

important safety goal. Hospitals should exercise caution when considering reductions in SARS-CoV-2 admission screening.

**Disclosures:** None

*Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology* 2023;3(Suppl. S2):s113–s114  
doi:10.1017/ash.2023.391

**Presentation Type:**

Poster Presentation - Oral Presentation

**Subject Category:** Diagnostic/Microbiology

**Comparison of clinical antibiotic susceptibility testing interpretations to CLSI standard interpretations**

Erin Hitchingham; Ashley Gambrell; Raquel Villegas and Daniel Muleta

**Background:** Clinical antibiotic susceptibility testing (AST) interpretations based on minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC) breakpoints are important for both clinical decision making and some reportable condition criteria. Standardization of MIC breakpoints across clinical laboratories is lacking; AST instruments are often validated for outdated Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) MIC breakpoint guidelines. In this study, we analyzed the agreement between the reported clinical laboratory AST interpretations and the guideline CLSI interpretation. **Methods:** Clinical laboratory AST data collected from the Multisite Gram-Negative Surveillance Initiative (MuGSI) carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales (CRE) surveillance program in Tennessee between 2019 and 2021 were utilized. MIC values from the clinical instrument were used to calculate CLSI standard interpretations following the 2019–2021 CLSI M100 guidelines. Agreement between the clinical laboratory and CLSI interpretations of the reported MIC values were measured using a weighted Cohen  $\kappa$  calculated in SAS version 9.4 software. Total matches were isolates with identical CLSI and clinical laboratory interpretations. **Results:** In total, 14 antibiotics were assessed. Of those, 9 antibiotics had at least moderate agreement ( $\kappa > 0.41$ ) between interpretations. Agreement between the clinical laboratory and the CLSI interpretations were near perfect ( $\kappa > 0.81$ ) for 3 antibiotics. Agreement between the clinical laboratory and the CLSI interpretations were poor for cefazolin (0.06) and ertapenem (0.14). Cefotaxime (–0.07) was the only antibiotic that suggested no agreement. **Conclusions:** Of the antibiotics included in the analysis, 36% had less than moderate agreement between clinical laboratory and CLSI AST interpretations. Given the increases in antimicrobial resistance globally and the emphasis placed on antibiotic stewardship, standardization across clinical AST panels should be prioritized. Inconsistencies have the potential to contribute to inappropriate antibiotic

use in addition to under- or overidentification of reportable conditions, including CRE.

**Disclosures:** None

*Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology* 2023;3(Suppl. S2):s114  
doi:10.1017/ash.2023.392

**Presentation Type:**

Poster Presentation - Oral Presentation

**Subject Category:** Environmental Cleaning

**Paradoxical consequences of wastewater interventions targeting carbapenemase-producing Enterobacterales**

David Lehman; Shireen Kotay; Hardik Parikh; Stacy Park and Amy Mathers

**Background:** *Serratia marcescens* is a leading cause of hospital-acquired infections. There has been increasing recognition of hospital wastewater as a reservoir for carbapenemase-producing Enterobacterales (CPE), including *S. marcescens*. Because CPE can proliferate in biofilms in sink drains and traps, controlling nosocomial spread is challenging. The ideal approach to eliminate transmission from wastewater to patients remains unknown. **Methods:** Patients were included if they were admitted to 1 of 2 intensive care units (ICUs) for >12 hours between December 1, 2010, and January 31, 2016. During this period at the University of Virginia Hospital, there was ongoing patient acquisition of multiple species producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* carbapenemase (KPC) as well as consistent perirectal KPC surveillance. In January 2014, to eliminate CPE-colonized sinks, the sink drains and traps in one of the ICUs (ie, the “intervention unit”) were exchanged followed by varied chemical mitigations to prevent recolonization. In another ICU, the same chemical mitigations were performed but without plumbing replacement (ie, the “control unit”). Acquisition of KPC-producing *S. marcescens* was defined as colonization or infection >12 hours after admission to either unit. To control for increases in patient-to-patient transmission, acquisition of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) was evaluated in the intervention unit during the same period and was defined as new colonization or infection with MRSA >12 hours after unit admission but within 21 days of last unit exposure. **Results:** For the postintervention period, risk of *S. marcescens* acquisition was increased (RR, 2.85; 95% CI, 1.24–6.58;  $P = .01$ ) in the intervention unit compared to the control unit. In the intervention unit, the risk of *S. marcescens* acquisition increased in the postintervention period compared to the preintervention period (RR, 6.26; 95% CI, 2.59–15.1;  $P < .0001$ ). There was no change in MRSA acquisition in the intervention unit representing consistent patient-to-patient infection prevention (RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.61–1.48;  $P = .81$ ). *S. marcescens* isolates were noted to be highly clonal. **Conclusions:** Exposure to the intervention unit following plumbing replacement was associated with increased relative risk of acquisition of KPC-producing *S. marcescens*. This increased risk was not observed in the control unit, which had only chemical plumbing interventions. There was no concomitant increase in patient-to-patient MRSA transmission. The disturbance of the wastewater environment through the plumbing replacement intervention may have led to the unintended consequence of more KPC-producing *S. marcescens* acquisition.

**Disclosures:** None

*Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology* 2023;3(Suppl. S2):s114  
doi:10.1017/ash.2023.393

**Presentation Type:**

Poster Presentation - Oral Presentation

**Subject Category:** Implementation Science

**Electronic phenotyping of community-acquired pneumonia: A tool for inpatient syndrome-specific antimicrobial stewardship**

Amy Chang; Annie Bui; David Ha; William Alegria; Marisa Holubar; Brian Lu; Leah Mische; Rebecca Linfield; Kyle Walding and Emily Mui

**Background:** Using patient data from the electronic health record (EHR) and computer logic, an “electronic phenotype” can be created to identify patients with community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) in real time to assist

**Table 1: Agreement between clinical AST interpretations and CLSI standard interpretations by antibiotic.**

Antibiotic (n=)	Total Matched (%)	Cohen's Kappa (95% CI)
Aztreonam (191)	181 (94.8%)	0.87 (0.79 – 0.95)
Cefepime (285)	248 (87.0%)	0.77 (0.70 – 0.84)
Ceftazidime (280)	263 (93.8%)	0.81 (0.72 – 0.89)
Ertapenem (313)	159 (50.8%)	0.14 (0.06 – 0.22)
Imipenem (318)	166 (91.8%)	0.84 (0.76 – 0.92)
Meropenem (318)	298 (93.8%)	0.84 (0.78 – 0.91)
Cefotaxime (169)	124 (73.4%)	-0.07 (-0.10 – -0.04)
Ciprofloxacin (282)	193 (68.4%)	0.38 (0.30 – 0.47)
Gentamicin (273)	219 (80.2%)	0.69 (0.64 – 0.74)
Levofloxacin (289)	186 (64.4%)	0.32 (0.24 – 0.39)
Tobramycin (277)	225 (81.3%)	0.75 (0.70 – 0.79)
Nitrofurantoin (273)	158 (57.9%)	0.57 (0.50 – 0.63)
Cefazolin (266)	81 (30.4%)	0.06 (0.03 – 0.08)
Tetracycline (141)	94 (66.7%)	0.66 (0.59 – 0.72)