

Pharmacist-driven antibiotic stewardship program in febrile neutropenic patients: A Prospective study

Kittiya Jantarathaneewat¹, Anucha Apisarnthanarak², Wasitthep Limvorapitak², David Weber³, and Preecha Montakantikul⁴

¹Mahidol University Faculty of Pharmacy

²Thammasat University Faculty of Medicine

³University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Gillings School of Global Public Health

⁴Mahidol University Phayathai Campus

April 05, 2024

Abstract

Aim: To determine role of pharmacists in an antibiotic stewardship program (ASP) for febrile neutropenic patients. **Methods:** A prospective study in four medical wards at Thammasat University Hospital between August 2019 and April 2020. Two medical wards were designated as the pharmacist-driven ASP group and two other medical wards were designated as a control group. Our primary outcome was to compare appropriate use of target antibiotics between the pharmacist-driven ASP group and control group. **Results:** The results showed 90 febrile neutropenic events in 66 patients. Choice of an appropriate antibiotic was significantly higher in the pharmacist-driven ASP group than the control group (88.9% versus 51.1%, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, there was greater appropriateness of the dosage regimen chosen as empirical therapy in the pharmacist-driven ASP group than in the control group (97.8% versus 88.7%, $p = 0.049$) and proper duration of target antibiotics in documentation therapy (91.1% versus 75.6%, $p = 0.039$). Although the pharmacist-driven ASP did not affect 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality and length of stay ($p = 0.810$ and 0.267 , respectively), multivariate analysis showed that pharmacist-driven ASP and infectious diseases consultation had favorable impact on 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality in chemotherapy induced febrile neutropenic patients (OR 0.082, 95%CI: 0.009-0.762, $P = 0.028$). **Conclusions:** Our study demonstrated that clinical pharmacists could implement an antibiotic stewardship program for febrile neutropenic patients. Pharmacist-driven ASP could be a great opportunity to improve antibiotic appropriateness in febrile neutropenic patients.

Introduction

Febrile neutropenia is a life-threatening complication of cancer therapy which can increase morbidity and mortality.¹ Broad spectrum antimicrobial agent administration is an essential part of the treatment of febrile neutropenia to cover hospital-acquired pathogens. Pharmacokinetic alterations of several antibiotics (e.g., piperacillin/tazobactam) were found in febrile neutropenic patients.²⁻³ Prescribing antibiotics with common dosage regimens might be inadequate for these patients. Furthermore, incorrect antibiotic dosing was found as the most common non-compliant antibiotic prescription practice in febrile neutropenic patients.⁴ Antibiotic optimization would be a challenging method among febrile neutropenic patients. An antibiotic stewardship program (ASP) in immunocompromised patients is suggested by the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) 2010 guideline.⁵ Recent evidence supports that adherence to ASP is associated with a lower mortality rate.⁶ Although several studies have shown the effectiveness of ASP implementation in febrile neutropenic patients, there is limited evidence of the effectiveness of ASP implementation led by a pharmacist.⁷⁻¹¹ Pharmacist-driven ASP has been reported to increase antibiotic appropriateness in several studies.¹²⁻¹⁴ We believe this is the first study to demonstrate that pharmacist-driven ASP can be

beneficial among febrile neutropenic patients. Our study compared antibiotic appropriateness between a pharmacist-driven ASP and a control group.

Methods

Study design and population

This prospective study was conducted at Thammasat University Hospital (TUH), a tertiary care and teaching hospital, between August 1, 2019 and April 30, 2020. Two medical wards were pre-designated as the pharmacist-driven ASP group and two other similar medical wards were pre-designated as the control group. Febrile neutropenia in our study was defined as fever (single temperature equivalent to $\geq 38.3^{\circ}\text{C}$ orally or equivalent to $\geq 38.0^{\circ}\text{C}$ orally over a 1-hour period) with neutropenic condition (patient who had ≤ 500 neutrophils per microliter or ≤ 500 neutrophils per microliter and a predicted decline to ≤ 500 neutrophils per microliter over the next 48 hours). High risk of febrile neutropenia was identified by the Multinational Association for Supportive Care in Cancer (MASCC) risk index score less than 21.¹⁵ Inclusion criteria included: Adult patients (i.e., age >18 years); patient diagnosed with febrile neutropenia; and patient received antibiotics for treatment of febrile neutropenia. Exclusion criteria included: receipt of antibiotics for febrile neutropenia <24 hours, pregnancy or lactation. This study was approved by the human research ethics committee, Thammasat University (no. 125/2019).

ASP

Our ASP team consisted of an infectious diseases-trained clinical pharmacist, infectious diseases physicians and hematologists. We developed TUH's recommended antibiotic and dosage regimen for empirical therapy in febrile neutropenia, which adapted from the IDSA 2010 and National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) 2020 guideline and distributed to primary physician prior to the pharmacist-driven ASP was implemented in two medical wards groups.^{5,15} In the intervention group, clinical pharmacist performed daily prospective audit and feedback to the primary physician. The pharmacist suggested a suitable antibiotic for each patient, calculated an appropriate dose and recommended the treatment duration for both empirical therapy and documented infection. Antibiotic appropriateness and antibiotic utilization in the intervention group was reported monthly by the clinical pharmacist. Medical personnel practicing in the intervention group were provided education via lectures and posters by the clinical pharmacists during monthly ward conferences. No ASP interventions were performed in the control group. The criteria to evaluate antibiotic appropriateness was adapted from previous studies (supplementary data, figure 1S).¹⁶⁻¹⁹ In empirical therapy evaluations, a clinical pharmacist evaluated an appropriateness of indications, antibiotic coverage, and dosage regimen of the antibiotics. Therapeutic evaluations for documented infection were divided into 2 groups – unknown source of infection, and known causative pathogens and source of infection. Both groups were also evaluated for antibiotic indication, dosage regimen, and duration of antibiotic therapy by pharmacist.

The primary outcome of this study was to compare antibiotic appropriateness between pharmacist-ASP driven group and the control group. Secondary outcomes were to compare antibiotic utilization, patient length of stay, 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality between the intervention and control groups. Target antibiotics in this study were ceftazidime, cefepime, piperacillin/tazobactam, meropenem and imipenem which are recommended as an empirical therapy for febrile neutropenia in current guidelines.^{15, 20-21} All intravenous antibiotics classes commonly used in these patients were evaluated in this study.

Statistical analysis

Minimum sample size required in each arm, calculated based on a previous study, were 33 subjects.¹⁶ Each outcome was defined as a febrile neutropenic event. All statistical analyses were performed using STATA version 16 (College Station, TX). Chi-square test (two-tailed) was used to compare proportion for categorical variables while t-test was used to compare means for continuous variables. Antibiotic utilization was reported as defined daily dose per 1000 patient-days. Trend of antibiotic utilization was analyzed by linear regression and reported as coefficient and p-value. Univariate and multivariate analysis of variables influencing on 30-

day infectious diseases-related mortality were performed. All comparisons were 2-sided and a P value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Ninety febrile neutropenic events occurred in 66 patients. The proportion of men in control group was higher than intervention group (57.8% versus 35.6%, $P = 0.035$). The mean age of all patients was 51.6 ± 15.6 years. Most patients were diagnosed with cytotoxic chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia (74.4%) while twenty patients were identified as a febrile neutropenia during period of initial hematologic abnormalities diagnosis (22.2%) and only three patients were diagnosed as a febrile neutropenia from other cause such as vitamin B12 deficiency, severe infection, and zidovudine-induced pancytopenia. The majority of our patients had hematologic malignancy (80%) and 8.9% had solid cancer. The MASCC risk index median score was 20 (interquartile range [IQR] 17-21). The median absolute neutrophil count was 153.9 cells/mm^3 (IQR 19-520). Fifty-one percent of patients had history of febrile neutropenia and 55.6 % of patients had been exposed to antibiotics within the past 3 months. Median duration of neutropenia was 7 days. The frequency of infectious diseases consultation was similar in both groups. Baseline characteristics are displayed in Table 1.

The major causative organisms were Gram negative bacteria (43.3%), followed by Gram positive bacteria (13.3%) and fungi (3.3%). The most common causative Gram negative bacteria were *Escherichia coli* (33.3%), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (25.6%), and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (10.3%). Most Gram negative bacteria exhibited multiple-drug resistant (69%). More carbapenem resistance Gram negative bacteria were often found in the pharmacist-driven ASP group compared to control group (8.9% versus 2.2%, $P = 0.167$) while extended spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) producing Gram negative bacteria were lower than the control group (6.7% versus 20%, $P = 0.063$). The most common causative Gram positive bacteria were *Enterococcus* spp. (41.7%), *Staphylococcus aureus* (33.3%), and *Corynebacterium* spp. (16.7%). Ampicillin-resistant *Enterococci* spp. was isolated from only in one patient and only one patient had methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). Most of the causative organisms were isolated from blood, urine, or sputum (27.8%, 12.2%, and 8.9%, respectively). The most common sources of infection were primary bacteremia, urinary tract infection, and pneumonia (23.3%, 13.3%, and 10%, respectively). However, the causative organisms were not isolated in nearly half of patients.

Overall, antibiotic appropriateness in the pharmacist-driven ASP group was significantly higher than control group (88.9% versus 51.1%, $P < 0.001$) (Table 2). In providing empirical therapy, the pharmacist-driven ASP group was more appropriate than the control group (97.8% versus 77.8%, $P = 0.007$). Appropriate dosage regimen in the pharmacist-driven ASP group was significantly higher than the control group (97.8% versus 88.7%, $P = 0.049$) as well as appropriate antibiotic coverage (100% versus 91.1%, $P = 0.041$) while appropriate indications was similar in both groups. When providing therapy for definitive infections, the overall appropriateness was greater in the pharmacist-driven ASP group than in the control group (88.9% versus 64.4%, $P = 0.004$) as was the duration of therapy (91.1% versus 75.6%, $P = 0.039$). For therapy if the source of infection was unknown, overall appropriateness in the pharmacist-driven ASP group also significantly greater than the control group (90% versus 54.4%, $P = 0.011$). Furthermore, appropriateness of duration of therapy in the pharmacist-driven group was significantly greater than in control group (93.2% versus 75.6%, $P = 0.022$). However, antibiotic appropriateness in cases of known causative pathogens were not significantly greater than the control group, but there was a trend of improved appropriateness in the pharmacist-driven ASP group. Total antibiotic duration between two groups were similar ($P = 0.948$) (Table 2). The compliance rate to the pharmacist suggestion was 93.8% in pharmacist-driven ASP group. The most common pharmacist interventions were de-escalation (31.3%), adding additional antimicrobials (18.8%), and avoiding serious drug interaction (18.1%).

The 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality and length of stay were similar in both groups (Table 2). In univariate analysis, neither pharmacist-driven ASP nor ID consultation showed a significant impact on 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality ($P = 0.810$ and 0.267 , respectively). However, in multivariate analysis, the pharmacist-driven ASP group and infectious diseases consultation significantly reduced the 30-day infectious diseases mortality in patient with cytotoxic chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia (OR

0.082, 95%CI: 0.009-0.762, $P = 0.028$). A MASCC score of less than 21 and a history of febrile neutropenia were associated with an increased 30-day infectious diseases mortality as described in Table 3. The utilization rate of target antibiotics in pharmacist-driven ASP group tended to be higher than control group (882 DDD/1000 patient-day versus 705.1 DDD/1000 patient-day). The trend of overall target antibiotic seemed to be higher in both groups (supplementary data, table 2S). The trend of ceftazidime, cefepime, and meropenem utilization was lower in pharmacist-driven ASP group while piperacillin/tazobactam utilization was higher. In the control group, ceftazidime utilization tended to be decreased, but other target antibiotics utilization including cefepime, piperacillin/tazobactam, and meropenem were increased. Overall intravenous antibiotic utilization in the pharmacist-driven ASP group declined while amount of utilization in the control group increased.

Discussion

The pharmacist-driven ASP group interventions in febrile neutropenic patients showed a favorable effect on antibiotic appropriateness in our study. We found higher antibiotic appropriateness in the pharmacist intervention group than the control group (88.9% versus 51.1%, $P < 0.001$). When providing empirical therapy, the pharmacist-driven ASP group was more appropriate than the control group which was different from a previous study.¹⁶ We believe that main reason for this discrepancy was that the previous study evaluated only prescribed antibiotic appropriateness based on the hospital guideline and described only antibiotics indicated for febrile neutropenia but did not assess the appropriateness of dosage regimens which was included in our assessment of appropriateness of prescribed antibiotics.^{16,22} Moreover, our ASP implementation provided daily review and feedback while the Madran et al study implemented a hospital guideline and had only a weekly discussion with the ASP team.¹⁶ Likely our study which provided more frequent feedback improved the primary physicians' compliance as noted in a recent study.¹⁰ Furthermore, our result showed that appropriate dosage regimens was more frequently found in the pharmacist-driven ASP group than the control group (97.8% versus 88.7%, $P = 0.049$). Our finding was similar to previous studies that appropriateness was 6.5-fold higher in the pharmacist intervention group than the control group.²³ On the other hand, appropriateness of antibiotic indication in the pharmacist-driven ASP group resembled the control group as described in Madran et al study.¹⁶ However, we also used current standard guidelines and all of our patients had a high risk of febrile neutropenia similar to the previous study.¹⁶

In documented infection evaluations, the pharmacist-driven ASP group had greater appropriateness of prescribed antibiotics than the control group (88.9% versus 64.4%, $P = 0.004$). Our result was similar to previous study in which more appropriateness was found in the intervention group.¹⁶ Moreover, appropriate duration of therapy was higher in the pharmacist-driven ASP group ($P = 0.039$). Our result was concordant with a previous study that pharmacist-driven ASP could reduce the duration of antibiotic therapy.²⁴ However, appropriateness of antibiotic indication was similar in both groups because our study divided the category of appropriateness into microbial susceptibilities and penetration of antibiotic to target site. If pathogens were identified and antibiotics susceptibilities were reported, it could help physicians to choose proper antibiotics. Since most pathogens in the control group were ESBL-producing organisms, this might affect antibiotic appropriateness because carbapenems are drugs of choice for ESBL-producing organisms and choice of antibiotics was controlled by an infectious diseases physician.²⁵ In addition, overall antibiotic appropriateness and proper duration of therapy in the pharmacist-driven ASP group were also greater than the control group when the source of infection was unknown ($P = 0.039$ and 0.066 , respectively) (supplementary data, Table 3S). However, total antibiotic duration between two groups did not difference. The reasons for prolonging antibiotic duration in intervention group were fungal infection (e.g., invasive pulmonary aspergillosis and mucormycosis), superinfection with MDR organisms, uncontrolled source of infection. Although the result did not show any difference of antibiotic appropriateness in case of known causative pathogens and source of infection between the two groups, the pharmacist-driven ASP group tended to use more proper antibiotics than the control group in terms of indication, dose and duration ($P = 0.384$, 0.833 , and 0.872 , respectively) (supplementary data, Table 4S).

Nevertheless, our study did not show a difference in the 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality between

the two study groups. Our patients tended to have longer neutropenia durations and higher CRE infection rates in the intervention group which differed from a previous study (16). As a result of rising CRE incidence in Thailand, our patients were more likely to be infected with CRE than reported in a previous study which might have affected the mortality rate in our study.^{16,26-27} However, other ASP studies in febrile neutropenic patients also showed no difference in mortality between two groups as well.^{10, 28-31} Based on our multivariate analysis, pharmacists should collaborate with other medical personnel such as infectious diseases physicians to improve the 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality in febrile neutropenic patients caused by cytotoxic chemotherapy. This study supports the IDSA Guideline that ASP team should be done by a multidisciplinary team to achieve successful ASP implementation.⁵ On-site infectious diseases specialist, including ID physician and pharmacist, can improve ASP effectiveness in recent study.³² Hence, multidisciplinary team would be beneficial for ASP implementation in these specific population which data are limited such as febrile neutropenic patient. Notably, although most of the febrile neutropenic patients in our study were caused by cytotoxic chemotherapy, there are some patients caused by hematologic abnormalities during diagnosis in our study which also mentioned in previous study.³³ Furthermore, our study did not find any difference in length of stay in both groups as has been noted in a previous study.¹⁰

Although our target antibiotics utilization in the pharmacist-driven ASP group increased during study period which was similar to a previous study, it might have affected inappropriate prescriptions in the control group.¹⁰ For instance, there were some antibiotics improperly used in empirical therapy in the control group such as ceftriaxone which were not included in our target antibiotics and antibiotics might have been prescribed at an improper low dose. Therefore, DDD of target antibiotics in the control group might be lower than expected. Moreover, we implemented a high dose of target antibiotics according to previous pharmacokinetic studies this might have contributed to higher DDD of target antibiotic in the pharmacist-driven ASP group.²⁻³ Besides, overall intravenous antibiotics in the pharmacist-driven ASP group demonstrated a lower trend than the control group.

Our study had several limitations. First, ward physician rotation could have affected the result. However, the result of this study also showed that the pharmacist intervention group had more appropriateness than the control group. Second, the study was implemented only in medical wards since TUH did not have a hematology-oncology ward during the study period and we could not fully perform interventions in the other wards such as the emergency department and intensive care unit. Ideally, the ASP implementations in febrile neutropenic patients should be done in all wards. Third, we calculated our sample size to demonstrate antibiotic appropriateness rather than 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality. A larger sample size is needed to assess the effect of pharmacist-driven ASP on 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality. Fourth, we could not evaluate the effect of pharmacist-driven ASP on antibiotic resistance since the study site did not have an isolation ward for febrile neutropenia patient with multidrug-resistant pathogens. Thus, acquisition of antibiotic resistance organisms from other patients might have affected our results. Finally, the role of pharmacists in Thailand may be different from western countries. Pharmacists cannot change antibiotic dosage regimen or discontinue antibiotics by themselves, a physician's signature is needed. Thus, pharmacist cooperation with physician was also an important aspect to implement a successful pharmacist-driven ASP in Thailand.

Conclusion

our study showed that pharmacist-driven ASP in febrile neutropenic patients could improve antibiotic appropriateness in both empirical and documentation therapy. However, 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality and length of stay were not different between the groups. Although target antibiotic utilization in the intervention group increased, we found a reduction in total antibiotic utilization in the pharmacist-driven ASP group.

Acknowledgements: We thank the primary physicians who practicing in the medical wards during study period at Thammasat University Hospital.

Funding: No financial support was provided relevant to this article.

Data availability statement: The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Talcott JA, Finberg R, Mayer RJ, Goldman L. The medical course of cancer patients with fever and neutropenia. Clinical identification of a low-risk subgroup at presentation. *Arch Intern Med* 1988;148(12):2561-8.
2. Lortholary O, Lefort A, Tod M, Chomat AM, Darras-Joly C, Cordonnier C. Pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics of antibacterial drugs in the management of febrile neutropenia. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2008;8(10):612-20.
3. Sime FB, Roberts MS, Warner MS, et al. Altered pharmacokinetics of piperacillin in febrile neutropenic patients with hematological malignancy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2014;58(6):3533-7.
4. Naeem D, Alshamrani MA, Aseeri MA, Khan MA. Prescribing Empiric Antibiotics for Febrile Neutropenia: Compliance with Institutional Febrile Neutropenia Guidelines. *Pharmacy (Basel)* 2018;6(3).
5. Barlam TF, Cosgrove SE, Abbo LM, et al. Implementing an Antibiotic Stewardship Program: Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. *CID*. 2016;62(10):e51-77.
6. Rosa RG, Goldani LZ, dos Santos RP. Association between adherence to an antimicrobial stewardship program and mortality among hospitalised cancer patients with febrile neutropaenia: a prospective cohort study. *BMC Infect Dis* 2014;14:286.
7. Paskovaty A, Pflomm JM, Myke N, Seo SK. A multidisciplinary approach to antimicrobial stewardship: evolution into the 21st century. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2005;25(1):1-10.
8. Cheng VC, To KK, Li IW, et al. Antimicrobial stewardship program directed at broad-spectrum intravenous antibiotics prescription in a tertiary hospital. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2009;28(12):1447-56.
9. Yeo CL, Chan DS, Earnest A, et al. Prospective audit and feedback on antibiotic prescription in an adult hematology-oncology unit in Singapore. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2012;31(4):583-90.
10. So M, Mamdani MM, Morris AM, et al. Effect of an antimicrobial stewardship programme on antimicrobial utilisation and costs in patients with leukaemia: a retrospective controlled study. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2018;24(8):882-8.
11. Ruiz-Ramos J, Frasset J, Poveda-Andrés JL, et al. Impact of an antimicrobial stewardship program on critical haematological patients. *Fam Hosp* 2017;41(4):479-87.
12. Storey DF, Pate PG, Nguyen AT, Chang F. Implementation of an antimicrobial stewardship program on the medical-surgical service of a 100-bed community hospital. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2012;1(1):32.
13. Rattanaumpawan P, Thamlikitkul V, Upanan P. 239A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial of Trained Pharmacists and Infectious Disease Clinical Fellows for Approval of Restricted Antibiotics in Hospitalized Medical Patients at Siriraj Hospital. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2014;1(suppl_1):S103-S.
14. Apisarnthanarak A, Lapcharoen P, Vanichkul P, Srisaeng-Ngoen T, Mundy LM. Design and analysis of a pharmacist-enhanced antimicrobial stewardship program in Thailand. *Am J Infect Control* 2015;43(9):956-9.
15. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Prevention and treatment of cancer-related infections Version 2.2020 June 5, 2020. Available at: https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/infections.pdf. Accessed Dec 27, 2020.
16. Madran B, Keske S, Tokca G, et al. Implementation of an antimicrobial stewardship program for patients with febrile neutropenia. *Am J Infect Control* 2018;46(4):420-4.

17. Kollef MH. Inadequate antimicrobial treatment: an important determinant of outcome for hospitalized patients. *Clin Infect Dis* 2000;31 Suppl 4:S131-8.
18. Kollef MH. Rebuttal From Dr Kollef. *Chest* 2017;151(4):744-5.
19. Kollef MH. The importance of appropriate initial antibiotic therapy for hospital-acquired infections. *Am J Med* 2003;115(7):582-4.
20. Freifeld AG, Bow EJ, Sepkowitz KA, 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):427-31.
21. Klastersky J, de Naurois J, Rolston K, et al. Management of febrile neutropaenia: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Ann Oncol* 2016;27(suppl 5):v111-v8.
22. van den Bosch CM, Geerlings SE, Natsch S, Prins JM, Hulscher ME. Quality indicators to measure appropriate antibiotic use in hospitalized adults. *Clin Infect Dis* 2015;60(2):281-91.
23. DeWitt KM, Weiss SJ, Rankin S, Ernst A, Sarangarm P. Impact of an emergency medicine pharmacist on antibiotic dosing adjustment. *Am J Emerg Med* 2016;34(6):980-4.
24. Ohashi K, Matsuoka T, Shinoda Y, et al. Clinical outcome of pharmacist-led prospective audit with intervention and feedback after expansion from patients using specific antibiotics to those using whole injectable antibiotics. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2019;38(3):593-600.
25. Harris PNA, Tambyah PA, Lye DC, 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):984-94.
26. Chotiprasitsakul D, Srichatrapimuk S, Kirdlarp S, Pyden AD, Santanirand P. Epidemiology of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae: a 5-year experience at a tertiary care hospital. *Infect Drug Resist* 2019;12:461-8.
27. Righi E, Peri AM, Harris PN, et al. Global prevalence of carbapenem resistance in neutropenic patients and association with mortality and carbapenem use: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2017;72(3):668-77.
28. Ko JH, Kim SH, Kang CI, et al. Evaluation of a Carbapenem-Saving Strategy Using Empirical Combination Regimen of Piperacillin-Tazobactam and Amikacin in Hemato-Oncology Patients. *J Korean Med Sci* 2019;34(2):e17.
29. Kirk A, Pierce J, Doll M, et al. Effect of carbapenem restriction on prescribing trends for immunocompromised wards at an academic medical center. *Am J Infect Control* 2019;47(8):1035-7.
30. Snyder M, Pasikhova Y, Baluch A. Early Antimicrobial De-escalation and Stewardship in Adult Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Recipients: Retrospective Review. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2017;4(4):ofx226.
31. Paskovaty A, Pastores SM, Gedrimaite Z, Kosteletzky N, Riedel ER, Seo SK. Antimicrobial de-escalation in septic cancer patients: is it safe to back down? *Intensive Care Med* 2015;41(11):2022-3.
32. Livorsi DJ, Nair R, Lund BC, et al. Antibiotic stewardship implementation and patient-level antibiotic use at hospitals with and without on-site Infectious Disease specialists. *Clin Infect Dis* . 2020; ciaa388.
33. Keng MK, Sekeres MA. Febrile neutropenia in hematologic malignancies. *Curr Hematol Malig Rep* . 2013 Dec;8(4):370-8.

Table 1 Baseline characteristics

Baseline characteristic	Total (90 FN episodes), No. (%)	Intervention (45 FN episodes), No. (%)
Age, mean years \pm SD	51.6 \pm 15.6	15.6 \pm 14.6
Male	42 (46.7)	16 (35.6)
Weight, mean kg \pm SD	57.76 \pm 1.50	58.94 \pm 1.94
Cause of febrile neutropenia		
Cytotoxic chemotherapy	67 (74.4)	34 (75.6)
During period of initial hematologic abnormalities diagnosis	20 (22.2)	10 (22.2)
Other causes ^a	3 (3.33)	1 (2.22)
Active hematologic cancer	72 (80)	34 (75.6)
Active solid cancer	8 (8.9)	4 (8.9)
MASCC score, median (IQR)	20 (17-21)	19 (13-21)
High risk of febrile neutropenia (MASCC<21)	45 (50)	25 (55.6)
Absolute neutrophil count, median cells/mm ³ (IQR)	153.9 (19– 520)	184 (40-645)
Had history of febrile neutropenia	46 (51.1)	20 (44.4)
Recent exposed to antibiotic within past 3 months	50 (55.6)	25 (55.6)
Neutropenia duration, median days (IQR)	7 (4-14)	8 (4-14)
Infectious diseases specialist consultation	50 (55.6)	27 (60)
Time to administer antibiotic, median hours (IQR)	1 (0-4)	1.5 (0-4)
Microbiological data		
Causative organism identified	49 (54.4)	26 (57.8)
Gram positive bacteria	12 (13.3)	7 (15.6)
Gram negative bacteria	39 (43.3)	20 (44.4)
ESBL-producing organisms	12 (13.3)	3 (6.7)
Carbapenem resistance organisms	5 (5.6)	4 (8.9)

ESBL, extended spectrum beta-lactamase; FN, febrile neutropenia; IQR, interquartile range; MASCC, Multi-national Association for Supportive Care in Cancer risk index score; SD, standard deviation

^a Other causes of febrile neutropenia were from vitamin B12 deficiency, zidovudine-induce pancytopenia and severe infection.

Table 2 Study outcomes

Outcomes	Intervention (45 FN episodes), No. (%)	Control (45 FN episodes), No. (%)	<i>P</i> value
Overall appropriateness	40 (88.9)	23 (51.1)	< 0.001
Step 1 Empirical therapy	44 (97.8)	35 (77.8)	0.007
Appropriate Indication	45 (100)	45 (100)	-
Appropriate coverage	45 (100)	41 (91.1)	0.041
Appropriate dosage regimen	44 (97.8)	39 (88.7)	0.049
Step 2 Documentation therapy	40 (88.9) ^b	29 (64.4)	0.004
Appropriate indication	43 (95.6)	41 (91.1)	0.361
Appropriate dosage regimen	44 (97.8)	43 (93.3)	0.242
Appropriate duration	41 (91.1)	34 (75.6)	0.039
Length of stay (days) (median (IQR))	28 (19-42)	23 (16-35)	0.689
30-day infectious diseases related mortality	6 (13.6)	5 (11.1)	1.000

Outcomes	Intervention (45 FN episodes), No. (%)	Control (45 FN episodes), No. (%)	<i>P</i> value
Total antibiotic duration (days) (median (IQR))	14 (10-23)	15 (10-21)	0.948
antibiotic duration in de-escalation	21 (14-28)	17.5 (15.5-29.5)	0.666
antibiotic duration in escalation	19 (13-34.5)	15 (11-25.5)	0.309

FN, febrile neutropenia; IQR, interquartile range

^b Total 44 FN episodes since one death occurred before culture was reported

Table 3 Multivariate analysis of 30-day infectious diseases-related mortality

Variables	Univariate analysis	Univariate analysis	Univariate analysis	Multivariate analysis	Multivariate analysis	Multivariate analysis
	OR	95%CI	<i>P</i> value	OR	95%CI	<i>P</i> value
Pharmacist-driven ASP group and infectious diseases consultation in chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenic patient	0.184	0.037 – 0.911	0.038	0.082	0.009 – 0.762	0.028
Male	0.653	0.176 – 2.419	0.524	0.836	0.164 – 4.266	0.830
High risk of febrile neutropenia	5.426	1.098 – 26.829	0.038	6.513	1.036 – 40.941	0.046
Had history of febrile neutropenia	5.143	1.040 – 25.420	0.045	8.034	1.321 – 48.848	0.024
Carbapenem resistance organisms	8.111	1.015 – 64.839	0.048	9.985	0.418 – 238.455	0.155

ASP, antibiotic stewardship program; CI, confidence interval; MASCC, Multinational Association for Supportive Care in Cancer risk index score; OR, odds ratio

