

Submission ID 911373

UNIVERSITY of

HOUSTON

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

BACKGROUND

- *Clostridioides difficile* infection (CDI) is one of the threats to public health in the United States (US)
- C. difficile ribotype (RT) 106 has been identified as prevalent ribotype causing community-associated and the second most prevalent in healthcare-asso CDI in the US (2)
- CDI caused by RT 027 was associated with double mortality rate within thirty days compared to other RTs (3)
- In an endemic setting in Houston TX, RT 014-020 was associated with decreased CDI disease severity and outcomes compared to RT 027(4)
- A systematic review evaluating the current literature about RT 106 concluded more data was needed regarding clinical outcomes with RT 106 (5)

OBJECTIVE

To evaluate and compare the clinical outcomes of RTs 106, 014-020, and 027, including severity of disease, mortality rate, and recurrence rate

METHODS

Study design

- We conducted a multicenter retrospective study of patients infected with *C. difficile* RT 106, RT 027, and RT 014-020 between 2016-2019 in Houston, Texas
- Electronic medical records were reviewed for patient demographics, laboratory data, exposure to CDI risk factors, and treatment outcomes including initial clinical cure, recurrence, and mortality

Culture and ribotyping

- *C. difficile* stool was plated onto cefoxitin cycloserinefructose agar (CCFA) plates and anaerobically incubated for 48–72 hours
- Isolates were ribotyped using fragment analysis PCR based on a standardized published method (6)

Statistical analysis

- Chi-square test, t-test, and logistic regression analysis were used in data analysis
- SPSS software version 26 was used to analyze data

A Novel Method to Assess Virulence of *Clostridioides difficile*: Focus on *C. difficile* Ribotype 106

Almutairi MS, Gonzales-Luna AJ, Alnezary FS, Fallatah SB, Alam MJ, Begum K, Garey KW University of Houston College of Pharmacy, Houston, Texas

major
(1)
s the most
d (CA) CDI
ociated (HA)

			• • • •	•
lable 1	. Baseline	cnarac	terisi	

Table 1. Baseline characteristics					Figure 1. CDI 90-day recurrence							
Characteristic	RT 014-020 N=152	RT 106 N= 128	p*	RT 027 N=116	p **	La 25%	p= 0.004 p= 0.12 20 7%					
Age (years), mean (SD)	65 (16)	64 (16)	0.50	69 (13)	< 0.01	20%	p= 0.20					
Female sex, no. (%)	93 (61.2)	82 (64.1)	0.62	64 (55.2)	0.15			13.3	%			
White, no. (%)	112 (73.7)	92 (73.6)	0.84	74 (64.9)	0.03	<u>د الم 8</u>	8.6%					
CCI score, mean (SD)	2.9 (2.3)	2.7 (2.2)	0.46	3.1 (1.9)	0.17	f 5%						
CDI episode, no. (%)			0.65		0.42	Cent						
1	111 (73)	99 (77.3)		82 (70.7)			14-020	RT 1()6	F	ST 027	
2	25 (16.4)	19 (14.8)		20 (17.2)					50			
≥3	16 (10.5)	10 (7.8)		14 (12.1)		Table 2: CDI outco	omes					
CDI classification, no. (%)	54 (35.5)	41 (32.0)	0.63	17 (14.7)	< 0.01	CDI outcome	RT 014-020	RT 106	p*	RT 027	p **	All RTs
НО	57 (37.5)	46 (35.9)		44 (37.9)			IN-152	IN- 120		IN-IIO		Ρ
CO-HCFA	41 (27.0)	41 (32.0)		55 (47.4)		Severe episode,	71 (46.7)	61 (47.7)	0.90	75 (64.7)	<0.01	0.01
Antibiotic exposure in past 30 days, no. (%)	124 (81.6)	107 (83.6)	0.66	98 (85.2)	0.73	no. (%) Initial clinical	20 (14.2)	25 (20.7)	0.29	27 (25.2)	0.33	0.08
Risk category of antibiotic, no. (%)			0.05		0.47	failure, no. (%) 90-day recurrence,	13 (8.6)	17 (13.3)	0.20	24 (20.7)	0.12	0.01
High	110 (90.2)	92 (86.8)		87 (88.8)		no. (%)	· · · ·	· · ·		· · · ·		
Medium	1 (0.8)	7 (6.6)		3 (3.1)		Poor prognosis [*] ,	83 (54.6)	75 (58.6)	0.50	84 (72.4)	0.02	<0.01
Low	11 (9.0)	7 (6.6)		8 (8.2)		$\frac{10.(70)}{30-day all-cause}$						
PPI use, no. (%)	82 (53.9)	60 (46.9)	0.24	63 (54.3)	0.25	mortality, no. (%)	16 (10.5)	13 (10.2)	0.51	14 (12.1)	0.63	0.87
Continued antibiotic use following diagnosis, no. (%)	100 (66.2)	88 (68.8)	0.65	82 (70.7)	0.74	*Composite outcome including initial severe infection, initial clinical failure, and 90-day recurrence *RT 106 vs RT 014-020; **RT 106 vs RT 027						rrence
Steroids, no. (%)	22 (14.5)	23 (18.0)	0.43	18 (15.5)	0.60	Table 3: Multivar	riable analys	sis of pool	r prog	nosis		
ICU	31 (20.4)	30 (23.4)	0.53	30 (25.9)	0.66	Variable		OR	9	5% CI	r	
Hypo-albuminemia	82 (64.6)	64 (66)	0.82	73 (81.1)	0.01	RT 027		2 27	1 2	270 CI 8 - 1 38	۱ 0>	, 01
GI surgery in past 6 months, no. (%)	24 (15.8)	20 (15.6)	0.97	14 (12.1)	0.42	RT 106		1.29	0.7	'4 – 2.2	0.3	36
Abbv: CCI, Charlson Comorbidity Index; CO, community-onset; HO, hospital-onset; CO-HFCA,				ICU admission with	nin 72 hrs	2.11	1.1	3 - 3.93	0.0	01		
community-onset, healthcare facility acquired; ICU, Intensive care unit; PPI, proton-pump inhibitor; *RT 106 vs RT 014-020; **RT 106 vs RT 027					Hypo-albuminemia	E	2.4	1	.4 - 4	<0.	.01	

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Antibiotic Resistance Threats in the United States 2019 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Emerging Infections Program; Healthcare-associated Infections Projects, Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/hai/eip/Annual-CDI-Report-2016.html (Accessed 20 Nov 2019) Labbé AC, Poirier L, Maccannell D, Louie T, Savoie M, Béliveau C, et al. Clostridium difficile infections in a Canadian tertiary care hospital before and during a regional epidemic associated with the BI/NAP1/027 strain. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2008;52(9):3180-7 Aitken, Samuel L et al. "In the Endemic Setting, Clostridium difficile Ribotype 027 Is Virulent But Not Hypervirulent." Infection control and hospital epidemiology vol. 36,11 (2015): 1318-23. doi:10.1017/ice.2015.187 Carlson TJ, Blasingame D, Gonzales-Luna AJ, Alnezary F, Garey KW. Clostridioides difficile ribotype 106: A systematic review of the antimicrobial susceptibility, genetics, and clinical outcomes of this common worldwide strain. Anaerobe. 2020;62:102142

RESULTS

CONCLUSIONS

A novel framework of contrasting emerging *C. difficile* ribotypes to other locally endemic strains demonstrated RT 106 to be moderately virulent when compared to RTs 027 and 014-020.

REFERENCES

Martinson JN, Broadaway S, Lohman E, Johnson C, Alam MJ, Khaleduzzaman M, et al. Evaluation of portability and cost of a fluorescent PCR ribotyping protocol for Clostridium difficile epidemiology. J Clin Microbiol. 2015;53(4):1192-7

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health NIAID (U01AI124290-01)



FUNDING