

## **IMPROVING ANTIBIOTICS USE IN PEDIATRIC HOSPITALS IN ARGENTINA: FEASIBILITY STUDY.**

Jorro-Baron, Facundo<sup>1,2</sup>; Echave, Cecilia<sup>2</sup>; Rodriguez, Viviana<sup>1</sup>; Aguilar, Maria-Jose<sup>3</sup>; Balboa, Romina<sup>2</sup>; Guglielmino, Marina<sup>1</sup>; Garcia-Causarano, Florencia<sup>2</sup>; Del Negro, Veronica<sup>3</sup>; Dondoglio, Patricia<sup>2</sup>; Falcon, Esteban<sup>3</sup>; Gibbons, Luz<sup>1</sup>; Guerrero, Celeste<sup>3</sup>; Juarez, Ximena<sup>2</sup>; López, Analía<sup>3</sup>; Matteucci, Erika<sup>2</sup>; Rodriguez, Ana Paula<sup>1</sup>; Vitar, Emilse<sup>1</sup>; Roberti, Javier<sup>1</sup>; Garcia-Elorrio, Ezequiel<sup>1</sup>; Falaschi, Andrea<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Clinical Effectiveness and Health Policy – IECS, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>2</sup>Hospital General de Niños Pedro de Elizalde, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>3</sup>Hospital de Niños Dr. Humberto Notti, Mendoza, Argentina

Pfizer Competitive Grant Program ID 68479861

### **Corresponding author:**

Facundo Jorro-Baron MD, MsC(c)

Researcher

Quality and Safety in Healthcare

Institute for Clinical Effectiveness and Health Policy

2024 Ravnani

(1414) Buenos Aires Argentina

+5491144000624

[fjorro@iecs.org.ar](mailto:fjorro@iecs.org.ar)

## Abstract

**Background:** We aimed to test the feasibility of a multifaceted intervention to enhance the quality of antibiotic prescription by reducing its overuse and increasing the use of narrow-spectrum agents, comprising a range of antimicrobial stewardship strategies in LMIC pediatric hospitals.

**Methods:** We implemented a quality improvement (QI) initiative for the treatment of three groups of infections: acute lower respiratory infections (ALRI), urinary tract infections (UTI), and skin and soft tissue infections (SSTI) in six units of two academic pediatric hospitals. We used an uncontrolled before-and-after design, preceded by a formative phase, to identify barriers and facilitators. The target population was Healthcare workers (HCWs). The strategy comprised an antibiotic audit and feedback, ward- or pathway-specific treatment guidelines, infection-based interventions focused on improving diagnostic accuracy, tailoring therapy to culture results, optimizing treatment duration (antibiotic time out), pharmacy-based interventions, and education.

**Results:** We recruited 617 patients: 249 in the baseline period (BP) and 588 in the implementation period (IP). The patients in the IP group were younger, weighed less, had higher critical care requirements, and had higher ALRI.

With implementation, we observed an increase in antibiotic days of therapy (1051 vs. 831; RR: 1.23 (1.14;1.33);  $p < 0.001$ ). After adjusting for age and place of hospitalization, the differences were significant. This increase was at the expense of a higher use of Access group antibiotics (382 vs. 310; RR: 1.23 (1.14;1.33);  $p < 0.001$ ) and lower use of the Watch group according to the WHO classification (552 vs. 623; RR: 0.89 (0.84; 0.94);  $p < 0.001$ ).

We observed a decrease in antibiotic resistance in the IP group (5% vs. 13%;  $p < 0.001$ ) at the expense of extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamase.

We found no differences in mortality rates between the two periods.

**Conclusion:** Through a QI initiative, the use of antibiotic stewardship programs in pediatric hospitals was shown to be feasible and may improve antibiotic use. We observed a decrease in antibiotic resistance, which may be due to an increase in antibiotic Access group use.

**Keywords:** antibiotic stewardship program, pediatric patient, quality improvement

## BACKGROUND

Antimicrobials are the most prescribed medications in pediatrics, with estimates indicating that between 37 and 61% of hospitalized infants and children receive antibiotics<sup>1</sup>. It has been established that 20 and 50% of these prescriptions are potentially unnecessary or inappropriate<sup>2,3</sup>, and many children continue to receive broad-spectrum antibiotics for viral infections or antibiotic courses that are excessively lengthy<sup>4</sup>. The overuse and misuse of antibiotics, inadequate sanitation, low vaccination rates, and insufficient infection prevention and control practices contribute to the high prevalence of drug-resistant infections in low- or middle-income countries (LMICs)<sup>5</sup>.

The misuse of antibiotics has led to antibiotic resistance, posing a serious threat to public health. Infections caused by multidrug-resistant bacteria are associated with higher mortality rates and prolonged hospital stays than those caused by susceptible bacteria<sup>6</sup>. Given the well-documented causal relationship between antibiotic overuse or misuse and the emergence of resistant bacteria, various organizations, including the World Health Organization (WHO), the Infectious Diseases Society of America, and the German Society of Infectious Diseases, have endorsed action plans that emphasize the importance of antibiotic stewardship programs (ASP) to monitor and promote the optimization of antimicrobial use to preserve our antibiotic armamentarium<sup>7,8</sup>. The implementation of ASP pilot program strategies has resulted in estimated annual cost savings of over €330,000<sup>9</sup>. According to recent studies, ASPs have been found to significantly decrease the overall consumption of antibiotics by 19% and the use of restricted antimicrobial agents by 27% within hospitals<sup>10</sup>.

Antimicrobial stewardship programs (ASPs) have been developed to optimize the treatment of infections, reduce infection-related morbidity and mortality, limit the emergence of multidrug-resistant organisms, and reduce unnecessary antimicrobial use<sup>11,12</sup>. Although ASPs have been developed and implemented in some areas of the world, there is a lack of research on LMICs. This may be because most ASPs are still in the development stage and/or not yet widely accepted as standard-of-care strategies<sup>4</sup> (4). Introducing ASPs in LMICs presents challenges, owing to factors such as limited availability and access to antibiotics, lack of diagnostics, and poor adherence to treatment<sup>13</sup>. Further research is urgently needed to determine the most effective ways to implement ASPs in LMICs, without compromising the quality of care provided to patients<sup>14</sup>.

The rate of antibiotic overuse in a pediatric Argentine population was 35% and was associated with lower respiratory tract, skin, and soft tissue infections<sup>15</sup>. Additionally, there was a problem with the overuse of ceftriaxone, which is classified as a Watch antibiotic in the AWARe classification system developed by the WHO. In 2019, the prevalence of antibiotic use in one of the included hospitals was 37%<sup>16</sup>. Most of the antibiotic indications were based on empirical evidence, with only 15% driven by microbiological results. Approximately 40% of the days of antibiotic therapy were used to treat hospital-acquired infections (HAI). Compliance with facility guidelines was observed in 57% of cases.

To address performance gaps, quality improvement (QI) initiatives have been employed for several decades to disseminate evidence and to learn from implementation science<sup>17</sup>. Our objective was to assess the feasibility of a multifaceted intervention aimed at enhancing the quality of antibiotic use by reducing overuse and increasing the use of narrow-spectrum agents through implementation of a range of antimicrobial stewardship strategies in pediatric hospitals.

## **METHODS**

### **Study design**

We undertook a Quality Improvement (QI) initiative in the inpatient units, neonatal intensive care units (NICU), and pediatric intensive care units (PICU) of two hospitals in Argentina. The hospitals were public, pediatric, and academic, with PICU and NICU level 1 (the best possible level). This project was conducted following a formative phase, following the design of a before-and-after study, encompassing a baseline period (BP) of 22 weeks and an intervention period (IP) of 30 weeks. This initiative was developed by applying the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's Breakthrough Series Model<sup>18</sup>. QI initiatives are characterized by using healthcare teams to enhance performance on a specific topic through the collection of data and the testing of ideas using plan-do-study-act (PDSA) cycles, supported by coaching and learning sessions. These initiatives are based on the premise that networks of facilities can be transformed into learning systems that accelerate improvements in healthcare performance, with the potential to achieve results on a large scale<sup>19–21</sup>.

### **Population**

This study targeted healthcare workers (HCWs) from participating hospitals, who were also research subjects. Outcomes were measured in patients admitted to the inpatient units, PICUs, and NICUs of each participating hospital. The study included patients with acute lower respiratory infections (ALRI), urinary tract infections (UTI), and skin and soft tissue infections (SSTI) who were admitted to the participating units.

### **Formative Research**

Pre-implementation formative research, commonly referred to as formative evaluation, was conducted. This phase employed a qualitative approach. Sixteen semi-structured interviews were conducted with health personnel from the participating units. Employing a rapid qualitative approach, a short-term participatory design was adopted, characterized by the convergence of methods and triangulation of data during data analysis, as well as an iterative process. The interviews were conducted at least one month before the implementation of the intervention and were conducted either in person, by telephone, or online at the convenience of the participants. The interview guide was formulated based on the constructs of normalization process theory (NPT)<sup>22</sup>. The interviews were transcribed and subsequently uploaded to Atlas.ti v8.4, a software program designed for the management of qualitative data.

### **Data Management**

The Institute for Clinical Effectiveness and Health Policy (IECS) acted as the study data center, providing a specialized data monitoring system to ensure the maintenance of high-quality databases, overseeing all data collection procedures, and facilitating the efficient transfer of study data. A local data center was established at each hospital. The IECS data unit was responsible for monitoring, consolidating, and analyzing the database using Redcap® following Good Clinical Research Practices. The unit also periodically monitored compliance with project procedures, including screening in units, data collection, adherence to the intervention protocol, and data quality. Source data verification was carried out in all participating units, and continuous communication was maintained between site coordinators and data collectors via telephone, email, and WhatsApp®. Run and

control charts were shared with teams to monitor progress, and each team reported on the development of improvement opportunities using a standardized report specifically designed for this purpose.

## Outcomes

We evaluated various aspects of antibiotic use and patient outcomes in selected healthcare units. These included the average number of antibiotic days of therapy per 1000 patient days (DOT), proportion of global antibiotic consumption in the Access and Watch groups of the WHO classification<sup>23</sup>, need for antibiotic adjustment, rate of de-escalation (transition from empirical therapy to pathogen-directed therapy based on culture results and clinical guidelines in less than 24 h), adherence to treatment guidelines for infectious diseases, incidence of HAI caused by multidrug-resistant organisms (MDROs), and length of hospital stay in days. We also used in-hospital mortality as a balanced measure, which was defined as a fatal outcome occurring up to hospital discharge.

To adjust for potential confounding factors, we controlled for age, sex, type of infection, and the presence of invasive procedures, such as central venous catheters, urethral catheters, and total parenteral nutrition.

## Intervention

We implemented a complex, implementation science-based package, following a formative research phase. The package was rolled out through two learning sessions and two action periods, utilizing PDSA cycles, and managed by a study coordinator responsible for ASP outcomes. A multidisciplinary team of opinion leaders was assembled for this endeavor<sup>24,25</sup>. Details of the intervention implementation and theory of change are presented in Table 1 and eFigure 1 (Supplement), respectively.

## Statistical Analysis

Patient characteristics were reported during both the study periods. Absolute and relative frequencies were calculated for categorical variables, whereas the median and interquartile range (IQR, quartile 1–quartile 3) were presented for continuous variables. For the comparison between the baseline and implementation periods, the chi-square test or Fisher test was used for categorical variables, and the Wilcoxon rank sum test was used for continuous variables. For the DOT outcome and the number of days of Access and Watch antibiotic consumption, the rate per 1,000 was calculated and reported in the two periods. To test the effect of the intervention, a ratio of the rates was estimated as  $\text{Rate}_{\text{IP}}/\text{Rate}_{\text{BP}}$ . To estimate this ratio, a generalized linear model, assuming a Poisson distribution, was used. The same model was used to conduct the subgroup analyses. For the proportion of antibiotic adjustment, de-escalation, and compliance with treatment guidelines, the ratio of the proportions was reported, and binomial distribution was assumed. Data were analyzed using the program R version 4.0.2 (The R Foundation).

## Ethics

The protocol was approved by each hospital IRB. Healthcare workers (HCWs) in the selected units were invited to participate and signed an informed consent request from the local Institutional Review Board (IRB).

## RESULTS

### Formative research

The following recommendations were suggested based on the results of this study: survey the teams responsible for the care of the study patients to enhance the collaborative actions of the intervention. It was recommended that all team members attend training sessions and subsequently participate in the intervention. Potential barriers to intervention, such as differences in criteria and communication issues between the staff, on-call staff, and infectious disease service teams, were identified as significant challenges by all participants. Therefore, it was recommended to restructure the training sessions to ensure that they do not exceed one hour in length and to provide flexible scheduling for asynchronous classes. Additionally, a survey of the technological resources available in each unit should be conducted. Most participants reported connectivity problems and a lack of equipment. It was suggested that specific sessions or meetings be conducted to disseminate the implementation results to enhance the motivation of the participants. In addition, considering the high turnover rate of participants owing to the rotation of residents, it was crucial to implement measures that streamlined the process of training new personnel.

The intervention was adapted according to formative research results.

### Study outcomes

We recruited 249 patients in the BP (1/10/2022-6/5/2022), and 588 in the IP (6/6/2022-1/1/2023). Patients in the IP group were younger (11.5 (3-41) months in the IP group and 30 (9-75) months in the BP group;  $p<0.001$ ), weighed less (9.1 (5.6-15) kg in the IP group and 12.2 (8-22.3) kg in the BP group;  $p<0.001$ ), and had higher PICU requirements (46.3% in the IP group and 31.3% in the BP group;  $p<0.001$ ). Hospital stay was similar between the two groups (8 (5-12) days in the IP group and 8 (4-13) days in the BP group).

The distribution of the type of infection differed between the two groups of patients. The percentages of ALRI in the IP group were 87.0% and 63.2% in the BP group; hospitalization in the PICU was 7.2% and 17.8% in the IP and BP groups, respectively; and the percentages of SSTI were 5.8% and 19.0% in the IP and BP groups, respectively. Patients in the IP group also required more mechanical ventilation (48.6% in the IP and 31.3% in the BP;  $p<0.001$ ), more use of central venous catheters (47.6% in the IP and 32.5% in the BP;  $p<0.001$ ), and higher use of urinary catheters (47.8% in the IP and 24.1% in the BP;  $p<0.001$ ). The complete characteristics of the patients in both periods are shown in Table 2.

After the implementation of the intervention, there was an increase in antibiotic DOT (1051 in the IP vs. 831 in the BP; RR: 1.23 (1.14;1.33);  $p<0.001$ ). After adjusting for age and place of hospitalization, this difference remained significant (1.21 (1.16;1.27);  $p<0.001$ ). The increase in antibiotic DOT was at the expense of a higher use of antibiotics in the Access group (382 in the IP group vs. 310 in the BP group; RR: 1.23 (1.14;1.33);  $p<0.001$ ), and a lower use of antibiotics in the Watch group (623 in the IP group vs. 552 in the BP group; RR: 0.89 (0.84; 0.94);  $p<0.001$ ) (Table 3). In the subgroup analysis, we found that age less than one year (RR: 1.56 (1.45;1.68);  $p<0.001$ ) and more than three years (RR: 1.20 (1.11;1.29);  $p<0.001$ ), hospitalization in the inpatient unit (RR 1.25 (1.17;1.34);  $p<0.001$ ), neonatology (RR: 1.38 (1.22;1.57);  $p<0.001$ ), and compliance with guidelines (RR: 1.38 (1.30;1.46);

$p < 0.001$ ) were significantly associated with increased antibiotic DOT (Table 4). We also found that Access group consumption increased more in the PICU (RR: 1.76 (1.52;2.04);  $p < 0.001$ ) and NICU (RR: 1.43 (1.15;1.79);  $p < 0.001$ ) (Table 3). When we analyzed the ALRI subgroup, we observed more antibiotic DOT in the IP regardless of the unit of hospitalization or age (adjusted RR: 1.08 (1.02;1.14);  $p = 0.006$ ). This increase occurred at the expense of antibiotic consumption in the Access group (adjusted RR: 1.31 (1.19;1.45);  $p < 0.001$ ). In the ALRI group, we also found a decrease in antibiotic consumption in the Watch group during the IP (adjusted RR: 0.85 (0.79;0.91);  $p < 0.001$ ).

Antibiotics that increased their use in the IP were ampicillin (4.3% vs. 7.5%), ampicillin-sulbactam (6.8% vs. 13.8%), gentamicin (1.8% vs. 5.0%), and clarithromycin (15.2% vs. 20.9%), all of which, except for clarithromycin, were antibiotics in the Access group. The new antibiotic guidelines of one hospital incorporated clarithromycin and increased its use locally (19.9% in the BP group vs. 25.1% in the IP group;  $p = 0.050$ ). However, we observed a decreased use of ceftriaxone (16.7% vs. 11.3%), piperacillin-tazobactam (9.9% vs. 6.6%), clindamycin (7.4% vs. 3.0%), and vancomycin (7.8% vs. 5.6%), all of which except for clindamycin were antibiotics in the Watch group (eTable 1, supplement).

We observed that 58% of BP and 67.5% of IP infections required antibiotic adjustments. The de-escalation rate was similar in both periods (31.2% in the BP group vs. 27.8% in the IP group; adjusted RR: 1.07 (0.73;1.57);  $p = 0.738$ ). There was an increase in compliance with the treatment guidelines in the IP group (67.4% vs. 74.5%; adjusted RR: 1.11 (1.00;1.22);  $p = 0.042$ ). The main cause of noncompliance with institutional guidelines was inappropriate antibiotics in both periods (69.0% in BP vs. 68.7% in IP; RR: 1.00 (0.83;1.19;  $p = 0.957$ ) (Table 4).

We could not analyze the rate of HAIs caused by antibiotic-resistant microorganisms because of their low incidence (eTable 2, supplement). However, we observed a decrease in the IP of microorganism antibiotic resistance (13.0% in the BP vs. 5.0% in the IP;  $p < 0.001$ ) at the expense of extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamase microorganisms (61.1% in the BP vs. 47.6% in the IP) (Table 5).

We found no differences in the mortality rates between the periods (2.8% in the BP group vs. 2.0% in the IP group;  $p = 0.474$ ).

## DISCUSSION

We implemented an ASP program across six units in two pediatric hospitals in a medium-income country utilizing a practical toolkit provided by the WHO (10). Our intervention was based on the guideline recommendation of using  $>60\%$  antibiotics from the Access group of the AWaRe classification. Although we were unable to achieve this suggested percentage, we observed an improvement in the percentage use of Access group antibiotics, as well as in the subgroup analysis based on the PICU and NICU. This improvement was attributed to enhanced compliance with the observed treatment guidelines.

One of the major strengths of our study was the significant change in the way physicians prescribed antibiotics. We were able to decrease the use of antibiotics within the Watch group and increase the use of antibiotics within the Access group, thereby reducing the development of antibiotic-resistant microorganisms, particularly extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamase microorganisms. In addition, we performed formative research that allowed us to adapt the intervention to each site.

During BP, we evaluated the current level of guideline compliance in each hospital using guidelines that were over 10 years old. We subsequently developed new treatment guidelines for both hospitals, which were strongly supported by local leaders despite the initial resistance from healthcare teams. To standardize clinical care processes and ensure effective implementation of treatment guidelines, hospital teams undertook five PDSA cycles, during which they tested ideas for establishing communication channels, creating an antibiotic administration-management program, and developing a data and learning management system.

Our investigation revealed a significant disparity in DOT between the intervention (IP) and control (BP) groups, which can be ascribed to the increased use of clarithromycin. We found higher rates of clarithromycin prescriptions in one hospital. We recommended this hospital review the use of clarithromycin in the ALRI guidelines. Despite the reformulation of the ALRI guidelines to decrease clarithromycin use, it is important to note that these changes could not be implemented before the completion of the study. A recent systematic review showed that ASPs are not associated with a reduction in antibiotic prescriptions for hospitalized pediatric patients, with only one of the four studies conducted in LMICs<sup>26</sup>. Another report demonstrated little change in antibiotic consumption in LMICs in recent years<sup>27</sup>. Furthermore, a previous analysis of IQVIA data from 2000 to 2010 reported a dramatic increase in global consumption, particularly in BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa), with this increase continuing through 2015<sup>27,28</sup>. Argentina is currently under evaluation as a member of the BRICS. The need for further research on implementing ASPs in LMICs is crucial because of the numerous obstacles encountered, such as the restricted availability of antibiotics, absence of diagnostic tools, and suboptimal treatment adherence<sup>13,29</sup>. These factors, along with the pressing demand for improved patient care, make it imperative to explore effective methods for implementing ASPs without compromising their quality.

Our findings revealed a decrease in MDRO prevalence in the IP group; however, there were too few cases of multidrug-resistant HAIs to establish a correlation with ASP. We believe that a longer ASP evaluation period is necessary to detect improvements in antibiotic DOT or MDRO incidence.

## Limitations

One of the primary limitations of our study was the discrepancy in the type of infection observed between the two periods. Other limitations included the age and illness severity of the patients, as the BP group consisted of older individuals and the IP group required more PICU admissions. We adjusted the results for age and critical care needs but were unable to improve de-escalation practices. The teams developed PDSA cycles to improve communication between microbiologic results, infectologists, and physicians to change the empirical therapy to pathogen-directed therapy; however, more PDSA cycles may be required to improve. Despite the limited resources available, the data collected during this study were of exceptional quality. They provided highly valuable information regarding the type of antibacterial drug utilized, dosage and duration of usage, culture type and time to rescue, organism resistance patterns, and de-escalation practices.

## CONCLUSION

To the best of our knowledge, this study is one of the first pediatric investigations in South America to evaluate the implementation of ASP in hospitals. Our results suggest that it is practicable to establish an ASP in pediatric hospitals in LMICs, provided that the guidelines set forth by the WHO

are followed and a minimum period for assessing the program's effectiveness can be determined. ASP has the potential to improve the quality of antibiotic use. However, further research is necessary to determine the relationship between ASP and duration of antibiotic use, as longer intervention periods are required for such an assessment.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the hospitalization staff of the Hospital General de Niños Pedro de Elizalde and Hospital Humberto Notti. We would like to thank Paperpal for the English language editing.

## Data Availability Link

[https://osf.io/dh3xk/?view\\_only=9799012b018b4db49e94cab6dab0112d](https://osf.io/dh3xk/?view_only=9799012b018b4db49e94cab6dab0112d)

## Competing interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Gerber, J. S. *et al.* Variability in antibiotic use at children's hospitals. *Pediatrics* **126**, 1067–1073 (2010).
2. Davey, P. *et al.* Interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing practices for hospital inpatients. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* vol. 2017 (2017).
3. Antibiotic Use | CDC. [https://www.cdc.gov/antibiotic-use/index.html?CDC\\_AA\\_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fantibiotic-use%2Fhealthcare%2Findex.html](https://www.cdc.gov/antibiotic-use/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fantibiotic-use%2Fhealthcare%2Findex.html).
4. Donà, D. *et al.* Implementation and impact of pediatric antimicrobial stewardship programs: a systematic scoping review. *Antimicrobial Resistance and Infection Control* vol. 9 (2020).
5. Laxminarayan, R., Sridhar, D., Blaser, M., Wang, M. & Woolhouse, M. Achieving global targets for antimicrobial resistance: The UN should promote targets, funding, and governance. *Science* vol. 353 874–875 (2016).
6. de Kraker, M. E. A., Davey, P. G. & Grundmann, H. Mortality and hospital stay associated with resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* bacteremia: Estimating the burden of antibiotic resistance in Europe. *PLoS Med.* **8**, (2011).
7. Barlam, T. F. *et al.* Implementing an antibiotic stewardship program: Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* vol. 62 e51–e77 (2016).
8. de With, K. *et al.* Strategies to enhance rational use of antibiotics in hospital: a guideline by the German Society for Infectious Diseases. *Infection* **44**, 395–439 (2016).
9. Huebner, J. *et al.* Pilotprojekt einer pädiatrischen Antibiotic-Stewardship-Initiative am Dr. von Haunerschen Kinderspital - neue Wege der pädiatrischen Infektiologie. *Klin. Padiatr.* **225**, 223–229 (2013).
10. Karanika, S., Paudel, S., Grigoras, C., Kalbasi, A. & Mylonakis, E. Systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical and economic outcomes from the implementation of hospital-based antimicrobial stewardship programs. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* vol. 60 4840–4852 (2016).
11. Araujo da Silva, A. R. *et al.* Role of antimicrobial stewardship programmes in children: a systematic review. *Journal of Hospital Infection* vol. 99 117–123 (2018).
12. Klatte, J. M. *<p>Pediatric Antimicrobial Stewardship Programs: Current Perspectives</p>*. *Pediatr. Heal. Med. Ther.* **Volume 11**, 245–255 (2020).
13. Pierce, J. *et al.* Global Antimicrobial Stewardship with a Focus on Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **96**, 621–629 (2020).
14. Alsan, M. *et al.* Out-of-pocket health expenditures and antimicrobial resistance in low-income and middle-income countries: an economic analysis. *Lancet. Infect. Dis.* **15**, 1203–1210 (2015).
15. S, R. *et al.* Efectividad de un programa para mejorar el uso de antibióticos en niños internados en un hospital pediátrico de

tercer nivel de atención en Argentina. *Arch. Argent. Pediatr.* **112**, (2014).

16. Falaschi, A., López, A. & PROA, E. Programa de Optimización de Uso de Antimicrobianos (PROA) Hospital Dr. Humberto Nott. *9º Congreso de Infectología Pediátrica - SAP* Sociedad Argentina de PEDIATRÍA [https://www.sap2.org.ar/i2/SAP\\_TL\\_Externo.php](https://www.sap2.org.ar/i2/SAP_TL_Externo.php) (2020).
17. Berwick, D. M. A primer on leading the improvement of systems. *British Medical Journal* vol. 312 619–622 (1996).
18. The Breakthrough Series: IHI's Collaborative Model for Achieving Breakthrough Improvement | IHI - Institute for Healthcare Improvement. <http://www.ihl.org/resources/Pages/IHIWhitePapers/TheBreakthroughSeriesIHIsCollaborativeModelforAchievingBreakthroughImprovement.aspx>.
19. Quality improvement made simple | The Health Foundation. <https://www.health.org.uk/publications/quality-improvement-made-simple>.
20. Wells, S. *et al.* Are quality improvement collaboratives effective? A systematic review. *BMJ Quality and Safety* vol. 27 226–240 (2018).
21. Garcia-Elorrio, E., Rowe, S. Y., Teijeiro, M. E., Ciapponi, A. & Rowe, A. K. The effectiveness of the quality improvement collaborative strategy in low- And middle-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **14**, 1–23 (2019).
22. May, C. *et al.* Understanding the implementation of complex interventions in health care: The normalization process model. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* **7**, (2007).
23. Organization, W. H. *Antimicrobial stewardship programmes in health-care facilities in low- and middle-income countries. A practical toolkit.* (2019).
24. Rohde, J. M., Jacobsen, D. & Rosenberg, D. J. Role of the hospitalist in antimicrobial stewardship: A review of work completed and description of a multisite collaborative. *Clinical Therapeutics* vol. 35 751–757 (2013).
25. Flodgren, G., O'brien, M. A., Parmelli, E. & Grimshaw, J. M. Local opinion leaders: Effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* vol. 2019 (2019).
26. Zay Ya, K., Win, P. T. N., Bielicki, J., Lambiris, M. & Fink, G. Association Between Antimicrobial Stewardship Programs and Antibiotic Use Globally: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Netw. open* **6**, E2253806 (2023).
27. Jackson, C. *et al.* Estimating global trends in total and childhood antibiotic consumption, 2011-2015. *BMJ Glob. Heal.* **4**, e001241 (2019).
28. Klein, E. Y. *et al.* Global increase and geographic convergence in antibiotic consumption between 2000 and 2015. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, E3463–E3470 (2018).
29. Berhe, D. F. *et al.* Prevalence of antimicrobial resistance and its clinical implications in Ethiopia: a systematic review. *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control* **10**, (2021).
30. Hurst, A. L. *et al.* Handshake stewardship: A highly effective rounding-based antimicrobial optimization service. *Pediatr. Infect. Dis. J.* **35**, 1104–1110 (2016).
31. Tamma, P. D., Avdic, E., Li, D. X., Dzintars, K. & Cosgrove, S. E. Association of adverse events with antibiotic use in hospitalized patients. *JAMA Intern. Med.* **177**, 1308–1315 (2017).
32. Whitney, E. Antibiotic stewardship—Basic principles in urinary tract infections, community acquired pneumonia, and skin and soft tissue infections. *Curr. Probl. Pediatr. Adolesc. Health Care* 101002 (2021) doi:10.1016/j.cppeds.2021.101002.
33. Timmons, V., Townsend, J., McKenzie, R., Burdalski, C. & Adams-Sommer, V. An evaluation of provider-chosen antibiotic indications as a targeted antimicrobial stewardship intervention. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **46**, 1174–1179 (2018).

Table 1. Template for Intervention Description and Replication.

## WHAT

A formal conceptual framework was established using a driver diagram (DD) based on evidence and expert consultations in the fields of quality improvement, pediatrics, and infectious diseases (see Figure 1). This framework utilized quality improvement tools such as prioritization matrices, block diagrams, and Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles.

The Antibiotic Stewardship Program (ASP) comprises several key components, including:

1. Antibiotic Group Definitions: The course covered the definitions of antibiotic groups according to WHO recommendations.
2. Audit and Feedback for Antibiotic Use Improvement: The "handshake stewardship" strategy was employed to enhance the effectiveness of prospective audits with feedback. This involved providing feedback to providers in face-to-face meetings<sup>7,30</sup>.
3. Development of Facility-Specific Treatment Guidelines: Each site developed tailored treatment guidelines or clinical pathways for common infections.
4. Antibiotic Timeout Implementation: The "antibiotic timeout" approach was used for provider-led reassessment of the ongoing necessity and choice of antibiotics. This process focused on four key questions<sup>31</sup>.

- \* Does the patient develop an infection that responds to antibiotics?

- \* Have the necessary culture and diagnostic tests been conducted?

- \* Can antibiotics be discontinued or optimized by narrowing their spectrum (also known as "de-escalation") or by switching from intravenous to oral administration?

- \* What is the appropriate duration for the antibiotic(s), considering the hospital stay and any post discharge therapy?

5. Infection-based interventions: These focus on tailoring therapy to culture results and optimizing the treatment duration to ensure compliance with guidelines or clinical pathways<sup>32</sup>.

6. Pharmacy-Based Interventions: The pharmacists at each facility implemented interventions aimed at documenting the indications for antibiotic use, adjusting dosages, optimizing doses, providing alerts for duplicate therapy, and preventing antibiotic-related drug interactions<sup>33</sup>.

7. Educational Initiatives: Education has been instrumental in comprehensive efforts aimed at enhancing antibiotic use in hospitals. It has been delivered through various means such as posters, electronic communication with staff groups, face-to-face interactions, and virtual sessions.

The Quality Improvement (QI) course comprised four asynchronous virtual modules and two synchronous virtual sessions. It encompassed a broad range of topics, including the theory of improvement, the model for improvement, DD, PDSA cycles, data analysis, and the psychology of

change.
<p><b>WHO PROVIDED</b></p> <p>The study's intervention necessitated that the coordinating team possess an advanced level of knowledge regarding quality improvement and implementation. To this end, a local improvement team comprising a pharmacist, physician, and expert in antibiotic use was established. The selection of these individuals was based on peer nomination, considering peers' assessments of their expertise and communication abilities. Coaching specialists in quality improvement were tasked with supervising local teams.</p>
<p><b>HOW</b></p> <p>Networking sessions were implemented monthly, with a duration of 90 minutes and participation from all centers and the coordinating team. These cycles included action periods during which each center worked individually on their change ideas based on the local context. Experts provided training on QI using the collaborative Breakthrough Series model from the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI), as well as practical recommendations for optimizing antimicrobial use.</p> <p>The purpose of the learning session cycles was to encourage collaborative learning and networking among all centers and the study-coordinating team, focusing on biweekly data and ongoing efforts. During these sessions, each participating center presented an improvement cycle to promote collective learning and exchange insights on challenges and strategies for implementing changes. In addition, updates on global measurements were shared.</p> <p>Implementation Deployment (Change Ideas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each site formed teams involving local facilitators, with at least one healthcare team member playing the role of executive implementation leader responsible for planning, dissemination, and development.</li> <li>• Overall coordination of the study was managed by healthcare quality, infectious disease, pediatric, and coaching improvement specialists.</li> <li>• Multidisciplinary teams comprising pharmacists, infectious disease specialists, wards, NICU, and PICU physicians were engaged in co-designing interventions at each site.</li> <li>• Follow-up calls were conducted by a coach to provide comprehensive support for implementation, analyze measurement results, and identify challenges in ongoing PDSA cycles to agree on the next steps.</li> <li>• Each center used Google Classroom® to record PDSA cycles.</li> </ul> <p>Data for Improvement: We reported the ongoing global data for each site in a biweekly manner. The data for each outcome were consolidated in run charts.</p>
<p><b>WHERE</b></p> <p>Interactions among the coordinating groups, sites, and participants were facilitated virtually. The coaching sessions were conducted remotely utilizing the Zoom® platform.</p>

<p><b>WHEN and HOW MUCH</b></p> <p>The QI implementation course was structured into four modules, each lasting five educational hours and consisting of two synchronous virtual sessions, each spanning 90 minutes. Reading and learning materials were accessible on the virtual campus, granting permanent access to the participants.</p> <p>Moreover, monthly networking sessions were held, each lasting 90 minutes, beginning from week 22 and continuing until week 52. Biweekly coaching sessions were also provided, with durations ranging from 30 to 60 minutes, commencing at week 22 and concluding at week 52. Furthermore, two extended learning sessions were conducted, each lasting 240 minutes.</p>
<p><b>TAILORING</b></p> <p>Coaching sessions were tailored to meet the unique needs of each site, considering their level of proficiency in implementing quality improvement (QI). The improvement recommendations were not prescriptive, allowing each center to adapt and implement the suggestions in a manner that aligns with their own capabilities and current state.</p>
<p><b>MODIFICATIONS</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><b>HOW WELL</b></p> <p>The study was conducted with equal participation from both centers.</p> <p>The Driver Diagram identified three primary drivers, eight secondary drivers, and 14 change ideas as the theory of change. It was expected that all sites would have implemented at least one test or change the idea for each primary driver based on the conclusions of the study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All primary drivers were incorporated into at least one change idea and the PDSA cycle.</li> <li>• The sites conducted five cycles to standardize clinical care processes, three to establish communication circuits, four to develop an antibiotic administration management program, and two to implement a data and learning management system.</li> <li>• Both sites updated their existing protocols for treating acute lower respiratory infections, urinary tract infections, and skin and soft tissue infections.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, twenty-four HCWs from local teams were trained in QI implementation by IECS QI advisors through a four-week course with two synchronous sessions, totaling 20 hours.</p>

**Table 2. Characterization of the participating sectors and their patients.**

	Baseline period (N=249) n/N (%)	Implementation period (N=588) n/N (%)	P-value <sup>§</sup>
Female sex	113/249 (45.4)	254/588 (43.2)	0.600
Age in months*	30 (9, 75)	11.5 (3, 41)	<0.001
Weight (Kg)*	12.2 (8-22.3)	9.1 (5.6-15)	<0.001
Unit of hospitalization			<0.001
Inpatients Unit	146/249 (58.6)	265/588 (45.1)	
Pediatric Intensive Care Unit	78/249 (31.3)	272/588 (46.3)	
Neonatal Intensive Care Unit	25/249 (10.0)	51/588 (8.7)	
Length of stay*	8 (4, 13)	8 (5, 12)	0.700
Discharge place			<0.001
Home	163/249 (65.5)	294/588 (50.0)	
Inpatients Unit	73/249 (29.3)	247/588 (42.0)	
Pediatric Intensive Care Unit	2/249 (0.8)	27/588 (4.6)	
Other institutions	4/249 (1.6)	8/588 (1.4)	
Death	7/249 (2.8)	12/588 (2.0)	
Type of infection			
Acute lower-respiratory infections	163/258 (63.2)	556/639 (87.0)	0.700
Community-Acquired Pneumonia	123/163 (75.5)	405/556 (72.8)	
Health Care-Associated Pneumonia	15/163 (9.2)	45/556 (8.1)	
Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia	14/163 (8.6)	53/556 (9.5)	
Other	11/163 (6.7)	53/556 (9.5)	
Urinary Tract Infection (UTI)	46/258 (17.8)	46/639 (7.2)	<0.001
Community-Acquired UTI	26/46 (56.5)	34/46 (73.9)	
Catheter-Associated UTI	4/46 (8.7)	10/46 (21.7)	
Other	16/46 (34.8)	2/46 (4.3)	
Skin and soft tissue infections (SSTI)	49/258 (19.0)	37/639 (5.8)	0.999
Community-Acquired SSTI	41/49 (83.7)	30/37 (81.1)	
Health Care-Associated SSTI	7/49 (14.3)	6/37 (16.2)	
Other	1/49 (2.0)	1/37 (2.7)	
Use of Mechanical Ventilatory Assistance	78/249 (31.3)	286/588 (48.6)	<0.001
Use of Central Venous Catheter	81/249 (32.5)	280/588 (47.6)	<0.001
Use of Urinary Catheter	60/249 (24.1)	281/588 (47.8)	<0.001
Use of Parenteral Nutrition	13/249 (5.2)	17/588 (2.9)	0.100

\* Median (IQR)

\*\* One patient can have more than one

<sup>§</sup>Wilcoxon rank sum test; Pearson's Chi-squared test; Fisher's exact test

**Table 3. Outcomes by study period and adjustment for age and unit of hospitalization.**

Outcome	Baseline period n/N	Implementation period n/N	Crude Ratio of Rates (CI 95%)	P-value**	Adjusted Ratio of Rates (CI 95%)**	P-value <sup>β</sup>
Days of antibiotic therapy	2605/3135 (830.94)	6749/6421 (1051.08)	1.23 (1.17;1.28)	<0.001	1.21 (1.16;1.27)	<0.001
Antibiotic consumption in the Access group	808/2605 (310.2)	2578/6749 (382.0)	1.23 (1.14;1.33)	<0.001	1.22 (1.13;1.33)	<0.001
Antibiotic consumption in the Watch group	1622/2605 (622.6)	3724/6749 (551.8)	0.89 (0.84;0.94)	<0.001	0.86 (0.81;0.91)	<0.001
Antibiotic adjustment	80/138 (58.0%)	284/421 (67.5%)	1.16 (0.99;1.36)	0.058	1.18 (1.00;1.38)	0.045
De-escalation	25/80 (31.2%)	79/284 (27.8%)	0.89 (0.61;1.30)	0.543	1.07 (0.73;1.57)	0.738
Compliance with treatment guidelines	174/258 (67.4%)	476/639 (74.5%)	1.10 (1.00;1.22)	0.043	1.11 (1.00;1.22)	0.042
Non-compliance with institutional guidelines						
- Inappropriate antibiotic	58/84 (69.0%)	112/163 (68.7%)	1.00 (0.83;1.19)	0.957	-	-
- Inappropriate antibiotic dosage*	4/84 (4.8%)	12/163 (7.4%)	1.55 (0.51;4.65)	0.438	1.35 (0.43;4.24)	0.602
- Inappropriate treatment duration*	24/84 (28.6%)	45/163 (27.6%)	0.97 (0.64;1.47)	0.873	0.79 (0.52;1.21)	0.287

\*The percentage was reported instead of the rate per 1,000

\*\*P-value obtained from the generalized linear model in which the period was tested

<sup>β</sup>P-value obtained from the generalized linear model in which the period was tested by adjusting for age and place of hospitalization. For the same outcomes, the adjustment was performed only by age due to collinearity.

Table 4. Subgroup analysis of principal outcomes based on hospitalization unit.

	Baseline n/N (Rate per 1,000)	Implementation n/N (Rate per 1,000)	Crude Ratio of Rates (CI 95%)	P-value*
<b>Days of antibiotic therapy (DOT)</b>				
<b>Age Group</b>				
Less than one year	846/1417 (597.04)	3708/3994 (928.39)	1.56 (1.45;1.68)	<0.001
Between one year and three	598/592 (1010.14)	1472/1158 (1271.16)	1.06 (0.96;1.16)	0.257
More than three	1161/1126 (1031.08)	1569/1269 (1236.41)	1.20 (1.11;1.29)	<0.001
<b>Unit of hospitalization</b>				
Inpatients unit	1264/1411 (895.82)	1986/1778 (1116.99)	1.25 (1.17;1.34)	<0.001
Pediatric intensive care unit	1004/993 (1011.08)	3952/3372 (1172.00)	1.05 (0.98;1.12)	0.182
Neonatal intensive care unit	337/731 (461.01)	811/1271 (638.08)	1.38 (1.22;1.57)	<0.001
<b>Compliance with guidelines</b>				
Yes	1610/2185 (736.84)	4774/4698 (1016.18)	1.38 (1.30;1.46)	<0.001
No	995/855 (1163.74)	1962/1679 (1168.55)	1.00 (0.93;1.08)	0.916
<b>Pediatric intensive care + mechanical ventilation</b>	921/909 (1013.20)	3812/3290 (1158.66)	1.02 (0.95;1.10)	0.517
<b>Antibiotic consumption in the Access group</b>				

	Baseline n/N (Rate per 1,000)	Implementation n/N (Rate per 1,000)	Crude Ratio of Rates (CI 95%)	P-value*
<b>Place of hospitalization</b>				
Inpatients unit	504/1264 (398.7)	825/1986 (415.4)	1.04 (0.93;1.16)	0.469
Pediatric intensive care unit	202/1004 (201.2)	1401/3952 (354.5)	1.76 (1.52;2.04)	<0.001
Neonatal intensive care unit	102/337 (302.7)	352/811 (434.0)	1.43 (1.15;1.79)	0.001

\*P-value obtained from the generalized linear model in which the period was tested

**Table 5. Microorganism antibiotic resistance by study period**

Microorganism antibiotic resistance	Baseline period	Implementation period	P-value
	(N = 138)	(N = 421)	
	n/N (%)	n/N (%)	
<b>Antibiotic resistance</b>	18/138 (13.0%)	21/421 (5.0%)	0.001
Methicillin resistance	3/18 (16.7%)	8/21 (38.1%)	0.171
Vancomycin resistance	0/18 (0.0%)	0/21 (0.0%)	>0.999
Extended-spectrum $\beta$ -lactamase	11/18 (61.1%)	10/21 (47.6%)	0.523
Carbapenemases	4/18 (22.2%)	6/21 (28.6%)	0.726