intensive Care Med* 2021;47(11):1181–1247. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-021-06506-y.
774. Giannella M, Muñoz P, Alarcón JM, Mularoni A, Grossi P, Bouza E, et al. Pneumonia in solid organ transplant recipients: A prospective multicenter study. *Transpl Infect Dis Off J Transplant Soc* 2014;16(2):232–241. DOI: 10.1111/tid.12193.
775. Hoyol, Linares L, Cervera C, Almela M, Marcos MA, Sanclemente G, et al. Epidemiology of pneumonia in kidney transplantation. *Transplant Proc* 2010;42(8):2938–2940. DOI: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2010.07.082.
776. Tomotani DYV, Bafi AT, Pacheco ES, de Sandes-Freitas TV, Viana LA, de Oliveira Pontes EP, et al. The diagnostic yield and complications of open lung biopsies in kidney transplant patients with pulmonary disease. *J Thorac Dis* 2017;9(1):166–175. DOI: 10.21037/jtd.2017.01.09.
777. Hsu JL, Kuschner WG, Paik J, Bower N, Vazquez Guillamet MC, Kothary N. The diagnostic yield of CT-guided percutaneous lung biopsy in solid organ transplant recipients. *Clin Transplant* 2012;26(4):615–621. DOI: 10.1111/j.1399-0012.2011.01582.x.
778. Razonable RR, Humar A. Cytomegalovirus in solid organ transplant recipients-Guidelines of the American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13512. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13512.
779. Humar A, Michaels M, AST ID working group on infectious disease monitoring. American Society of transplantation recommendations for screening, monitoring and reporting of infectious complications in immunosuppression trials in recipients of organ transplantation. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2006;6(2):262–274. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2005.01207.x.
780. Ljungman P, Boeckh M, Hirsch HH, Josephson F, Lundgren J, Nichols G, et al. Definitions of cytomegalovirus infection and disease in transplant patients for use in clinical trials. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2017;64(1):87–91. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciw668.
781. Chemaly RF, Chou S, Einsele H, Griffiths P, Avery R, Razonable RR, et al. Definitions of resistant and refractory cytomegalovirus infection and disease in transplant recipients for use in clinical trials. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2019;68(8):1420–1426. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy696.
782. Manuel O, Husain S, Kumar D, Zayas C, Mawhorter S, Levi ME, et al. Assessment of cytomegalovirus-specific cell-mediated immunity for the prediction of cytomegalovirus disease in high-risk solid-organ transplant recipients: A multicenter cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2013;56(6):817–824. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cis993.
783. Manuel O, Pang XL, Humar A, Kumar D, Doucette K, Preiksaitis JK. An assessment of donor-to-recipient transmission patterns of human cytomegalovirus by analysis of viral genomic variants. *J Infect Dis* 2009;199(11):1621–1628. DOI: 10.1086/598952.
784. Gardiner BJ, Nierenberg NE, Chow JK, Ruthazer R, Kent DM, Snyderman DR. absolute lymphocyte count: a predictor of recurrent cytomegalovirus disease in solid organ transplant recipients. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2018;67(9):1395–1402. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy295.
785. Meesing A, Abraham RS, Razonable RR. Clinical correlation of cytomegalovirus infection with cmv-specific cd8+ t-cell immune competence score and lymphocyte subsets in solid organ transplant recipients. *Transplantation* 2019;103(4):832–838. DOI: 10.1097/TP.0000000000002396.
786. Humar A, Gregson D, Caliendo AM, McGeer A, Malkan G, Krajden M, et al. Clinical utility of quantitative cytomegalovirus viral load determination for predicting cytomegalovirus disease in liver transplant recipients. *Transplantation* 1999;68(9):1305–1311. DOI: 10.1097/00007890-199911150-00015.
787. Dioverti MV, Lahr BD, Germer JJ, Yao JD, Gartner ML, Razonable RR. Comparison of standardized cytomegalovirus (CMV) viral load thresholds in whole blood and plasma of solid organ and hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients with cmv infection and disease. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2017;4(3):ofx143. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofx143.
788. Beam E, Germer JJ, Lahr B, Yao JDC, Limper AH, Binnicker MJ, et al. Cytomegalovirus (CMV) DNA quantification in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid of immunocompromised patients with CMV pneumonia. *Clin Transplant* 2018;32(1). DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13149.
789. Marchetti S, Santangelo R, Manzara S, D'onghia S, Fadda G, Cattani P. Comparison of real-time PCR and pp65 antigen assays for monitoring the development of Cytomegalovirus disease in recipients of solid organ and bone marrow transplants. *New Microbiol* 2011;34(2):157–164. PMID: 21617827.
790. Paya C, Humar A, Dominguez E, Washburn K, Blumberg E, Alexander B, et al. Efficacy and safety of valganciclovir vs oral ganciclovir for prevention of cytomegalovirus disease in solid organ transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2004;4(4):611–620. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2004.00382.x.
791. Limaye AP, Budde K, Humar A, Vincenti F, Kuypers DRJ, Carroll RP, et al. Letermovir vs valganciclovir for prophylaxis of cytomegalovirus in high-risk kidney transplant recipients: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2023;330(1):33–42. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2023.9106.
792. Asberg A, Humar A, Rollag H, Jardine AG, Mouas H, Pescovitz MD, et al. Oral valganciclovir is noninferior to intravenous ganciclovir for the treatment of cytomegalovirus disease in solid organ transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2007;7(9):2106–2113. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2007.01910.x.
793. Lowance D, Neumayer HH, Legendre CM, Squifflet JP, Kovarik J, Brennan PJ, et al. Valacyclovir for the prevention of cytomegalovirus disease after renal transplantation. International Valacyclovir cytomegalovirus prophylaxis transplantation study group. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340(19):1462–1470. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199905133401903.
794. Atabani SF, Smith C, Atkinson C, Aldridge RW, Rodriguez-Perálvarez M, Rolando N, et al. Cytomegalovirus replication kinetics in solid organ transplant recipients managed by preemptive therapy. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2012;12(9):2457–2464. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2012.04087.x.
795. Razonable RR, Hayden RT. Clinical utility of viral load in management of cytomegalovirus infection after solid organ transplantation. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2013;26(4):703–727. DOI: 10.1128/CMR.00015-13.
796. Sia IG, Wilson JA, Groettum CM, Espy MJ, Smith TF, Paya CV. Cytomegalovirus (CMV) DNA load predicts relapsing CMV infection after solid organ transplantation. *J Infect Dis* 2000;181(2):717–720. DOI: 10.1086/315242.
797. Humar A, Kumar D, Boivin G, Caliendo AM. Cytomegalovirus (CMV) virus load kinetics to predict recurrent disease in solid-organ transplant patients with CMV disease. *J Infect Dis* 2002;186(6):829–833. DOI: 10.1086/342601.
798. Razonable RR, Åsberg A, Rollag H, Duncan J, Boisvert D, Yao JD, et al. Virologic suppression measured by a cytomegalovirus (CMV) DNA test calibrated to the World Health Organization international standard is predictive of CMV disease resolution in transplant recipients. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2013;56(11):1546–1553. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cit096.
799. Subramanian AK, Theodoropoulos NM. Infectious diseases community of practice of the american society of transplantation.

- Mycobacterium tuberculosis infections in solid organ transplantation: Guidelines from the infectious diseases community of practice of the American Society of Transplantation. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13513. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13513.
800. Nambiar P, Silibovsky R, Belden KA. Infection in kidney transplantation. *Contemp Kidney Transplant* 2018;307–327. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-19617-6_22.
801. Torre-Cisneros J, Doblaz A, Aguado JM, San Juan R, Blanes M, Montejo M, et al. Tuberculosis after solid-organ transplant: incidence, risk factors, and clinical characteristics in the RESITRA (Spanish Network of Infection in Transplantation) cohort. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2009;48(12):1657–1665. DOI: 10.1086/599035.
802. Muñoz P, Rodríguez C, Bouza E. Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection in recipients of solid organ transplants. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2005;40(4):581–587. DOI: 10.1086/427692.
803. Subramanian AK. Tuberculosis in solid organ transplant candidates and recipients: Current and future challenges. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 2014;27(4):316–321. DOI: 10.1097/QCO.0000000000000082.
804. Horne DJ, Narita M, Spitters CL, Parimi S, Dodson S, Limaye AP. Challenging issues in tuberculosis in solid organ transplantation. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2013;57(10):1473–1482. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cit488.
805. Bansal SB, Ramasubramanian V, Prasad N, Saraf N, Soman R, Makharia G, et al. South Asian transplant infectious disease guidelines for solid organ transplant candidates, recipients, and donors. *Transplantation* 2023;107(9):1910–1934. DOI: 10.1097/TP.0000000000004521.
806. Angarone M, Snyderman DR. AST ID Community of Practice. Diagnosis and management of diarrhea in solid-organ transplant recipients: Guidelines from the American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13550. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13550.
807. Maes B, Hadaya K, de Moor B, Cambier P, Peeters P, de Meester J, et al. Severe diarrhea in renal transplant patients: results of the DIDACT study. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2006;6(6):1466–1472. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2006.01320.x.
808. Vyas VD, Parameswaran SA, Paramasivan P, Sankaranarayanan K, Palaniswamy KR, Mohan AT, et al. Etiological profile of diarrhea in solid organ transplant recipients at a tertiary care center in Southern India. *Transpl Infect Dis Off J Transplant Soc* 2021;23(4):e13584. DOI: 10.1111/tid.13584.
809. Tiwari V, Anand Y, Gupta A, Divyaveer S, Bhargava V, Malik M, et al. Etiological spectrum of infective diarrhea in renal transplant patient by stool PCR: An Indian perspective. *Indian J Nephrol* 2021;31(3):245–253. DOI: 10.4103/ijn.IJN_169_20.
810. Mullane KM, Dubberke ER. AST ID Community of Practice. Management of Clostridioides (formerly Clostridium) difficile infection (CDI) in solid organ transplant recipients: Guidelines from the American Society of Transplantation Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13564. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13564.
811. Wong D, Nanda N. Clostridium difficile disease in solid organ transplant recipients: A recommended treatment paradigm. *Curr Opin Organ Transplant* 2020;25(4):357–363. DOI: 10.1097/MOT.0000000000000778.
812. Kelly CR, Ihunnah C, Fischer M, Khoruts A, Surawicz C, Afzali A, et al. Fecal microbiota transplant for treatment of clostridium difficile infection in immunocompromised patients. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2014;109(7):1065–1071. DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2014.133.
813. Senoner T, Breikopf R, Trembl B, Rajic S. Invasive fungal infections after liver transplantation. *J Clin Med Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute*; 2023;12(9):3238. DOI: 10.3390/jcm12093238.
814. Pappas PG, Alexander BD, Andes DR, Hadley S, Kauffman CA, Freifeld A, et al. Invasive fungal infections among organ transplant recipients: results of the transplant-associated infection surveillance network (TRANSNET). *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2010;50(8):1101–1111. DOI: 10.1086/651262.
815. Sclarici M, Jorgenson M, Saddler C, Smith J. Fungal Infections in liver transplant recipients. *J Fungi* 2021;7(7):524. DOI: 10.3390/jof7070524.
816. Sharma M, Rudramurthy SM, Chakrabarti A. Epidemiology of invasive fungal infections in solid organ transplant recipients: An Indian Perspective. *Curr Fungal Infect Rep* 2022;16(4):179–187. DOI: 10.1007/s12281-022-00446-w.
817. Soman R, Rege S, Jeloka T, Jhaveri T, Bansal S. expert group opinion for diagnosis and management of fungal infections in solid organ transplant recipients in South Asia. *Indian J Transplant* 2022;16:41. DOI: 10.4103/ijot.ijot_78_21.
818. Shekar M, Elumalai R, Elayaperumal I, Yelahanka RP, Anandkumar DG, Bandi VK, et al. Prevalence and outcome of systemic fungal infections in renal transplant recipients - A tertiary care experience. *Saudi J Kidney Dis Transplant Off Publ Saudi Cent Organ Transplant Saudi Arab* 2019;30(5):1137–1143. DOI: 10.4103/1319-2442.270270.
819. Andes DR, Safdar N, Baddley JW, Alexander B, Brumble L, Freifeld A, et al. The epidemiology and outcomes of invasive candida infections among organ transplant recipients in the United States: results of the transplant-associated infection surveillance network (TRANSNET). *Transpl Infect Dis Off J Transplant Soc* 2016;18(6):921–931. DOI: 10.1111/tid.12613.
820. Aslam S, Rotstein C. AST infectious disease community of practice. Candida infections in solid organ transplantation: Guidelines from the American Society of transplantation infectious diseases community of practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13623. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13623.
821. Husain S, Camargo JF. Invasive aspergillosis in solid-organ transplant recipients: Guidelines from the American Society of transplantation infectious diseases community of practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13544. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13544.
822. Iversen M, Burton CM, Vand S, Skovfoged L, Carlsen J, Milman N, et al. Aspergillus infection in lung transplant patients: incidence and prognosis. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol* 2007;26(12):879–886. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-007-0376-3.
823. Ullmann AJ, Aguado JM, Arian-Akdagli S, Denning DW, Groll AH, Lagrou K, et al. Diagnosis and management of aspergillus diseases: Executive summary of the 2017 ESCMID-ECMM-ERS guideline. *Clin Microbiol Infect. Elsevier*; 2018;24:e1–e38. DOI: 10.1016/j.cmi.2018.01.002.
824. Herbrecht R, Denning DW, Patterson TF, Bennett JE, Greene RE, Oestmann J-W, et al. Voriconazole versus Amphotericin B for primary therapy of invasive aspergillosis. *N Engl J Med* 2002;347(6):408–415. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa020191.
825. Denning DW, Ribaud P, Milpied N, Caillot D, Herbrecht R, Thiel E, et al. Efficacy and safety of voriconazole in the treatment of acute invasive aspergillosis. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2002;34(5):563–571. DOI: 10.1086/324620.
826. Wieland T, Liebold A, Jagiello M, Retzl G, Birnbaum DE. Superiority of voriconazole over amphotericin B in the treatment of invasive aspergillosis after heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant Off Publ Int Soc Heart Transplant* 2005;24(1):102–104. DOI: 10.1016/j.healun.2003.10.014.
827. Węclawiak H, Garrouste C, Kamar N, Linas M-D, Tall P, Dambrin C, et al. Aspergillus fumigatus-related spondylodiscitis in a heart transplant patient successfully treated with voriconazole. *Transplant Proc* 2007;39(8):2627–2628. DOI: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2007.08.014.
828. Yi WM, Schoeppler KE, Jaeger J, Mueller SW, MacLaren R, Fish DN, et al. Voriconazole and posaconazole therapeutic drug monitoring: A retrospective study. *Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob* 2017;16(1):60. DOI: 10.1186/s12941-017-0235-8.
829. Troke PF, Hockey HP, Hope WW. Observational study of the clinical efficacy of voriconazole and its relationship to plasma concentrations in patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2011;55(10):4782–4788. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.01083-10.
830. Lufft V, Kliem V, Behrend M, Pichlmayr R, Koch KM, Brunkhorst R. Incidence of pneumocystis carinii pneumonia after renal transplantation. Impact of immunosuppression. *Transplantation* 1996;62(3):421–423. DOI: 10.1097/00007890-199608150-00022.
831. Varnas D, Jankauskienė A. Pneumocystis Jirovecii pneumonia in a kidney transplant recipient 13 months after transplantation: A Case

- report and literature review. *Acta Medica Litu* 2021;28(1):136–144. DOI: 10.15388/Amed.2020.28.1.5.
832. Hayes MJ, Torzillo PJ, Sheil AG, McCaughan GW. Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia after liver transplantation in adults. *Clin Transplant* 1994;8(6):499–503. PMID: 7865910.
833. Choi Y-I, Hwang S, Park G-C, Namgoong J-M, Jung D-H, Song G-W, et al. Clinical outcomes of Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia in adult liver transplant recipients. *Transplant Proc* 2013;45(8):3057–3060. DOI: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2013.08.074.
834. Martin SI, Fishman JA. AST infectious diseases community of practice. Pneumocystis pneumonia in solid organ transplantation. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2013;13 Suppl 4:272–279. DOI: 10.1111/ajt.12119.
835. Klein NC, Duncanson FP, Lenox TH, Forszpaniak C, Sherer CB, Quentzel H, et al. Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole versus pentamidine for pneumocystis carinii pneumonia in AIDS patients: results of a large prospective randomized treatment trial. *AIDS Lond Engl* 1992;6(3):301–305. DOI: 10.1097/00002030-199203000-00007.
836. O'Brien JG, Dong BJ, Coleman RL, Gee L, Balano KB. A 5-year retrospective review of adverse drug reactions and their risk factors in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients who were receiving intravenous pentamidine therapy for Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 1997;24(5):854–859. DOI: 10.1093/clinids/24.5.854.
837. Benfield T, Atzori C, Miller RF, Helweg-Larsen J. Second-line salvage treatment of AIDS-associated Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia: A case series and systematic review. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 1999 2008;48(1):63–67. DOI: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e31816de84d.
838. Kim T, Hong H-L, Lee Y-M, Sung H, Kim S-H, Choi S-H, et al. Is caspofungin really an effective treatment for Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia in immunocompromised patients without human immunodeficiency virus infection? Experiences at a single center and a literature review. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2013;45(6):484–488. DOI: 10.3109/00365548.2012.760842.
839. Fishman JA. Treatment of infection due to pneumocystis carinii. *Antimicrob agents Chemother* 1998;42(6):1309–1314. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.42.6.1309.
840. Roux A, Gonzalez F, Roux M, Mehrad M, Menotti J, Zahar J-R, et al. Update on pulmonary Pneumocystis jirovecii infection in non-HIV patients. *Med Mal Infect* 2014;44(5):185–198. DOI: 10.1016/j.medmal.2014.01.007.
841. Ewald H, Raatz H, Boscacci R, Furrer H, Bucher HC, Briel M. Adjunctive corticosteroids for Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia in patients with HIV infection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;2015(4):CD006150. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006150.pub2.
842. Latherinot E, Lanternier F, Bougnoux M-E, Lecuit M, Couderc L-J, Lortholary O. Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia. *Infect Dis Clin North Am* 2010;24(1):107–138. DOI: 10.1016/j.idc.2009.10.010.
843. Fishman JA, Gans H. AST infectious diseases community of practice. Pneumocystis jirovecii in solid organ transplantation: Guidelines from the American Society of transplantation infectious diseases community of practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13587. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13587.
844. Wright AJ, Fishman JA. Central nervous system syndromes in solid organ transplant recipients. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2014;59(7):1001–1011. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciu428.
845. Fishman JA. Infection in renal transplant recipients. *Semin Nephrol* 2007;27(4):445–461. DOI: 10.1016/j.semnephrol.2007.03.006.
846. Zivković S. Neuroimaging and neurologic complications after organ transplantation. *J Neuroimaging Off J Am Soc Neuroimaging* 2007;17(2):110–123. DOI: 10.1111/j.1552-6569.2007.00097.x.
847. Ison MG, Nalesnik MA. An update on donor-derived disease transmission in organ transplantation. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2011;11(6):1123–1130. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2011.03493.x.
848. Grossi PA, Fishman JA. AST infectious disease community of practice. Donor-derived infections in solid organ transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2009;9 Suppl 4:S19–S26. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2009.02889.x.
849. Pedroso JL, Dutra LA, Braga-Neto P, Abrahao A, Andrade JBC de, Silva GL da, et al. Neurological complications of solid organ transplantation. *Arq Neuropsiquiatr. Academia Brasileira de Neurologia – ABNEURO* 2017;75:736–747. DOI: 10.1590/0004-282X20170132.
850. van den Bogaart L, Lang BM, Rossi S, Neofytos D, Walti LN, Khanna N, et al. Central nervous system infections in solid organ transplant recipients: Results from the Swiss Transplant Cohort Study. *J Infect* 2022;85(1):1–7. DOI: 10.1016/j.jinf.2022.05.019.
851. Baddley JW, Forrest GN. AST infectious diseases community of practice. Cryptococcosis in solid organ transplantation-Guidelines from the American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13543. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13543.
852. Henao-Martínez AF, Beckham JD. Cryptococcosis in solid organ transplant recipients. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 2015;28(4):300–307. DOI: 10.1097/QCO.0000000000000171.
853. Singh N, Lortholary O, Alexander BD, Gupta KL, John GT, Pursell K, et al. An immune reconstitution syndrome-like illness associated with cryptococcus neoformans infection in organ transplant recipients. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2005;40(12):1756–1761. DOI: 10.1086/430606.
854. Rakvit A, Meyerrose G, Vidal AM, Kimbrough RC, Sarria JC. Cellulitis caused by cryptococcus neoformans in a lung transplant recipient. *J Heart Lung Transplant Off Publ Int Soc Heart Transplant* 2005;24(5):642. DOI: 10.1016/j.healun.2003.12.007.
855. Lebeaux D, Freund R, van Delden C, Guillot H, Marbus SD, Matignon M, et al. Outcome and treatment of nocardiosis after solid organ transplantation: New insights from a European study. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2017;64(10):1396–1405. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cix124.
856. Restrepo A, Clark NM. Infectious diseases community of practice of the American Society of Transplantation. Nocardia infections in solid organ transplantation: Guidelines from the Infectious Diseases Community of Practice of the American Society of Transplantation. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13509. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13509.
857. Peleg AY, Husain S, Qureshi ZA, Silveira FP, Sarumi M, Shutt KA, et al. Risk factors, clinical characteristics, and outcome of Nocardia infection in organ transplant recipients: A matched case-control study. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2007;44(10):1307–1314. DOI: 10.1086/514340.
858. Clark NM, Reid GE. AST infectious diseases community of practice. Nocardia infections in solid organ transplantation. *Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg* 2013;13 Suppl 4:83–92. DOI: 10.1111/ajt.12102.
859. Moylett EH, Pacheco SE, Brown-Elliott BA, Perry TR, Buescher ES, Birmingham MC, et al. Clinical experience with linezolid for the treatment of nocardia infection. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2003;36(3):313–318. DOI: 10.1086/345907.
860. Pouch SM, Patel G. AST infectious diseases community of practice. Multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacterial infections in solid organ transplant recipients-Guidelines from the American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13594. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13594.
861. Tamma PD, Aitken SL, Bonomo RA, Mathers AJ, van Duin D, Clancy CJ. Infectious diseases society of America 2023 guidance on the treatment of antimicrobial resistant gram-negative infections. *Clin Infect Dis* 2023;ciad428. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciad428.
862. Pérez-Nadales E, Fernández-Ruiz M, Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez B, Pascual Á, Rodríguez-Baño J, Martínez-Martínez L, et al. Extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing and carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales bloodstream infection after solid organ transplantation: Recent trends in epidemiology and therapeutic approaches. *Transpl Infect Dis Off J Transplant Soc* 2022;24(4):e13881. DOI: 10.1111/tid.13881.
863. Pereira MR, Rana MM, AST ID Community of Practice. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in solid organ transplantation-

- Guidelines from the American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant* 2019;33(9):e13611. DOI: 10.1111/ctr.13611.
864. WHO clinical staging of HIV disease in adults, adolescents and children. In: Consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing hiv infection: recommendations for a public health approach. 2nd edition. [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2016 [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK374293/>.
865. Fauci AS, Lane HC. Four decades of HIV/AIDS - Much accomplished, Much to do. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383(1):1–4. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1916753.
866. May MT, Gompels M, Delpuch V, Porter K, Orkin C, Keggs S, et al. Impact on life expectancy of HIV-1 positive individuals of CD4+ cell count and viral load response to antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS Lond Engl* 2014;28(8):1193–1202. DOI: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000000243.
867. BHIVA guidelines on antiretroviral treatment for adults living with HIV-1 2022 (2023 interim update) [Internet] [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from: <https://www.bhiva.org/hiv-1-treatment-guidelines>.
868. Garland JM, Levinson A, Wing E. Care of critically ill patients with human immunodeficiency virus. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2020;17(6):659–669. DOI: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201909-694CME.
869. O'Halloran C, Sun S, Nash S, Brown A, Croxford S, Connor N, et al. HIV in the United Kingdom: Towards Zero 2030. 2019 report. December 2019. *Public Health Engl Lond*. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/603d1dcae90e07055c1404c8/HIV_in_the_UK_2019_towards_zero_HIV_transmissions_by_2030.pdf.
870. Akgün KM, Gordon K, Pisani M, Fried T, McGinnis KA, Tate JP, et al. Risk factors for hospitalization and medical intensive care unit (MICU) admission among HIV infected veterans. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 1999 2013;62(1):52–59. DOI: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e318278f3fa.
871. Barbier F, Mer M, Szychowiak P, Miller RF, Mariotte É, Galicier L, et al. Management of HIV-infected patients in the intensive care unit. *Intensive Care Med* 2020;46(2):329–342. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-020-05945-3.
872. Gutierrez J, Albuquerque ALA, Falzon L. HIV infection as vascular risk: A systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis. *PloS One* 2017;12(5):e0176686. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0176686.
873. Ruiz GO, Herrera CFL, Bohórquez JAM, Betancur JE. Mortality in patients with acquired human immunodeficiency virus infection hospitalized in an intensive care unit during the period 2017–2019. *Sci Rep* 2022;12(1):15644. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-19904-z.
874. Turvey SL, Bagshaw SM, Eurich DT, Sligl WI. Epidemiology and outcomes in critically ill patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection in the era of combination antiretroviral therapy. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol J Can Mal Infect Microbiol Médicale* 2017;2017:7868954. DOI: 10.1155/2017/7868954.
875. Schulze AB, Mohr M, Sackarnd J, Schmidt LH, Tepasse P-R, Rosenow F, et al. Risk factors in HIV-1 positive patients on the intensive care unit: A single center experience from a tertiary care hospital. *viruses*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. 2023;15(5):1164. DOI: 10.3390/v15051164.
876. Azoulay É, de Castro N, Barbier F. critically ill patients with hiv: 40 years later. *Chest* 2020;157(2):293–309. DOI: 10.1016/j.chest.2019.08.002.
877. O'Connor J, Vjecha MJ, Phillips AN, Angus B, Cooper D, Grinsztejn B, et al. Effect of immediate initiation of antiretroviral therapy on risk of severe bacterial infections in HIV-positive people with CD4 cell counts of more than 500 cells per µL: secondary outcome results from a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet HIV*. Elsevier; 2017;4(3):e105–e12. DOI: 10.1016/S2352-3018(16)30216-8.
878. Pecego A, Amâncio R, Costa D, Bozza F, Siqueira M, Oliveira M, et al. Etiology, clinical, and epidemiological characteristics of severe respiratory infection in people living with HIV. *Int J STD AIDS* 2020;31(2):100–108. DOI: 10.1177/0956462419882587.
879. Maartens G, Griesel R, Dube F, Nicol M, Mendelson M. Etiology of pulmonary infections in human immunodeficiency virus-infected inpatients using sputum multiplex real-time polymerase chain reaction. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2020;70(6):1147–1152. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz332.
880. Elabbadi A, Pichon J, Visseaux B, Schnuriger A, Bouadma L, Philippot Q, et al. Respiratory virus-associated infections in HIV-infected adults admitted to the intensive care unit for acute respiratory failure: A 6-year bicenter retrospective study (HIV-VIR study). *Ann Intensive Care* 2020;10:123. DOI: 10.1186/s13613-020-00738-9.
881. Hao J, Liu J, Pu L, Li C, Yin N, Li A. Pulmonary infections and outcomes in AIDS patients with respiratory failure: A 10-year retrospective review. *Infect Drug Resist Dove Press*; 2023;16:1049. DOI: 10.2147/IDR.S395658.
882. Kenmoe S, Bigna JJ, Fatawou Modiyingi A, Ndongang MS, Ngoupo PA, Simo FBN, et al. Case fatality rate and viral aetiologies of acute respiratory tract infections in HIV positive and negative people in Africa: The VARIAFRICA-HIV systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Virol Off Publ Pan Am Soc Clin Virol* 2019;117:96–102. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcv.2019.06.006.
883. Burtle D, Marsh S, Matin N. Update on the management of patients with HIV infection in anaesthesia and critical care. *BJA Educ* 2023;23(7):264–272. DOI: 10.1016/j.bjae.2023.03.004.
884. Gheuens S, Cheeseman SH, Koralnik IJ. Hidden in plain view: Emergence of progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy after treatment of CNS toxoplasmosis. *Acta Neurol Belg* 2011;111(3):217–219. PMID: 22141286.
885. Gildenberg PL, Gathe JC, Kim JH. Stereotactic biopsy of cerebral lesions in AIDS. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2000;30(3):491–499. DOI: 10.1086/313685.
886. Stenzel W, Pels H, Staib P, Impeken P, Bektas N, Deckert M. Concomitant manifestation of primary CNS lymphoma and toxoplasma encephalitis in a patient with AIDS. *J Neurol* 2004;251(6):764–766. DOI: 10.1007/s00415-004-0440-1.
887. Müller M, Wandel S, Colebunders R, Attia S, Furrer H, Egger M, et al. Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome in patients starting antiretroviral therapy for HIV infection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2010;10(4):251–261. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70026-8.
888. Havlir DV, Kendall MA, Iwe P, Kumwenda J, Swindells S, Qasba SS, et al. Timing of antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection and tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365(16):1482–1491. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1013607.
889. Huang L, Quartin A, Jones D, Havlir DV. Intensive care of patients with HIV infection. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355(2):173–181. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra050836.
890. Panel on antiretroviral guidelines for adults and adolescents. Guidelines for the use of antiretroviral agents in adults and adolescents with HIV. Department of Health and Human Services. [Internet]. [cited 2024 Dec 2]. Available from: <https://clinicalinfo.hiv.gov/sites/default/files/guidelines/documents/adult-adolescent-arv/guidelines-adult-adolescent-arv.pdf>.
891. Grau I, Pallares R, Tubau F, Schulze MH, Llopias F, Podzamczar D, et al. Epidemiologic changes in bacteremic pneumococcal disease in patients with human immunodeficiency virus in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Arch Intern Med* 2005;165(13):1533–1540. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.165.13.1533.
892. Huson MAM, Stolp SM, van der Poll T, Grobusch MP. Community-acquired bacterial bloodstream infections in HIV-infected patients: A systematic review. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2014;58(1):79–92. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cit596.
893. Nadjim B, Mtowe G, Amos B, Walker NF, Diefendal H, Reyburn H, et al. Severe febrile illness in adult hospital admissions in Tanzania: A prospective study in an area of high malaria transmission. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 2012;106(11):688–695. DOI: 10.1016/j.trstmh.2012.08.006.
894. Kiertiburanakul S, Watcharatipagorn S, Chongtrakool P, Santanirand P. Epidemiology of bloodstream infections and predictive factors of mortality among HIV-infected adult patients in Thailand in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Jpn J Infect Dis* 2012;65(1):28–32. PMID: 22274154.

895. Phe T, Vlieghe E, Reid T, Harries AD, Lim K, Thai S, et al. Does HIV status affect the aetiology, bacterial resistance patterns and recommended empiric antibiotic treatment in adult patients with bloodstream infection in Cambodia? *Trop Med Int Health* 2013;18(4):485–494. DOI: 10.1111/tmi.12060.
896. Barr DA, Lewis JM, Feasey N, Schutz C, Kerkhoff AD, Jacob ST, et al. Mycobacterium tuberculosis bloodstream infection prevalence, diagnosis, and mortality risk in seriously ill adults with HIV: A systematic review and meta-analysis of individual patient data. *Lancet Infect Dis Elsevier*; 2020;20(6):742–752. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(19)30695-4.
897. Qi T, Zhang R, Shen Y, Liu L, Lowrie D, Song W, et al. Etiology and clinical features of 229 cases of bloodstream infection among Chinese HIV/AIDS patients: A retrospective cross-sectional study. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol* 2016;35(11):1767–1770. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-016-2724-7.
898. Castagnola E FF. Prevention of life-threatening infections due to encapsulated bacteria in children with hyposplenism or asplenia: A brief review of current recommendations for practical purposes. *Eur J Haematol* 2003;71:319–326. DOI: 10.1034/j.1600-0609.2003.00158.x.
899. Sumaraju V, Smith GL SS. INFECTIOUS COMPLICATIONS IN ASPLENIC HOSTS. *Infect Dis Clin North Am* 2001;15:551–65. DOI: 10.1016/S0891-5520(05)70159-8.
900. RN Davidson RAW. Prevention and management of infections in patients without a Spleen. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2001;7:657–660. DOI: 10.1046/j.1198-743x.2001.00355.x.
901. Di. E. Postsplenectomy sepsis 10 years or more after operation. *J Clin Pathol* 1985;38:309–311. DOI: 10.1136/jcp.38.3.309.
902. Pizzigallo GL. E. Bacterial infections following splenectomy for malignant and nonmalignant hematologic diseases. *Mediterr J Hematol Infect Dis* 2015;7:e2015057. DOI: 10.4084/MJHID.2015.057.
903. Morgan TL TEB. Overwhelming post-splenectomy infection (OPSI): A case report and review of the literature. *J Emerg Med* 2012;43:758–763. DOI: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2011.10.029.
904. Waghorn DJ. Overwhelming infection in asplenic patients: Current best practice preventive measures are not being followed. *J Clin Pathol* 2001;54:214–218. DOI: 10.1136/jcp.54.3.214.
905. ML B. Overwhelming postsplenectomy infection still a problem. *West J Med* 1992;157:440–443. PMID: 1306065.
906. Thomsen RW, Schoonen WM, Farkas DK, Riis A, Jacobsen J, Fryzek JP, et al. Risk for hospital contact with infection in patients with splenectomy: A populationbased cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:546–555. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-151-8-200910200-00008.
907. Sawmiller CJ, Dudrick SJ HM. Postsplenectomy capnocytophaga canimorsus sepsis presenting as an acute abdomen. *Arch Surg* 1998;133:1362–1365. DOI: 10.1001/archsurg.133.12.1362.
908. Gupta S, Madkaikar M, Singh S, Sehgal S. Primary immunodeficiencies in India: A perspective. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2012;1250:73–79. DOI: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06353.x.
909. Madkaikar M, Mishra A, Desai M, Gupta M, Mhatre S, Ghosh K. Comprehensive report of primary immunodeficiency disorders from a tertiary care center in India. *J Clin Immunol* 2013;33(3):507–512. DOI: 10.1007/s10875-012-9829-2.
910. Madkaikar M, Mishra A, Ghosh K. Diagnostic approach to primary immunodeficiency disorders. *Indian Pediatr* 2013;50(6):579–586. DOI: 10.1007/s13312-013-0171-4.
911. Halliday E, Winkelstein J, Webster ADB. Enteroviral infections in primary immunodeficiency (PID): A survey of morbidity and mortality. *J Infect* 2003;46(1):1–8. DOI: 10.1053/jinf.2002.1066.
912. ESID - European Society for Immunodeficiencies. [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from: <https://esid.org/Working-Parties/Registry-Working-Party/Diagnosis-criteria>.
913. Antachopoulos C, Walsh TJ, Roilides E. Fungal infections in primary immunodeficiencies. *Eur J Pediatr* 2007;166(11):1099–1117. DOI: 10.1007/s00431-007-0527-7.
914. Ram S, Lewis LA, Rice PA. Infections of people with complement deficiencies and patients who have undergone splenectomy. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2010;23(4):740–780. DOI: 10.1128/CMR.00048-09.
915. Odek C, Kendirli T, Doğu F, Yaman A, Vatansever G, Cipe F, et al. Patients with primary immunodeficiencies in pediatric intensive care unit: Outcomes and mortality-related risk factors. *J Clin Immunol* 2014;34(3):309–315. DOI: 10.1007/s10875-014-9994-6.
916. el Habbal MH, Strobel S. Leucocyte adhesion deficiency. *Arch Dis Child* 1993;69(4):463–466. DOI: 10.1136/adc.69.4.463.
917. Bousfiha A, Jeddane L, Picard C, Ailal F, Bobby Gaspar H, Al-Herz W, et al. The 2017 IUIS phenotypic classification for primary immunodeficiencies. *J Clin Immunol* 2018;38(1):129–143. DOI: 10.1007/s10875-017-0465-8.
918. Abolhassani H, Sagvand BT, Shokuhfar T, Mirminachi B, Rezaei N, Aghamohammadi A. A review on guidelines for management and treatment of common variable immunodeficiency. *Expert Rev Clin Immunol* 2013;9(6):561–574; quiz 575. DOI: 10.1586/eci.13.30.
919. Boyle ML, Scalchunes C. Impact of intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) treatment among patients with Primary Immunodeficiency diseases. *Pharm Policy Law*. IOS Press; 2008;10(1–4):133–146.
920. Shabani M, Nichols KE, Rezaei N. Primary immunodeficiencies associated with EBV-induced lymphoproliferative disorders. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2016;108:109–127. DOI: 10.1016/j.critrevonc.2016.10.014.
921. Bonagura VR. Using intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) to treat patients with primary immune deficiency disease. *J Clin Immunol* 2013;33 Suppl 2:S90–S94. DOI: 10.1007/s10875-012-9838-1.
922. Freeman AF, Holland SM. Antimicrobial prophylaxis for primary immunodeficiencies. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009;9(6):525–530. DOI: 10.1097/ACI.0b013e328332be33.
923. Rubin LG, Levin MJ, Ljungman P, Davies EG, Avery R, Tomblyn M, et al. 2013 IDSA clinical practice guideline for vaccination of the immunocompromised host. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* 2014;58(3):309–318. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cit816.
924. Committee on Infectious Diseases. Meningococcal conjugate vaccines policy update: booster dose recommendations. *Pediatrics* 2011;128(6):1213–1218. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2011-2380.