Decision models to improve healthcare-associated *C. difficile* PCR test use in patients with community-acquired pneumonia

Nathaniel J. Rhodes,^{1,2,3*} Caroline C. Jozefczyk,⁴ W. Justin Moore,^{1,3} Paul R. Yarnold,⁵ Karolina Harkabuz,¹ Sarah H. Sutton,^{6,7} Christina Silkaitis,⁷ Chao Qi,⁸ Richard G. Wunderink,⁹ Teresa R. Zembower^{6,7,8}

Author Affiliations:

¹Department of Pharmacy Practice, Northwestern University, Chicago College of Pharmacy, Downers Grove, IL, USA; ²Pharmacometrics Center of Excellence, Northwestern University, Downers Grove, IL, USA; ³Department of Pharmacy, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, IL, USA; ⁴Department of Pharmacy, Ohio Health, Mansfield, OH, USA; ⁵Optimal Data Analysis, LLC, Chicago, USA; ⁶Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA; ⁷Healthcare Epidemiology and Infection Prevention, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, IL, USA; ⁸Department of Pathology, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, IL, USA; ⁹Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

***Corresponding author and reprints:** Nathaniel J. Rhodes, PharmD, MSC, BCPS AQ-Infectious Diseases, Associate Professor of Pharmacy Practice. Department of Pharmacy Practice, Chicago College of Pharmacy, Northwestern University. 555 31st Street, Downers Grove, IL. 60515; Office: AH364, 630-515-7376; Fax: 630-515-6958; Email: nrhode@northwestern.edu

Running title: Predictive model of healthcare-associated CDI in CAP

Keywords: antibiotic stewardship, pneumonia, diagnostic testing, classification tree analysis

Abstract words: 250

Manuscript words: 3738

Abstract:

Adults hospitalized with community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) typically receive antibiotics and thus are at increased risk of developing *Clostridioides difficile* infection (CDI), a disease of significant morbidity. We developed and validated a CAP-specific clinical decision algorithm to facilitate optimal diagnostic stewardship of *C. difficile* polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing. The study was a single-center retrospective, case-control analysis of hospitalized adult patients empirically treated for CAP between January 1, 2014 and May 29, 2018. A series of predictive models and validity assessments were used to evaluate demographic and post-admission patient-specific risk factors as predictors of CDI case status among patients with CAP. Thirty-two PCR confirmed CDI cases were identified and 232 randomly selected controls were drawn from the total CAP population. After propensity score weighting, hospital-onset (HO) CDI was significantly associated with broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use ($P=0.002$) as was subsequent community-onset (CO) CDI ($P=0.005$). Modified-APACHE II > 8.5 ($P=0.003$) and broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use ($P=0.002$) were associated with healthcare-associated CDI and were robust in multiple validity analyses. Patients with m-APACHE II ≤ 8.5 who received broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics were more likely (odds=1:2) to experience healthcare-associated CDI compared to those who did not receive these broad-spectrum agents (odds=1:125) and compared to those with m-APACHE II > 8.5 irrespective of treatment (odds=5:27). We conclude that broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use was the common factor in development of CDI in patients with CAP in all settings. Prospective studies are needed to confirm the reproducibility and clinical utility of our model when used for diagnostic test stewardship.

Introduction

Pneumonia is the leading infectious cause of death and eighth leading cause of death overall among patients in the U.S. (1). Overuse of broad-spectrum antibiotics, which are likely inappropriate for the majority of patients with community acquired pneumonia (CAP), is a major driver of infectious complications including *Clostridioides difficile* associated diarrhea (2). *C. difficile* infection (CDI) is a significant complication of antibiotic treatment that is responsible for high morbidity. CDI most commonly presents as new onset diarrhea among patients with recent antibiotic exposure, but it can rarely present as ileus and toxic megacolon (3). The diagnosis of CDI relies on both clinical and microbiological evidence of disease. Strictly from an analytical perspective, *C. difficile* polymerase chain reaction nucleic acid amplification testing (i.e., PCR testing) on liquid stool specimens is a highly sensitive and specific test [90% and 96%, respectively (4)]; however, clinical false positive tests can occur in patients who are colonized by *C. difficile* (5, 6). We and others have found inconsistent documentation of clinical disease and a high occurrence of alternate etiologies for diarrhea in hospitalized patients (e.g., laxative use, oral contrast, systemic chemotherapy) (7). To address this gap in practice and thus reduce clinical false positive results, consensus guidelines recommend implementing institutional testing criteria or, alternatively, following a multistep laboratory testing algorithm (3). While the use of institutional testing criteria theoretically should improve PCR test utilization, applying one set of criteria to all hospitalized patients may constitute optimal test use. Thus, a need exists for population-specific test criteria in order to steward *C. difficile* PCR testing.

Diagnostic stewardship within hospitals can be achieved through an integrated approach supported by Antimicrobial Stewardship Programs (ASPs), Infection Prevention Programs, and the clinical microbiology laboratory. Once population-specific risk factors are defined, models that support clinical decision making can help narrow the pool of patients who require PCR testing for definitive diagnosis and prioritize testing for those who are high risk. Certain patient populations may carry higher risk than

72 others, particularly those who often receive antibiotics and have frequent need for hospitalization.

73 Inappropriate antibiotic use in patients with CAP (e.g., excessive duration of therapy) can lead to CDI (8-

74 10). Epidemiological studies have documented a lack of judicious prescribing among patients with lower

75 respiratory tract infections including CAP (11, 12). Inappropriate prescribing corresponds with prolonged

76 lengths of stay (13) and greater mortality (14). Importantly, healthcare-associated outbreaks of CDI have

77 been associated with inappropriate antibiotic use in CAP (15). Therefore, improvements in antibiotic

78 prescribing are expected to both significantly improve outcomes in CAP and reduce the risk of CDI

79 development. The present study develops and validates CAP-specific decision models to support optimal

80 diagnostic and antimicrobial stewardship in this population.

Materials and Methods

Design

This study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Boards of Northwestern University (#STU00206507) and Midwestern University (#3047). The study took place at Northwestern Memorial Hospital (NMH), an 897-bed tertiary academic medical center in Chicago, IL. We conducted a retrospective, case-control study of patients treated empirically for CAP. Cases and controls were eligible if they were hospitalized between January 1, 2014 and May 29, 2018, were adults (aged 18 years or older), and received systemic antibiotics with an indication listed as CAP. Case patients were excluded if they were PCR positive for CDI within the previous 90 days, had cystic fibrosis, had a history of frequent hospitalization (≥ 3 admissions within prior 30 days), required initial ICU management for severe CAP, or had a rapidly fatal underlying condition (i.e., expired within 48 hours of admission). Inclusion and exclusion criteria for control patients were similar except that controls could not have had any prior documented positive *C. difficile* PCR test during the study period. The index admission for cases and controls was taken as the first hospitalization for CAP during the study period. All eligible cases were considered. Eligible controls were sampled from the entire cohort of CAP patients targeting a 7:1 ratio of controls for each case to maximize available power.

C. difficile specimen processing and PCR methods

As previously described (16), *C. difficile* specimens at our facility were evaluated using PCR testing. Briefly, liquid stool specimens were screened and processed by the clinical microbiology laboratory. All formed stools were rejected by the laboratory. Specimens sent from patients with a previous PCR test result within the prior seven days were not orderable through the electronic health record (EHR) at our hospital. Evaluable clinical specimens underwent DNA extraction and PCR amplification for the toxin B gene (i.e., *tcdB*). PCR was performed using one of the following methods according to study year: BD

GeneOhm™ kit (BD Diagnostics) and SmartCycler (years 2012-2015) or BD Max™ kit (BD Diagnostics) (years 2015-2018). All PCR conditions were performed according to manufacturer protocol.

Data Sources and Definitions:

Patient data were retrieved from the EHR system (Cerner, Millennium) by querying the Northwestern Electronic Data Warehouse (EDW). Briefly, admissions records were searched for hospital encounters matching the inclusion criteria. Hospital admission characteristics (i.e., length of stay, antibiotic treatment), patient demographics (i.e., age, weight, sex, comorbidities) were extracted from the EHR. CDI was classified as a positive *C. difficile* PCR test. PCR test results were extracted from a line list of LabID events reported to the National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) accessed through the NMH portal. These data were cross-referenced against the list of all patients who were empirically treated for CAP during the study period. Patients were considered to be cases if they had a positive PCR test result on file within 180 days after the index admission for CAP. Controls could not have any positive PCR test results during the entire study period (i.e. 90 days before to 180 days after CAP diagnosis). CDI onset was classified according to NHSN criteria as community onset (CO), CO-healthcare facility associated (CO-HCFA), and hospital onset (HO). For the purposes of this study, we considered healthcare-associated CDI to be the composite of HO and CO-HCFA. According to the NHSN definitions, HO CDIs were defined as LabID events that occurred between day 4 of the index hospitalization and discharge, and CO-HCFA CDIs were defined as LabID events within 28 days after discharge from the index admission. Comorbidities and other clinical demographics at or before the index hospitalization were verified by manual chart review and included heart failure, dialysis-dependent chronic kidney disease, MRSA colonization, antibiotic receipt within the previous 90 days, hospitalization for two or more days in the previous 90 days, asthma, COPD, diabetes mellitus, ambulatory status, receipt of chronic acid suppression therapy, history of tube feeding requirement, hematologic malignancy, and receipt of immunosuppression therapy. Patient acuity and severity were classified using a modified-APACHE II

score (m-APACHE II) (17) and the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) (18) applied on hospital day 1. The presence of chronic comorbidities including immunocompromise, respiratory failure, hepatic failure or heart failure, were assessed as a component of the m-APACHE II score. Data were stored in REDCap (19). CAP antibiotics were classified based on spectrum of activity, class, and as concordant or discordant based upon our institutional CAP treatment algorithm (**Figure S1**) (20). Broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics included cefepime, meropenem, and piperacillin-tazobactam; Broad-spectrum Gram-positive antibiotics included linezolid and vancomycin; and guideline-concordant antibiotic use was considered empiric antibiotic use that followed our hospital's CAP treatment algorithm.

Univariate statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all variables. Differences in demographics between cases and randomly sampled controls were compared at the univariate level. Continuous variables were evaluated using Student's t-test or Wilcoxon rank sum test and categorical variables were evaluated using Chi-square or Fisher's exact tests, as appropriate. All analyses were performed in R (21).

Model Development and Validation

Model development was completed using the *ODA* package for R (22), which is an R-based interface for the Optimal Data Analysis (ODA) and Classification Tree Analysis (CTA) software programs developed by Yarnold and Soltysik (23). Briefly, baseline attributes were evaluated during the index admission and considered as predictors of CDI case status for use in propensity score development. CO, CO-HFCA, HO, and any healthcare-associated CDI were evaluated as dependent (i.e., class) variables. Independent variables (i.e., attributes) observed post-admission (e.g., severity of illness and antibiotic treatment) were considered as independent variables to predict the class variables. Missing data were considered missing at random if univariate ODA failed to associate missingness with class membership. ODA identified

variables with maximum accuracy for case status, and these were used in the propensity score weighting (24, 25). Propensity score weights were developed using baseline characteristics to address threats to causal inference (24). Time-to-event weights based on length of stay data were also considered as a weight alone or in combination with the propensity score weight (26). Next, CTA was used to identify a family of models that predicted CDI status using post-admission attributes, weighted by the optimal (i.e., having greatest effect strength after adjusting for chance) propensity score for each respective outcome. The sensitivity (Sn), specificity (Sp), and positive and negative predictive values for each class were calculated for each model. Model performance was described in terms of the Effect Strength for Sensitivity (ESS) which assesses predictive accuracy corrected for chance: for a two-category class variable, $ESS = 100 \times [(0.5 \times (Sp + Sn)) - 0.5] / 0.5$. In addition, the distance statistic D (23) is the number of additional effects with equivalent ESS needed to obtain perfect classification of the sample (27). The final models for each class variable were selected among competing models based upon their weighted ESS or WESS (indicating that observations are weighted with respect to their specific propensity and/or observed time) and D statistics. The model(s) with the highest WESS and lowest D was (were) considered the most accurate and parsimonious for each respective outcome. Cross-generalizability to an independent random sample was estimated via one sample (“leave-one-out” or LOO) jackknife analysis (28). The *NOVOboot()* function in ODA was used to evaluate the reliability of the predictions using bootstrap resampling with replacement (n=25,000 resamples with 50% replacement) to estimate an exact discrete 95% confidence interval (CI) for ESS for the model and this was compared to the exact discrete 95% CI for ESS for chance (i.e., model predictions were randomly scrambled relative to the class variable) (29).

Results

Sample Demographics

Overall, 4216 eligible patients received empiric treatment for CAP at our center during the study period. A total of 32 eligible PCR confirmed CDI cases were identified, and 232 randomly selected controls were drawn from the overall population of patients admitted during the study period. Cases were comprised of HO CDI (6.4%, n=17), CO CDI (3%, n=8), and CO-HCFA CDI (2.7%, n=7). Correspondingly, 9% (n=24) patients experienced a healthcare-associated CDI after their index CAP admission. Some data elements were missing for n=13 subjects, but these were considered as missing at random because univariate ODA failed to identify any associations with the above class variables (all P values > 0.2).

Baseline demographic differences between cases and controls are shown in **Table 1**. Case and controls in the training data set were similar with respect to female sex (50 vs 51%, respectively) and age [mean (SD): 68.5 (17.6) vs 62.4 (17.8), respectively]. However, cases had a higher mean (SD) modified-APACHE II score [11.2 (4.22) vs 8.14 (4.39); P<0.001] and a higher PSI [105 (26.3) vs 77.1 (31.2)]. In general, cases were more likely to have a history of acid suppressant use (P<0.01), tube feeding requirements (P<0.01), hematologic malignancy (P=0.02), immunosuppression (P=0.01), renal insufficiency (P<0.01), multiple chronic comorbidities (P<0.01), MRSA colonization (P=0.01), antibiotic use within the previous 90 days (P<0.001), and a history of previous hospitalization > 48 hr in the previous 90 days (P<0.001). Cases were more likely to have been admitted from a nursing home or LTAC (P=0.01), whereas controls were more likely to have been admitted to the general medicine service compared to oncology or surgical services (P<0.001).

Univariate Predictors of Case and Control Status

We evaluated a total of 39 baseline attributes as predictors of case or control classification, as shown in **Table 1**. ODA revealed seven attributes as having >24% ESS that also had stable estimates in jackknife (i.e., LOO) analysis. A summary of the attributes is shown in **Table 2**. Prior hospitalization > 48 hr in last 90 days (ESS=39.9%), modified APACHE II > 8.5 (ESS=32.9%), antibiotic use in the last 90 days (ESS=31.8%), the presence of chronic comorbidities (ESS=28.5%), BUN > 29 mg/dL (ESS=27.6%), and a history of acid-suppressant use (ESS=24.4%) were positively associated with case status whereas admission directly to a general medicine ward (ESS=26.8%) was associated with control status. These predictors were evaluated as potential propensity scores using classification tree analysis (CTA) to identify optimal weighted CTA models of CDI.

Differences between cases and controls with respect to empiric antibiotic use are shown in **Table 3**. Guideline concordant antibiotic use was numerically more common among controls as compared to cases. Initial broad-spectrum Gram-negative agents were more commonly prescribed for cases than controls [n=11 (34.4%) vs n=24 (10.3%); P<0.001] as were broad-spectrum Gram-positive agents [n=11 (34.4%) vs n=25 (10.8%); P=0.00113].

Optimal propensity scores weights defined using Classification Tree Analysis

Of the baseline attributes identified as predictors of any CDI case status (n=32) in the univariate analysis, only prior hospitalization > 48 hr in the last 90 days and BUN > 29 mg/dL were retained after the first propensity score development step. Two potential configurations of these attributes were identified yielding two potential propensity scores: 1) a three strata CTA model rooted by prior hospitalization (ESS=53.12%), and 2) a three strata CTA model rooted by BUN > 29 mg/dL (ESS=53.12%). As these models were isometric with respect to predictive performance but differed in configuration, each was

considered as a candidate propensity score in subsequent model building procedures. **Figure 1** shows the configuration and predictive performance of model (1) above. In addition to these two scores, a propensity score based on hospital length of stay (LOS), and the multiplicative interactions between LOS and each of the propensity scores derived from the two CTA models above were also considered (n=5 scores total). In this way, we identified every single statistically viable propensity score for the sample.

Selection of optimal Classification Tree Analysis Models for CDI

The results of the final model build are summarized in **Table 4**. Each of the following classifications were considered in model development: CO CDI, HO CDI, CO-HCFA CDI, and healthcare-associated CDI. The following attributes were considered as predictors in model development: empiric broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use, empiric broad-spectrum Gram-positive antibiotic use, guideline-concordant antibiotic use, and m-APACHE II score on the day of hospital admission. Each of the propensity scores developed above were iteratively considered and a weighted ESS (WESS) was calculated for each of the resulting models (n=5 propensity scores x n=4 classifications = up to 20 models to be evaluated), where the highest WESS maximizes overall model accuracy.

CTA identified only one predictive model for CO CDI; the model was weighted by LOS and had relatively low discriminatory power (ESS=13.7%, D=12.6, WESS=20.7%). CTA did not identify any predictive model for CO-HCFA CDI as a unique class. However, CTA identified several models for HO CDI. The globally optimal model predicted HO CDI using empiric broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use with moderate to strong discriminatory power (ESS=48.7%, D=2.1, WESS=56.3%). Likewise, CTA identified several models for healthcare-associated CDI; the globally optimal model predicted healthcare-associated CDI using m-APACHE II on hospital day 1 and empiric broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use with moderate discriminatory power (ESS=47.5%, D=3.3, WESS=49.3%).

The configuration and performance metrics of this model are shown in **Figure 2**. Each of these models had weighted PPV (wPPV) that exceeded the base rate of CDI for each class by over 2-fold (HO CDI base rate=6.4%, wPPV = 43.7%; CO CDI base rate=3%, wPPV=8.5%; and healthcare-associated CDI base rate=9%, wPPV=18.1%).

Validity assessment of the optimal Classification Tree Analysis Model

Novometric bootstrap validity assessment with n=25,000 resamples with 50% replacement was performed. In this analysis, the lower bound (2.5th percentile) of the 95% CI for the model ESS and the upper bound (97.5th percentile) of the 95% CI for chance ESS overlap was assessed. With respect to the models from **Table 4**, CO and HO CDI had model and chance 95% CI intervals that overlapped. No model was identified for CO-HCFA CDI. The model for healthcare-associated CDI had a lower bound 95% CI that did not overlap chance, confirming its generalizability. The results of this analysis are graphically depicted in **Figure 3**. These findings were reproduced in multiple random seeds (data not shown). Using this model, the odds of being a healthcare-associated CDI case were as follows: among those with an m-APACHE II $\leq$ 8.5 who did not receive broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics, the odds were 1:125; among those with an m-APACHE II $\leq$ 8.5 who received broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics the odds were 1:2, and among those with a m-APACHE II $>$ 8.5 the odds were 5:27 independent of antibiotics prescribed for CAP.

Discussion

We identified a series of predictive models that accounted for demographic, severity of illness, and post-admission factors that modify the risk of CDI in patients hospitalized for CAP. Broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use, including piperacillin-tazobactam, meropenem, and cefepime, was significantly associated with subsequent development of CO and HO CDI. Moreover, we identified a robust model of healthcare-associated (i.e., HO or CO-HCFA) CDI with high negative predictive value. Our models were weighted by optimal propensity scores for each outcome, and the PPV for each CDI model was more than 2-fold greater than the baseline CDI rate in each category. Our model of healthcare-associated CDI was reproducible and has implications for diagnostic *C difficile* PCR stewardship. For example, consider a patient who develops diarrhea while admitted to a hospital who 1) received only narrow-spectrum CAP antibiotics and 2) was not severely ill upon admission. In such a patient, a clinical decision rule could bypass the need for PCR-based testing given the low baseline risk of CDI, whereas a non-severely ill patient who received broad-spectrum antibiotics for CAP may benefit from PCR testing to rule out CDI. Our model also has the potential to impact empiric CAP antibiotic decision-making. For example, a 64-year-old male nursing home patient with past medical history of CHF who presented with a new cough, fever, and a focal infiltrate is admitted to the general floor for CAP. He is without confusion, tachypnea or history of liver disease or cancer. Electronic decision support notifies the prescriber that the patient's m-APACHE II score is low and thus broad Gram-negative coverage for CAP dramatically increases the risk of developing CDI within the next few weeks for this patient. With this and other clinical and laboratory factors in mind, the prescriber may choose to initiate standard CAP antibiotic therapy and observe closely. Clearly, a critical appraisal of patient-specific factors is needed to fine-tune any diagnostic and prescribing algorithms.

Our findings have significance in the light of the revised pneumonia guidelines (30, 31). Healthcare-associated pneumonia (HCAP), a major driver of broad-spectrum antibiotic use, is no longer recognized

as a valid diagnosis (31). The rationale for the abolition of HCAP stems from the poor predictive performance of these criteria when antibiotic-resistant pathogens are not endemic (32) and the failure of broad-spectrum agents to significantly improve outcomes among patients classified as having HCAP (14). Likewise, overuse of broad-spectrum antibiotics targeting HCAP can increase the risk of adverse effects such as CDI. We found that among patients with a lower m-APACHE II score who were empirically treated for CAP, receipt of broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics increased the odds of healthcare-associated CDI to 1:2 compared to similar patients who did not receive these antibiotics (odds 1:125). Our predictive model is supported by multiple validity assessments including jackknife and bootstrap analyses. Our findings are consistent with prior research (33) and are biologically plausible. Patients treated for CAP experienced increased *C. difficile* carriage over the course of hospitalization, and the risk of carriage increases with excessive antibiotic treatment durations (10), which is supported by observational data (34). Broad-spectrum antibiotic use can also increase the risk of CDI. Chalmers et al. found that CDI was significantly associated with empiric use of piperacillin-tazobactam (22.9% vs 2.3%; $P < 0.0001$) in patients with pneumonia. On the other hand, they found no significant association with CDI among patients receiving narrow-spectrum penicillins (24.6% vs 35.0%; $P = 0.09$) (8). These findings are in line with ours and support the need for optimal approaches to antimicrobial stewardship for patients with CAP.

Our approach considered baseline factors including comorbidities, prior healthcare exposure, and baseline laboratory abnormalities as predictors of CDI. Our final propensity score consisted of hospitalization for > 48 hr in the previous 90 days at the root, with a secondary split for patients not previously hospitalized with an admission BUN > 29 mg/dL. We observed many differences between cases and controls in our univariate analysis. However, the majority of these factors 1) were unstable predictors in jackknife analysis or 2) were relatively weak effects. We considered baseline severity of illness (as measured by m-APACHE II score) as an adjustment factor in our final decision algorithms after propensity score

weighting. Ultimately, m-APACHE II > 8.5 and broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use were major predictors of healthcare-associated CDI. HO CDI, specifically, was strongly associated with broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use. Thus, interventions that reduce broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic use among patients being treated for CAP should reduce HO CDI.

Our study has several limitations. This was a single center retrospective case-control analysis. Cases are likely under-reported, and causality cannot be inferred. However, we identified suitable propensity score weights to address threats to causal inference and more appropriately balance cases and controls. Our final decision models are likely incomplete as evidenced by the D statistic (e.g., HO CDI: D=2.2, healthcare-associated CDI: D=3.3). Thus, two to three additional variables with equal explanatory power may exist that comprehensively classify each of these outcomes. More work is needed to improve clinical decision support related to *C. difficile* testing in this population. However, our decision model of healthcare-associated CDI risk was validated using several approaches, and this model can be easily translated into EMR-based algorithms and prescriber feedback strategies. Such an approach is supported by the current CDI guidelines, which call for institutional testing criteria to address false positives (3).

In summary, we identified relatively simple and biologically plausible clinical decision models that predict the risk of healthcare-associated CDI among hospitalized patients with CAP. Our models had high NPVs and, if paired with PCR testing in two-step clinical algorithms, could greatly reduce false positive PCR test results and avoid unnecessary treatment in patients colonized with *C. difficile*.

Acknowledgements: None

Funding Information: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. This study was completed as part of our normal work. REDCap is supported at FSM by the Northwestern University Clinical and Translational Science (NUCATS) Institute. Research reported in this publication was supported, in part, by the National Institutes of Health's National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, Grant Number UL1TR001422. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors have no actual or potential conflicts of interest in relation to the data presented in this study.

Data availability: Data will be made publicly available upon publication and upon request for peer review.

References

1. **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services** 2017, posting date. Leading causes of death and numbers of deaths, by sex, race, and Hispanic origin: United States, 1980 and 2016. [Online.]
2. **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases. Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services** November 2018 2013, posting date. Antibiotic Resistance Threats in the United States, 2013. [Online.]
3. **McDonald LC, Gerding DN, Johnson S, Bakken JS, Carroll KC, Coffin SE, Dubberke ER, Garey KW, Gould CV, Kelly C, Loo V, Shaklee Sammons J, Sandora TJ, Wilcox MH.** 2018. Clinical Practice Guidelines for Clostridium difficile Infection in Adults and Children: 2017 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) and Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA). Clin Infect Dis **66**:987-994.
4. **Deshpande A, Pasupuleti V, Rolston DD, Jain A, Deshpande N, Pant C, Hernandez AV.** 2011. Diagnostic accuracy of real-time polymerase chain reaction in detection of Clostridium difficile in the stool samples of patients with suspected Clostridium difficile Infection: a meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis **53**:e81-90.
5. **Loo VG, Bourgault AM, Poirier L, Lamothe F, Michaud S, Turgeon N, Toye B, Beaudoin A, Frost EH, Gilca R, Brassard P, Dendukuri N, Beliveau C, Oughton M, Brukner I, Dascal A.** 2011. Host and pathogen factors for Clostridium difficile infection and colonization. N Engl J Med **365**:1693-1703.
6. **Samore MH, DeGirolami PC, Tlucko A, Lichtenberg DA, Melvin ZA, Karchmer AW.** 1994. Clostridium difficile colonization and diarrhea at a tertiary care hospital. Clin Infect Dis **18**:181-187.

7. **Kelly SG, Yarrington M, Zembower TR, Sutton SH, Silkaitis C, Postelnick M, Mikolajczak A, Bolon MK.** 2016. Inappropriate Clostridium difficile Testing and Consequent Overtreatment and Inaccurate Publicly Reported Metrics. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol **37**:1395-1400.
8. **Chalmers JD, Akram AR, Singanayagam A, Wilcox MH, Hill AT.** 2016. Risk factors for Clostridium difficile infection in hospitalized patients with community-acquired pneumonia. J Infect **73**:45-53.
9. **Madaras-Kelly KJ, Burk M, Caplinger C, Bohan JG, Neuhauser MM, Goetz MB, Zhang R, Cunningham FE, Pneumonia Duration of Therapy Medication Utilization Evaluation G.** 2016. Total duration of antimicrobial therapy in veterans hospitalized with uncomplicated pneumonia: Results of a national medication utilization evaluation. J Hosp Med **11**:832-839.
10. **Bruns AH, Oosterheert JJ, Kuijper EJ, Lammers JW, Thijsen S, Troelstra A, Hoepelman AI.** 2010. Impact of different empirical antibiotic treatment regimens for community-acquired pneumonia on the emergence of Clostridium difficile. J Antimicrob Chemother **65**:2464-2471.
11. **Yi SH, Hatfield KM, Baggs J, Hicks LA, Srinivasan A, Reddy S, Jernigan JA.** 2017. Duration of Antibiotic Use among Adults with Uncomplicated Community-Acquired Pneumonia Requiring Hospitalization in the United States. Clin Infect Dis.
12. **Tomczyk S, Jain S, Bramley AM, Self WH, Anderson EJ, Trabue C, Courtney DM, Grijalva CG, Waterer GW, Edwards KM, Wunderink RG, Hicks LA.** 2017. Antibiotic Prescribing for Adults Hospitalized in the Etiology of Pneumonia in the Community Study. Open Forum Infect Dis **4**:ofx088.
13. **Pereira JM, Goncalves-Pereira J, Ribeiro O, Baptista JP, Froes F, Paiva JA.** 2017. Impact of antibiotic therapy in severe community-acquired pneumonia: Data from the Infauci study. J Crit Care **43**:183-189.
14. **Shindo Y, Ito R, Kobayashi D, Ando M, Ichikawa M, Shiraki A, Goto Y, Fukui Y, Iwaki M, Okumura J, Yamaguchi I, Yagi T, Tanikawa Y, Sugino Y, Shindoh J, Ogasawara T, Nomura F, Saka H, Yamamoto M, Taniguchi H, Suzuki R, Saito H, Kawamura T,**

- Hasegawa Y.** 2013. Risk factors for drug-resistant pathogens in community-acquired and healthcare-associated pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **188**:985-995.
15. **Polgreen PM, Chen YY, Cavanaugh JE, Ward M, Coffman S, Hornick DB, Diekema DJ, Herwaldt LA.** 2007. An outbreak of severe *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease possibly related to inappropriate antimicrobial therapy for community-acquired pneumonia. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **28**:212-214.
16. **Christensen AB, Barr VO, Martin DW, Anderson MM, Gibson AK, Hoff BM, Sutton SH, Widmaier V, Salim AA, Silkaitis C, Qi C, Zembower TR, Postelnick MJ, Rhodes NJ.** 2019. Diagnostic stewardship of *C. difficile* testing: a quasi-experimental antimicrobial stewardship study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **40**:269-275.
17. **Hamilton KW, Bilker WB, Lautenbach E.** 2007. Controlling for severity of illness in assessment of the association between antimicrobial-resistant infection and mortality: impact of calculation of Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) II scores at different time points. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **28**:832-836.
18. **Fine MJ, Auble TE, Yealy DM, Hanusa BH, Weissfeld LA, Singer DE, Coley CM, Marrie TJ, Kapoor WN.** 1997. A prediction rule to identify low-risk patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* **336**:243-250.
19. **Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG.** 2009. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* **42**:377-381.
20. **Northwestern Memorial Hospital ASP** 2018, posting date. Community Onset Pneumonia (CAP) NMH Treatment Guidelines for Non-ICU Patients. [Online.]
21. **R Core Team.** 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing, 3rd ed. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
22. **Rhodes NJ.** 2020. ODA: a package and R-interface for the MegaODA software suite. R package version 1.0.1.3.

23. **Yarnold PR, Soltysik RC.** 2016. Maximizing Predictive Accuracy. ODA Books.
24. **Linden A, Yarnold PR.** 2017. Using classification tree analysis to generate propensity score weights. *J Eval Clin Pract* **23**:703-712.
25. **Yarnold PR.** 2016. How Many EO-CTA Models Exist in My Sample and Which is the Best Model? *Optimal Data Analysis* **5**:2.
26. **Linden A, Yarnold PR.** 2018. Estimating causal effects for survival (time-to-event) outcomes by combining classification tree analysis and propensity score weighting. *J Eval Clin Pract* **24**:380-387.
27. **Yarnold PR.** 2015. Distance from a theoretically ideal statistical classification model defined as the number of additional equivalent effects needed to obtain perfect classification for the sample. *Optimal Data Analysis* **4**:81-86.
28. **Yarnold PR.** 2016. Using the UniODA to Determine the ESS of a CTA Model in LOO Analysis. *Optimal Data Analysis* **5**:3-10.
29. **Rhodes NJ, Yarnold PR.** 2020. Generating Novometric Confidence Intervals in R: Bootstrap Analyses to Compare Model and Chance ESS. *Optimal Data Analysis* **9**:6.
30. **Metlay JP, Waterer GW, Long AC, Anzueto A, Brozek J, Crothers K, Cooley LA, Dean NC, Fine MJ, Flanders SA, Griffin MR, Metersky ML, Musher DM, Restrepo MI, Whitney CG.** 2019. Diagnosis and Treatment of Adults with Community-acquired Pneumonia. An Official Clinical Practice Guideline of the American Thoracic Society and Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **200**:e45-e67.
31. **Kalil AC, Metersky ML, Klompas M, Muscedere J, Sweeney DA, Palmer LB, Napolitano LM, O'Grady NP, Bartlett JG, Carratalà J, El Solh AA, Ewig S, Fey PD, File TM, Restrepo MI, Roberts JA, Waterer GW, Cruse P, Knight SL, Brozek JL.** 2016. Management of Adults With Hospital-acquired and Ventilator-associated Pneumonia: 2016 Clinical Practice Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the American Thoracic Society. *Clin Infect Dis* **63**:e61-e111.

32. **Jain S, Self WH, Wunderink RG, Fakhran S, Balk R, Bramley AM, Reed C, Grijalva CG, Anderson EJ, Courtney DM, Chappell JD, Qi C, Hart EM, Carroll F, Trabue C, Donnelly HK, Williams DJ, Zhu Y, Arnold SR, Ampofo K, Waterer GW, Levine M, Lindstrom S, Winchell JM, Katz JM, Erdman D, Schneider E, Hicks LA, McCullers JA, Pavia AT, Edwards KM, Finelli L, Team CES.** 2015. Community-Acquired Pneumonia Requiring Hospitalization among U.S. Adults. *N Engl J Med* **373**:415-427.
33. **Llewelyn MJ, Hand K, Hopkins S, Walker AS.** 2015. Antibiotic policies in acute English NHS trusts: implementation of 'Start Smart-Then Focus' and relationship with *Clostridium difficile* infection rates. *J Antimicrob Chemother* **70**:1230-1235.
34. **Vaughn VM, Flanders SA, Snyder A, Conlon A, Rogers MAM, Malani AN, McLaughlin E, Bloemers S, Srinivasan A, Nagel J, Kaatz S, Osterholzer D, Thyagarajan R, Hsaiky L, Chopra V, Gandhi TN.** 2019. Excess Antibiotic Treatment Duration and Adverse Events in Patients Hospitalized With Pneumonia: A Multihospital Cohort Study. *Ann Intern Med* **171**:153-163.

464 **Table 1.** Demographics and baseline characteristics of cases and controls

	Total (N=264)	Case (N=32)	Control (N=232)	P-value
Age (years)				
Mean (SD)	63.1 (17.9)	68.5 (17.6)	62.4 (17.8)	0.0705
Weight (kg)				
Mean (SD)	84.4 (27.5)	84.8 (28.6)	84.4 (27.4)	0.945
Missing	11 (4.2%)	0 (0%)	11 (4.7%)	
Temperature (highest in first 24 hr of admission)				
Mean (SD)	37.3 (3.75)	38.8 (10.3)	37.1 (1.19)	0.377
Respiratory rate (breaths/min)				
Mean (SD)	19.5 (3.54)	19.0 (3.10)	19.5 (3.60)	0.35
Missing	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	
Heart rate (beats/min)				
Mean (SD)	93.1 (18.6)	95.2 (17.8)	92.8 (18.7)	0.487
White cell count (10³ cells/μL)				
Mean (SD)	10.0 (5.32)	9.31 (5.75)	10.1 (5.26)	0.439
Missing	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.9%)	
Modified APACHE II				
Mean (SD)	8.52 (4.48)	11.2 (4.22)	8.14 (4.39)	<0.001
Missing	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.9%)	
Pneumonia Severity Index				
Mean (SD)	80.5 (32.0)	105 (26.3)	77.1 (31.2)	<0.001
Female				
n (%)	135 (51.1%)	16 (50.0%)	119 (51.3%)	>0.99
African American/Black				
n (%)	62 (23.5%)	4 (12.5%)	58 (25.0%)	0.18
Asian				
n (%)	7 (2.7%)	1 (3.1%)	6 (2.6%)	0.6
Caucasian/White				
n (%)	133 (50.4%)	21 (65.6%)	112 (48.3%)	0.0888
Hispanic/Latinx				
n (%)	9 (3.4%)	1 (3.1%)	8 (3.4%)	>0.99
Native American/Alaska Native				
n (%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	0.121
Other Race				
n (%)	51 (19.3%)	4 (12.5%)	47 (20.3%)	0.35
Acute kidney injury				
n (%)	30 (11.4%)	3 (9.4%)	27 (11.6%)	>0.99
Nursing home or LTAC resident				
n (%)	5 (1.9%)	3 (9.4%)	2 (0.9%)	0.0138

	Total (N=264)	Case (N=32)	Control (N=232)	P-value
Altered mental status				
n (%)	19 (7.2%)	5 (15.6%)	14 (6.0%)	0.0637
Pleural effusion				
n (%)	70 (26.5%)	9 (28.1%)	61 (26.3%)	0.832
PORT Class II				
n (%)	109 (41.3%)	3 (9.4%)	106 (45.7%)	<0.001
PORT Class III				
n (%)	49 (18.6%)	6 (18.8%)	43 (18.5%)	>0.99
PORT Class IV				
n (%)	89 (33.7%)	17 (53.1%)	72 (31.0%)	0.0168
PORT Class V				
Yes	17 (6.4%)	6 (18.8%)	11 (4.7%)	0.00929
History of acid-suppressant use				
n (%)	92 (34.8%)	18 (56.2%)	74 (31.9%)	0.00957
History of asthma				
n (%)	30 (11.4%)	3 (9.4%)	27 (11.6%)	>0.99
History of congestive heart failure				
n (%)	24 (9.1%)	6 (18.8%)	18 (7.8%)	0.0532
History of COPD				
n (%)	39 (14.8%)	4 (12.5%)	35 (15.1%)	>0.99
History of Diabetes mellitus				
n (%)	59 (22.3%)	9 (28.1%)	50 (21.6%)	0.376
History of hematologic malignancy				
n (%)	55 (20.8%)	12 (37.5%)	43 (18.5%)	0.0195
History of immunosuppression^a				
n (%)	57 (21.6%)	13 (40.6%)	44 (19.0%)	0.0101
History of renal insufficiency				
n (%)	32 (12.1%)	9 (28.1%)	23 (9.9%)	0.00708
History of tube-feeding requirement				
n (%)	7 (2.7%)	4 (12.5%)	3 (1.3%)	0.00486
Antibiotic use in the last 90 days				
n (%)	83 (31.4%)	19 (59.4%)	64 (27.6%)	<0.001
MRSA colonization history				
n (%)	2 (0.8%)	2 (6.2%)	0 (0%)	0.0143
Non-ambulatory status				
n (%)	6 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	6 (2.6%)	>0.99
Hospitalization > 48 hr in last 90 days				
n (%)	56 (21.2%)	18 (56.2%)	38 (16.4%)	<0.001
Chronic comorbidities^b				
n (%)	74 (28.0%)	17 (53.1%)	57 (24.6%)	0.00147

	Total (N=264)	Case (N=32)	Control (N=232)	P-value
Missing	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	
BUN > 29 mg/dL				
n (%)	35 (13.3%)	12 (37.5%)	23 (9.9%)	<0.001
General medicine service				
n (%)	252 (95.5%)	23 (71.9%)	229 (98.7%)	<0.001

Abbreviations: BUN, blood urea nitrogen; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; LTAC, long-term acute care; MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*

Legend: a.) Chronic comorbidities included dialysis-dependent renal failure, advanced liver disease, symptomatic congestive heart failure, chronic respirator dependency, or immunocompromised status; b.) immunocompromised host defined by receipt of therapeutic immune suppression, chemotherapy, long-term or recent high dose corticosteroids, leukemia, lymphoma, or AIDS.

471 **Table 2.** Baseline attributes that were stable predictors of case or control in training and validity analysis

Attribute, if “yes” then predict “Class”	Primary ODA Model				Leave-one-out Model		
	Class	PAC %	ESS %	M.C. P-value	Class	ESS %	M.C. P-value
Hospitalization > 48 hr in last 90 days	Case	80.3	39.9%	<0.001	Case	39.9%	0.000003
Modified-APACHE II > 8.5	Case	57.6	32.9%	0.0016	Case	32.9%	0.000382
Antibiotic use in the last 90 days	Case	70.8	31.8%	0.0004	Case	31.8%	0.000466
Chronic comorbidities	Case	72.6	28.5%	0.0019	Case	28.5%	0.001287
BUN > 29 (mg/dL)	Case	83.7	27.6%	0.0002	Case	27.6%	0.000165
General medicine service	Control	90.2	26.8%	<0.001	Control	26.8%	0.00000032
History of Acid-suppressant use	Case	66.7	24.4%	0.0103	Case	24.4%	0.006898

477 **Legend:** M.C. P-values require no distributional assumptions and are exact.

478 **Abbreviations:** BUN, blood urea nitrogen; ESS, effect strength for sensitivity; ESP, effect strength for
 479 predictive value; M.C., Monte Carlo; PAC, percent accuracy in classification (i.e., overall accuracy).

Table 3. Receipt of broad-spectrum and guideline-concordant antibiotics among cases and controls

	Total (N=264)	Case (N=32)	Control (N=232)	P-value
Any broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics				
Yes	35 (13.3%)	11 (34.4%)	24 (10.3%)	<0.001
No	229 (86.7%)	21 (65.6%)	208 (89.7%)	
Any broad-spectrum Gram-positive antibiotics				
Yes	36 (13.6%)	11 (34.4%)	25 (10.8%)	0.001
No	228 (86.4%)	21 (65.6%)	207 (89.2%)	
Receipt of guideline-concordant antibiotics				
Yes	187 (70.8%)	18 (56.2%)	169 (72.8%)	0.058
No	74 (28.0%)	14 (43.8%)	60 (25.9%)	
Missing	3 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.3%)	

Legend: Broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics included cefepime, meropenem, and piperacillin-tazobactam; Broad-spectrum Gram-positive antibiotics included: linezolid and vancomycin; Guideline-concordant antibiotic use was considered any empiric antibiotic use consistent with our hospital-specific CAP treatment algorithm which is included as **Figure S1**.

Table 4. Summaries of the optimal weighted CTA models and performance metrics for each class

Dependent variable (class)	ESS	WESS	Sens.	Spec.	P-value
CO-CDI	13.7%	20.7%	100%	13.7%	
Broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics					0.005
Weight: LOS					
HO-CDI	48.7%	56.3%	58.8%	89.9%	
Broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics					0.002
Weight: LOS x model 1 score ^c					
Healthcare-associated CDI^{a,b}	47.5%	49.3%	95.8%	51.7%	
m-APACHE II score					0.003
Broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotics					0.002
Weight: model 1 score ^c					

Abbreviations: CDI, *C. difficile* infection, CO, Community onset; HO, hospital onset; ESS, effect

strength for sensitivity; LOS, length of stay; WESS, weighted effect strength for sensitivity

Legend: a) No model identified for CO-HCFA CDI. b) Healthcare-associated is the composite of HO and CO-HCFA CDI. c) Model 1 weights were derived from the CTA model shown in Figure 1.

490 **Figure 1.** CTA propensity score model and associated model performance characteristics (Model 1)

491

492 **Abbreviations:** Sens. sensitivity; Spec. specificity; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive

493 predictive value.

Figure 2. Globally optimal CTA model of healthcare-associated CDI and model performance characteristics (Final model)

Abbreviations: Sens., sensitivity; Spec., specificity; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value.

Legend: Final weighted CTA model (overall ESS = 47.5%). Final weighting accomplished using the CTA model propensity score, which was developed using a three strata model (weighted ESS = 49.3%).

Figure 3. Novometric bootstrap analysis using the CTA model of healthcare-associated CDI (Final model).

Legend: The CTA model was resampled using bootstrap resampling with replacement (n=25,000 resamples with 50% replacement) for the original model confusion matrix (see Figure 2) as well as chance (i.e., the final model predictions randomly scrambled relative to the class variable). The lack of overlap between the Chance UB and Model LB is denoted by the alignment (rather than reversal) of the dashed lines with the corresponding Chance (sky blue) and Model (pink) bootstrap distributions.

Abbreviations: LB, lower bound of the 95% CI (i.e., 2.5th percentile); UB, upper bound of the 95% CI (i.e., 97.5th percentile).

Appendix

Figure S1. Northwestern Memorial Hospital CAP algorithm for non-ICU patients.

Legend: Patients with two or fewer pre-defined risk factors associated with respiratory infections caused by expanded spectrum Gram-negative pathogens (*Pseudomonas aeruginosa*) are recommended to receive standard empiric CAP therapy (e.g. ceftriaxone with azithromycin) and those patients with three or more risk factors associated with expanded spectrum Gram-negative pathogens are recommended to receive empiric broad-spectrum Gram-negative antibiotic coverage (e.g. piperacillin-tazobactam, cefepime) with a macrolide, as appropriate, based upon patient-specific drug allergies. Gram-positive risk necessitating empiric Gram-positive coverage (e.g. vancomycin, linezolid) is defined as the presence of two or more demographic risk factors or in those patients whose clinical presentation is consistent with MRSA pneumonia.