

University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus

Factors Associated with Actionable Results on Gastrointestinal Panel Testing for Children Hospitalized with Acute Diarrhea

Erin C. Ho^{a,b}, MD, Jillian M. Cotter^a, MD, MSCS, Jacob Thomas^c, MS, Meghan Birkholz^a, MSPH, Samuel R. Dominguez^{a,b}, MD, PhD

^aDepartment of Pediatrics, ^bSection of Infectious Disease, University of Colorado School of Medicine and Children's Hospital Colorado, Aurora, CO; ^cAdult and Child Consortium for Health Outcomes

BACKGROUND

- Gastrointestinal multiplex PCR panels (GIP) are a popular testing modality for evaluating the etiology of acute gastroenteritis (AGE)
- It remains unclear which patients benefit from GIP testing as most AGE is due to a viral or unknown etiology, and treatment is supportive
- Finding a bacteria or parasite (an actionable **result)** on GIP may impact patient management and outcomes through faster initiation or targeting of antimicrobial therapy

OBJECTIVE

To assess which clinical reasons for testing (order indication) and patient factors are associated with actionable GIP results for hospitalized children with acute diarrhea

METHODS

- Cross-sectional study of hospitalized children ≤18 years with AGE, diarrhea, or dehydration and at least one GIP (FilmArray, BioFire Diagnostics) performed
- Study included 1,124 GIPs performed across 967 hospital encounters between 2015-2018 at 5 Children's Hospital Colorado sites
- Patients grouped based on underlying medical history: **CCC** (\geq 1 complex chronic condition) vs. **non-CCC** (previously healthy)
- GIP results categorized as actionable (bacteria) or parasite detected), **non-actionable** (virus only), or **no organism detected**
- Performed multivariable regression analyses to evaluate which order indications and patient factors (demographics, ICU status, number of stools) were associated with actionable results
- Excluded detection of C. difficile in patients < 1</p> year and EAEC/EPEC/ETEC in all ages due to high rates of asymptomatic carriage

RESULTS

Table 1: Characteristics of study population

	All Encounters N = 967	Non-CCC N = 478	CCC N = 489
Age (years)	3.7 (1.2-10.7)	3.0 (1.0-11.2)	4.5 (1.4-10.4)
Female gender	446 (46.1%)	221 (46.2%)	225 (46.0%)
Ethnicity*			
Not Hispanic/Latino Hispanic/Latino Unknown	641 (66.3%) 292 (30.2%) 34 (3.5%)	316 (66.1%) 137 (28.7%) 25 (5.2%)	325 (66.5%) 155 (31.7%) 9 (1.8%)
ICU stay*	238 (24.6%)	60 (12.6%)	178 (36.4%)
Length of stay (hours)*	90.8 (47.4-196.6)	65.0 (41.6-109.1)	140.5 (69.3-382.6)
> 1 GIP performed*	94 (9.7%)	27 (5.6%)	67 (13.7%)
Time to first GIP (hours)*	17.5 (5.5-48.6)	13.4 (4.7-27.2)	24.2 (7.0-92.4)
< 72 hours to first GIP*	777 (80.4%)	430 (90.0%)	347 (71.0%)

N represents the number of hospital encounters; values as N(%) or median (interguartile range) * Indicates p-value < 0.05 between CCC and non-CCC

Table 3: Multivariable regression analysis – factors assoc. with actionable results

		Non-CCC			CCC	
	Variable ^a	RR (95% CI)	p-value	Variable	RR (95% CI)	p-value
Age	(years)			Age (years)		
1-	-2 (vs. < 1)	4.53 (2.56 - 7.99)	<0.001	1-2 (vs. < 1)	7.38 (2.68 - 20.37)	<0.001
2-	-5	3.43 (1.92 - 6.13)	<0.001	2-5	7.14 (2.59 - 19.69)	<0.001
2	5	3.72 (2.16 - 6.42)	<0.001	≥ 5	5.62 (2.07 - 15.24)	<0.001
Male	gender	0.73 (0.57 - 0.94)	0.014	Male gender	0.78 (0.57 - 1.06)	0.11
Seaso	on			Season		
S	pring (vs. winter)	1.57 (1.03 - 2.39)	0.037	Spring (vs. winter)	0.84 (0.55 - 1.27)	0.41
Si	ummer	1.91 (1.27 - 2.87)	0.002	Summer	0.94 (0.61 - 1.46)	0.79
Fa	all	1.49 (0.96 - 2.3)	0.074	Fall	1.12 (0.75 - 1.68)	0.58
ICU	Admission	0.92 (0.62 - 1.38)	0.70	ICU Admission	0.66 (0.48 - 0.92)	0.015
$\geq 4 s$	tools per day	1.24 (0.92 - 1.67)	0.15	\geq 4 stools per day	0.74 (0.55 - 1)	0.052
Orde	r Indication ^b			Order Indication ^b		
• D bl	iarrhea with lood or pus	1.53 (1.09 - 2.13)	0.013	• Diarrhea with blood or pus	1.3 (0.86 - 1.96)	0.22
• So di	evere water-loss iarrhea	0.79 (0.52 - 1.19)	0.25			
• In	nternational travel	1.54 (0.9 - 2.62)	0.11			
• Ej	pi/surveillance sting	0.39 (0.1 - 1.46)	0.16			
• 0	ther	0.98 (0.66 - 1.47)	0.92			

^a Variables age, gender, season, ICU admission, and number of daily stools were determined a priori ^b Individual GIP order indications were included only if associated with actionable results in bivariate analyses with a p-value < 0.2.

Table 2: Prevalence of provider-reported GIP order indications

· · ·		
GIP Order Indication	Non-CCC N = 512	CCC N = 612
'Diarrhea with blood or pus'*	106 (20.7%)	79 (12.9%)
'Concern for C. difficile'*	50 (9.8%)	119 (19.4%)
'Prolonged diarrhea (>7 days)'*	79 (15.4%)	58 (9.5%)
'Severe water-loss diarrhea/dehydration'	109 (21.3%)	120 (19.6%)
'Hemolytic uremic syndrome'	6 (1.2%)	2 (0.3%)
'International travel-associated diarrhea'*	18 (3.5%)	1 (0.2%)
'Epidemiologic/surveillance testing'*	19 (3.7%)	48 (7.8%)
'Other'*	125 (24.4%)	185 (30.2%)
		1 0.05

N represents the number of GIP tests; values as N(%); * Indicates p-value < 0.05

Figure 1: Prevalence of GIP result type by order indication



■ Actionable result (bacteria or parasit

Proportion (%) of GIP result types for each order indication, by CCC status; N represents the number of GIP tests. ^a N < 10



CONCLUSIONS

N. CCC

- Age > 1 year was strongly associated with actionable results for both non-CCC and CCC cohorts
- For non-CCC (previously healthy) patients, **bloody** stools, international travel, and non-winter **season** were associated with actionable results
- For CCC patients, no order indications were associated with actionable results; **ICU admission** was negative associated

IMPLICATIONS

There are some identifiable factors (e.g., age < 1 yr) and order indications, especially for previously healthy children, that may be useful for improving diagnostic stewardship of GIP testing

000

31.3% $39.0%$ $(N = 512)$ $20.6%$ $30.7%$ $48.7%$ $(N = 612)$ 6 $17.0%$ $40.5%$ (106) $26.6%$ $19.0%$ $54.4%$ (79) $30.0%$ $44.0%$ (50) $22.7%$ $17.6%$ $59.7%$ (119) $34.2%$ $36.7%$ (79) $20.7%$ $27.6%$ $51.7%$ (58) $45.9%$ $31.2%$ (109) $16.7%$ $46.7%$ $36.6%$ (120) $83.3%$ $16.7%$ 60 * $50.0%$ $50.0%$ (2) *	Non-CC	Ċ				
6 17.0% 40.5% (106) 26.6% 19.0% 54.4% (79) 30.0% 44.0% (50) 22.7% 17.6% 59.7% (119) 34.2% 36.7% (79) 20.7% 27.6% 51.7% (58) 45.9% 31.2% (109) 16.7% 46.7% 36.6% (120) 83.3% 16.7% $(6)^a$ 50.0% 50.0% $(2)^a$	31.3%	39.0%	(N = 512)	20.6% 30.7%	48.7%	(N = 612)
30.0% 44.0% (50) 22.7% 17.6% 59.7% (119) 34.2% 36.7% (79) 20.7% 27.6% 51.7% (58) 45.9% 31.2% (109) 16.7% 46.7% 36.6% (120) 83.3% 16.7% $(6)^a$ 50.0% 50.0% $(2)^a$	/o 17.0%	40.5%	(106)	26.6% 19.0%	54.4%	(79)
34.2% 36.7% (79) 20.7% 27.6% 51.7% (58) 45.9% 31.2% (109) 16.7% 46.7% 36.6% (120) 83.3% 16.7% $(6)^{a}$ 50.0% 50.0% $(2)^{a}$	30.0%	44.0%	(50)	22.7% 17.6%	59.7%	(119)
45.9% 31.2% (109) 16.7% 46.7% 36.6% (120) 83.3% 16.7% $(6)^a$ 50.0% 50.0% $(2)^a$	34.2%	36.7%	(79)	20.7% 27.6%	51.7%	(58)
83.3% 16.7% (6) a 50.0% (2) a (2) a	45.9%	31.2%	(109)	16.7% 46.7%	36.6%	(120)
	83.3%	16.7%	(6) ^a	50.0%	50.0%	(2) ^a
$0\% \qquad 11.1\% \qquad 38.9\% \qquad (18) \qquad 100.0\% \qquad (1)^{a}$	0% 11.1%	38.9%	(18)	100.0%	/ 0	(1) ^a
47.4% 42.1% (19) 18.8% 39.6% 41.6% (48)	47.4%	42.1%	(19)	18.8% 39.6%	41.6%	(48)
31.2% 44.8% (125) 18.9% 33.0% 48.1% (185)	31.2%	44.8%	(125)	18.9% 33.0%	48.1%	(185)
% OF TESTS		% OF	TESTS			
te) \square Non-actionable result (virus only) \square No organism	te)	■ Non-action	nable rea	sult (virus only)		organism