



Risk of Clostridioides difficile infection recurrence in the VINCat hospitals: a prospective observational cohort study

Journal:	<i>Future Microbiology</i>
Manuscript ID	FMB-2022-0076.R1
Manuscript Type:	Short Communication
Keywords:	Clostridioides difficile infection, colitis, recurrence, risk factors

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Short communication

1
2
3 1
4
5
6 2 **Risk of *Clostridioides difficile* infection recurrence in the VINCat hospitals: a**
7
8
9 3 **prospective observational cohort study**

10
11
12 4 **ABSTRACT**13
14
15 5 Background

16
17
18 6 The 2016 cumulative incidence of *Clostridioides difficile* infection (CDI) in Spain was reported by
19
20
21 7 European Center for Disease Control (ECDC) to be above the mean of other European countries. The
22
23 8 aim of this multicenter prospective observational cohort study was to examine the risk factors that
24
25 9 determine 90-day CDI recurrence in Catalonia, Spain.

26
27
28 10 Methods

29
30
31 11 The study included 558 consecutive adults admitted to hospital who had a symptomatic, first positive,
32
33 12 CDI diagnosis. Sociodemographic, clinical, and epidemiological variables were recorded. The primary
34
35 13 outcome was 90-day CDI recurrence.

36
37
38 14 Results

39
40
41 15 In this Catalan population, having received more than 1 course of antibiotics in the 30 days prior to
42
43 16 CDI diagnosis (OR=2.459, 95% CI: 1.195; 5.060, $p=0.015$) and active chemotherapy (OR=4.859, 95% CI:
44
45 17 1.495; 15.792, $p=0.009$) are significant predictors of 90-day CDI recurrence.

46
47
48
49 18 Conclusions

50
51
52 19 The identification of independent risk factors of 90-day CDI recurrence will enable the optimization of
53
54 20 preventive measures in at-risk populations.

55
56
57 21 **KEYWORDS**
58
59
60

1
2
3 22 *Clostridioides difficile* infection, colitis, recurrence, risk factors
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

23 Introduction

24 *Clostridioides difficile*, is a Gram-positive, spore-forming, strict anaerobic bacterium that causes *C.*
25 *difficile* infection (CDI). It is transmitted via the oral-fecal route and it is the main cause of healthcare-
26 related infective diarrhea, as well as often being associated with community-acquired cases of colitis
27 [1].

28 *C. difficile* spores are highly resistant to environmental conditions, including alcohol-based hand
29 washes and many disinfectants, allowing them to remain on surfaces for long periods of time. This is
30 extremely problematic in health-care settings [2], with transmission of *C. difficile* spores occurring for
31 the most part via the contaminated hands of health-care professionals, but also through contact with
32 contaminated surroundings or contaminated medical utensils and devices [3]. In Spain, the mean
33 hospital incidence density of CDI reported in 2016 was 4,26 episodes/10.000 patients- days above the
34 mean European incidence [4].

35 Recurrence of CDI is very common, and it leads to significant morbidity and increased healthcare costs.
36 After successful treatment of an initial episode, up to 15-35% patients experience disease recurrence
37 with a relapse of CDI symptoms within 3 months [5–7]. Key risks have been previously analyzed, with
38 several factors including age >65 years, severe underlying disease, concomitant use of non-CDI active
39 antibiotics, renal failure, history of previous CDI, possibly continued use of antacid medications, initial
40 disease severity and recent hospitalization being associated with increased risk of recurrence [6,8,9].
41 Ideally, these risk factors could be used as clinical prediction tools that allow the attending physicians
42 to respond quickly and effectively to reduce the risk of subsequent recurrences [6].

43 In Catalonia (Spain), the VINCat program (Vigilancia de les Infeccions Nosocomials als hospitals de
44 Catalunya - Infection Control and Antimicrobial Stewardship Catalan Program), a nosocomial infection
45 surveillance and control program, has been in operation at acute care hospitals since 2006. It consists
46 of a network of multidisciplinary hospital teams with the common goal of reducing hospital acquired
47 infection rates in the region. The program includes an antibiotic stewardship module in which data of

1
2
3 48 the annual antibiotic consumption by families and molecules are monitored and compared between
4
5 49 hospitals (benchmarking). In addition, different actions are in place to limit the duration of antibiotic
6
7 50 prescription and the use of broad-spectrum antibiotics, especially carbapenems and quinolones in the
8
9 51 general digestive surgery and urology services. experience [10,11].
10
11

12
13 52 The objective of the present study carried out at the hospitals in the VINCAt program, was to analyze
14
15 53 the clinical characteristics of adult patients with CDI in Catalonia and to examine the risk factors that
16
17 54 determine 90-day recurrence, to design a risk prediction tool and other future strategies of CDI
18
19 55 prevention tailored to the population in this region. This study also aimed to provide recurrence
20
21 56 information that may be of use in other geographical areas with populations of similar characteristics
22
23 57 to those of Catalonia.
24
25

26 27 58 **Methods**

28 29 30 59 **Study design and setting**

31
32
33 60 This multicenter prospective observational cohort study was carried out at the 28 hospitals
34
35 61 participating in the VINCAt program, that comprise a representative sample of the 3 levels of acute-
36
37 62 care hospitals included in the Catalan Health Care System (high-tech hospitals, tertiary referral
38
39 63 hospitals and district general hospitals). They account for 40.9% of all adult acute-care hospital beds
40
41 64 in Catalonia and amounted to a total of 1,740,846 hospital-days during the study period. The infection
42
43 65 prevention and control team within each participating hospital was responsible for *C. difficile*
44
45 66 surveillance and appointed an investigator responsible for the recording and validating of all the
46
47 67 studied variables in a standardised questionnaire. Sociodemographic, clinical and epidemiological
48
49 68 variables and disease evolution at discharge and after 90 days were recorded for each case. New CDI
50
51 69 cases were identified following diagnostic and microbiological testing in addition to reviews of the
52
53 70 patients' clinical histories and discussions with the referring teams. Diagnosis and classification of CDI
54
55 71 was made following VINCAt criteria already described elsewhere [12]. The participating clinical
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 72 laboratories were periodically audited to ensure that all CDI cases were consecutively reported. All
4
5 73 data was reviewed by the study coordinator.
6
7

8 74 **Population and definitions**

9
10
11 75 The study included all consecutive adults (≥ 18 years at diagnosis) admitted to any hospital area from
12
13 76 1st January until 31st December 2018 that met the study definition of CDI which strictly met VINCat
14
15
16 77 criteria. CDI was defined as the presence of diarrhea (≥ 3 loose stools in ≤ 24 hours) or toxic megacolon
17
18 78 without any other known cause while meeting at least one of the following criteria: (a) the isolation
19
20 79 of a toxin-producing strain in a laboratory stool sample or a positive test result for *C. difficile* toxins A
21
22 80 or B in a laboratory stool specimen [13]; (b) confirmed pseudomembranous colitis by endoscopic,
23
24 81 surgical or histological examination. Microbiological testing was performed at each participating
25
26 82 hospital's microbiology laboratory. Toxigenic culture of the stool samples was the technique of choice
27
28 83 in this study because of its high sensitivity ($>95\%$) [14]. Samples were cultured on selective medium
29
30 84 like cycloserine-cefoxitin fructose agar (CCFA), on chromogenic medium like ChromID® *C. difficile*
31
32 85 (bioMérieux), or on non-selective medium like brucella agar or Schaedler agar with 5% sheep blood,
33
34 86 vitamin K and hemin, always under anaerobic conditions at 37°C for 48 - 72 hours. This was followed
35
36 87 by testing of the isolates via immunoassays to determine their ability to produce *C. difficile* toxins A
37
38 88 and B [13,15].
39
40
41
42

43 89 Colonised but asymptomatic patients (even if they were carriers of a toxin-producing strain), patients
44
45 90 that had suffered previous CDI episodes and those admitted to specific convalescence and palliative
46
47 91 care units were excluded.
48
49

50
51 92 Three possible scenarios of CDI acquisition were considered in this study: (i) Hospital-acquired (HA)
52
53 93 CDI: infection identified >48 hours after admission to the hospital and before discharge. (ii)
54
55 94 Healthcare-associated (HCA) CDI: infection starting in the community or within 48 hours of admission,
56
57 95 in patients admitted to a health centre (hospital, nursing home, outpatient dialysis or community
58
59 96 health centre) in the 4 weeks prior to the onset of symptoms. (iii) Community-acquired (CA) CDI:

1
2
3 97 infection starting in the community or within 48 hours of admission, with no admission to a health
4
5 98 centre in the previous 4 weeks.
6
7

8 99 Previous antibiotic treatment was defined as the administration of more than 48 hours of antibiotics
9
10 100 during the 30 days preceding hospital admission. This information was obtained from the patients'
11
12 101 electronic clinical record.
13
14

15 102 Patients were followed up for 90 days post-diagnosis of CDI. Recurrence was defined as a second
16
17 103 episode (following the same VINCat criteria as the first episode) occurring within 90 days from the
18
19 104 onset of a previous episode, provided that CDI symptoms from the first episode had resolved [7]. Cure
20
21 105 was defined as treatment response without recurrence of CDI during the follow-up period [16].
22
23

24 106 Deceased patients during the follow up period were excluded from this analysis.
25
26

27 107 No diagnostic tests were made, or samples taken from any participant in addition to those required
28
29 108 by routine care. This study complies with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and the legal
30
31 109 structure according to international human rights and biomedicine and personal data protection
32
33 110 legislation. The Ethics Committee of XXXXXX approved the study (ref: *Blinded for review*). All data
34
35 111 were treated as confidential, and records were accessed anonymously.
36
37

38 39 112 **Statistical analysis**

40
41
42 113 Categorical data were presented as frequency (n) and proportions (%) and were analyzed using a
43
44 114 Pearson χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test. 2-tailed p values of <0.05 were considered statistically
45
46 115 significant.
47
48

49
50 116 To develop the risk prediction model for 90-day CDI recurrence, variables that were significantly
51
52 117 associated with recurrence in the univariate analyses (i.e., $p < 0.05$) and that were clinically relevant
53
54 118 were considered in the multivariate Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test. Results were presented as
55
56 119 estimate odd ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs). All analyses were two
57
58 120 sided, and significance level was set to 0.05.
59
60

1
2
3 121 The analysis was performed using the IBM SPSS v20 statistical package and R v4.0.4 statistical
4
5 122 software.
6
7

8 123
9

11 124 **Results**

15 125 **Description of patients with CDI**

16
17
18 126 Of the 558 inpatients with CDI included in this analysis, 351 (62.9%) were > 65 years old and 256
19
20 127 (45.9%) were men. 230 (41.2%) infections were HA, 170 (30.5%) were CA and 158 (28.3%) were HCA.
21
22 128 285 (51%) patients had been admitted to a healthcare facility in the year prior to the CDI. 142 (25.4%)
23
24 129 patients had diabetes mellitus, 93 (16.7%) presented with oncological disease and 48 (8.6%) were on
25
26 130 active chemotherapy at the time of the infection (Table 1).
27
28

29
30 131 372 (66.7%) patients had received previous antibiotic treatment within 30 days; of them, 184 (49.5%),
31
32 132 had received more than one course of antibiotics in the 30 days prior to the CDI diagnosis. 193 (34.6%)
33
34 133 patients received a penicillin antibiotic, 116 (20.8%) cephalosporins antibiotic, 113 (19.7%) patients
35
36 134 received a course of quinolone antibiotics and 69 (12.4%) patients received carbapenems (Table 1) To
37
38 135 treat the CDI episode, 285 (51%) patients received metronidazole and 198 (35.5%) received
39
40 136 vancomycin (Table 2). During the episode of CDI and the 90-day follow-up period, 262 (47%) patients
41
42 137 received antibiotic treatment for reasons other than to treat CDI. Of them, 135 patients (51.5%)
43
44 138 received more than 1 antibiotic course in that 90-day period. 95 (17.0%) patients received a penicillin
45
46 139 antibiotic, 99 (17.7%) received cephalosporins, 78 (14%) received quinolones and 77 (13.8%) were
47
48 140 prescribed carbapenems. Furthermore, during this period, 378 (67.7%) patients were taking proton
49
50 141 pump inhibitors (Table 2).
51
52

53
54
55 142 30 (5.4%) patients were admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) due to CDI. 66 (12%) patients
56
57 143 presented with a recurrence of the disease within 90 days from the index CDI (Table 1). Recurrence
58
59 144 rates were 9%, 10% and 17% for CA, HA and HCA, respectively.
60

145 **Characteristics associated with 90-day recurrence**

146 Patients who had a recurrence within 90 days following their index CDI were more likely to be > 65
147 years old (74.2% vs 61.4%, $p=0.000$), to have an HCA infection (40.9% vs 26.6%, $p=0.009$), to have been
148 admitted to a healthcare facility in the previous year (66.7% vs 49%, $p=0.000$), be suffering from
149 oncological disease (24.2% vs 15.7%, $p=0.005$) or to be on active chemotherapy at the time of the
150 infection (18.2% vs 7.3%, $p=0.010$).

151 In relation to antibiotic treatment, patients developing recurrent infections were also more likely to
152 have received more than 1 course of antibiotics in the 30 days prior to the CDI diagnosis (73.1% vs
153 45.6%, $p<0.001$), or to have received a recent quinolone (31.8% vs 18.1%, $p=0.008$) or cephalosporin
154 (34.8% vs 18.9%, $p=0.003$) course compared with those in which the CDI had resolved (Table 1). No
155 differences in recurrence rate were observed among patients receiving initial therapy for CDI with
156 vancomycin or with metronidazole (OR 1.1 95%CI 0.6-2.0)

157 **Risk prediction model for 90-day recurrence**

158 In the multivariate model, age >65 years, oncological disease, active chemotherapy, admission to a
159 healthcare facility in the previous year, HCA of the infection, more than 1 course of antibiotics prior
160 to diagnosis and recent treatment with quinolones or cephalosporins were included. Of them, only
161 having received more than 1 course of antibiotics in the 30 days prior to the CDI diagnosis (OR=2.459,
162 95% CI: 1.195; 5.060, $p=0.015$) and active chemotherapy (OR=4.859, 95% CI: 1.495; 15.792, $p=0.009$)
163 were significant predictors of 90-day CDI recurrence (Table 3).

164 **Discussion**

165 To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest epidemiological study to investigate predictors for 90-
166 day recurrence of CDI in Catalonia [17]. 558 CDI cases were analyzed with 66 (12%) experiencing a
167 recurrent episode within the 90-day follow-up period.

1
2
3 168 Although risk factors for CDI among hospitalized patients such as age, prior hospital admission and
4
5 169 antibiotic use has been recently reassessed [18] anticipating which patients may suffer from recurrent
6
7 170 CDI continues to be a subject of debate. An extensive range of risk factors for severe or recurrent CDI
8
9
10 171 have been described in the literature [6,19] and the aim of our study was to identify which ones were
11
12 172 specific to the characteristics of the population in Catalonia to create a rigorous clinical prediction tool
13
14 173 that would help the patients in this region. The results from our study are in line with previously
15
16 174 published international studies that determined that older age [20–23], continued use of antibiotics
17
18 175 after CDI diagnosis or after CDI treatment [20,21] and underlying disease [20,24] are prognostic
19
20
21 176 markers of an increased risk of recurrent CDI. On the other hand initial CDI severity [20,23] and
22
23 177 continued use of proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) [20,23] have also been widely reported to increase the
24
25 178 risk of CDI and recurrence. In fact, PPIs are among the most commonly used medications and the Food
26
27
28 179 and Drug Administration issued a warning with respect to the utilization of PPIs and risk of developing
29
30 180 CDI [25]. However, the use of PPIs did not show statistical significance in our study.

31
32
33 181 Our multivariate model determined that having received more than 1 course of antibiotics in the 30 days
34
35 182 prior to the CDI diagnosis was a significant predictor of 90-day CDI recurrence. Thus, these results, we
36
37 183 believe that the cumulative exposure and antimicrobial selection caused by the administration of
38
39
40 184 more than one antibiotic group has played a relevant role towards recurrence of CDI. This aligns with
41
42 185 previous studies that established that cumulative antibiotic exposure prior to admission is the greatest
43
44 186 contributor to the risk of subsequent CDI [26,27]. This could be related to antibiotics altering the
45
46 187 intestinal microbiota and subsequently producing an environment where CDI is easily developed [28].
47
48 188 Actions such as antimicrobial stewardship that actively modify prescription behavior for high-risk
49
50
51 189 antimicrobials like cephalosporins and quinolones have been described as an effective method for
52
53 190 decreasing *C. difficile* recurrence rates [29]. In our study, nearly 20% of patients received quinolones
54
55 191 which might have contributed to the increased risk of CDI. However, following the formal
56
57 192 recommendation against the generalized use of quinolone therapy, from 2017 to 2020 quinolone
58
59 193 consumption steadily decreased in VINCat hospitals (data not shown). Furthermore, antimicrobial

1
2
3 194 stewardship programmes, when implemented alongside infection control measures, have shown to
4
5 195 have a synergistic effect and are therefore recommended for future antimicrobial stewardship
6
7
8 196 planning [30].
9

10 197 Malignancy is also a widely recognized risk factor for primary and recurrent CDI [31,32].
11
12 198 Chemotherapy, immunosuppression and frequent exposure to broad-spectrum antibiotics, coupled
13
14
15 199 with regular visits to healthcare facilities, are the most probable cause for the increased risk of CDI in
16
17 200 this group of patients [33]. In our study, malignancy itself was not found to be an independent risk
18
19 201 factor for recurrent CDI, however, oncological patients undergoing chemotherapy treatment
20
21 202 presented a significantly higher risk of recurrence probably due to chemotherapy agents altering the
22
23 203 normal gut microbiota composition by causing mucosal inflammation, decreasing the repair capacity
24
25 204 of the mucosal epithelium or promoting an anaerobic environment which favors CDI [34–37].
26
27
28

29 205 The originality of our study lies in its assessment of the risk of recurrence based on the location of the
30
31 206 initial infection. Previous hospitalization is a known risk factor for CDI [1], however, recent studies
32
33 207 have reported that a substantial proportion of CDI occurs in the community and its incidence has been
34
35 208 increasing [38]. Bearing this in mind, our study investigated whether the location of acquisition of the
36
37 209 infection was a key factor in the risk of future recurrence in the Catalan population. The results showed
38
39 210 that patients who suffered a recurrence were more likely to have attended a healthcare facility in the
40
41 211 previous year. This does not mean that patients had acquired the toxigenic CD in a previous facility. It
42
43 212 is not proof of acquisition; it only denotes that they were at higher risk. In fact, this association was
44
45 213 not confirmed in the multivariate analysis.
46
47
48

49
50 214 Our study has several limitations that warrant mention. Even if this is a multicenter study, all
51
52 215 participating hospitals are located in Catalonia (seven and a half million inhabitants) and the results
53
54 216 may not be generalizable. As it is an observational study, treatment decisions are made at the
55
56 217 discretion of the treating physician and therefore biased selections may be present in relation to the
57
58 218 severity of the disease and the use of metronidazole or vancomycin. Importantly, since 2021,
59
60

1
2
3 219 metronidazole is only recommended in CDI when the preferred options, fidaxomicin and vancomycin,
4
5 220 are not available [16]. Since our study was carried out before this recommendation, 51% of the
6
7 221 patients received metronidazole. In addition, when analyzing the impact of the use of different
8
9 222 antibiotics in CDI recurrence risk, all antibiotics from the same class were grouped together and no
10
11 223 differentiation was made between narrow and broad spectrum antibiotics or different generations
12
13 224 within the same class. The sample size does not allow us to identify strong correlations between clinical
14
15 225 factors and the risk of recurrence, despite some of them being well known CDI recurrence risk factors.
16
17 226 Furthermore cumulative amount of antibiotics as defined daily doses were not compared between
18
19 227 patients with and without recurrence. And finally, the results of this study may be affected by the
20
21 228 exclusion of deceased patients from this analysis since death is considered a competing risk and its
22
23 229 occurrence hinders analysis of the results..

24
25
26
27
28 230 Besides limitations, the results of our study show the importance of CDI surveillance with data
29
30 231 collection and analysis to identify infection trends and risk factors for recurrence. Addressing these
31
32 232 factors, might be critical to tailor individualized therapy such as vancomycin tapering or monoclonal
33
34 233 antibodies against CD toxins that will keep at-risk patients safe. .

35 36 37 38 234 **Conclusions**

39
40
41 235 Our prospective observational study has identified several risk factors linked to CDI recurrence in the
42
43 236 Catalan population that will increase the awareness of infection prevention and control teams within
44
45 237 the participating organizations, so that policies and preventive measures can be optimized, and
46
47 238 recurrence rates can be reduced through prevention protocols in these at-risk populations. Further
48
49 239 studies with larger sample sizes are required to dispel any uncertainties regarding the role of the
50
51 240 different risk factors in the recurrence of CDI in the Catalan population.

52 53 54 55 56 241 57 58 59 242 **Summary Points**

- 1
2
3 243 • CDI is the main cause of healthcare-related infective diarrhea, as well as often being
4
5 244 associated to community-acquired cases of colitis.
6
7
8 245 • Up to 15-35% patients experience disease recurrence with a relapse of CDI symptoms within
9
10 246 3 months.
11
12 247 • An extensive range of risk factors that determine CDI recurrence have been described and
13
14 248 identifying the specific ones that are more likely to affect different populations would be
15
16 249 useful.
17
18
19 250 • Among the patients admitted to the VINCat hospitals in Catalonia, Spain, having received
20
21 251 more than 1 course of antibiotics in the 30 days prior to CDI diagnosis and active
22
23 252 chemotherapy are significant predictors of 90-day CDI recurrence.
24
25
26 253 • The identification of these 2 risk factors will enable the optimization of preventive measures
27
28 254 in the at-risk populations.
29
30
31 255

References

Papers of special note have been highlighted as: * of interest; ** of considerable interest.

1. Smits WK, Lyras D, Lacy DB, Wilcox MH, Kuijper EJ. Clostridium difficile infection. *Nat. Rev. Dis. Prim.* 2, 1–20 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrdp.2016.20>
2. Paredes-Sabja D, Shen A, Sorg JA. Clostridium difficile spore biology: sporulation, germination, and spore structural proteins. *Trends Microbiol.* 22(7), 406–16 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2014.04.003>
3. Cohen SH, Gerding DN, Johnson S, et al. Clinical Practice Guidelines for Clostridium difficile Infection in Adults: 2010 Update by the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA) and the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA). *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* 31(5), 431–55 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1086/651706>
4. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Annual Epidemiological Report for 2016 Healthcare-associated infections: Clostridium difficile infections. In: *Annual Epidemiological Report on Communicable Diseases in Europe*, ECDC, Stockholm (2018).
5. Singh T, Bedi P, Bumrah K, Singh J, Rai M, Seelam S. Updates in Treatment of Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection. *J. Clin. Med. Res.* 11(7), 465–71 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.14740/jocmr3854>
6. Kelly CP. Can we identify patients at high risk of recurrent Clostridium difficile infection? *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 18(Suppl 6), 21–27 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12046>
7. Bujanda L, Cosme Á. [Clostridium-difficile-associated diarrhea]. *Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* 32(1), 48–56 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gastrohep.2008.02.003>
8. Debast SB, Bauer MP, Kuijper EJ. European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases: Update of the Treatment Guidance Document for Clostridium difficile Infection.

279 *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 20(Suppl 2), 1–26 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12418>

280 9. D'Agostino RB, Collins SH, Pencina KM, Kean Y, Gorbach S. Risk Estimation for Recurrent

281 *Clostridium difficile* Infection Based on Clinical Factors. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 58(10), 1386–93

282 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu107>

283 10. Gudiol F, Limón E, Fondevilla E, Argimon JM, Almirante B, Pujol M. The development and

284 successful implementation of the VINCat Program. *Enferm. Infecc. Microbiol. Clin.* 30(Suppl

285 3), 3–6 (2012). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0213-005X\(12\)70089-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0213-005X(12)70089-7)

286 *** A description of the nosocomial infection surveillance program that has run the present study**

287 11. Grau S, Hernández S, Limón E, Calbo E, Horcajada JP. Impact of changes in the WHO's 2019

288 update of DDDs on the measurement of adult hospital antibacterial consumption in Catalonia

289 (Spain), 2008–18. *JAC-Antimicrobial Resist.* [Internet]. 2(4), dlaa079 (2020). Available from:

290 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jacamr/dlaa079>.

291 12. Sopena N, Freixas N, Bella F, *et al.* Impact of a training program on the surveillance of

292 *Clostridioides difficile* infection. *Epidemiol. Infect.* 147, e231 (2019).

293 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268819001080>

294 13. Mateu L, Fernández-Rivas G, Sopena N. Diagnosis and treatment of *Clostridioides difficile*

295 infection. *Med. Clin. (Barc).* 155(1), 30–35 (2020).

296 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medcli.2020.02.005>

297 **** Recent Spanish review on the diagnosis and treatment of *C. difficile* infection.**

298 14. Lee HS, Plechot K, Gohil S, Le J. *Clostridium difficile*: Diagnosis and the Consequence of Over

299 Diagnosis. *Infect. Dis. Ther.* 10(2), 687 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40121-021-00417-7>

300 15. Crobach MJT, Planche T, Eckert C, *et al.* European Society of Clinical Microbiology and

301 Infectious Diseases: update of the diagnostic guidance document for *Clostridium difficile*

- 1
2
3 302 infection. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 22-Suppl 4, S63–S81 (2016).
4
5 303 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2016.03.010>
6
7
8
9 304 *** European guidance for the diagnosis of *C.difficile* infection**
10
11 305 16. van Prehn J, Reigadas E, Vogelzang EH, *et al.* European Society of Clinical Microbiology and
12
13 306 Infectious Diseases: 2021 update on the treatment guidance document for Clostridioides
14
15 307 *difficile* infection in adults. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 27-Suppl 2, S1–S21 (2021).
16
17 308 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2021.09.038>
18
19
20
21 309 **** Latest European guidance on the treatment of *C. difficile* infection. Provides definitions of**
22
23 310 **recurrence and cure.**
24
25
26 311 17. Rodríguez-Pardo D, Almirante B, Bartolomé RM, *et al.* Epidemiology of clostridium difficile
27
28 312 infection and risk factors for unfavorable clinical outcomes: Results of a hospital-based study
29
30 313 in Barcelona, Spain. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 51(5), 1465–1473 (2013).
31
32 314 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.03352-12>
33
34
35 315 *** A previous study on risk factors for *C. difficile* infection in one hospital in Catalonia**
36
37
38 316 18. Davies K, Lawrence J, Berry C, *et al.* Risk Factors for Primary Clostridium difficile Infection;
39
40 317 Results From the Observational Study of Risk Factors for Clostridium difficile Infection in
41
42 318 Hospitalized Patients With Infective Diarrhea (ORCHID). *Front. public Heal.* 8, Article 293
43
44 319 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00293>
45
46
47
48 320 19. Welfare MR, Lalayiannis LC, Martin KE, Corbett S, Marshall B, Sarma JB. Co-morbidities as
49
50 321 predictors of mortality in Clostridium difficile infection and derivation of the ARC predictive
51
52 322 score. *J. Hosp. Infect.* 79(4), 359–63 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2011.08.015>
53
54
55 323 20. Hu MY, Katchar K, Kyne L, *et al.* Prospective Derivation and Validation of a Clinical Prediction
56
57 324 Rule for Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection. *Gastroenterology.* 136(4), 1206–14 (2009).
58
59 325 <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2008.12.038>
60

- 1
2
3 326 21. Garey KW, Sethi S, Yadav Y, DuPont HL. Meta-analysis to assess risk factors for recurrent
4
5 327 Clostridium difficile infection. *J. Hosp. Infect.* 70(4), 298–304 (2008).
6
7
8 328 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2008.08.012>
9
10
11 329 22. Chakra CNA, Pepin J, Valiquette L. Prediction Tools for Unfavourable Outcomes in Clostridium
12
13 330 difficile Infection: A Systematic Review. *PLoS One.* 7(1), e30258 (2012).
14
15 331 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030258>
16
17
18 332 23. Eyre DW, Walker AS, Wyllie D, *et al.* Predictors of First Recurrence of Clostridium difficile
19
20 333 Infection: Implications for Initial Management. *Clin. Infect. Dis. An Off. Publ. Infect. Dis. Soc.*
21
22 334 *Am.* 55(Suppl 2), S77-87 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis356>
23
24
25 335 24. Pépin J, Valiquette L, Cossette B. Mortality attributable to nosocomial Clostridium difficile–
26
27 336 associated disease during an epidemic caused by a hypervirulent strain in Quebec. *C. Can.*
28
29 337 *Med. Assoc. J.* 173(9), 1037–42 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.050978>
30
31
32
33 338 25. Tawam D, Baladi M, Jungsuwadee P, Earl G, Han J. The Positive Association between Proton
34
35 339 Pump Inhibitors and Clostridium Difficile Infection. *Inov. Pharm.* 12(1) (2021).
36
37 340 <https://doi.org/10.24926/iip.v12i1.3439>
38
39
40 341 26. Webb BJ, Subramanian A, Lopansri B, *et al.* Antibiotic Exposure and Risk for Hospital-
41
42 342 Associated Clostridioides difficile Infection. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 64(4) (2020).
43
44 343 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.02169-19>
45
46
47 344 27. Karaoui WR, Rustom LBO, Bou Daher H, *et al.* Incidence, outcome, and risk factors for
48
49 345 recurrence of nosocomial Clostridioides difficile infection in adults: A prospective cohort
50
51 346 study. *J. Infect. Public Health* [Internet]. 13(4), 485–490 (2020). Available from:
52
53 347 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31838001/>. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2019.11.005>
54
55
56
57 348 28. Song JH, Kim YS. Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection: Risk Factors, Treatment, and
58
59 349 Prevention. *Gut Liver.* 13(1), 16 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.5009/gnl18071>
60

- 1
2
3 350 29. Feazel LM, Malhotra A, Perencevich EN, Kaboli P, Diekema DJ, Schweizer ML. Effect of
4
5 351 antibiotic stewardship programmes on Clostridium difficile incidence: a systematic review
6
7 352 and meta-analysis. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 69(7), 1748–1754 (2014).
8
9
10 353 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dku046>
11
12
13 354 30. Baur D, Gladstone BP, Burkert F, *et al.* Effect of antibiotic stewardship on the incidence of
14
15 355 infection and colonisation with antibiotic-resistant bacteria and Clostridium difficile infection:
16
17 356 a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet. Infect. Dis.* 17(9), 990–1001 (2017).
18
19 357 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(17\)30325-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30325-0)
20
21
22 358 31. Kamboj M, Son C, Cantu S, *et al.* Hospital-Onset Clostridium difficile Infection Rates in Persons
23
24 359 with Cancer or Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant: A C3IC Network Report. *Infect. Control*
25
26 360 *Hosp. Epidemiol.* 33(11), 1162–5 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1086/668023>
27
28
29 361 32. Delgado A, Reveles IA, Cabello FT, Reveles KR. Poorer outcomes among cancer patients
30
31 362 diagnosed with Clostridium difficile infections in United States community hospitals. *BMC*
32
33 363 *Infect. Dis.* 17, 448 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-017-2553-z>
34
35
36 364 33. Cornely OA, Mullane KM, Birch T, *et al.* Exploratory Evaluation of Bezlotoxumab on Outcomes
37
38 365 Associated With Clostridioides difficile Infection in MODIFY I/II Participants With Cancer.
39
40 366 *Open Forum Infect. Dis.* 7(2), ofaa038 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofaa038>
41
42
43 367 34. Dutta D, Lim SH. Bidirectional interaction between intestinal microbiome and cancer:
44
45 368 opportunities for therapeutic interventions. *Biomark. Res.* 8(1), Article 31 (2020).
46
47 369 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40364-020-00211-6>
48
49
50 370 35. Khan A, Raza S, A. Batul S, *et al.* The Evolution of Clostridium difficile Infection in Cancer
51
52 371 Patients: Epidemiology, Pathophysiology, and Guidelines for Prevention and Management.
53
54 372 *Recent Pat. Antiinfect. Drug Discov.* 7(2), 157–70 (2012).
55
56 373 <https://dx.doi.org/10.2174/157489112801619674>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 374 36. Chung MS, Kim J, Kang JO, Pai H. Impact of malignancy on Clostridium difficile infection. *Eur.*
4
5 375 *J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* 2016 3511. 35(11), 1771–6 (2016).
6
7 376 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-016-2725-6>
8
9
10 377 37. Anand A, Glatt AE. Clostridium difficile Infection Associated with Antineoplastic
11
12 Chemotherapy: A Review. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 17(1), 109–13 (1993).
13 378
14 379 <https://doi.org/10.1093/clinids/17.1.109>
15
16
17
18 380 38. Lee E, Song K-H, Bae JY, *et al.* Risk factors for poor outcome in community-onset Clostridium
19
20 381 difficile infection. *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control.* 7, Article 75 (2018).
21
22 382 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-018-0365-6>
23
24
25
26 383
27
28 384
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Risk of *Clostridioides difficile* infection recurrence in the VINCat hospitals: a prospective**
 2 **observational cohort study**

3 **Table 1. Baseline demographic and epidemiological characteristics of adult inpatients with CDI.**

Demographic variables	Total N=558	Resolved CDI N=492	Recurring CDI N=66	P value
Age >65	351 (62.9%)	302 (61.4%)	49 (74.2%)	0.000
Gender (Male)	256 (45.9%)	222 (45.1%)	34 (51.5%)	0.121
Comorbidity factors				
Diabetes Mellitus	142 (25.4%)	123 (25%)	19 (28.8%)	0.398
Renal replacement therapy	22 (3.9%)	17 (3.5%)	5 (7.6%)	0.578
Inflammatory Bowel Disease	31 (5.5%)	25 (2.5%)	6 (9.1%)	0.310
HIV infection	6 (1.1%)	5 (1%)	1 (1.5%)	0.705
Solid organ transplant	17 (3%)	16 (3.3%)	1 (1.5%)	0.492
Oncological disease	93 (16.7%)	77 (15.7%)	16 (24.2%)	0.005
Active chemotherapy	48 (8.6%)	36 (7.3%)	12 (18.2%)	0.010
Immunosuppressive therapy [#]	51 (9.1%)	46 (9.3%)	5 (7.6%)	0.891
Previous Antibiotic administration*	372 (66.7%)	320 (65%)	52 (78.8%)	0.070
Penicillins	193 (34.6%)	166 (33.7%)	27 (40.9%)	0.250
Cephalosporins	116 (20.8%)	93 (18.9%)	23 (34.8%)	0.003
Quinolones	113 (19.7%)	89 (18.1%)	21 (31.8%)	0.008
Carbapenems	69 (12.4%)	57 (11.6%)	12 (18.2%)	0.126
>1 previous antibiotic (N=372 patients)	184 (49.5%)	146 (45.6%)	38 (73.1%)	<0.001
Etiological variables				
Acquisition				
HCA	158 (28.3%)	131 (26.6%)	27 (40.9%)	0.009
HA	230 (41.2%)	206 (41.9%)	24 (36.4%)	0.301
CA	160 — <u>170</u> (28.7 <u>30.5</u> %)	155 (31.5%)	15 (22.7%)	0.001
PAHCF in the last year	285 (51%)	241 (49%)	44 (66.7%)	0.000
Severity level				
ICU	30 (5.4%)	30 (6.1%)	0%	0.125
Antibiotics treatment				
Metronidazole	285 (51%)	245 (49.8%)	40 (60.6%)	0.095
Vancomycin	198 (35.5%)	174 (35.4%)	24 (36.4%)	0.937
Other treatments during CDI and the follow-up period				

Antibiotic treatment (Not for CDI)	262 (47.0%)	226 (45.9%)	36 (54.5%)	0.188
Cephalosporins	99 (17.7%)	86 (17.5%)	13 (19.7%)	0.658
Penicillins	95 (17.0%)	83 (16.9%)	12 (18.2%)	0.790
Quinolones	78 (14.0%)	70 (14.2%)	8 (12.1%)	0.643
Carbapenems	77 (13.8%)	65 (13.2%)	12 (18.2%)	0.272
>1 antibiotic (N=262 patients)	135 (51.5%)	116 (51.3%)	19 (52.8%)	0.872
Proton pump inhibitors	378 (67.7%)	326 (66.9%)	49 (74.2%)	0.229
CA: community acquired; CDI: <i>Clostridioides difficile</i> infection; HA: hospital acquired; HCA: healthcare associated; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; ICU: intensive care unit; PAHCF: previous admission to a healthcare facility *Previous antibiotic administration is defined as the administration of antibiotic treatment for >48h during the 30 days prior to CDI diagnosis # For the purposes of this study the term immunosuppressive therapy includes being on chemotherapy for cancer, being within one year out from receiving a hematopoietic stem cell or solid organ transplant, untreated HIV infection with CD4 T lymphocyte count < 200, combined primary immunodeficiency disorder, and receiving >20mg/day prednisolone for more than 14 days.				

4

5

For Review Only

1 **Risk of *Clostridioides difficile* infection recurrence in the VINCat hospitals: a prospective**
 2 **observational cohort study**

3 **Table 2. CDI treatment and other treatments during CDI and the follow-up period**

Treatment	Total N=558	Resolved CDI N=492	Recurring CDI N=66	P value
Antibiotics treatment				
Metronidazole	285 (51%)	245 (49.8%)	40 (60.6%)	0.095
Vancomycin	198 (35.5%)	174 (35.4%)	24 (36.4%)	0.937
Other treatments during CDI and the follow-up period				
Antibiotic treatment (Not for CDI)	262 (47.0%)	226 (45.9%)	36 (54.5%)	0.188
Cephalosporins	99 (17.7%)	86 (17.5%)	13 (19.7%)	0.658
Penicillins	95 (17.0%)	83 (16.9%)	12 (18.2%)	0.790
Quinolones	78 (14.0%)	70 (14.2%)	8 (12.1%)	0.643
Carbapenems	77 (13.8%)	65 (13.2%)	12 (18.2%)	0.272
>1 antibiotic (N=262 patients)	135 (51.5%)	116 (51.3%)	19 (52.8%)	0.872
Proton pump inhibitors	378 (67.7%)	326 (66.9%)	49 (74.2%)	0.229
CA: community acquired; CDI: <i>Clostridioides difficile</i> infection; HA: hospital acquired; HCA: healthcare associated; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; ICU: intensive care unit; PAHCF: previous admission to a healthcare facility *Previous antibiotic administration is defined as the administration of antibiotic treatment for >48h during the 30 days prior to CDI diagnosis # For the purposes of this study the term immunosuppressive therapy includes being on chemotherapy for cancer, being within one year out from receiving a hematopoietic stem cell or solid organ transplant, untreated HIV infection with CD4 T lymphocyte count < 200, combined primary immunodeficiency disorder, and receiving >20mg/day prednisolone for more than 14 days.				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Title: Risk of *Clostridioides difficile* infection recurrence in the VINCat hospitals: a
2 prospective observational cohort study

3
4 Table 3. Multivariate analysis of the risk factors associated with 90-day CDI recurrence.

Variables	OR	95% CI	p-value
Age>65	2.024	0.996;4.11	0.051
Oncological disease	0.602	0.225;1.609	0.312
Active chemotherapy	4.859	1.495;15.792	0.009
Previous Cephalosporins administration	1.568	0.815;3.018	0.178
Previous Quinolone administration	1.512	0.769;2.974	0.230
>1 Previous antibiotic	2.459	1.195;5.060	0.015
PAHCF in the last year	0.487	0.220;1.080	0.077
HCA	1.308	0.630;2.716	0.472
CA	1.031	0.420;2.530	0.947
CA: community acquired; CI: confidence interval; HCA: healthcare associated; OR: odds ratio; PAHCF: previous admission to a healthcare facility within the last year			

5

6