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Introduction

At The Royal Melbourne Hospital (RMH), vancomycin is used in specific surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis indications. During the most recent vancomycin shortages, which reached critical levels mid-March 2017, teicoplanin was substituted for vancomycin for these surgical prophylaxis indications. Although teicoplanin is more expensive than vancomycin, studies show it may be easier to utilise appropriately in the peri-operative setting without compromising antimicrobial coverage²-⁴.

Aims

To retrospectively analyse if, in light of the nation-wide vancomycin shortage, surgical antibiotic prophylaxis with teicoplanin was more appropriately prescribed and administered compared to vancomycin.

Methods

A retrospective analysis of all patients who received vancomycin in surgeries in the main theatres at RMH during a two-week period prior to the critical vancomycin shortage (13th to 26th February 2017), and patients who received teicoplanin during a two-week period during the critical vancomycin shortage (20th March to 2nd April 2017) was conducted.

Appropriateness of prescribing was assessed against the respective surgical prophylaxis protocols, detailed below⁵.

Results and Discussion

Overall the percentage of patients who received a vancomycin and teicoplanin in the respective periods was significantly lower than originally estimated. However, the data collection only looked at patients who actually received the two drugs. There may be patients who potentially required the drugs, but did not receive them, which was not covered in the scope of this study.

The proportion of surgical procedures where vancomycin was administered as surgical prophylaxis during the two-week period prior to the critical vancomycin shortage (13th to 26th February 2017) was 21/649 (3%).

The proportion of surgical procedures where teicoplanin was administered as surgical prophylaxis during a two-week period during the critical vancomycin shortage (20th March to 2nd April 2017) was 27/619 (4%).

However the results demonstrated some consistent themes with few outliers, and it was felt that reasonable conclusions could be drawn from this data. The results for both drugs are shown below.

Analysis of appropriateness of vancomycin use

Graph 1. Detailed analysis of appropriateness of vancomycin use (n=27)

Graph 1 showed that 16 out of 21 (76%) cases of vancomycin administration was inappropriate. Vancomycin administration with more logistically challenging requirements for surgical prophylaxis, may be more difficult to adhere to. The audit highlighted that administration in relation to incision time was particularly poorly executed and/or documented.

The recorded “surgery start time” may not accurately correlate with the time of first incision and considering variation in pre-mixed practices of the anaesthetists, this data point may not be a reliable indication of the actual time difference between vancomycin infusion start time and surgery start time, potentially skewing results.

In practice, the surgical team may find it difficult to adhere to protocol recommendations for time of administration of vancomycin especially in emergency situations where surgery may have to commence immediately. As RMH is one of the major trauma referral centres in Victoria, administering antibiotics with sufficient time prior to surgery may be compromised if the surgery is an emergency. The results show 15 out of 21 (71%) of the vancomycin receiving surgeries were emergency compared to the 11 (38%) of the teicoplanin surgeries.

Four (19%) patients received vancomycin when it was not indicated and six (29%) patients received an inappropriately low vancomycin dose. Sub-therapeutic dosing may increase their susceptibility to surgical site infections or other more serious complications depending on their surgery.

Analysis of appropriateness of teicoplanin use

Graph 2. Detailed analysis of appropriateness of teicoplanin use (n=27)

Ease of teicoplanin administration potentially contributed to the lower, five out of 27 (22%), surgeries where administration of teicoplanin was deemed inappropriate. Like the vancomycin audit, the time of administration in relation to the surgery start time was not always clearly documented. Overall appropriateness of teicoplanin administration was double that of the results for vancomycin administration.

Six out of the 27 (22%) patients who received teicoplanin did not require the glycopeptide as per the surgical prophylaxis guidelines. Considering the added expense of using teicoplanin over vancomycin, unnecessary use of the drug contributes to a financial deficit as well as promoting resistance.

Dose errors of teicoplanin affected six out of 27 (22%) patients. Five of these six patients also received 400mg of teicoplanin, which resulted in a total of 1000mg for a patient weighing over 100kg. Vancomycin, under dosing in heavier patients could result in suboptimal tissue concentrations. Weight-based dosing for teicoplanin in surgical prophylaxis may have contributed to these errors. However, despite fixed-dose vancomycin in the protocol, six patients received the incorrect dose. It appeared that heavier patients seemed to be more likely to receive a dose non-compliant with protocol.

Inappropriate prescribing was not more prevalent in particular surgeons or with particular surgeons. These aspects seemed to have little bearing on the use of the glycopeptides.

Conclusion

This study provided insight into how the nation-wide shortage of vancomycin may have affected the use of glycopeptides in surgical prophylaxis protocols at RMH. Teicoplanin use was not more appropriate than vancomycin use for surgical prophylaxis in this study. Based on this conclusion, the added expense of teicoplanin would be difficult to justify outside the context of a vancomycin shortage, as it does not appear to provide any additional benefit to patients.

Re-familiarisation of the appropriate guidelines, which are available in theatres, by surgical staff may help to improve adherence and potentially result in better outcomes for patients requiring surgical prophylaxis.
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