Results The study included 61 patients (55.7% female) receiving vancomycin (n=39) or gentamicin (n=22) with mean age of 65.9 ± 19.5 years and mean Cr of 0.7 ± 0.5 mg/mL. The main diagnosis was urinary tract (18.0%) or osteoarticular (14.8%) infection; 104 analytical determinations were conducted (69.2% vancomycin, 30.8% gentamicin); and 57.6% of Pcs were outside the therapeutic range. PIs were: PI-1 (42.3%), PI-2 (53.8%) and PI-3 (3.8%). The reasons for vancomycin versus gentamicin suspension were: 'clinical/microbiological recovery' (66.6 vs. 31.8%); 'therapeutic failure' (2.6 vs. 0.0%); 'de-escalation' (7.7 vs. 22.7%); 'sequential therapy' (17.9 vs. 40.9%); 'severe toxicity' (0.0 vs. 4.5%); or death (5.2 vs. 0.0%). We observed nephrotoxicity in 2.6% of vancomycin-treated patients and 9.0% of gentamicin-treated patients.

Conclusion The pharmacist adds value to antimicrobial optimisation. Dose or interval modification (PI-2) was the most frequent intervention, increasing treatment effectiveness in a large number of patients and minimising as far as possible the risk of nephrotoxicity.

REFERENCE AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alcazar CM, *et al.* *Eur J Hosp Pharm* 2017;24:A171.

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-046

PHARMACEUTICAL INTERVENTIONS IN ANTIMICROBIAL TREATMENT IN A 150-BED HOSPITAL

¹R Gázquez Pérez, ²LE Lobo León, ²MJ Lorente Galisteo, ²L Jiménez Pichardo, ¹A Alcalá Soto*, ¹C Puivecino Moreno, ¹A Varas Pérez, ¹V Sánchez-Matamoros Piazza. ¹Hospital Universitario Jerez de La Frontera, Pharmacy Service, Jerez de La Frontera Cádiz, Spain; ²Hospital San Juan Grande, Pharmacy Service, Jerez De La Frontera Cádiz, Spain

10.1136/ejhp-pharm-2019-eahpconf.195

Background The correct use of antimicrobial treatment is necessary to ensure their effectiveness, the control of resistance and to avoid the occurrence of adverse reactions.

Purpose To analyse the pharmaceutical interventions (PI) in antimicrobial treatment and quantify the degree of their acceptance.

Material and methods Descriptive and retrospective study in a 150 bed-hospital was made. PI on antimicrobial treatments were analysed over a period of 16 months (December 2016 – March 2018). The collected data were: age, antimicrobial treatment, type of PI and degree of acceptance of the PI. The reasons for PI were classified into: inadequate dosage, dose adjustment due to renal insufficiency, drug change after antibiogram, therapeutic duplicity, suspension of treatment due to inadequate duration and change of route of administration. The degree of acceptance of the PI was detected based on the medical prescription modifications according to the recommendations. The pharmaceutical recommendations were made through the daily evolutions in the patient's history in the Ticares computer program.

Results Two-hundred and forty-four PI were carried out in 132 patients (1.84 PI per patient). The average age of the patients was 79 years (53% women). The PI, according to classification were: 160 (65.6%) PI due to changes in the antimicrobial administration route (92 were accepted, 57.5%); 70 (28.7%) PI due to suspension of treatment due to inadequate duration (44 were accepted, 62.90%); seven (2.9%) PI for dose adjustment due to renal failure (three were accepted, 42.9%); three (1.2%) PI due to therapeutic duplicity (100%

accepted); three (1.2%) PI due to inadequate posology (two were accepted, 66.7%); and one (0.4%) PI due to antimicrobial change after antibiogram (the patient was discharged and it could not be confirmed if there was a change in the prescription). Regarding the degree of acceptance, 144 (59%) IP were accepted and 60 (37,29%) IP were not accepted.

Conclusion More than half of the pharmaceutical interventions resulted in a change in the medical prescription according to the recommendation. The pharmaceutical validation adds safety to the hospitalisation process and represents an improvement in the quality of care.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-047

FEASIBILITY OF PHARMACY FOLLOW-UP OF ANTIBIOTIC RE-EVALUATION IN A UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL: DAY-2 OR/AND DAY-7?

H Benoist*, R Baveux, G Saint-Lorant. *Caen University Hospital, Pharmacy, Caen, France*

10.1136/ejhp-pharm-2019-eahpconf.196

Background Despite the benefits of antibiotic re-evaluation (decrease in the emergence of bacterial resistance, adverse effects and costs) physicians do not systematically trace it. In our hospital, after the implementation in June 2013 of a day-2 antibiotic re-evaluation (AR) module in the prescription software and three awareness periods of prescribers, only 53% of AR were done for 10 high-risk antibiotics.

Purpose The aim of this work was to study the feasibility of a follow-up by pharmacy of antibiotic re-evaluation.

Material and methods All antibiotic re-evaluation of the 10 antibiotics followed in 2017 were analysed by pharmacy from the AR module (status of prescriber, indication, date of AR). This analysis was compared with the number of patients initiated under these antibiotics and delivered by the pharmacy. In order to determine the feasibility of follow-up, all antibiotic prescriptions were analysed during 2 weeks to know the number of prescriptions and re-evaluation at day-2 and day-7 delivered by the pharmacy per day.

Results In 2017, there were 464 patients treated with linezolid and only 34 AR were traced at day-2 (7.3%). For other antibiotics, AR module use rate was: Imipenem/Cilastatine 38/308 (12.3%), Ceftazidime 32/225 (14.2%), Levofloxacin 130/590 (22%) and Cefepime 42/137 (30.7%). The AR was made on average at 4.3 days. A mean of 85 antibiotic prescriptions were analysed and delivered by the pharmacy per day. Among these prescriptions a daily mean of 31 prescriptions were sent to the pharmacy at day-2 and four at day-7. To enable the feasibility of follow-up, infectious disease physicians have validated an exhaustive list of infections requiring antibiotic therapy for more than 7 days, based on new international antibiotic therapy duration recommendations. This list allows the pharmacy to check the indication of treatment and to dispense antibiotics or not at day-7.

Conclusion Pharmacists have a crucial role to play in the AR through its follow-up. A day-7 AR module will be added in early 2019 to our prescription software. The day-7 follow-up of all antibiotic prescriptions by the pharmacy and its ability to halt dispensing might reduce the emergence of bacterial resistance and limit antibiotic consumption through a better traceability of AR.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-048 QUALITY OF THE EMPIRIC ANTIBIOTIC TREATMENT IN COMMUNITY-ACQUIRED PNEUMONIA

S Conde*, MD Belles, C Raga, M Tripijana, T Cebolla, M Juan, R Ferrando. *Hospital General Universitario de Castellón, Hospital Pharmacy, Castellón, Spain*

10.1136/ejhp-2019-eahpconf.197

Background Due to the increasing threat of antibiotic resistance it is highly important to fit the antibiotic therapy to the infectious disease and the most prevalent microorganism responsible for it.

Purpose Analyse the empirical antibiotic prescription (EAP) profile of the patients with community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) who required hospital admission depending on the clinical unit.

Material and methods A retrospective observational study was performed during March 2018 in which the EAP of the patients with CAP who were admitted to the internal medicine (IM) or pneumology (NEM) unit were monitored.

Age, sex, medical unit, comorbidities (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, bronchiectasis, diabetes, nephropathy, heart failure), hospitalisation in the previous 30 days, C reactive protein and procalcitonine were registered. The FINE score was calculated to assess disease gravity. EAP was recorded.

Patients were stratified according to the medical unit and EAP was evaluated based on the agreement with clinical guidelines.

Quantitative variables are expressed as median and interquartile range and qualitative variables as percentages. The chi-squared test was performed (SPSSv.15).

Results A total of 45 patients were included. Sixty-seven per cent were admitted in the NEM unit (30/45) and 33% in the IM unit (15/45). Sixty-three per cent and 40% of the patients admitted in the NEM and IM units were women and median age was 73 (65–80) and 86 (78–91) years' old, respectively.

According to the FINE score, 57% of the NEM unit patients showed high risk and 30% medium risk. In the IM unit, 93% showed high risk.

Dual therapy based on ceftriaxone plus levofloxacin was the most frequent EAP in the NEM unit (43%), followed by levofloxacin (23%). However, in the IM unit levofloxacin (47%) was the most usual EAP followed by ceftriaxone plus levofloxacin (20%).

EAP in the NEM unit agreed with clinical guidelines and patient's condition in 50% of cases, while in the IM unit it agreed in the 80% of prescriptions ($p=0.053$).

Conclusion Empirical antibiotic treatment in community-acquired pneumonia is variable depending on the medical unit.

Although internal medicine patients showed greater severity of illness, dual therapy based on ceftriaxone and levofloxacin was prescribed in fewer rates than in the pneumology unit.

Thus, it is necessary to carry out educational activities to optimise empirical antibiotic therapy in community-acquired pneumonia.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

<http://www.elsevier.es/es-revista-medicina-clinica-2-articulo-guia-multidisciplinar-valoracion-pronostica-diagnostico-S002577531200855X>

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-049

CEFTOBIPROLE IN EMPIRICAL TREATMENT OF BONE AND JOINT INFECTIONS: SURVEY OF THE PRESCRIPTIONS, RESPECT OF THE PROTOCOL AND ECONOMIC EVALUATION OVER 6 MONTHS

¹M Debailleul*, ¹J Di Paolo, ²S Genay, ³H Dezeque, ⁴E Senneville, ⁵S Putman, ⁶H Migaud, ⁷C Loiez, ²B Decaudin, ²P Odou. ¹Institut de Pharmacie- Chu Lille, Nord, Lille, France; ²Institut de Pharmacie- Chu Lille- Ea 7365 Grita Faculté De Pharmacie- Université Lille, Nord, Lille, France; ³Centre Hospitalier Lille- Centre de Référence Des Infections Ostéoarticulaires Complexes Crioac- Lille-Tourcoing, Nord, Lille, France; ⁴Service Des Maladies Infectieuses- Centre Hospitalier de Dron- Tourcoing- Université de Lille- Lille- Centre De Référence Des Infections Ostéoarticulaires Complexes Crioac- Lille-Tourcoing, Nord, Lille-Tourcoing, France; ⁵Clinique D'orthopaédie- Chu de Lille- Université de Lille, Nord, Lille, France; ⁶Clinique D'orthopaédie- Chu Lille- Centre de Référence des Infections Ostéoarticulaires Complexes Crioac- Lille-Tourcoing, Nord, Lille, France; ⁷Institut de Microbiologie- Chu de Lille – Université de Lille, Nord, Lille, France

10.1136/ejhp-2019-eahpconf.198

Background In our hospital, a protocol is used in empirical treatment for bone and joint prosthetic device infections. It combines the use of efficient antibiotics on methicillin resistant staphylococci (MRS) with the search for gene *mecA* indicating resistance to methicillin (answer is obtained within 2 hours after the sampling). Since January 2018, the combination of daptomycin and ceftipime as empirical antibiotic therapy has been replaced by ceftobiprole. Antibiotics are administered until the result of resistance genes is available. In the case of negative response, a relay by ceftipime is performed until adaptation to antibiogram results.

Purpose The aim of this study was to evaluate the respect of this protocol and the economic impact of using ceftobiprole instead of the daptomycin-ceftipime combination.

Material and methods A prospective monocentric study was performed between January and July 2018. Data, collected by the analysis of all prescriptions, were: indications, previous history of MRS, prescriptions (monotherapy, way of administration and posology), results of expression of *mecA*, number of administrations and relays. Ceftobiprole-related cost was compared to theoretical cost of the daptomycin-ceftipime combination.

Results A total of 154 patients received ceftobiprole after surgery because of bone and/or prosthetic infections: (83/154 (55%) osteoarticular prosthesis; 59 (38%) osteosynthesis; 10 (6.5%) induced membrane technique; and one (0.5%) external fixator. Five (3%) patients had a previous history of MRS infection. Ceftobiprole monotherapy was given to 152 patients and ceftipime combination in two. All prescriptions respected dosage and administration way. Eight (5%) of the prescriptions did not comply with the protocol, including indications (six; 4%) and monotherapy (two; 1%). *MecA* search was negative for 139 (90%) of patients, positive for nine (6%) and uninterpretable for six (4%). Patients received 2.34 ± 2.57 ceftobiprole injections (2.02 ± 1.80 if *mecA* search was negative). When negative, a switch to ceftipime was performed for 130 (94%) patients. The cost gain from this antibiotic therapy switch was € 24 501 in 6 months.

Conclusion This study showed a respect of ceftobiprole use in this protocol. Most of the prescriptions were compliant with protocol (indications, administrations). If *mecA* search was negative, the relay was appropriate mainly by ceftipime. The economic gain was demonstrated over this period, but it will be reassessed with the arrival of the generic of daptomycin.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.