

Application of guidelines for aminoglycosides use in French hospitals in 2013–2014

jerome robert, Y. Péan, S. Alfandari, J-P Bru, J.P. Bedos, C Rabaud, R. Gauzit

▶ To cite this version:

jerome robert, Y. Péan, S. Alfandari, J-P Bru, J.P. Bedos, et al.. Application of guidelines for aminoglycosides use in French hospitals in 2013-2014. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, 2017, 36 (7), pp.1083-1090. 10.1007/s10096-016-2892-5. hal-01560010

HAL Id: hal-01560010 https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01560010v1

Submitted on 11 Jul 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	Application	on or guidennes for animogrycosides use
2		in French hospitals in 2013-2014
3		
4	Jérôme Robert ^{1,2} , Yves Péar	³ , Serge Alfandari ⁴ , Jean-Pierre Bru ⁵ , Jean-Pierre Bedos ⁶ , Christian
5	Rabaud ⁷ , Rémy Gauzit ⁸ on l	pehalf of the Société de Pathologie Infectieuse de Langue Française
6	(SPILF), the Observatoin	re National de l'Epidémiologie de la Résistance Bactérienne aux
7	Antibiotiques (ONERBA) ar	nd the Surveillance de la Prescription des Antibiotiques (SPA) group
8		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	et des Maladies Infectieuses. ² AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universi F-75013 Paris, France ³ Observatoire National de (ONERBA), Paris, France ⁴ Service de Réanimation et ⁵ Infectious Diseases Depart ⁶ Intensive Care Unit, CH Hope ⁷ Infectious Diseases Depart	MC Univ Paris 06, CR7, INSERM, U1135, Centre d'Immunologie, CIMI, team E13 (Bacteriology), F-75013, Paris, France taires Pitié Salpêtrière – Charles Foix, Bacteriology and Hygiene, l'Epidémiologie de la Résistance Bactérienne aux Antibiotiques Maladies Infectieuses, CH Gustave Dron, Tourcoing, France ment, CH de la Région d'Annecy, Annecy, France enri Mignot de Versailles, Le Chesnay, France ment, CHU de Nancy, Nancy, France Cochin, APHP, Paris, France des use in French hospitals
22	* Corresponding Author:	Jérôme ROBERT
23		Laboratoire de Bactériologie-Hygiène
24		Faculté de Médecine Pierre et Marie Curie (UPMC Paris 6),
25		91 Boulevard de l'hôpital
26		75634 Paris 13, France
27		Tel: (33) 1 40 77 97 49
28		Fax: (33) 1 42 16 20 72
29		E-mail: jerome.robert@aphp.fr
30	Word count: 2539	
31		
32	Key words: aminoglycoside	s, amikacine, gentamicin, dosage
33		
34		

Abstract

35

Purpose. In 2011, the French Agency for Safety of Health Products issued guidelines 36 underlining the principles of proper aminoglycosides' use. The aim of the survey was to 37 38 evaluate adherence to these guidelines two years after their issue. **Methods**. Characteristics of patients receiving aminoglycosides were recorded by voluntary 39 40 facilities during a 3-month survey in 2013-2014. The modalities of aminoglycosides treatment 41 were analysed by comparison with the French guidelines. 42 **Results**. 3323 patients were included by 176 facilities. Patients were mainly hospitalized in medical wards (33.0%), and treated for urinary-tract infections (24.7%). Compliance 43 44 regarding the clinical indication and the daily aminoglycosides dose was observed in 65.2% 45 and 62.9% of the cases, respectively. A 30-minute once-daily IV administration was recorded 46 in 62.5% of the cases. Aminoglycosides treatment duration was appropriate (≤5 days) for 47 93.6% of the patients. When considering the four criteria together, 23.2% of the patients had a 48 treatment regimen aligned with the guidelines. Requests for measurements of peak and trough 49 AG serum concentrations matched the guidelines in 24.9% and 67.4% of the cases, 50 respectively. 51 **Conclusions**. Two years after guidelines issue, aminoglycosides use remains unsatisfactory in 52 French health-care facilities. Efforts should be made for guidelines promotion, especially 53 regarding the issue of underdosing.

Introduction

55

Despite their rather old age, aminoglycosides (AG) continue to be widely used for the 56 treatment of severe infections, including endocarditis, due to Gram-negative bacilli, 57 58 staphylococci or enterococci, partly due to their broad antibacterial spectrum and the recent 59 emergence of multi-resistant microorganisms. AG pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties include rapid concentration-dependent bactericidal activity, and a narrow 60 61 therapeutic index (renal and auditory toxicity). The therapeutic effect is highest if the peak 62 plasma concentration (Cmax)/minimal inhibiting concentrations (MIC) ratio is over 8 to 10 [1,2]. As most broad-spectrum antibiotics, AG are used in clinical practice on an empirical 63 64 basis as well as after availability of antibiotic susceptibility tests. In fact, because of their toxicity, AG are recommended only in the first days of treatment, i.e. when the bacterial 65 66 inoculum is heavy, but also when the causative agent and its antibiotics susceptibility are 67 unknown. Because of AG characteristics, special attention should be given to AG daily dose 68 69 determination, treatment duration, route of administration, and in some settings, to drug 70 monitoring. 71 Although these requirements are known since the mid-1980s, AG use remained often inappropriate, in adult patients [3,4], as well as in the paediatric population [5,6]. 72 In 2011, a multidisciplinary group of experts was commissioned by the French Agency for

73

Safety of Health Products (ANSM) to develop up-to-date recommendations on the proper use

of intravenous AG [7]. Two years after their issue, we decided to evaluate the appropriateness

of AG prescriptions in the light of these recommendations.

77

74

75

76

78

Methods

Study design

Practitioners of public and private heath-care facilities registered to the French society for infectious diseases (SPILF, www.infectiologie.com) or to the French observatory for national epidemiology of bacterial resistance to antibiotics (ONERBA, www.onerba.org) were asked to participate in an observational prospective study on AG use. From November 2013 to January 2014, each facility had to record data for at least 10 consecutive inpatients, or all inpatients if less than 10 cases were eligible, treated by AG. Topical and prophylactic uses of AG were excluded. Only the first prescription was considered in case of multiple AG regimens during the study period.

Data collection

Basic demographic data, renal function, prior history of hospitalization and antibiotic treatment in the previous three months, or received since admission and before the first AG administration were recorded.

Data regarding AG prescription included the site of infection, empirical versus documented treatment, presence of septic shock or others reasons for AG choice, and concomitant antibiotics used. Modalities of AG treatment included mode of administration, dose administered, treatment duration, and drug monitoring by determining serum concentrations. The modalities of treatment were analysed by comparison with the French recommendations for AG use issued in 2011 by the French for Safety of Health Products [7]. Briefly, appropriate administration was defined as AG administered intravenously over 30 min in a once-daily dose or multiple daily doses in case of endocarditis. Duration was considered appropriate if AG-containing treatment was ≤ 5 days, excepted in case of endocarditis, bone and joint infections and cystic fibrosis. Appropriate daily dose was defined as 15-30 mg/kg bodyweight for amikacine, 3-8 mg/kg bodyweight for gentamicin and tobramycin, and 4-8

mg/kg bodyweight for netilmicin. In case of septic shock or severe sepsis, the higher upper limits of the ranges were required. Appropriate AG indications were limited to severe infections (septic shock, complicated pyelonephritis, Gram-positive endocarditis, infections due to P. aeruginosa, $Acinetobacter\ sp$), high-risk infections (late nosocomial infections and foreign-body infections) or infections in high-risk patients (cystic fibrosis, newborns, and immunosuppressed patients). Monitoring of AG peak serum concentration was not required if treatment duration was ≤ 3 days, except in cases of septic shock, severe burns, febrile neutropenia, intensive care units (ICU) patients with mechanical ventilation, morbid obesity, polytrauma patients, cystic fibrosis. Monitoring of AG trough concentration was required in case of planned or effective treatment duration > 5 days, and in case of severe renal impairment, as declared by clinicians. In other cases, no trough monitoring was required.

Multidrug-resistant bacteria were defined as Enterobacteriaceae producing extended-spectrum β-lactamase (ESBL), or resistant to carbapenems, and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). Enterobacteriaceae resistant to extended-spectrum cephalosporins but susceptible to carbapenems and ESBL-negative, and antibiotic resistance patterns of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter* spp. isolates were also recorded.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables are expressed as median and range, and were compared by using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Chi^2 test of Fisher's exact test were used when appropriate for comparing categorical variables. For multi-level categorical variables, chi^2 tests for homogeneity are presented. Statistical analysis was performed by using STATA (STATA Corp, College Station, TX, USA) and p < 0.05 was deemed significant.

A multivariate analysis model was developed in order to determine variables independently associated with a daily AG dose in the recommended ranges. Variables with p < 0.10 in univariate analysis were introduced in the model, and backward analysis was performed.

Variables not significantly associated with the outcome were removed based on the Wald statistic. The Hosmer-Lemeshov test was used for assessing model' fitness. Only the most parsimonious model, i.e. the model with the least variables and the most significance, is presented.

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

Results

Facilities

A total of 215 healthcare facilities (25 teaching hospitals, 158 non-teaching or private hospitals and 32 rehabilitation or long-term care facilities) participated in the study. The participating facilities accounted for a total of 56,232 acute-care beds and 21,529 rehabilitation or long-term care beds, representing 19% of all French healthcare beds. Among all facilities, 39 did not record any patient treated by AG during the study period, resulting in 176 facilities that recorded at least one patient treated by AG. Among the 176 latter, 98 (55.7%) declared reviewing systematically all AG-containing regimens, including 79 in all wards of the facility, and 42 by an electronic system. However, only 43 of the 98 (43.9%) facilities reviewing all prescriptions have organized an AG control feedback to the prescribers.

152

153

Aminoglycosides use

- A total of 3,323 patients with a least one AG regimen were included in the study (Table 1),
- including 2,007 (60.4%) treated by gentamicin, 1,267 (38.1%) by amikacin, and 49 (1.5%) by
- another AG (Table 2).
- Patients were mainly hospitalized in medical wards (n=1 098, 33.0%), surgical wards
- 158 (n=1 002, 30.2%), or in ICU (n=600, 18.1%). The median age of the patients was 65.0
- 159 (interquartile range IQR, 48-78) years, 20.9% were more than 80 years old, 1,878 (56.5%)
- were male, and 836 (25.2%) had renal failure (Table 1). Patients were mainly treated for
- urinary-tract infections (n=822, 24.7%) and digestive or respiratory tract infection (n=653,
- 162 19.7% and n=601, 18.1%, respectively).
- 163 The use of an AG in the antibiotic regimen was justified by the presence of a septic shock in
- 164 447 (13.5%) cases. In the absence of septic shock, AG-containing regimens were prescribed
- in case of high-risk infections (n=579, 17.4%), infection in high-risk patients (n=292, 8.8%),

and pyelonephritis (n=438, 13.2%). The presence or suspicion of multidrug-resistant organisms accounted for only 129 (3.9%) cases. AG were used on an empirical basis in 2568 (77.3%) cases, and on a bacteriologically documented basis for 755 (22.7%) patients. Among the 755 latter, AG were used to treat infections due to Enterobacteriaceae in 352 (46.6%) patients, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in 133 (17.6%) cases, *Staphylococcus aureus* in 148 (19.6%) cases, and streptococci or enterococci in 128 (17.0%) cases.

Administration by a single daily dose was the rule (n=3061, 92.1%), but its duration was over 30 minutes in only 2185 (65.8%) cases. The median daily dose was in the recommended ranges for all AG, although at the lower range, and the median duration was 3 days (IQR, 2-3) days (Table 2).

Compliance

AG compliance with the French guidelines was assessed according to four main criteria.

The **clinical indication** for AG was respected for 2167 (65.2%) patients (Table 3). This proportion was higher for patients treated on a bacteriologically documented basis (75.8%) than for those treated on an empirical basis (62.1%; p<0.01). Pyelonephritis and community-acquired digestive tract infections represented 33.2% and 23.0% of inappropriate AG indications, respectively.

Compliance regarding the total daily AG dose was observed for 2091 (62.9%) patients (Table 3). Of interest, patients in large facilities (> 300 beds) or university hospitals were slightly more likely to receive the recommended daily AG dose (65.0%) than in the other facilities (59.6%; p<0.01). Patients in facilities claiming having a process for reviewing all AG-containing regimens, including those having an AG control feedback to the prescriber were not more likely to receive the recommended daily AG dose than those in facilities without any AG review process.

Once-daily IV administration over 30 minutes was observed for 2076 (62.5%) patients (Table 3).

The overall duration of AG treatment regimen was concordant with the guidelines.
i.e. mainly 5 days or less, for 3110 (93.6%) patients. When considering all four criteria
together, only 23.2% of the patients had an AG treatment regimen in full accordance with the
guidelines. 2.0

In a logistic multivariate analysis, having a normal renal function (Odds ratio, 1.7; 95% confidence interval, 1.3-2.2), and being hospitalised in a large facility (OR: 2.0) were the two variables independently associated with a daily AG dose in the recommended range (Table 4). Others factors, including age \geq 75 years (OR: 0.7), overweight (OR 0.5), septic shock (OR: 0.07), and infection in high-risk patients (OR: 0.02) were inversely associated to having a dose in the recommended range. All other introduced factors, including MDR bacteria or endocarditis were not independently associated with a dose in the recommended range. When forced in the model although not significant in univariate analysis, none of the variables linked to the review process of AG in the facility were associated with the outcome variable.

Finally, requests for measurements of peak and trough serum concentrations matched the guidelines in 828 (24.9%) and 2241 (67.4%) cases (Table 3).

Discussion

The present survey aimed at evaluating adherence to AG guidelines in French healthcare facilities. The results show that AG are used in all type of wards, and that ICUs represented only 18.1% of all AG prescriptions. As expected, AG were mainly used in association with other antibiotics (97.1%) and on an empirical basis (77.3%). Indications for AG use were considered unnecessary in more than 1 out of 3 cases (34.8%). The total AG daily dose was in the recommended ranges in only 62.9% of the cases. Finally, the AG treatment duration was ≤5 days for a majority of cases (93.6%).

The primary indication of AG use was concordant with the guidelines in 65.2% of the cases. This means that, for one third of the patients, the use of AG could be challenged. Such a result underlines the need for disseminating information regarding AG indications. Of interest, patients with pyelonephritis represented a large part of those with AG use that did not match guidelines criteria. The rise in Enterobacteriaceae producing extended-spectrum beta-lactamase, and in fluoroquinolone resistance in the community may explain AG overuse [8]. After the issue of the French AG guidelines, the French Infectious Diseases Society updated guidelines for the management of community-acquired urinary tract infections (www.infectiologie.com). In the latter, AG are indicated on an empirical basis only in case of complicated pyelonephritis, i.e. with severe sepsis or with need of invasive procedure on the urinary tract. These guidelines should further decrease AG indications in pyelonephritis. On the contrary, AG are part of IDSA guidelines for the treatment of uncomplicated pyelonephritis, but usually as a single antibiotic, which is seldom the case in our study [9].

In the present survey, AG daily dose was in the recommended ranges for 62.9% of the patients. In multivariate analysis, we showed that older age, obesity, septic shock and infections in high-risk patients were factors associated to AG underdosing. Such results have been previously reported [10,11]. This discordance with the guidelines is likely to be partly

linked to the narrow therapeutic index of AG, that encourage prescribers to use lower doses to avoid toxicity, although pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic objectives have been described 25 years ago [1,2]. However, AG toxicity is not directly related to peak serum concentration and toxicity remains similar for doses below or within the recommended ranges [12]. Patients with weight > 100 kg are prone to receive AG doses below ranges recommended in

the French guidelines. However, it should be noticed that computation of AG daily dose is complex in such patients. Indeed, guidelines are not very clear regarding computation of AG daily dose in overweight or obese patients. The use of the actual body weight, an adaptation of the ideal body weight plus a percentage of the patient's excess bodyweight, or lean weight is still debatable [13–15]. Therefore, efforts should be made to clarify AG dose computation in the overweight population, which may represent more than one third of the patients in many part of the world [16].

Finally, it has been previously reported that ICU patients, and especially those with severe sepsis or septic shock, are at increased risk of AG underdosing, which consequently results in low peak serum concentrations [11,17]. This has been linked to an increase in the volume of distribution per kilogram in these patients. The recent French guidelines have been adapted to take into account the need for increasing AG daily dose in the ICU population. However, our results show that changes have not been taken into account. Despite higher recommended loading doses in the updated guidelines, it has been shown that as much as one third of patients in severe sepsis may have aminoglycosides serum peak level below the therapeutic target [11].

As recommended in French guidelines, more than 93% of the patients received AG for a duration \leq 5 days, except for endocarditis and bone and joint infections. The 5-day cut-off is considered as a good compromise between efficacy and safety [18,19]. However, it is currently suggested to use a shorter duration of time, i.e. \leq 72 hours of treatment. The

treatment duration could be prolonged to 5 days in case of unsatisfactory clinical improvement or in absence of positive bacteriological result.

Our study has some weaknesses. First it is based on a voluntary participation of facilities, and as always, representativeness could be questioned. However, the large number of patients included in a high number of facilities throughout the French territory may have limited this bias. Second, we did not record any information regarding the initial prescriber of AG-containing regimen, which could have helped to understand discrepancies with guidelines. However, we did not show any differences in overall guideline compliance between facilities with a process for reviewing AG-containing regimens and the others. This raises the question of effective AG stewardship or of facility organisation. Precise data regarding the review process, including the background training of the reviewer or consultant, were not collected.

In conclusion the use of aminoglycosides in French healthcare facilities remains inappropriate in a substantial proportion of cases although guidelines availability since more than two years. This is not surprising when considering the numerous barriers to guidelines implementation. [20] In addition, in France, guidelines diffusion is usually passive or semi-passive, while it has been shown that better antibiotic use requires multifaceted interventions [21,22]. This is especially worrisome regarding the use of an appropriate loading dose. The use of higher loading doses should be widely publicized and use of computerized system for optimized dose computation in coordination with the hospital pharmacist and infectious diseases specialist may help improving this situation.

287 Acknowledgements

288 In memoriam: Sandrine CLEMENT (www.neanima.fr). Our deepest sympathies go out to her

289 family.

290

The Surveillance de la Prescription des Antibiotiques (SPA) group: name (facility, city)

292

293 P. ABGUEGUEN (CHU Angers, ANGERS), A. AKPABIE (Hôpital E. Roux - APHP, LIMEIL BREVANNES), 294 S. ALFANDARI(CH Tourcoing, TOURCOING), P. ANDRE (Clinique du Millenaire, MONTPELLIER) 295 (Polyclinique ST-Roch, MONTPELLIER), V. ANGELUS (Clinique L'Angelus, MARSEILLE), S. ARENA-296 CANAULT (Maternite Catholique Provence L'Etoile, AIX EN PROVENCE), A. ARREGUY (CH St-Palais, 297 BAYONNE), N. BACHALAT (Hôpital Joffre - APHP, DRAVEIL), MT. BANOS (CH Lannemezan, 298 LANNEMEZAN), P. BAUNE (Hôpital Charles Richet, VILLIERS LE BEL), O. BELLON (CH Brignoles, 299 BRIGNOLES), M. BENAISSA (CH Apt, APT), N. BENICHOUGRANE (Hôpital Européen, MARSEILLE), G. 300 BENISTAND (Polyclinique Grand-Sud, NIMES), F. BERGHEAU (Ch Pays de Gier, St CHAMOND), N. 301 BERTRAND (Clinique Chantecler, MARSEILLE), C. BERTRAND (Clinique Rhone Durance, AVIGNON), C. 302 BIANCHI (CHR Pontchaillou, RENNES), H. BLAISE (Clinique du Parc, NANTES), C. BONNAL (Hôpital 303 Bretonneau - APHP PARIS), S. BORDES-COUECOU (CHIC Cote Basque, BAYONNE), A. BOUMEDIENE 304 (CHCB Kerio, PLEMET), M. BOURLEAUD (CH de Bastia, BASTIA), S. BOURZEIX DE LAROUZIERE 305 (CH Moulin Yzeure, MOULINS), D. BREGER (Clinique Sourdille, NANTES), C. BROCARD (Clinique Les 306 Ormeaux, LE HAVRE), JP. BRU (CH Région d'Annecy, PRINGY), P. CABARET (ES St-Vincent de Paul, 307 LILLE), P. CABARET (Hôpital St Philibert, LOMME), P. CABARET (Clinique Ste Marie, CAMBRAI), V. 308 CADIOU (SLD Beauséjour, HYERES), B. CASTAN (CH ND la Miséricorde, AJACCIO), B. CATTIER (CH 309 Amboise-Chateaurenault, AMBOISE), C. CAZORLA (CHU Saint-Etienne, ST ETIENNE), D. CERVONI 310 (Centre Les Arbelles, BOURG EN BRESSE), M. CHADAPAUD (CH MJ. Treffot, HYERES), C. CHAIX (CH 311 Carpentras, CARPENTRAS), C. CHAUVET (CH Montélimar, MONTELIMAR), P. CIPIERRE (Clinique du 312 Parc, PERIGUEUX), M. CLIQUENOIS (Hôpital de L'Isle-Adam, L'ISLE ADAM), Y. COLIN (Centre Medical 313 L'Arbizon, BAGNERES DE BIGORRE), S. COMPAROT (CH L. Giorgi, ORANGE), O. CORBELLI (Clinique 314 Vignoli SALON DE PROVENCE), N. CORDAT (Clinique du Val de l'Ouest, ECULLY), S. CORMONT 315 (Hôpital de Felleries Liessies, FELLERIES), M. CORNESSE (Hôpital Beauregard, MARSEILLE), F. 316 COULOMB (CH Dreux, DREUX), J. CROUZET (CH Pasteur, BAGNOLS SUR CEZE), J. DARASTEANU 317 (CH Chartres, CHARTRES), M. DAUMAS (CH Imbert Joseph, ARLES), MH. DEBOISSE (Clinique du 318 Colombier, LIMOGES), C. DEBRUILLE (CH Douai, DOUAI), B. DECOUARD (MSPBx Bagatelle, 319 TALENCE), S. DEFRETIN (Clinique St-Roch, RONCQ), B. DEGRENDEL (Centre Sainte Clotilde, STE 320 CLOTILDE), J. DELHOMME (CHIC Alencon-Mamers, ALENCON), G. DELHON BUGARD (Clinique 321 Charcot, STE FOY LES LYON), G. DEMELIN (Hôpital Thiais, THIAIS), A. DEMOUZON (EPDS de Gorze, 322 GORZE), E. DEVAUD (CH R. Dubos, PONTOISE), S. DEWULF (CH Zuydcoote, ZUYDCOOTE), A. DINH 323 (Hôpital R. Poincaré - APHP, GARCHES), C. DOMRAULT-TANGUY (CH Henin Beaumont, HENIN 324 BEAUMONT), F. DOMY (Clinique Trenel, STE COLOMBE), F. DOUCET-POPULAIRE (Hôpital A. Beclere 325 - APHP, CLAMART), L. DRIEUX-ROUZET (Hôpital Charles Foix - APHP, IVRY SUR SEINE), M. 326 DUVIQUET (Hôpital Vaugirard - APHP, PARIS), A. EDEN (CH Joffre, PERPIGNAN), S. EDOUARD (CH 327 Dieppe, DIEPPE), L. EL-HAJJ (Clinique Convert, BOURG EN BRESSE), C. ELOY (CH Troyes, TROYES), 328 M. EMONET (CH Blois, BLOIS), J. EPIFANIE (Centre E. Clémentel, ENVAL), L. ESCAUT (Hôpital Bicêtre -329 APHP, LE KREMLIN BICETRE), F. ESPINASSE (Hôpital Ambroise Paré - APHP, BOULOGNE 330 BILLANCOURT), C. ETIENNE (CH Gaillac, GAILLAC), M. FABRE (CH P. Oudot, BOURGOIN-JALLIEU), 331 V. FIHMAN (Hôpital Louis Mourier - APHP, COLOMBES), E. FORESTIER (CH Chambéry, CHAMBERY), 332 D. FRAISSE (CH Ales, ALES), C. FRANCESCHI (Hôpital de Lunel, LUNEL), C. FUHRMANN (Centre Léon 333 Bérard, LYON), M. GACHOT (Institut Gustave Roussy, VILLEJUIF), M. GAILLARD (CH E. Roux, LE PUY 334 EN VELAY), B. GARO (CHRU Brest, BREST), R. GAUZIT (Hôpital Cochin - APHP, PARIS), P. GEROME 335 (HIA Desgenettes, LYON), M. GILLMANN (CH Lemire-St-Avold, ST AVOLD), L. GIRAUDON (CH Sète, 336 SETE), F. GLATH (Hôpital de Pompey/Lay St Christophe, POMPEY), P. GRANIER (CH Fleyriat, BOURG EN 337 BRESSE), B. GRAVAGNA (Clinique Mutualiste de Lyon E.André et Union, LYON), A. GREDER-BELAN 338 (CH Mignot, LE CHESNAY), F. GREIL (Centre réadaptation Revel, ST MAURICE / DARGOIRE), S. 339 GROSSE (Hôpital St Maurice - Moyeuvre-Grande, MOYEUVRE GRANDE), C. GUERIN (SSR l'Amandier,

CHATENAY MALABRY), C. GUIGNABERT (CH G. Ramon, SENS), M. GUILLAUME (CH Voiron,

Nancy, VANDOEUVRE LES NANCY), L. HENNEQUIN (Hôpital du Neuenberg, INGWILLER), P.

VOIRON), S. GUITTET (Pôle santé Léonard de Vinci, CHAMBRAY LES TOURS), S. HENARD (CHU

340

341

```
343
       HONDERLICK (Hôpital Foch, SURESNES), S. HONORE (CH Auxerre, AUXERRE), A. HUAULT (EMPR
344
       Le Normandy, GRANVILLE), A. HUOT (Clinique MC Chenove, CHENOVE), L. DUCRUET (CH Ain Val de
345
       Saône, PONT DE VEYLE), L. JEANNIN (Institut de Mar Vivo, LA SEYNE SUR MER), A. JULLIAN (Centre
346
       de rééducation cardio-respiratoire, DIEULEFIT), A. JUNG (Hôpital de Sarralbe, SARRALBE), N. KASSIS-
347
       CHIKHANI (Hôpital Paul Brousse - APHP, VILLEJUIF), E. LAFEUILLE, A. ADE (CHU Pitié-Salpêtrière -
348
       APHP, PARIS), LAGNIEN-GAUME (CH L. Pasteur, DOLE), C. LANTERNIER (Clinique des Alpes,
349
       GRENOBLE), C. LARTIZIEN (Hôpital maritime, BERCK), C. LAURANS (CH Roubaix, ROUBAIX), O.
350
       LAURENT (Clinique Guillaume de Varye, ST DOULCHARD & Clinique Le Blaudy, PRECY), C. LECHICHE
351
       (CHU Caremeau, NIMES 9), D. LECOINTE (GH P. Doumer, LIANCOURT), M. LECOO (CH W Morey,
352
       CHALON SUR SAONE), N. LEFEBVRE (CHRU Strasbourg, STRASBOURG), A. LEFORT (Hôpital Beaujon
353
       - APHP, CLICHY), AM. LELOUP (DAPT de Châtillon, CHATILLON), R. LEPEULE (CHU A.Chenevier-
354
       H.Mondor - APHP, CRETEIL), T. LEVENT (Polyclinique Vauban, VALENCIENNES & CH Maubeuge,
355
       MAUBEUGE), A. LIGNEREUX (CH Gabriel Martin, ST PAUL), J. LIVARTOWSKI (Hôpital privé d'Antony,
356
       ANTONY), B. LOCTIN (Clinique de La Part-Dieu, LYON), V. LOUBERSAC (Clinique Breteche, NANTES),
357
       JC. LUCET (CHU Bichat - APHP, PARIS), C. MAC NAB (HIA Percy, CLAMART), F. MADOUMIE
358
       (Clinique des Emailleurs, LIMOGES), P. MAHE (CH F. Grall, LANDERNEAU), N. MARCHISET (CH
359
       d'Ambert, AMBERT), S. MARGUERY (Clinique Ste Marthe, DIJON), L. MARI (Centre de gérontologie de
360
       Montolivet, MARSEILLE), I. MARTIN (CH Roanne, ROANNE), C. MASSA (Clinique Montréal,
361
       CARCASSONNE), C. MATHERN (Hôpital de Creutzwald, CREUTZWALD), V. MATHIS (Association
362
       hospitalière de Joeuf, JOEUF), L. MAZZONI (Clinica Oxford, CANNES & Clinique Le Méridien, CANNES
363
       LA BOCCA), M. MELET (Polyclinique du Parc, CAEN), M.MELET (Clinique St-Jean Languedoc, Clinique
364
       Sarrus-Teinturiers & Clinique A. Pare, TOULOUSE), M. MERTZ (Hôpital de Billom, BILLOM), V.
365
       MESPLEDE (MRC Sainte Odile, BILLERE), A. MILESI-LECAT (CH Vichy, VICHY), R. MONTEIL (Hôpital
366
       Condat, CONDAT), P. MONTEIL (Médipole de Savoie, CHALLES LES EAUX), V. MOULIN (Hôpital
367
       Corentin Celton - APHP, ISSY LES MOULINEAUX), A. MOUNE (Clinique du Palais, GRASSE), E. MURET
368
       (Clinique St-George, NICE), PH. NAUDE (Maison de convalescence Les Elieux, SEICHAMPS), D. NAVAS
369
       (CHU Nantes, NANTES), G. NICOLAOS (CH Coulommiers, COULOMMIERS), JY. NIZOU (L'Institut
370
       Mutualiste Montsouris, PARIS), M. NOLL-BURGIN (GH St Vincent, STRASBOURG), C. NOWAK (CH
371
       Angoulême, ANGOULEME), M. OLEHAINI (CH Vierzon, VIERZON), O. PANTALONI (Clinique St-Pierre,
372
       PERPIGNAN), O. PATEY (CH Villeneuve-St-Georges, VILLENEUVE ST GEORGES), E. PONCET (Clinique
373
       La Source, ST LEGER LES MELEZES), F. POSPISIL (Polyclinique Synergia, CARPENTRAS), S. POULET
374
       (Polyclinique Les Fleurs, OLLIOULES), G. RAHAL (Clinique Turin & Hôpital privé des Peupliers, PARIS), C.
       RAPP (HIA Begin, ST MANDE), S. RASTOUL (Clinique St-Louis, POISSY), S. RAYNAUD (Clinique
375
376
       médicale Monie, VILLEFRANCHE DE LAURAGAIS), J. REVEIL (CH Charleville Mezières,
377
       CHARLEVILLE MEZIERES), P. RIBELLE (Clinique Tivoli, BORDEAUX), A. RICARD (Clinique Richelieu,
378
       SAINTES), G. RONDELOT (CHR Metz-Thionville, HAYANGE), J. ROUSSEAU (Clinique de Cognac,
379
       COGNAC), O. SABOT (CH Belley, BELLEY), L. SAFONT, Polyclinique St-Privat, BOUJAN SUR LIBRON),
380
       M. SAREM (CH Sémur-en-Auxois, SEMUR EN AUXOIS), P. SAUTIER (HP Pays de Savoie, ANNEMASSE),
381
       L. SCHANG (Clinique St-Antoine, NICE), L. SENG (Clinique de Thorigny, SERRIS), V. SIMHA (Hôpital San
382
       Salvadour, HYERES), B. SIMPLOT (Hôpital de Lamarche, LAMARCHE), S. SIRE (CH Jean Rougier,
383
       CAHORS), M. SOULERIN (Clinique du Vivarais, AUBENAS), B. SOULLIE (HIA Robert Picque,
384
       VILLENAVE D'ORNON), C. SOUYRI (Centre de rééducation, CHAUDES AIGUES), JP. STAHL (CHU
385
       Grenoble, LA TRONCHE) J. TALARMIN (CH de Cornouaille, QUIMPER), V. TALPIN (Hôpital de La
386
       Clayette, LA CLAYETTE), V. TONNERRE (Clinique Mutualiste du Médoc, LESPARRE MEDOC), J.
387
       TRACOL (Centre chirurgical St-Roch, CAVAILLON), F. TURCHET (Clinique Belledonne, ST MARTIN
388
       D'HERES), F. VANDENBOS (La Maison du Mineur, VENCE), E. VAUTRIN (CH St-Dizier, ST DIZIER), N.
389
       VEISSE (Centre MGEN Pierre-Chevalier, HYERES), V. VERNET-GARNIER (CHU Reims, REIMS), M.
390
       VESANES (Hôpital du Marin, LE MARIN), R. VIAL (Hôpital de Beaujeu, BEAUJEU), F. VIELH (CH Le Secq
391
       de Crépy, BOULAY), P. VILLEMAIN (CH de St-Flour, ST FLOUR), P. VILLEMAIN (CH Aurillac,
392
       AURILLAC), P. VILLEMAIN (CH Thann, THANN), J. VIOT (Centre de convalescence Wilson, ANTIBES;
393
       Clinique du Parc Impérial, NICE 1 & MC Magnolias, ST LAURENT DU VAR), M. VOGT (Clinique Ste-
394
       Odile, STRASBOURG), C. WATELET (Clinique SSR Chateau de Gleteins, JASSANS RIOTTIER), Tamarins
395
       (Clinique les Flamboyants & Clinique Les Tamarins, LE PORT)
```

398 399	Funding: The Société de Pathologie Infectieuse de Langue Française (SPILF) provided
400	financial support for data management.
401	
402	Competing interests: none declared.
403	
404	Ethical approval: not required
405	
406	
407	
408	

REFERENCES

410		
411	[1]	Moore RD, Lietman PS, Smith CR. Clinical Response to Aminoglycoside Therapy: Importance of the
412		Ratio of Peak Concentration to Minimal Inhibitory Concentration. J Infect Dis 1987;155:93–9.
413		doi:10.1093/infdis/155.1.93.
414	[2]	Zelenitsky SA, Harding GKM, Sun S, Ubhi K, Ariano RE. Treatment and outcome of Pseudomonas
415		aeruginosa bacteraemia: an antibiotic pharmacodynamic analysis. J Antimicrob Chemother
416		2003;52:668–74. doi:10.1093/jac/dkg403.
417	[3]	Chuck SK, Raber SR, Rodvold KA, Areff D. National survey of extended-interval aminoglycoside
418		dosing. Clin Infect Dis 2000;30:433–9. doi:10.1086/313692.
419	[4]	Leong CL, Buising K, Richards M, Robertson M, Street A. Providing guidelines and education is not
420		enough: an audit of gentamicin use at The Royal Melbourne Hospital. Intern Med J 2006;36:37-42.
421		doi:10.1111/j.1445-5994.2006.01002.x.
422	[5]	Houot M, Pilmis B, Thepot-Seegers V, Suard C, Potier C, Postaire M, et al. Aminoglycoside use in a
423		pediatric hospital: there is room for improvement-a before/after study. Eur J Pediatr 2016.
424		doi:10.1007/s00431-016-2691-0.
425	[6]	Begg EJ, Vella-Brincat JWA, Robertshawe B, McMurtrie MJ, Kirkpatrick CMJ, Darlow B. Eight years'
426		experience of an extended-interval dosing protocol for gentamicin in neonates. J Antimicrob Chemother
427		2009;63:1043–9. doi:10.1093/jac/dkp073.
428	[7]	Anonymous. Update on good use of injectable aminoglycosides, gentamicin, tobramycin, netilmicin,
429		amikacin. Pharmacological properties, indications, dosage, and mode of administration, treatment
430		monitoring. Médecine Mal Infect 2012;42:301–8. doi:10.1016/j.medmal.2011.07.007.
431	[8]	Nicolas-Chanoine M-H, Gruson C, Bialek-Davenet S, Bertrand X, Thomas-Jean F, Bert F, et al. 10-Fold
432		increase (2006-11) in the rate of healthy subjects with extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing
433		Escherichia coli faecal carriage in a Parisian check-up centre. J Antimicrob Chemother 2013;68:562–8.
434		doi:10.1093/jac/dks429.
435	[9]	Gupta K, Hooton TM, Naber KG, Wullt B, Colgan R, Miller LG, et al. International clinical practice
436		guidelines for the treatment of acute uncomplicated cystitis and pyelonephritis in women: A 2010 update
437		by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the European Society for Microbiology and Infectious
438		Diseases. Clin Infect Dis 2011;52:e103–20. doi:10.1093/cid/ciq257.
439	[10]	Fraisse T, Gras Aygon C, Paccalin M, Vitrat V, De Wazieres B, Baudoux V, et al. Aminoglycosides use
440		in patients over 75 years old. Age Ageing 2014;43:676–81. doi:10.1093/ageing/afu023.

441 [11] Taccone FS, Laterre P-F, Spapen H, Dugernier T, Delattre I, Layeux B, et al. Revisiting the loading dose 442 of amikacin for patients with severe sepsis and septic shock. Crit Care 2010;14:R53. 443 doi:10.1186/cc8945. 444 Barclay ML, Kirkpatrick CM, Begg EJ. Once daily aminoglycoside therapy. Is it less toxic than multiple [12] 445 daily doses and how should it be monitored? Clin Pharmacokinet 1999;36:89–98. 446 doi:10.2165/00003088-199936020-00001. 447 [13] Payne KD, Hall RG. Dosing of antibacterial agents in obese adults: does one size fit all? Expert Rev 448 Anti Infect Ther 2014;12:829–54. doi:10.1586/14787210.2014.912942. 449 [14] Pai MP, Nafziger AN, Bertino JS. Simplified estimation of aminoglycoside pharmacokinetics in 450 underweight and obese adult patients. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2011;55:4006–11. 451 doi:10.1128/AAC.00174-11. 452 Polso AK, Lassiter JL, Nagel JL. Impact of hospital guideline for weight-based antimicrobial dosing in [15] 453 morbidly obese adults and comprehensive literature review. J Clin Pharm Ther 2014;39:584-608. 454 doi:10.1111/jcpt.12200. 455 Ng M, Fleming T, Robinson M, Thomson B, Graetz N, Margono C, et al. Global, regional, and national [16] 456 prevalence of overweight and obesity in children and adults during 1980-2013: a systematic analysis for 457 the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. Lancet 2014;384:766-81. doi:10.1016/S0140-458 6736(14)60460-8. 459 [17] Gonçalves-Pereira J, Martins A, Póvoa P. Pharmacokinetics of gentamicin in critically ill patients: pilot 460 study evaluating the first dose. Clin Microbiol Infect 2010;16:1258-63. doi:10.1111/j.1469-461 0691.2009.03074.x. 462 Bertino JS, Booker LA, Franck PA, Jenkins PL, Franck KR, Nafziger AN. Incidence of and Significant [18] 463 Risk Factors for Aminoglycoside-Associated Nephrotoxicity in Patients Dosed by Using Individualized 464 Pharmacokinetic Monitoring. J Infect Dis 1993;167:173–9. doi:10.1093/infdis/167.1.173. 465 [19] Maller R, Ahrne H, Holmen C, Lausen I, Nilsson LE, Smedjegard J. Once- versus twice-daily amikacin 466 regimen: efficacy and safety in systemic Gram-negative infections. J Antimicrob Chemother 467 1993;31:939-48. doi:10.1093/jac/31.6.939. 468 Cabana MD, Rand CS, Powe NR, Wu AW, Wilson MH, Abboud P-AC, et al. Why Don't Physicians [20] 469 Follow Clinical Practice Guidelines? JAMA 1999;282:1458. doi:10.1001/jama.282.15.1458. 470 Gross PA, Pujat D. Implementing practice guidelines for appropriate antimicrobial usage: a systematic [21] 471 review. Med Care 2001;39:II55-69. 472 [22] Barlam TF, Cosgrove SE, Abbo LM, MacDougall C, Schuetz AN, Septimus EJ, et al. Implementing an 473 Antibiotic Stewardship Program: Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the 17

474	Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. Clin Infect Dis 2016;62:ciw118.
475	doi:10.1093/cid/ciw118.
476	
477	

Table 1. Characteristics of the 3 323 patients treated by aminoglycosides during the 3-month study period

Continuous variables	Median	Interquartile range
Age	65	(48-78)
Weight	69	(56-80)
Categorical variables	N	(%)
Sex male	1 878	(56.5)
Renal insufficiency	836	(25.2)
Recent hospitalization	1 445	(43.5)
Recent antibiotic treatment	899	(27.1)
Ward of hospitalization		
- Medicine	1 098	(33.0)
- Surgery	1 002	(30.2)
- Oncology/haematology	167	(5.0)
- Paediatric	244	(7.3)
- Intensive care unit	600	(18.1)
- Rehabilitation and long-term care units	212	(6.4)
Site of infection		
- Respiratory tract	601	(18.1)
- Digestive tract	653	(19.7)
- Urinary tract	822	(24.7)
- Bone and joints	200	(6.0)
- Endocarditis	126	(3.8)
- Febrile neutropenia	92	(2.8)
- Others	829	(24.9)

Table 2. Characteristics of the 3 323 aminoglycosides treatment regimens

Categorical variables	N	%
Drug		
- Amikacin	1 267	(38.1)
- Gentamicin	2 007	(60.4)
- Tobramycin	47	(1.4)
Single daily dose	3 061	(92.1)
Intravenous administration over 30 minutes	2 185	(65.8)
AG in combination regimen	3 228	(97.1)
AG in empirical regimen	2 568	(77.3)
Primary indication for AG use		
- Septic shock	447	(13.5)
- Infection in high-risk patient	292	(8.8)
- High-risk infection (late nosocomial infection, foreign body)	579	(17.4)
- Multidrug-resistant organism (confirmed or suspected)	129	(3.9)
- Pseudomonas sp. or Acinetobacter sp. (confirmed or suspected)	189	(5.7)
- Pyelonephritis	438	(13.2)
- Community-onset digestive tract infection	284	(8.5)
- Endocarditis (confirmed or suspected)	130	(3.9)
- Positive blood culture	97	(2.9)
- Others	738	(22.2)
Continuous variables	Median	Interquartile range
Daily dose (mg/kg bodyweight)		
- Amikacin	15.4	(13.6-20.5)
- Gentamicin	3.3	(2.8-4.9)
- Tobramycin	5.2	(3.1-6.6)
AG treatment duration (days)	3	(2-3)

Table 3. Compliance with aminoglycosides guidelines

Criteria for compliance	N	%
Indication: treatment of severe infections or of high-risk patients	2 167	(65.2)
Daily dose in mg/kg bodyweight in the recommended range and at the upper limit in case of shock or severe sepsis	2 091	(62.9)
Once-daily intravenous administration over 30 minutes	2 076	(62.5)
Duration \leq 5 days excepted for endocarditis, bone and joint infections, and cystic fibrosis	3 110	(93.6)
All four criteria above	771	(23.2)
Monitoring of aminoglycoside peak serum concentration	828	(24.9)
Monitoring of aminoglycoside trough serum concentration	2 241	(67.4)

Table 4. Univariate and multivariate analysis for association with daily aminoglycoside dosein the recommended ranges

Variable	Univariate analysis		Multiv	Multivariate analysis	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	
Large facility	1.2	1.1-1.5	2.0	1.4-2.9	
Age ≥ 75 years	0.6	0.56-0.74	0.7	0.56-0.87	
Weight $\geq 100 \text{ kg}$	0.7	0.54-0.99	0.5	0.36-0.81	
Normal renal function	2.2	1.9-2.5	1.7	1.3-2.2	
Primary indication for AG use (confirmed or suspected)					
- Septic shock	0.1	0.08-0.13	0.07	0.05-0.10	
- Pseudomonas sp. or Acinetobacter sp.	2.3	1.5-3.4	-		
- Multidrug-resistant organism	1.8	1.2-2.8	-		
- Infection in high-risk patient	0.05	0.03-0.07	0.02	0.01-0.04	
- Endocarditis	2.3	1.5-3.5	-		

492 OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval