

stabilization, 27 (6.6%) developed a bloodstream infection (BSI), of which 21 (77.8%) came from the DCL group (Figures 2, 3). 19% of BSI in the DCL group were caused by yeast. 30.7% of patients developed a culture-positive surgical site infection (SSI) or intra-abdominal infection (IAI), with a rate of 40.6% in the DCL group (Table 2). Yeast were isolated in 40.5% of patients with positive cultures, 86.3% of which were isolated in the DCL group, with an overall incidence of 20.8% in the entire DCL group. Median time from arrival to infection diagnosis was 11 days. Patients generally received empiric Piperacillin-tazobactam while the abdomen was in discontinuity. **Conclusions:** Infection in civilian trauma laparotomy often arises as SSI or IAI, and is most pronounced in the DCL population. Yeast represents an unexpectedly high proportion of causative organisms. Further research is required to assess whether yeast burden can be mitigated by either incorporating antifungal prophylaxis at time of initial laparotomy, or by shortening empiric post-laparotomy antibiotic courses.

Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology 2025;5(Suppl. S2):s50–s51

doi:10.1017/ash.2025.253

Presentation Type:

Poster Presentation

Subject Category: Antibiotic Stewardship

Barriers and Enablers to Penicillin Allergy Delabeling in Pediatric Primary Care: Findings from a Multisite Qualitative Study
Eileen Carter¹, Elizabeth Monsees², Sharon Hwang³, Tara Schmidt⁴, Mary Lou Manning⁴, Cliff O'Callahan⁵, Rana El Feghaly⁶ and Monika Pogorzelska-Maziarz⁷

¹University of Connecticut School of Nursing; ²Children's Mercy Hospital; ³Nemours Children's Hospital; ⁴Thomas Jefferson University; ⁵Middlesex Health and University of Connecticut; ⁶Children's Mercy Kansas City and ⁷Villanova University

Background: Up to 10% of children have penicillin allergy labels, although, when tested, >95% tolerate penicillin. These labels expose children to increased risks of harm through adulthood. Professional allergy societies recommend the proactive removal of low-risk penicillin allergy labels among children by history alone or following direct oral drug challenges. However, access to subspecialty allergy testing is limited and recent studies have demonstrated that direct oral amoxicillin challenges in low-risk populations can be safely performed in pediatric primary care settings. We aimed to identify prescribers' attitudes towards penicillin allergy delabeling and barriers and enablers to penicillin allergy delabeling in pediatric primary offices. **Method:** We conducted a multisite qualitative study consisting of interviews and/or focus groups with 29 primary care prescribers at 10 primary care practices of two health systems in the northeast U.S. We analyzed data using conventional content analysis and grouped barriers and enablers to penicillin allergy delabeling according to the Capability, Opportunity, and Motivation domains of the COM-B Behavior Change Wheel. **Results:** Prescribers agreed that unnecessary penicillin allergy labels in children should be avoided and shared their experiences delabeling penicillin allergies from history alone and collaborating with parents to trial amoxicillin in children with low-risk penicillin allergies. Predominant barriers among prescribers to penicillin allergy delabeling included insufficient capability (suboptimal knowledge and skills in penicillin allergy delabeling), poor social and environmental opportunity (parent unwillingness to trial penicillin, lack of time, inadequate office space and resources), and poor motivation (tendency to accept reported penicillin allergies due to perception that consequences of penicillin allergy are rare and distant, inherent logistical difficulties to delabel, and lack of reasons to delabel). To facilitate penicillin allergy delabeling, participants recommended the implementation of a protocol and training in penicillin allergy delabeling, interventions to engage parents in delabeling, innovative approaches to address insufficient resources and infrastructures, and amplification of reasons for primary care prescribers to delabel. We provide representative quotes of the barriers and corresponding enablers to penicillin allergy delabeling in pediatric primary care in Table. **Conclusion:** There is precedent for penicillin allergy delabeling in pediatric primary care. Findings indicate that prescribers are inclined to delabel low-risk penicillin allergies

if given the necessary education/training, parent support, resources, and infrastructure.

Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology 2025;5(Suppl. S2):s51

doi:10.1017/ash.2025.254

Table. Representative Quotes of Barriers and Corresponding Enablers to Primary Care Prescribers' Delabeling Penicillin Allergies Using the COM-B Behavior Change Wheel		
Barriers	Corresponding Enabler	
CAPABILITY – Primary care prescribers' knowledge and skills to delabel penicillin allergies. Providers expressed suboptimal knowledge and skills in penicillin allergy delabeling. "I honestly think there needs to be more provider education for this... Maybe even though the child's itchy, should I've just continued them today on – to complete their ten days?... I usually go to the national conferences. That's not usually something that comes up. And so provider education would be helpful." – Interviewee 2	Provide education and training (e.g., pathway) to guide penicillin allergy delabeling "We have so many clinical pathways at [facility], but, um, like, a kind of decision tree that would help providers feel confident if, you know, these are the symptoms that they hear, then they can feel comfortable removing it. I feel like that kind of guided decision-making can help people feel more comfortable with those types of decisions." – Interviewee 8	
OPPORTUNITY – Primary care prescribers' social and environmental ability to delabel penicillin allergies. Visits are not amenable to penicillin allergy delabeling "Some of our patients... the very complex... are 40 minutes, but everybody else is 20... it's not really conducive to doing a lot of other stuff. We can't even figure out how to do fluoride varnish in a timely way, which is so easy and quick. It's it's—there's a lot we wish we could do, but we're not in a position to do it right now. I love the idea. It'd be great, you know, but those are the barriers that I see." – Interviewee 7 Parent resistance to penicillin allergy delabeling "I'd say it goes about like, 50/50 how um, whether a family is interested in delabeling or not. Some families are like, "No. They are allergic to penicillin. We are allergic to penicillin, and we are always going to be allergic to it." – Interviewee 13	Develop innovative approaches to facilitate penicillin allergy delabeling "It might be technically feasible, um, especially, you know, we could consider structuring that on days when the office doesn't have all the providers there. So we have some space." – Interviewee 12 Engage parents in penicillin allergy delabeling "I think [parents] would be pretty receptive, you know, especially if you explain how you're giving them, you know, broader spectrum antibiotics or or antibiotics that may not be the best choice because of the allergy. Um, I think, again, if you can convey expertise that it is okay and safe to de-label them based on the history, I think parents—most most parents, I think, would be okay with it." – Interviewee 10	
MOTIVATION – Primary care prescribers' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to delabel penicillin allergies. Poor infrastructure and resources to delabel "I think, one, the primary care visits are short, and the idea of creating these lengthy visits where we would have one room occupied with this patient for a very long time just kinda logistically doesn't seem like it would be met with a lot of, um, agreement. And, two, um, like, it—I just don't think we are equipped to be managing somebody who ends up having anaphylaxis and kind of setting up the possibility that they would have that reaction in primary care." – Interviewee 8 Lack of reasons to delabel "There's just more and more things that we, as primary care providers... are expected to do... We don't actually have to put this pressure on our primary care doctors... There's other ways to do this." – Interviewee 12	Harness the necessary infrastructure and resources to delabel "If there was a separate physical space. Because like I said, they're gonna have to be there for a little bit to observe. Um, uh, and the staffing that goes with that. But, you know, if you could align everything together I think it would be— it would be okay with that." – Focus Group 5, Speaker 2 Greater awareness of reasons to delabel "I mean, time is limited, but I see this as you put in time ahead of time, which saves you time in the end. Does that make sense? Because it's important for patients, especially—I've seen over and over again, a kid gets labeled for whatever reason they have an anoxicallergic allergy and now they're working on their like fourth ear infection. And then you're— you don't even— you're like, well, what do I do? You know, what do I do now? You're kind of running out of options. And I think I'm concerned about antimicrobial resistance." – Interviewee 2	

Presentation Type:

Poster Presentation

Subject Category: Antibiotic Stewardship

Does Purple Reign? PCR versus grams stain for critical result reporting for blood cultures growing gram positive cocci

Julia Fischer¹, Gabryjela Walsh², Humberto Urrutia², Adina Paley², Michael Lorenzo² and Jennifer Schimmel²

¹Baystate Medical Center and ²Baystate Health

Background: Gram positive cocci (GPC) in blood cultures (BLCX) can represent pathogens or contaminants. Many laboratories notify care teams of a positive BLCX with the gram stain (GS) as a critical results report (CRR). However, PCR results are available about 90 minutes later and can provide useful information to distinguish a contaminant from a pathogen. This study aimed to investigate the effects of changing CRR from Gram Strain Results (GSR) to PCR Results (PCRR) on anti-MRSA coverage (AMC) and other healthcare utilization for GPC. **Methods:** Retrospective observational study of adult patients with BLCX growing GPC. Clinical and healthcare utilization information was collected using the electronic medical record. A "true pathogen" (TP) was defined as: MRSA, MSSA, Enterococcus, Streptococcus pyogenes, Streptococcus agalactiae and Streptococcus pneumoniae. We also defined TP as a coagulase-negative staphylococci or other Streptococcus species with 2/2 positive BLCX with intraarticular or endovascular hardware present and modified Pitt score (mPitt) greater than or equal to 4. A "likely contaminant" (LC) was defined as coagulase negative staphylococci or Streptococcus species (not included in the initial TP definition) with 1-2 BLCX positive, with or without intraarticular or endovascular hardware present, mPitt < 4. CRR protocol was changed from a call from the laboratory to the floor upon GSR to a call with the PCRR to relay both the GS and the PCR data. **Results:** Of 167 patients included, 91 had CRR with GSR and 76 had CRR with PCRR. For GSR, 56 were classified as TP and 25 were classified as LC. For PCRR 38 were classified as TP and 37 were classified as LC. Overall, there was more use of AMC for patients with GSR (63%) compared to PCRR (42%) p < 0.05. There was a significant difference in AMC for TP after PCRR (42%) compared to GSR (74%) p < 0.05. There was no significant difference AMC for LC in PCRR (41%) from GSR (56%) p = 0.37. For LC, there was a decrease in echocardiograms 21% compared to 28% and ID consults 24% compared to 60% respectively with PCRR compared to GSR. **Conclusion:** PCR CRR decreased AMC for TP and for total patients after PCR CRR indicating that changing CRR to PCR