e-ISSN: 0975-1556, p-ISSN:2820-2643

Available online on www.ijpcr.com

International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2023; 15(4); 107-118

Review Article

Anti-Microbial Utilization in Surgical Wards: A Systematic Review

Tamil Selvan M[1], Lavanya K[2], Nileshraj G[3], Jayanthi MK[4]

[1]Tutor, Department of Pharmacology, Arunai Medical College and Hospital, Thiruvanamalai.

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Arunai Medical College and Hospital, Thiruvanamalai.

[3]Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Arunai Medical College and Hospital, Thiruvanamalai.

[4]Professor, Department of Pharmacology, JSS Medical College, Mysore

Received: 29-01-2023 / Revised: 18-02-2023 / Accepted: 27-03-2023

Corresponding author: Tamil Selvan M

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract

Antimicrobial resistance has become one of the most serious problems in the world and problems in the management of infected critically unwell individuals. This is partly owing to the rising prevalence of pathogenic microbes that are resistant to currently available antimicrobial medicines, resulting in the use of ineffective treatments. Measures to avoid antimicrobial resistance in ICU's are obtained and should be used as soon as possible. For the near future, the restricted availability of new antimicrobial treatment classes emphasises the importance of preventing antibiotic, antiviral, and antifungal resistance.

Keywords: Antimicrobial, Antibiotics, Treatment, Resistance.

Introduction

In 1992, In order to replace the phrase "surgical wound infection," the word "Infection on the site of surgery" (SSI) was added to the medical lexicon. Using uniform surveillance guidelines, the Incisional and organ/space SSIs are taken into consideration by the NNIS (National Nosocomial Infection Study) and NHSN (National Healthcare Safety Network).

Despite the fact that surgical site infections are potentially prevented, they continue to occur, implying that microbiological risk cannot be totally removed. SSIs are a common cause of morbidity and mortality, despite the implementation of infection prevention strategies. Patients with SSIs are more likely to need further operations, re-hospitalization, or ICU rehabilitation, and their mortality risk is higher[1,2]. In 2010, the infection risk for non-orthopaedic interventions was 2.4 percent and 1.2 percent for orthopaedic interventions, according to a national study based on SSI data from eleven Italian regions and one hundred hospitals[3]. Antimicrobial prophylaxis is a high-efficacy SSI control measure identified as drug administration prior to bacterial contamination of the surgical area[4,5].

Global and international standards recommend effective surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis[5-7] . In consultation with an Infection Control Committee (ICC) made up of physicians and pharmacists, each hospital in Italy prepares its own protocol (hospital guidelines) that

includes antimicrobial prophylaxis and treatment recommendations. Piedmont began using an indicator system in 2008 to assess the organisation, surveillance, control, and education activities related to healthcare-associated infections; in 2010, an SSI control indicator was added, which included antimicrobial prophylaxis surveillance, which showed conformance in only 39% of cases.

The SSIs issue has national and worldwide repercussions, according to recent publications[9-11]. Three of the six SCIP performance metrics linked to SSI prevention were timing, antibiotic selection, and duration of antimicrobial prophylaxis. The Surgical Care Improvement Project (SCIP) was founded in 2006 in the United States with the goal of reducing surgical complications by 25% by 2010[12,13].

Antimicrobial Prophylaxis:

Antimicrobial prophylaxis is a critical component of antimicrobial therapy. Antibiotic prophylaxis before surgery can prevent up to 80% of infections on the site of surgery[14]. The use of high-dose antimicrobials and non-surgical invasive treatments (cardiology, gastroenterology) has resulted in a rise in medical antimicrobial prophylaxis indications. Infection prevention in non-surgical circumstances. In reviews and guidelines, these signs have been described[15-17].

The Netherlands' Health Council determined in 2015 there be in need of information about the scope, indications, and indication base of medical antimicrobial prophylaxis[18]. Medical antimicrobial prevention does not appear to be covered in depth in published audits[19]. We believe it is accountable for a significant portion of total antimicrobial medication consumption in hospitals.

Antimicrobial Resistance:

Multidrug-resistant bacteria have a wide range of clinical, environmental, and economic implications. Antimicrobial resistance has exist designated as a public health preference by the WHO, The worldwide action plan's major goals are to combat antimicrobial resistance and to use antimicrobials responsibly[20]. Improved antibiotic use necessitates the execution of administration programmes, and while lately created oral antimicrobials are would rather options, a large majority of illnesses until now necessitate parenteral infusions, which may necessitate extended hospitalizations[21-23].

OPAT:

Since the 1970s, outpatient parenteral antibiotic therapy (OPAT) has been used as a deliberate mode of care delivery, involving the administration of antibiotics via parenteral infusion outside of a hospital setting [23,24]. Bone infections, skin and soft-tissue infections, urinary tract infections, and infections at the surgical site are among the most common conditions treated with OPAT regimens[24,25]. The patient satisfaction rate for OPAT is high, and it is a clinically safe procedure with great clinical results[26]. However, for the best results, a multidisciplinary team must carefully select patients based on clinical circumstances, comorbidities, family and self-care capacities, medication adherence, and venous approach[23,26].

In addition to the benefits outlined above, cost depletion has been a persistent issue for OPAT implementation in general and personal health systems[23,24]. Economic examination of antimicrobial therapy strategies allows for an assessment of opportunity costs, allowing selections to ensure the greatest health benefits with the least amount of resources invested[27,28]. As a result, the purpose of this study was to undertake a comprehensive analysis of economic evaluations of OPAT as a healthcare modality as a substitute for hospitalisation.

Escalated Use of Antimicrobials in Long-term care offices:

Antimicrobials represent more than 40% of all fundamental meds gave in LTCFs, making them perhaps the most generally recommended pharmacological agent [29,30]. The utilization of foundational antimicrobial in LTCFs is assessed to be around 8% as of now [31,32]. During a one-year period, a resident's chances of receiving at least one course of a basic antimicrobial treatment range from half to seventy percent[31,33]. Topical antibacterial medicines are also commonly recommended in LTCFs, though the amount to which these medications are used is less well understood[33].

Inappropriate use of Antimicrobial in LTCFs:

Antimicrobial usage in LTCFs is deemed ineffective in a large percentage of cases. According to recent statistics, 25% to 75% of systemic antimicrobials are used[31,32] just as up to 60% of effective antimicrobials [33] are advised in an ineffective manner Inappropriate antimicrobial usage is an issue in all contexts, though[34,35]. The undeniable degree of antimicrobial use, just as the extra issues recorded underneath, require cautious thought of ways of improving recommending rehearses in LTCFs.

Unfavourable Consequences of Inappropriate Antimicrobial use:

Residents at LTCFs are routinely exposed to antimicrobial agents since illnesses are common[36,37]. Some medications, even when taken correctly, can cause negative side effects. Older nursing home (NH) residents are at a higher risk of medication-related adverse effects due to the physiological impacts of ageing on kidney, liver, and cerebral function, the presence of comorbid clinical disorders, and the usage of several medications to treat these illnesses at the same time. The most serious consequence of improper antibiotic administration in LTCFs is the development of antimicrobial resistance in this high-risk group, as well as an increased danger of safe life forms being transferred to other patients in the LTCF[38].

Issues in Optimization Utilization of Antimicrobial in LTCFs:

Advancing ideal antimicrobial use in LTCFs has a number of challenges. To begin with, infection clinical diagnosis is typically imprecise. Inhabitants in LTCFs regularly have hearing and intellectual weaknesses, and manifestations may not be expressed or seen precisely.

Persistent concomitant clinical conditions can mask infection signs and symptoms. Infectious diseases may not show with typical clinical signs and symptoms[39]. There is a higher likelihood of afebrile infection, also the febrile reaction might be debilitated [40,41]. Instead of localising observations, disease might give ambiguous fundamental manifestations like confusion, diminished hunger, or a second rate temperature.

The materials accessible to help doctor (or other wellbeing proficient) clinical appraisal are restricted. Clinical rules for the finding of diseases have for the most part been created for more youthful populaces with less comorbidities, and their pertinence in the LTCF populace has not been tried as a rule[42]. Clinical diagnostic uncertainty contributes to the overuse of empirical antimicrobials.

Antimicrobials and Comfort Care:

Antimicrobial therapy in infected elderly institutionalised individuals has the potential to save their lives. It is widely agreed that it is ethically appropriate not to administer antimicrobial medication to certain patients in LTCFs[43]. Abstract standards have been proposed to assist specialists with making decisions on whether or not to treat hazardous contaminations [44,45].

Furthermore, a few medical clinics and NHs have established techniques to resolve the moral difficulties surrounding the use of anti-

toxins for patients with dangerous conditions, and advance mandates frequently include antimicrobial treatment among life-supporting medicines like as bonding and ventilator

Table 1: For Common Infections, Indicative Assessment and Empirical Antimicrobial Therapy

Clinical Condition	Negligible Diagnostic Test	Exact Antimicrobial
Upper Respiratory Tract infection Pharyngitis Coryza Sinus Infections	Throat Swab None CT (Refractory only)	Treat provided that Strep A None TMP-SMX+amoxicillin, cefuroxime axetil, macrolide[44,45]
Lower Respiratory Tract Infection Acute Bronchitis Pneumonia	None Sputum gram stain and culture, Chest radiography	Most cases infection, no anti-microbials showed TMP-SMX+amoxicillin, cefuroxime axetil, macrolide[44,45]
Urinary Tract Infection	Manifestation evaluation , Urinalysis, Urine culture, Blood culture	TMP-SMX, quinolone, aminoglycosides[44,45].

Empirical Antimicrobial Therapy:

Without even a trace of societies or while hanging tight for culture results, the LTCF specialist should regularly begin treatment with experimental anti-microbials[46]. This part contains experimental antimicrobial treatment proposals for the most well-known types of sicknesses found in New Hampshire occupants: upper and lower respiratory parcel contaminations, UTI's, (Table 1). A short clarification of clinical worries, the most widely recognized bacterial diseases, appropriate pretreatment examination, and exact anti-toxin treatment choices are remembered for every syndrome's discussion.

An observational antibiotic ought to be dynamic against the most well-known contaminations and fit for arriving at the essential remedial focus at the disease site. Thus, it's basic to appropriately survey the patient to decide the wellspring of contamination and to pick drugs and organization courses that are proper for the clinical circumstance[47]. The utilization of empirical antimicrobial treatment doesn't discredit the need to make a specific conclusion and, sooner rather than later, recognize the causal etiologic specialist. At the point when the term of exact treatment arrives at 3 to 4 days, drug harmfulness, costs, and the arrangement of opposition are bound to be clinically significant hardships[48].

The degree to which a research centre assessment is gotten changes by organization. Culture discoveries may not be open or might be postponed in the LTCF, regularly for a long time. Assuming that societies are accessible, the outcomes are hard to decipher, to some extent on the grounds that the way of life example introduced is of low quality. Empirical therapy should be reviewed once cultural and sensitivity testing are available. The antibiotic treatment of decision ought to have a limited range, accomplish helpful fixations at the site of contamination, be all around endured, have low harmfulness, and be the most financially savvy choice. The seriousness of the patient's affliction, the idea of hidden problems, earlier antimicrobial openings, earlier diseases with safe organic entities, and a background marked by medicine hypersensitivities all effect the decision of a particular exact anti-microbial. The choice of

empirical antimicrobials can also be influenced by the NH's environment.

Antibiotic resistance patterns that are peculiar to a given institution's context or patient population are common[49]. As a result, the recommendations in this position paper for precise or conclusive antimicrobial treatment should not be interpreted as defining medications of choice or even ideal treatment in all circumstances; rather, they should be used as broad guidelines by LTCF clinicians who should incorporate epidemiological, clinical, and publicly available research centre data to provide the best possible care to patients.

According to the earlier discussion on the lack of major helpful preliminaries in this population, any requests for appraisal or experimental treatment for specific disorders would be assigned to class B, III (Table 2).

Table 2: Order of the strength and quality of evidence of each recommendation

Classification	Definition
Definition Categories mirroring the strength of suggestions:	
A	Great proof to help the suggestion.
B	Moderate proof to help the suggestion.
C	Helpless proof to help the proposal.
Classifications mirroring the nature of proof for the suggestion	
I	Proof from a properly randomized, controlled preliminary, for example.
II	Proof could come from a single well-planned clinical trial without randomization, from case-controlled logical exams (preferably with many foci), from numerous time-series research, or from emotional results in uncontrolled trials.
III	Proof from respected experts' opinions, based on clinical experience, expressive examinations, or master council reports.

i)Upper Respiratory Infection:

Etiology: The normal cold, pharyngitis, and sinus diseases are the most widely recognized upper respiratory contaminations. Infections are the most widely recognized reason for upper respiratory contaminations in NH patients; in any case, the β-haemolytic gathering is unique. In the older, streptococcus is a typical reason for pharyngitis. The most well-known reasons for bacterial sinusitis are Streptococcus pneumoniae and Haemophilus influenzae. Different living beings, like gram-negative bacilli and anaerobic microorganisms, are as often as possible liable for long haul, repetitive sinus diseases.

Patient Assessment: Visualizing the throat and obtaining a pharyngeal swab for a bunch demonstration test A streptococcus test should be the first step in diagnosing pharyngitis. An otoscopic check ought to be performed on ear infection patients. In patients who have a fever, nasal release, and face agony or cerebral pain, bacterial sinusitis ought to be inspected. By and large, no extra symptomatic or microbiological testing is required. Nonetheless, in unmanageable cases that don't react to observational treatment, a sinus radiography or figured tomographic assessment of the sinuses or mastoids might be required. To distinguish a conclusive causal

element, careful goal of center ear liquid or an impeded sinus might be required

Empirical therapy: If a throat culture or a valid streptococcal screening test reveals the presence of group A streptococci, penicillin may be given. To treat severe sinusitis, antimicrobials such as trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole are used. Sulfamethoxazole, amoxicillin, or cefuroxime axetil are recommended anti-toxins. Experimental treatment often incorporates macrolide anti-infection agents like clarithromycin or azithromycin, however the viability of clarithromycin against H influenzae has been addressed. Patients who don't react well to treatment with more restricted range anti-infection agents ought to be given amoxicillin-clavulanic corrosive. Quinolones are seldom used to treat contaminations at these areas.

Lower Respiratory Infection:

Etiology: In more seasoned LTCF patients, S pneumoniae is as yet the most well-known bacterial reason for pneumonia[50-52]. However, a variety of different bacterial and nonbacterial infections can cause pneumonia in this population[53,54]. Gram-negative bacilli are ordinarily refined from patients who have been treated with antimicrobials or from inhabitants of NHs with high antimicrobial use [55]. Nonetheless, these organisms are phenomenal reasons for pneumonia. Patients with prior constant lung illness are in danger for H influenzae contamination, just like those with conditions that watch out for desire. Blended high-impact and anaerobic pneumonic contaminations are normal in patients with sicknesses that incline to yearning[53]. Patients with dental caries are more likely to get anaerobic infection, while edentulous patients are less likely.

Albeit a few people with bacterial pneumonia can't expectorate respiratory emissions, they regularly have useful hacks. Patients with dry hacking hacks might be contaminated with abnormal contaminations, for example, the normal sickness Chlamydia pneumoniae [54,56].

Patient evaluation and examination:

Since numerous NH patients have hidden lung issues, it's hard to differentiate between constant manifestations and intense lower respiratory disease. Without the benefit of a chest radiograph, the conclusion of pneumonia is regularly made based on a fresh start of fever and expanded hack, expanded sputum creation, and an adjustment of sputum character [42]. North of 25 breaths each moment has been distinguished as a solid clinical sign of pneumonia[57].

Patients suspected of having pneumonia should have a minimum workup that includes a respiratory rate assessment and a pulmonary auscultation. Patients with bacterial bronchitis or contamination with tuberculosis who don't display trademark lung indications of bacterial pneumonia on actual assessment might have bacterial bronchitis or disease with tuberculosis a strange specialist A chest radiograph ought to be taken previously or soon after exact treatment has been managed to people with suspected pneumonia has been started If open, beat oximetry might be useful.

Sputum samples from patients with pneumonia should be collected for Gram stain and culture. In any case, this is often inconceivable drying out or a reluctance to consent with respect to the patient due to a variety of reasons. If a sputum sample is acquired, the nature of the sample should be established by direct Gram staining prior to culture, as evidenced by the presence of significant numbers of polymorphonuclear leukocytes and a general lack of epithelial cells [58]. The Gram stain can also be used to differentiate pneumococcus, which may not be segregated in culture due to its inability to withstand cold and transport to the lab. Only acquire sputum or serological testing to detect rare contaminations such as Legionella, Mycoplasma, or pertussis in extreme conditions. Despite the fact that testing for specific viral etiologies at a research

centre can be valuable in flare-up circumstances when a conclusion can aid with setting up the appropriate contamination management policies, it is rarely suggested. Spreads for corrosive quick bacilli and sputum for Mycobacterium tuberculosis culture should be obtained if reactivation TB is being explored. Blood societies aren't generally required, but they should be collected from people who are seriously ill and need to be admitted to an emergency room. They could be positive in up to 20% of cases under the current environment.

Empirical therapy:

There are a few antibacterial choices for the exact treatment of pneumonia in LTCF patients[59]. Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, doxycycline, amoxicillin, cefuroxime axetil, or erythromycin, clarithromycin, or azithromycin are all acceptable antibiotics. In NH patients with pneumonia, quinolones, broad-spectrum cephalosporins or penicillins, and aminoglycoside antimicrobials should not be administered as first-line antibiotics.

A quinolone might be utilized if penicillin-safe pneumococci are suspected, yet there are developing concerns in regards to quinolone opposition in these strains. For patients, clindamycin ought to be utilized. It can be used in conjunction with trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole if anaerobic pneumonia is suspected after aspiration if an infection that is both aerobic and anaerobic is deemed In individuals who require parenteral therapy, intramuscular ceftriaxone may be administered[60].

iiiUrinary Tract Infection:

In LTCFs, UTI's are the most usually distinguished and treated diseases asymptomatic bacteriuria influences over 30% of no catheterized LTCF occupants and for all intents and purposes generally constantly siphoned patients[31,36]. For non-symptomatic bacteriuria, many therapy courses are provided ineffectively[61]. Asymptomatic bacteriuria treatment has little effect on the development of indicative infection, persistent genitourinary problems such indulgence, or death[62]. Asymptomatic bacteriuria treatment has little effect on the development of indicative infection, persistent genitourinary problems such indulgence, or death [63,64].

Etiology:

The most common cause of UTI in both syphoned and non-siphoned NH residents is Escherichia coli. Other Enterobacteriaceae species, such as Proteus, Klebsiella, Providencia, and Enterobacter, as well as enterococci and Pseudomonas aeruginosa, are typically isolated, especially from persons who have recently been treated with antimicrobials [31,61]. Bacterial prostatitis is a typical reason for intermittent pee contamination in guys. Patients who have been siphoned for quite a while have polymicrobial bacteriuria, which contains a wide scope of creatures that change all alone, paying little mind to anti-toxin pressure[31].

Patient Assessment and Investigation:

A urinalysis and urine culture ought to be remembered for the essential upon of patients with signs and side effects that suggest a urinary parcel contamination; urine analysis ought not be gained from asymptomatic patients. It's ideal to get a spotless catch or halfway urine test. This can be hazardous in nursing homes assuming that individuals can't collaborate. To secure a decent example, straight catheterization might be required. Patients with inhabiting urethral catheters ought to have a urine test gathered for culture utilizing a recently introduced catheter50 or goal of the catheter tubing lumen; examples ought not be taken from the seepage sack. Assuming normalized assortment strategies that limit defilement are used, urine examples can be recovered from newly embedded outer (condom) catheters in men [65,66]. To keep tainting creatures from congesting, all urine samples ought to be refrigerated previously

and during transport to the microbial science research facility. Any quiet with afflictions or a temperature more than 102°F (38.5°C) however under 96°F (36°C) ought to have blood societies taken. For patients with polymicrobic bacteriuria, positive blood societies might uncover a particular causative microorganism [50].

Empirical therapy:

Observed treatment ought to be begun provided that side effects are clear and serious enough that waiting 2 to 3 days for culture results would be inadequate. Past urine culture and affectability testing ought to be assessed to find examples of antimicrobial refusal to accept that can assist with directing exact treatment choice. Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole is the most utilized emperical treatment for indicative UTI's. Quinolone meds are effective against antibiotic-resistant gram negative bacteria, however amoxicillin is the favored anti-microbial for enterococcal infections. For specific patients, beginning parenteral treatment with a solitary every day measurements of an aminoglycoside might be suitable. Most of indicative lower UTI's in women in the NH are treated with antimicrobials for three to seven days[67]. Patients with signs or symptoms of pyelonephritis or genitourinary tract problems, as well as men, may benefit from 10 to 14 days of treatment. Chronic prostatic infections may necessitate treatment for two or more weeks. In this case, agents that enter the prostate gland, such as trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole or quinolones, should be utilised.

Conclusion

Antimicrobial usage should be reviewed as part of infection control activities in LTCFs. The goal of this action should be to encourage antimicrobial stewardship and, in the long run, to reduce antibiotic resistance in the LTCF. Antimicrobial usage review is best classified as part of an infection control programme since incorrect antibiotic prescribing practises have an impact on the success or failure of infection control activities. Infection control professionals, medical directors, nursing staff, practising physicians, and pharmacists are all needed for this interdisciplinary programme.

Antibiotics prescribed in the LTCF should be tracked by the antimicrobial review programme. Depending on the size of the institution and the number of antibiotics administered, surveillance data should be evaluated on a regular basis, such as monthly, quarterly, or semi-annually. The programme should include a list of the specific antibiotics utilised in the LTCF, as well as the number of doses or days of therapy and expenses. These data should be coupled with data on infections caused by resistant microorganisms wherever possible. The infection control committee should assess this material before submitting it to the prescribing committee.

The antimicrobial review programme should design and support antibiotic stewardship programmes. Include information in the patient's medical records on the justification for taking antimicrobials for symptomatic illnesses as part of the treatment plan. Antibiotics, particularly broad-spectrum antibiotics, should be avoided wherever feasible.

Reference

1. Horan TC, Gaynes RP, Martone WJ, Jarvis WR, Emori TG. CDC definitions of nosocomial surgical site infections, 1992: a modification of CDC definitions of surgical wound infections. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1992;13:606–8.
2. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Surveillance of surgical site infections in Europe 2008–2009. ECDC: Stockholm; 2012.
3. ASSR Emilia Romagna. Sorveglianza delle infezioni del sito chirurgico in Italia. Interventi ortopedici anno 2010. Interventi non ortopedici anno 2011. Bologna: ASSR Emilia Romagna; 2012.

4. Mangram AJ, Horan TC, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR. Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1999;20:250–80.
5. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence: Surgical site infection. Prevention and treatment of surgical site infection. 2008.
6. Istuto superior di sanita: Sistema nazionale per le line guida- Antibiotico profilassi perio peratoria nell' adulto. 2008. http://www.snlgiss.it/ign_antibioticoprofilassi-perioperatoria-adulto-2008. Accessed 8 may 2022.
7. ASSR Emilia Romagna. Compendio delle principali misure per la prevenzione e il controllo delle infezioni correlate all'assistenza. 1st ed. ASSR Emilia Romagna: Emilia Romagna; 2010.
8. Prospero E, Barbadoro P, Marigliano A, Martini E, D'Errico MM. Perioperative antibiotic prophylaxis: improved compliance and impact on infection rates. Epidemiol Infect. 2011;139:1326–31.
9. Pittalis S, Ferraro F, Piselli P, Ruscitti LE, Grilli E, Lanini S, et al. Appropriateness of surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis in the Latium Region of Italy, 2008: a multicenter study. Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2013;14:1–4.
10. Friedman ND, Styles K, Gray AM, Low J, Athan E. Compliance with surgical antibiotic prophylaxis at an Australian teaching hospital. AJIC. 2013;41:71–4.
11. Hohmann C, Eickhoff C, Radziwill R, Schulz M. Adherence to guidelines for antibiotic prophylaxis in surgery patients in German hospitals: a multicentre evaluation involving pharmacy interns. Infection. 2012;40:131–7.
12. Bratzler W, Hunt DR. The surgical infection prevention and surgical care improvement projects: national initiatives to improve outcomes for patients having surgery. Clin Infect Dis. 2006;43:322–30.
13. Napolitano LM. Perspectives in surgical infections: what does the future hold? Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2010;11:111–23.
14. Bowater RJ, Stirling SA, Lilford RJ. Is antibiotic prophylaxis in surgery a generally effective intervention? Testing a generic hypothesis over a set of meta-analyses. Ann Surg. 2009;249:551–6.
15. Sutcliffe JA, Briggs JH, Little MW, McCarthy E, Wigham A, Bratby M, et al. Antibiotics in interventional radiology. Clin Radiol. 2015;70:223–34.
16. 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:e56–93.
17. Khashab MA, Chithadi KV, Acosta RD, Bruining DH, Chandrasekhara V, et al. Antibiotic prophylaxis for GI endoscopy. Gastrointest Endosc. 2015;81:81–9.
18. Health Council of the Netherlands: Antibiotics in hospitals: prophylaxis and antibiotic stewardship. https://www.gezondheidsraad.nl/sites/default/files/201512_antibiotica_in_ziekenhuizen.pdf. Accessed 6 Feb 2022.
19. Usluer G, Ozgunes I, Leblebicioglu H, Turkish Antibiotic Utilization Study G. A multicenter point-prevalence study: antimicrobial prescription frequencies in hospitalized patients in Turkey. Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob. 2005;4:16.
20. World Health Organization. Antimicrobial resistance: draft global action plan on antimicrobial resistance. Sixty-Eighth World Health Assembly A68/20. 2015. Available from: http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA68/A68_20-en.pdf.
21. Dellit TH, Owens RC, McGowan JE Jr, 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.

22. Drekonja DM, Filice GA, Greer N, et al. Antimicrobial stewardship in outpatient settings: a systematic review. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2015;36(2):142–152.
23. Chapman AL, Seaton RA, Cooper MA, et al. Good practice recommendations for outpatient parenteral antimicrobial therapy (OPAT) in adults in the UK: a consensus statement. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2012;67(5):1053–1062.
24. MacKenzie M, Rae N, Nathwani D. Outcomes from global adult outpatient parenteral antimicrobial therapy programmes: a review of the last decade. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2014;43:7–16.
25. The British Society for Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. National outcomes registry (NORS). OPAT Registry. User guide for NORS (Adult & Paediatric). [cited 2022 Feb 21]. Available from: http://opatregistry.com/documents/userguide.pdf.
26. Tice AD, Rehm SJ, Dalovisio JR, et al. Practice guidelines for outpatient parenteral antimicrobial therapy. Clin Infect Dis. 2004;38:1651–1672.
27. Palmer S, Raftery J. Opportunity cost. BMJ. 1999;318(7197):1551–1552.
28. Russell LB, Siegel JE, Daniels N, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis as a guide to resource allocation in health: roles and limitations. In: GoldMR, Siegel JE, Russell LB, et al., editors. Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1996; 3–24.
29. Wayne SJ, Rhyne RL, Stratton M. Longitudinal prescribing patterns in a nursing home population. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1992;40:53-56.
30. Crossley K, Henry K, Irvine P, Willenbring K. Antibiotic use in nursing homes: prevalence, cost, and utilization review. Bull NY Acad Med. 1987;63:510-518.
31. Warren JW, Palumbo FB, Fitterman L, Speedie SM. Incidence and characteristics of antibiotic use in aged nursing home patients. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1991; 39:963-972.
32. Zimmer JG, Bentley DW, Valenti WM, Watson NM. Systemic antibiotic use in nursing homes. A quality assessment. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1986;34:703-710.
33. Yakabowich MR, Keeley G, Montgomery PR. Impact of a formulary on personal care homes in Manitoba. CMAJ. 1994; 150: 1601-1607.
34. Montgomery P, Semenchuk M, Nicolle LE. Antimicrobial use in nursing homes in Manitoba. Journal of Geriatric Drug Therapy. 1995;9:55-74.
35. Kunin CM. The responsibility of the infectious disease community for the optimal use of antimicrobial agents. J Infect Dis. 1985;151:388-398.
36. Nicolle LE, McIntyre M, Zacharies H, MacDonell JA. Twelve-month surveillance of infections in institutionalized elderly men. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1984; 32: 513-519.
37. Magaziner J, Tenney JH, DeForge B, Hebel JR, Muncier HL Jr, Warren JW. Prevalence and characteristics of nursing home-acquired infections in the aged. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1991;39:1071-1078.
38. John JF Jr, Ribner BS. Antibiotic resistance in long-term care facilities. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1991; 12:245-250.
39. Norman DC, Toledo SD. Infections in elderly persons: an altered clinical presentation. Clin Geriatr Med. 1992; 8: 713-719.
40. Castle SC, Norman DC, Yeh M, Miller D, Yoshikawa TT. Fever response in elderly nursing home residents: are the older truly colder? J Am Geriatr Soc. 1991;39:853-857.
41. McAlpine CH, Martin BJ, Lennox IM, Roberts MA. Pyrexia in infection in the elderly. Age Ageing. 1986;15:230-234.
42. McGeer A, Campbell B, Emori TG, Hierholzer WJ, Jackson MM, Nicolle LE, et al. Definitions of infection for

surveillance in long-term care facilities. Am J Infect Control. 1991;19:1-7.
43. Kapp MB. Legal and ethical standards in geriatric medicine. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1985;33:179-183.
44. Mott PD, Barker WH. Hospital and medical care use by nursing home patients: the effect of patient care plans. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1988;36:47-53
45. Freer JP, Bentley DW. The role of antibiotics in comfort care. In: Olson E, Chichiw ER, Libow LS, eds. Controversies in Ethics in Long Term Care. New York City, New York: Springer Publishing Co; 1995:91-104.
46. Katz PR. Antibiotics for nursing home residents. When are they appropriate? Postgrad Med. 1993;93:173-180.
47. Jones SR, Parker DF, Liebow ES, Kimbrough RC, Freur RS. Appropriateness of antimicrobial therapy in long-term care facilities. Am J Med. 1987;83:499-502.
48. John JF Jr, Ribner BS. Antibiotic resistance in long-term care facilities. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1991;12:245-250.
49. Nicolle LE, Strausbaugh LJ, Garibaldi RA. Infections and antibiotic resistance in nursing homes. Clin Microbiol Rev. 1996;9:1-17.
50. Muder RR, Brennen C, Wagener MM, Goetz AM. Bacteremia in a long-term care facility: a five-year prospective study of 163 consecutive episodes. Clin Infect Dis. 1992;14:647-654.
51. Hirata-Dulas CA, Stein DJ, Guay DR, Gruninger RP, Peterson PK. A randomized study of ciprofloxacin versus ceftriaxone in the treatment of nursing home-acquired lower respiratory tract infections. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1991;39:979-985.
52. Peterson PK, Stein D, Guay DR, Logan G, Obaid S, Gruninger R, et al. Prospective study of lower respiratory tract infections in an extended-care nursing home program: potential role of oral ciprofloxacin. Am J Med. 1988;85:164-171.
53. Marrie TJ, Durant H, Kwan C. Nursing home-acquired pneumonia. A case-control study. J Am Geriatr Soc 1986;34:697-702.
54. Loeb M, McGeer A, McArthur M, Walter S, Simor AE. Risk factors for pneumonia and other lower respiratory tract infections in elderly residents of long-term care facilities. Arch Intern Med. 1999; 159: 2058-2064.
55. Garb JL, Brown RB, Garb JR, Tuthill RW. Differences in etiology of pneumonias in nursing home and community patients. JAMA. 1978;240:2169-2172.
56. Orr PH, Peeling RW, Fast M, Brunka J, Duckworth H, Harding GK, et al. Serologic study of responses to selected pathogens causing respiratory tract infection in the institutionalized elderly. Clin Infect Dis. 1996;23:1240-1245.
57. McFadden JP, Price RC, Eastwood HD, Briggs RS. Raised respiratory rate in elderly residents: a valuable physical sign. BMJ 1982;284:626-627.
58. Van Scoy RE. Bacterial sputum cultures. A clinician's viewpoint. Mayo Clin Proc 1977;52:39-41.
59. Mylotte JM, Ksiazek S, Bentley DW. Rational approach to the antibiotic treatment of pneumonia in the elderly. Drugs Aging. 1994;4:21-33.
60. Phillips SL, Branaman-Phillips J. The use of intramuscular cefoperazone versus intramuscular ceftriaxone in patients with nursing home-acquired pneumonia. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1993;41:1071-1074.
61. Eberle CM, Winsemius D, Garibaldi RA. Risk factors and consequences of bacteriuria in non-catheterized nursing home residents. J Gerontol. 1993; 48: M266-M271.
62. Nicolle LE, Mayhew WJ, Bryan L. Prospective randomized comparison of therapy and no therapy for asymptomatic bacteriuria in institutionalized elderly women. Am J Med. 1987;83:27-33.

63. Nicolle LE, Mayhew WJ, Bryan L. Prospective randomized comparison of therapy and no therapy for asymptomatic bacteriuria in institutionalized elderly women. Am J Med. 1987;83:27-33.
64. Bjork DT, Pelletier LL, Tight RR. Urinary tract infections with antibiotic-resistant organisms in catheterized nursing home patients. Infect Control. 1984;5:173-176.
65. Ouslander JG, Greengold BA, Silverblatt FJ, Garcia JP. An accurate method to obtain urine for culture in men with external catheters. Arch Intern Med. 1987;147:286-288.
66. Nicolle LE, Harding GK, Kennedy J, McIntyre M, Aoki F, Murray D. Urine specimen collection with external devices for diagnosis of bacteriuria in elderly incontinent men. J Clin Microbiol. 1988; 26:1115-1119.
67. Nicolle LE. Urinary tract infections in long-term care facilities. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1993;14:220-225.