



Vancomycin AUC:MIC-Based Dosing is Associated with Significantly Less Acute Kidney Injury in Patients Admitted to a Burn Intensive Care Unit

Kaitlin A. Pruskowski, PharmD, BCPS, BCCCP, FCCM^{1,2} and Gregory C. Rummel, BS, MD Candidate 2023²

¹US Army Institute of Surgical Research, JBSA Fort Sam Houston, TX ²Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, MD

The opinions or assertions contained herein are the private views of the author and are not to be construed as official or as reflecting the views of the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense.

Introduction

- Vancomycin is the drug of choice for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA)
- Vancomycin is proven to be nephrotoxic and demonstrates an exposure-response relationship
- Traditionally trough-based dosing >15 mcg/mL were found to have a greater risk of vancomycin associated acute kidney injury (VIKI)
- Trough dosing underestimates true AUC by approximately 25%
- American Society of Health-Systems Pharmacist (ASHP) updated vancomycin dosing guidelines to target AUC 400-600 mcg*h/mL in 2020.
- Bayesian modeling is the gold-standard for pharmacokinetic calculations and AUC:MIC modeling, but models in critically ill and burn patients are limited

Objectives

- To compare the incidence of acute kidney injury (AKI) in patients who were dosed to achieve a target trough 15-20 mcg/mL to those who were dosed to target AUC: MIC 400-600 mcg*h/mL

Methods

- Retrospective cohort study
- Inclusion Criteria:
 - Age ≥ 18 years
 - Admitted to BICU between January 2017 through December 2020
 - Received at least 24 hours of vancomycin therapy
- Exclusion Criteria
 - Receiving renal replacement therapy at the time of vancomycin administration
 - History of chronic kidney disease
- Trapezoidal method was used to calculate AUC
- AKIN criteria was used to determine incidence of AKI

Results

- Two hundred thirty-five subjects who received 317 courses of vancomycin were included.
- One hundred twenty courses were dosed to achieve an AUC goal, and 197 courses were dosed to achieve a trough goal.
- Patients in the AUC group received significantly less vancomycin than in the trough group
- Risk factors for AKI and administration of concomitant nephrotoxins were similar between the two groups

Table 1. Demographic characteristics

	Trough-Based (N=150)	AUC:MIC-Based (N=85)	P-value
Age, years, mean ± SD	46.6 ± 17.7	48.7 ± 18.3	0.199
Male gender, n (%)	105 (70%)	61 (71.7%)	0.775
Admission body weight, kg, mean ± SD	90.9 ± 28.2	91.7 ± 26.5	0.414
ICU LOS, days, mean ± SD	21.2 ± 23.2	20.3 ± 28	0.601
Hospital LOS, days, mean ± SD	36.3 ± 40.9	33.6 ± 36.5	0.699
%TBSA, mean ± SD	24.6 ± 20.5	25.4 ± 16.9	0.401
Admission diagnosis			0.494
Burn, n (%)	97 (64.6%)	48 (56.5%)	
NSTI, n (%)	28 (18.7%)	21 (24.7%)	
Skin disease	16 (10.7%)	7 (8.3%)	
Polytrauma	8 (5.3%)	3 (3.5%)	
Other	6 (4%)	3 (3.5%)	

Table 2. Vancomycin and Concomitant Nephrotoxins

	Trough-Based (N=197)	AUC:MIC-Based (N=120)	P-value
Total daily dose, mg, mean ± SD	3524 ± 1551	3145 ± 1491	0.032
Concomitant nephrotoxins	103 (52.3%)	50 (41.6%)	0.093
Aminoglycoside, n (%)	48 (24.5%)	24 (20.5%)	0.419
Piperacillin/tazobactam, n (%)	52 (26.5%)	18 (15.4%)	0.022
Liposomal amphotericin B, n (%)	3 (1.5%)	8 (6.8%)	0.022
Voriconazole, n (%)	1 (0.5%)	8 (6.8%)	0.002
Acyclovir, n (%)	2 (1%)	1 (0.9%)	1.000
NSAID, n (%)	14 (7.1%)	9 (7.7%)	0.857

Table 3. AKI and Known Risk Factors

	Trough-Based (N=197)	AUC:MIC-Based (N=120)	P-value
AKI, n (%)	40 (20.3%)	12 (10.3%)	0.017
Known risk factor for AKI, n (%)	104 (52.8%)	65 (55.6%)	0.635
History of hypertension, n (%)	66 (33.5%)	32 (26.7%)	0.202
Concomitant furosemide, n (%)	39 (19.8%)	35 (29.9%)	0.041
Renal insufficiency, n (%)	25 (12.7%)	25 (21.4%)	0.042

Conclusions

- Using AUC:MIC-based dosing was associated with a decreased incidence of AKI than trough-based dosing in patients admitted to the burn ICU
- AUC:MIC-based dosing was associated with significantly lower total daily doses of vancomycin

References

1. Kelesidis T, et al. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2016;37:70-9
2. Lodise TP, et al. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;49:507-14
3. Neely M, et al. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy* 2014;58(1):309-316
4. Mogile BT, et al. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2018;52:805-10
5. Neely M, et al. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy* 2014;58(1):309-316

Statements

This study was conducted under a protocol reviewed and approved by the USAISR Research Regulatory Department with a HIPAA waiver approved by the US Army Medical Research and Development Command Institutional Review Board and in accordance with the approved protocol.