Harrist Harr						Gram-Positive Organisms						Occi	ırrence											
How to Use:					BETA STREPTOCOCCUS GROUP B								30											
					ENTEROCOCCUS SPP (including E. faecalis & E. faecium) ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM							321												
-Click on the desired organi	ism to highligh											312												
the antibiotic sensitivities below.				- 1	ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS SPP							202 307												
				- 1		STA							716											
-To select for multiple organisms, hold ctrl				- 1	STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS (all) STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS-MRSA STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS-MSSA							242 475												
				- 1	STA	APHYLO	ococci	US, COA	GULASE	NEGATIV		3	183											
					STREE	тосо	CCUS A	NGINOS	US (MII	LLERI) GRO	UP		85											
Gram-Positive Organisms	n	%	n	96	n	%	n	%	n	96	n	%	n	%	n	96	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	96
TA STREPTOCOCCUS GROUP B			30	40%													30	100%					30	100
ITEROCOCCUS SPP (including E. faecalis & E.		67%			173	95%					297	99%	504	75%			316		515	20%			821	67
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS	312	100%			80	96%				_		100%	170	99%			143	100%	175	18%			312	88
		100%									36	100%											36	0
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS-VRE	36												151	99%			126	10096	154	1996			276	100
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS-VSE	276	100%			68	97%				_			12000											
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM	276 202	8%			92	93%						99%	84	24%			118	9%	90	19%			202	
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VRE	276 202 153	8% 1%								-	159 152	99% 99%	84 65				118 88	9% 0%	90				154	0
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VRE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VSE	276 202 153 50	8% 1% 30%			92	93%				(8)	152	99%	65	24% 25%			118 88 31	9% 0% 35%	90 70	19% 17%			154 49	100
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VRE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS SPP	276 202 153	8% 1%	***	500	92 73	93% 95%	744	000/	704	750	152 84	99% 98%	65 250	24% 25% 76%	744		118 88	9% 0% 35%	90 70 250	19% 17% 23%	746	070/	154 49 307	100 73
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VRE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS SPP APHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS (all)	276 202 153 50	8% 1% 30%	666	68%	92 73 73	93% 95% 100%			704	75%	152 84 46	99% 98% 100%	65	24% 25%		66%	118 88 31	9% 0% 35%	90 70 250 569	19% 17% 23% 91%			154 49 307 252	24 0 100 73 100
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VRE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS SPP APHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS (all) STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS-MRSA	276 202 153 50	8% 1% 30%	223	56%	92 73 73	93% 95%	241	98%	232	38%	152 84	99% 98% 100%	65 250 50	24% 25% 76% 98%	242	0%	118 88 31	9% 0% 35%	90 70 250 569 186	19% 17% 23% 91% 85%	241	94%	154 49 307	100 73
ENTEROCOCCUS FAECAUS-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VRE ENTEROCOCCUS FAECIUM-VSE ENTEROCOCCUS SPP APHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS (all)	276 202 153 50	8% 1% 30%			92 73 73 61	93% 95% 100% 100%			232 472		152 84 46	99% 98% 100%	65 250	24% 25% 76%			118 88 31	9% 0% 35%	90 70 250 569	19% 17% 23% 91%			154 49 307 252	100 73 100

Presentation Type:

Poster Presentation - Poster Presentation **Subject Category:** Antibiotic Stewardship

Creating an electronic antibiogram using visualization software: Easily updatable and removes the need for yearly manual review

Ashley Dauphin; Christopher McCoy; Robert Bowden; Matthew Lee; Howard Gold and Ryan Chapin

Background: Previously, our hospital manually built a static antibiogram from a surveillance system (VigiLanz) culture report. In 2019, a collaboration between the antimicrobial stewardship team (AST) and the infection control (IC) team set out to leverage data automation to create a dynamic antibiogram. The goal for the antibiogram was the ability to easily distribute and update for hospital staff, with the added ability to perform advanced tracking and surveillance of organism and drug susceptibilities for AST and IC. By having a readily available, accurate, and Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI)-compliant antibiogram, clinicians have the best available data on which to base their empiric antibiotic decisions. Methods: First, assessment of required access to hospital databases and selection of a visualization software (MS Power BI) was performed. Connecting SQL database feeds to Power BI enabled creation of a data model using DAX and M code to comply with the CLSI, generating the first isolate per patient per year. Once a visual antibiogram was created, it was validated against compiled antibiograms using data from the microbiology laboratory middleware (bioMerieux, Observa Integrated Data Management Software). This validation process uncovered some discrepancies between the 2 reference reports due to cascade reporting of susceptibilities. The Observa-derived data were used as the source of truth. The antibiogram prototype was presented to AST/IC members, microbiology laboratory leadership, and other stakeholders to assess functionality. Results: Following feedback and revisions by stakeholders, the new antibiogram was published on a hospital-wide digital platform (Fig. 1). Clinicians may view the antibiogram at any time on desktops from a firewall (or password)-protected intranet. The antibiogram view defaults to the current calendar year and users may interact with the antibiogram rows and columns without disrupting the integrity of the background databases or codes. Each year, simple refreshing of the Power BI antibiogram and

changing of the calendar year allows us to easily and accurately update the antibiogram on the hospital-wide digital platform. **Conclusions:** This interdisciplinary collaboration resulted in a new dynamic, CLSI-compliant antibiogram with improved usability, increased visibility, and straightforward updating. In the future, a mobile version of the antibiogram may further enhance accessibility, bring more useful information to providers, and optimize AST/IC guidelines and education.

Disclosures: None

Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology 2023;3(Suppl. S2):s34 doi:10.1017/ash.2023.262

Presentation Type:

Poster Presentation - Poster Presentation **Subject Category:** Antibiotic Stewardship

Identifying the relationship between hospital rurality and antibiotic overuse

Hannah Hardin; Valerie Vaughn; Andrea White; Jennifer Horowitz; Elizabeth McLaughlin; Julia Szymczak; Lindsay Petty; Anurag Malani; Scott Flanders and Tejal Gandhi

Background: Antibiotic overuse and the resulting patient outcomes span all hospitals. However, although antibiotic stewardship can improve antibiotic use, effective stewardship programs require expertise and an infrastructure that are not present in all hospitals. Rural hospitals have less access to resources, infectious disease expertise, and participation in academic research. Thus, we compared antibiotic overuse at discharge between rural and nonrural hospitals for patients diagnosed with community-associated pneumonia (CAP) or urinary tract infection (UTI)—the 2 most common hospital infections. Methods: To determine whether antibiotic overuse at discharge was higher among rural versus nonrural hospitals, we analyzed data from a 41-hospital prospective cohort of patients treated for CAP or UTI between July 1, 2017, and July 30, 2019, in Michigan. Antibiotic overuse was defined as treatment that was unnecessary (ie, patient did not have an infection), excessive (ie, duration >4 days for CAP), or included suboptimal fluoroquinolone use (ie, safer alternative available). Overuse was determined based on patient risk