



Clinical profile and outcome of patients with pancreatic necrosis infected with carbapenem resistant infections (PanCRI): A prospective observational study



Keywords:

Carbapenem-resistant organisms
Pancreatic infections
Klebsiella pneumoniae
Ceftazidime-avibactam
Tigecycline

Dear Editor,

We read with interest the article by Lin C et al. that has shown high sensitivity and negative predictive value of metagenomic next-generation sequencing in the diagnosis of infections among patients with pancreatic necrosis. The authors stressed upon the importance of having confirmed microbiological diagnosis and possible harms associated with empiric antibiotics. This is especially important in countries with a high burden of carbapenem resistant infections as carbapenems are usually considered as antibiotics of choice owing to their good pancreatic concentrations.

We conducted a single-center prospective observational study from June 5, 2022 to December 31, 2022 among patients diagnosed with carbapenem resistant organisms (CRO)-infected necrotizing pancreatitis (approval number AIG/EIC-BH&R 29/06.2022–05). Consecutive patients diagnosed with CRO pancreatic infections were recruited from wards and intensive care units after taking written informed consent. Data including baseline characteristics at the time of diagnosing CRO infection, interventions performed, organisms isolated, antibiotics received, and superadded infections were noted. The primary objective was to study the treatment outcomes of CRO-infected pancreatic necrosis on day 28 and determine the clinical failure predictors. CRO infection was defined in a patient with pancreatic necrosis not improving on empiric antibiotics who had a pancreatic tissue sample or a drain growing a micro-organism that was found to be resistant to carbapenem on

Abbreviations: ALT, Alanine transaminase; BL-BLI, Beta Lactam-Beta Lactamase Inhibitor; CRO, Carbapenem Resistant Organisms; CT, Computed Tomography; DEN, Direct Endoscopic Necrosectomy; EUS, Endoscopic ultrasound; FNAC, Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology; NDM, New Delhi Metallo-beta-lactamase; SOFA, Serial Organ Failure Assessment; TLC, Total leucocyte counts.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pan.2023.06.009>

1424-3903/© 2023 IAP and EPC. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

susceptibility testing. Patients with CRO infection were followed to the hospital until day 28 or discharge/death (whichever was earlier) from the recruitment day. The outcome was a clinical success if the patient improved clinically and was either discharged or showed stabilization/improvement in Serial Organ Failure Assessment score (SOFA) by day 28 from the time of recruitment. Conversely, the outcome was a clinical failure if the patient had expired or had deterioration in SOFA score by more than two from the time of recruitment.

During the study period, we recruited 48 patients with pancreatitis infected with CRO (Table 1 and Table 2). Of 48 patients with CRO-infected pancreatitis, ten patients succumbed to illness (20.8%). Clinical success was observed in 32 (66.6%) patients on Day 28 after diagnosis of CRO infection, whereas 16 patients had a clinical failure (33%). In univariate analysis, high SOFA score, APACHE II score, total leucocyte count (TLC), alanine transaminase (ALT), elevated blood urea, the requirement of oxygen, the requirement of vasopressors, and low albumin at the time of diagnosis of CRO infection were associated with higher clinical failure rates (Table 1). There was a trend toward increased adverse outcomes in patients who developed *Candida auris* infection.

Delayed drainage and debridement approach for treating infected necrotizing pancreatitis is favored as the collections take approximately 3–4 weeks to form walled-off necrosis and liquefy. In between, patients receive empiric antibiotics and other supportive care, with which a proportion of patients are rescued from intervention [1,2]. Traditionally, carbapenem antibiotics are preferred over other antibiotics due to their better penetration into the pancreatic tissue [3]. However, the increased prevalence of carbapenem-resistant infections poses a significant challenge to this approach [4]. Unlike severe acute pancreatitis, where culture isolation from the extra pancreatic site is more common, most patients with pancreatic necrosis are diagnosed with CRO infection only after drainage [5]. More importantly, 56% of patients were on ineffective empiric antibiotics against the eventually isolated bacteria. In this context, where empiric therapy is ineffective in many cases and the role of early microbiological diagnosis using invasive techniques or metagenomic next generation sequencing needs to be discussed. In previous studies, the role of fine needle aspiration (FNAC) cultures for diagnosing infected pancreatic necrosis was discredited due to no difference in diagnostic accuracy compared to clinical features and imaging [6]. However, clinical features and imaging cannot differentiate carbapenem-resistant infections from carbapenem-sensitive infections. Therefore, in areas with a high prevalence of carbapenem-resistant infections, the

Table 1
Comparison of clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients with CRE-infected pancreatic necrosis.

Parameters	Clinical success (n = 32)	Clinical failure (n = 16)	p-value	
Age	39.4 ± 10.8	43.2 ± 14.8	0.075	
Male gender	31 (96.8%)	13 (81.2%)	0.065	
Diabetes mellitus	11 (34.3%)	3 (18.8%)	0.262	
Hypertension	8 (25%)	5 (31.2%)	0.646	
SOFA score	1 [1,2]	6 (2–9)	.000	
APACHE II SCORE	6 (4–10)	12 (9–16)	.001	
Fever	17 (53.1%)	10 (62.5%)	0.537	
Oxygen requirement	8 (25%)	12 (75%)	0.01	
Vasopressor requirement	1 (3.1%)	8 (50%)	<0.001	
Parenteral requirement	2 (6.3%)	3 (18.8%)	0.181	
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	26 (81.3%)	12 (75%)	0.358	
<i>Candida auris</i>	3 (9.4%)	5 (31.3%)	0.055	
Time from admission to <i>Candida</i> isolation	29.3 ± 13	35.4 ± 2.7	0.017	
<i>Enterococci</i>	6 (18.8%)	5 (31.3%)	0.331	
Time to <i>Enterococci</i> isolation	34.8 ± 15.1	32 ± 8.8	0.205	
Polymicrobial infection	4 (12.5%)	1 (6.3%)	0.504	
Resistance				
	Colistin	4/32	2/16	0.359
	Minocycline	22/31	11/16	0.765
	Tigecycline	7/32	3/14	0.124
	Fosfomycin	6/7	6/9	0.038
	Amikacin	18/32	11/16	0.404
	Ceftazidime	29/31	16/16	0.449
Before culture	Carbapenem	19 (59.37%)	13 (81.25%)	0.13
	BL-BLI	21 (65.6%)	9 (56.2%)	0.527
	Aminoglycoside	5 (15.6%)	1 (6.2%)	0.355
	Tigecycline	9 (28.1%)	9 (56.2%)	0.058
	Minocycline	1 (3.1%)	0	0.475
	Polymyxins	5 (15.6%)	5 (31.2%)	0.209
After culture	Ceftazidime-avibactam ± Aztreonam	11 (34.4%)	7 (43.7%)	0.527
	Polymyxins	8 (25%)	8 (50%)	0.083
	Minocycline	3 (9.4%)	1 (6.25%)	0.712
	Tigecycline	21 (65.6%)	8 (50%)	0.297
	Fosfomycin	2 (6.25%)	2 (12.5%)	0.46
	Amikacin	10 (31.25%)	2 (12.5%)	0.157
Procalcitonin (Median)	0.77 (0.32–1.96)	0.83 (0.6–7.9)	0.458	
Open necrosectomy	9 (28.12%)	6 (37.5%)	0.509	
PCD	24 (75%)	15 (93.7%)	0.117	
EUS drainage	10 (31.25%)	4 (25%)	0.653	
DEN	6 (18.8%)	2 (12.5%)	0.584	
Time from admission to culture positive	10 (6.5–19)	10 (5–26)	.869	
TLC (cells/mm ³)	13,300 (10,050–15800)	20,700 (10,300–38100)	.012	
Albumin level (grams/dl)	2.6 (2.2–3)	2.3 (2.1–2.7)	.010	
Blood Urea (mg/dl)	21 (18–25.5)	56 (34–63)	<0.001	
Creatinine (mg/dl)	0.7 (0.68–0.74)	0.7 (0.67–0.86)	.662	
Total Bilirubin (mg/dl)	0.9 (0.6–1.15)	1.2 (0.8–2.2)	.057	
AST	25 (17–51)	38 (29–90)	.067	
ALT	15 (11–33.5)	30 (21–69)	.015	
Duration of antibiotics	14 (8.5–21)	12 (7–23)	.574	

SOFA- Serial organ failure assessment; APACHE II- Acute Physiology and Chronic health evaluation II; PCD- Percutaneous drainage; EUS-Endoscopic ultrasound; DEN-Direct endoscopic necrosectomy; TLC-Total leucocyte count; AST- Aspartate transaminase; ALT-Alanine transaminase.

role of FNAC cultures needs to be reinvestigated. The role of metagenomic next generation sequencing for suspected infected pancreatic necrosis should be further studied not only to identify the causative microorganism but also to understand the genomic resistance to improve the patient outcomes.

Author contributions

Praveen T, Shravani E and Siva K contributed to study conception. Anand G, Hardik R and HariPriya C contributed to design of study. Shravani E and Chandu D carried out the study. Chandu D, Nitin G and Aniruddha P analyzed and interpreted the data. Sadhana V, Naveen P and Santhosh S drafted the article. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of manuscript.

Table 2
Outcomes of Ceftazidime-avibactam and Aztreonam in managing CR *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolates.

Sn	Age/sex	Duration of ceftazidime-avibactam + aztreonam	Antibiotics received before Ceftazidime avibactam + aztreonam	Carba R test	Phenotypic double disc test for synergy	Outcomes
01	25/M	17 days	Meropenem, Cefoperazone -Sulbactam, Polymyxin B	Not done	Not done	Survived
02	18/M	6 days	Tigecycline, Imipenem - Cilastatin	NDM & OXA-48	Not done	Survived
03	45/M	16 days	Tigecycline, Imipenem - Cilastatin	NDM & OXA-48	Not done	Survived
04	23/M	28 days	Tigecycline, Imipenem - Cilastatin	Not done	Synergy positive	Survived
05	24/M	10 days	Cefoperazone - sulbactam, Imipenem - Cilastatin	NDM	Not done	Survived
06	36/M	14 days	Colistin, Minocycline	NDM	Not done	Survived
07	56/F	17 days	Meropenem, Cefoperazone - sulbactam	NDM & OXA-48	Not done	Survived
08	55/M	08 days	Meropenem, Tigecycline	NDM & OXA-48	Not done	Expired
09	34/M	10 days	Meropenem, Amikacin	Not done	Synergy positive	Survived
10	53/M	02 days	Meropenem, Cefoperazone -sulbactam, Tigecycline, Polymyxin - B	Not done	Not done	Mortality
11	40/M	08 days	Meropenem, Tigecycline, Colistin	NDM & OXA-48	Not done	Survival
12	49/M	22 days	Meropenem, Cefoperazone + -sulbactam, Tigecycline, Polymyxin - B	Not done	Not done	Mortality
13	35/M	22 days	Tigecycline, Meropenem	Not done	Synergy positive	Survived
14	45/M	28 days	Polymyxin B, Tigecycline, Meropenem	Not done	Synergy positive	Survived
15	44/M	06 days	Cefoperazone -Sulbactam, Piperacillin -Tazobactam	Not done	Synergy positive	Survived
16	36/M	25 days	Meropenem	Not done	Synergy positive	Survived
17	55/M	05 days	Imipenem + Cilastatin, Tigecycline.	Not done	Synergy positive	Survived
18	31/M	12 days (Ceftazidime + Avibactam) alone	Cefoperazone + sulbactam, Imipenem + Cilastatin	OXA-48	Not done	Survived

NDM - New Delhi metallo-beta-lactamase.

Funding

All the authors disclose that there are no financial or non-financial interests that are directly or indirectly related to the work submitted for publication.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

- [1] van Santvoort HC, Bakker OJ, Bollen TL, Besselink MG, Ahmed Ali U, Schrijver AM, et al. A conservative and minimally invasive approach to necrotizing pancreatitis improves outcome. *Gastroenterology* 2011 Oct;141(4):1254–63.
- [2] Mouli VP, Sreenivas V, Garg PK. Efficacy of conservative treatment, without necrosectomy, for infected pancreatic necrosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* 2013 Feb;144(2):333–40. e2.
- [3] Tenner S, Baillie J, DeWitt J, Vege SS. American College of Gastroenterology. American College of Gastroenterology guideline: management of acute pancreatitis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013 Sep;108(9):1400–15. 1416.
- [4] Garg A, Garg J, Kumar S, Bhattacharya A, Agarwal S, Upadhyay GC. Molecular epidemiology & therapeutic options of carbapenem-resistant Gram-negative bacteria. *Indian J Med Res* 2019 Feb;149(2):285–9.
- [5] Wu D, Huang Y, Xiao J, Qin G, Liu H, Peng J. Risk factors for mortality among critical acute pancreatitis patients with carbapenem-resistant organism infections and drug resistance of causative pathogens. *Infect Dis Ther* 2022 Jun;11(3):1089–101.
- [6] van Baal MC, Bollen TL, Bakker OJ, van Goor H, Boermeester MA, Dejong CH, et al. The role of routine fine-needle aspiration in the diagnosis of infected necrotizing pancreatitis. *Surgery* 2014 Mar;155(3):442–8.

Shravani Etrouth
Department of Clinical Pharmacy, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: etrouthshravani@gmail.com.

Praveen Kumar Tirlangi*
Department of Infectious Diseases, Kasturba Medical College,
Manipal, India
Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India

Nitin Gupta
Department of Infectious Diseases, Kasturba Medical College,
Manipal, India

Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India
E-mail address: nityanitingupta@gmail.com.

Santosh Reddy Satti, Chandu Priyanka Dasari
Department of Clinical Pharmacy, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail addresses: dr.santhoshreddycp@aighospitals.com (S.R. Satti),
chandu.d2510@gmail.com (C.P. Dasari).

Sadhana Veturi
Department of Microbiology, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: dr.sadhana@aighospitals.com.

Siva Kumar
Department of Critical Care Medicine, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: sivakumarl.dr@gmail.com.

Hardik Rughwani
Department of Gastroenterology, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: hardik.hr@gmail.com.

Aniruddha Pratap Singh
Department of Gastroenterology, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: draniruddhapratapsingh@gmail.com.

Anand Gupta
Department of Critical Care Medicine, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: dranand.g@aighospitals.com.

Hari Priya Reddy Challa
Department of Infectious Diseases, AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: challa.haripriya.reddy@gmail.com.

Naveen Reddy Podduturi
AIG Hospitals, Hyderabad, India
E-mail address: dr.naveen.reddy@aighospitals.com.

* Corresponding author. Department of Infectious Diseases,
Kasturba Medical College, Manipal, Karnataka, 576104, India.
E-mail address: praveenkuma.124@gmail.com (P.K. Tirlangi).

Available online 26 June 2023