Stable post-TRUS biopsy sepsis rates and antibiotic resistance over 5 years in patients from Newcastle, New South Wales

To the Editor: Sepsis after transrectal ultrasound (TRUS)-guided prostate biopsy is a potentially serious complication. Antibiotic prophylaxis reduces the risk of sepsis; however, practices are highly variable among urologists.

Several reports show increasing incidence of bacterial resistance in patients with sepsis after TRUS-guided biopsy.1,2 Preprocedure screening of high-risk patients using cultures from rectal swabs would allow targeted prophylaxis.3-5 We performed a retrospective audit of all men undergoing a TRUS-guided prostate biopsy by one of nine urologists in Newcastle, New South Wales, to assess the incidence of bacteraemia and changes in antimicrobial susceptibility.

Unique patient data were collected retrospectively from private and public hospital records, including data on positive blood cultures from Hunter Area, Douglass Hanly Moir, Lavery and Healthscope pathology services. Patient and pathology records were cross-referenced and data were analysed using Microsoft Excel. This clinical audit did not require ethics committee approval, in accord with the NSW Health policy on authorisation to commence human research in public health organisations.

From 2008 to 2012, 4218 men underwent a TRUS-guided prostate biopsy. Median age was 64 years. Of these men, 35 (0.8%) developed bacteraemia, with the annual incidence varying between 4/935 (0.4%) and 12/999 (1.2%) over the 5 years (non-significant differences). There were no recorded deaths from sepsis. Most of the cultures from men who developed bacteraemia (29/35) grew Escherichia coli. None grew Enterococcus species. The isolate cultured was resistant to at least one of the preprocedure prophylactic antibiotics given in 13 out of 35 cases.

Bacteraemia was uncommon, and the rates we found were comparable to previously reported ones.2 Antimicrobial resistance fluctuated (Box) without significant change.

Of note, we found quinolone resistance for cultures from 5/12 patients who developed bacteraemia in 2012. Worldwide emergence of multidrug-resistant E. coli sequence type 131 has coincided with a rising incidence of quinolone-resistant infection after TRUS-guided prostate biopsy in New Zealand.6

Only five isolates (out of 35) were resistant to both gentamicin and ciprofloxacin, while 12 were resistant to one of these, suggesting that a prophylactic combination remains superior to either agent alone. The low overall incidence of post-TRUS bacteraemia due to a pathogen with resistance to ciprofloxacin and gentamicin (5/4218; 0.1%) implies that there is no utility in screening with cultures from rectal swabs before TRUS biopsy in the population we studied. It remains essential to administer antibiotics prophylactically 1 hour before the procedure and at an appropriate dose to maximise sepsis prevention.
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Primary abdominal tuberculosis presenting as chronic dyspepsia

To the Editor: Tuberculosis (TB) continues to be a leading cause of preventable morbidity and mortality worldwide. Although Australia has the lowest rates in the world, more recently there has been a spike secondary to increased international travel and migration.1

TB can affect virtually any organ system in the body and can present with atypical or non-specific symptoms. A population-based study in America found that classical symptoms of cough and fever of > 2 weeks’ duration and weight loss were variably present and were insensitive predictors for TB.2

A 51-year-old immunocompetent man who had migrated from Somalia 18 years previously presented with a 6-year history of being treated with proton pump inhibitors for chronic duodenal ulcers. Repeated gastroscopies showed oedematous thickened duodenum. He had a 6-month history of anorexia, nausea, vomiting and weight loss, and was referred for diagnostic laparoscopy for suspected gastrointestinal malignancy.

A computed tomography scan of the abdomen showed small coeliac axis lymph nodes and oedematous thickened duodenum (Box). Gastroscopic biopsy samples over the past 6 years had shown chronic inflammation but no granulomas. Laparoscopy showed florid peritoneal nodules suggestive of miliary TB. A biopsy sample was positive for polymerase chain reaction (Xpert MTB/RIF, Cepheid) and cultures for Mycobacterium tuberculosis. The patient was diagnosed with gastrointestinal TB. He responded well to antitubercular treatment.

Gastrointestinal TB is difficult to diagnose. From a review of 23 patients in India, the most common symptoms of duodenal TB were vomiting (14 patients), epigastric pain (13), and weight loss and anorexia (7).3 Patients with extrapulmonary TB may or may not have concomitant pulmonary TB.2

The ileocaecal region is most commonly involved, followed by the colon, jejunum, appendix, duodenum, stomach, sigmoid colon and rectum.4 Gastroduodenal TB is rare and is often misdiagnosed as peptic ulcer disease. Preoperative endoscopic biopsies have rarely shown underlying aetiology.3

Abdominal TB, although uncommon in developed nations, should be suspected in immunocompromised patients or people from highly endemic areas presenting with longstanding non-specific symptoms that do not resolve with standard therapy. Delayed diagnosis can lead to complications such as peritonitis, and intestinal obstruction and perforation. Therefore, early diagnosis and treatment improves patient outcomes without the need for surgical intervention.
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people living with HIV attending a tertiary care hospital in Melbourne. The study received approval from our research ethics committee. Between 1 January 1990 and 6 March 2014, a total of 500 patients were under the care of the HIV clinic. These patients were included in a retrospective analysis of data extracted from existing pathology and administrative databases.

Mean age at presentation was 38 years, median length of time attending the clinic was 24.5 months (range, 1–289 months), and 383 patients (77%) were male. Two hundred and twenty patients (44%) were born outside Australia in over 60 different countries. Fifty-eight patients (12%) originated from low-income countries, 106 (21%) from middle-income countries, and 324 (65%) from high-income countries, including Australia.

All patients were included to assess screening for TB in accordance with existing guidelines, which currently recommend screening at diagnosis.2,3 Only patients from areas endemic for schistosomiasis (≥10% prevalence)4 were included in the data extraction for schistosomiasis screening. Similarly, only patients from areas endemic for strongyloidiasis (≥20% or unknown prevalence)5 were included in the data extraction for strongyloidiasis screening.

We also performed a prospective analysis of previously unscreened patients attending the clinic from 7 March to 29 August 2014.

Serological testing comprised Quantiferon-TB Gold (Cellestis) (Mantoux testing for some patients before 2004), Schistosoma IgG indirect haemagglutination assay (ELITech), and Strongyloides IgG enzyme immunoassay (DRG Diagnostics).

In the retrospective audit, five of 58 patients who had been screened for schistosomiasis returned positive serology results, indicating past or current infection. In the prospective sample, one of 22 patients was found to have a past or current Schistosoma infection that was previously undiagnosed despite the patient originating from an endemic country.

In our retrospective analysis, seven of 83 patients who had been screened for strongyloidiasis returned positive serology results, indicating past or current infection. In the prospective phase, one of 20 patients was found to have a past or current S. stercoralis infection that was previously undiagnosed despite the patient having come from an endemic country.

In the retrospective audit, 10 patients were diagnosed with active TB and were excluded from further analysis. TB screening was recorded in 257 of 490 patients (52%); of these, 24 (9%) were positive and 11 (4%) had indeterminate results. In the prospective sample, two of 19 patients not previously screened for TB returned positive results. Both of these patients were born in high-risk countries.

Our results suggest that screening for TB, strongyloidiasis and schistosomiasis should be a part of primary care for HIV-infected patients originating from areas endemic for these infections.

Gurry et al
unless otherwise indicated. † Optimal timing uncertain; ideally 14 days after emergency splenectomy, or earlier if there is a risk of loss of the patient to follow-up. ‡ Amoxicillin 250 mg daily was the most commonly prescribed prophylactic antibiotic, with a variable duration of recommendation (1 year to lifelong). • except for the rate of first vaccination against Streptococcus pneumoniae, Neisseria meningitidis and Haemophilus influenzae type b (Box). At discharge, most patients were advised to follow up with their general practitioner; however, GPs were neither provided with the information on the type of vaccination given in the hospital, nor with the appropriate recommendation on follow-up vaccinations.

Our study highlights gaps in best practice and areas for quality improvement and education. Lack of awareness of the guidelines among the surgical teams was found to be a notable factor in the poor compliance with the 2008 ASID guidelines. Asplenia and hyposplenia care should involve a multidisciplinary approach with involvement of surgeons, infectious diseases physicians, haematologists, pharmacists and clinical nurse coordinators.

We recommend the ASID 2008 guidelines be updated, as there have been changes in the vaccination recommendations since publication. A national spleen registry could be considered, for sending vaccination reminders and providing long-term follow-up and ongoing support. This would also allow prospective data collection for assessing compliance and measuring rates of OPSI.

Compliance with recommendations in the ASID management guidelines for prevention of sepsis in patients with asplenia or hyposplenia, before and after guideline publication in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of compliance</th>
<th>Number of patients*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preguideline (n = 37)</td>
<td>Postguideline (n = 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First vaccination after surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumococcal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meningococcal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemophilus influenzae type b</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of first vaccination,† median (range)</td>
<td>7 (−7 to 44)</td>
<td>7 (1 to 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophylactic antibiotic use‡</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve antibiotic supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-reduction measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient alerts (eg, bracelet)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splenic salvage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of sepsis included in histology report</td>
<td>0/36</td>
<td>0/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of sepsis reported if Howell-Jolly body seen in peripheral blood smear</td>
<td>0/15</td>
<td>0/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meningococcal vaccination for travellers to high-risk areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing the patient of malaria risks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing the patient of Babesia risks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient warned of risks associated with animal bites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spleen registry referral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASID = Australasian Society for Infectious Diseases. * Unless otherwise indicated. † Optimal timing uncertain; ideally 14 days after emergency splenectomy, or earlier if there is a risk of loss of the patient to follow-up. ‡ Amoxicillin 250 mg daily was the most commonly prescribed prophylactic antibiotic, with a variable duration of recommendation (1 year to lifelong). •

Prophylactic antibiotic use and other measures, as summarised in the national Australasian Society for Infectious Diseases (ASID)-endorsed guidelines for prevention of sepsis in asplenic and hyposplenic patients.

We performed a retrospective cohort study among adult patients who had undergone post-traumatic splenectomy at a tertiary referral centre in Sydney, to assess compliance by health professionals and identify factors that could improve uptake of ASID recommendations. We reviewed hospital medical records and discharge summaries to assess compliance with recommendations before and after the publication of the ASID guidelines.

The Research and Ethics Office of the South Western Sydney Local Health District granted site-specific approval on the basis of low and negligible risk.

A total of 79 patients were identified, 37 in the preguideline group (January 2003 – June 2008) and 42 in the postguideline group (July 2008 – December 2013). Our findings are summarised in the Box.

Overall, compliance with the recommendations was poor,

Ravindra Dotel MB BS1
Iain B Gosbell FRACP, FRCPA, FASM1,2
Ann Hofmeyr MB ChB, FRACP, FRCPA1

1 Liverpool Hospital, Sydney, NSW.
2 University of Western Sydney, Sydney, NSW.

dotel@yahoo.com

Competing interests: No relevant disclosures.

doi: 10.5694/mja14.01643
Pitney may have knowledge of the field, his conclusions do not appear to be based on published scientific literature, which is clear.2 We feel that it would be impossible to overturn a field that has a well established body of scientific evidence. Our ethical duty, based on our knowledge, is to consider the health implications of climate change, on the assumption that climate scientists are broadly correct.3 Were we agnostic or sceptical about climate science, we would leave consideration of its health aspects to others.

Pitney’s interpretation seems to include the promotion of nuclear power, dams and the continuation of business-as-usual fossil fuel burning, which even the International Energy Agency cautions against.4 Besides climate protection, local effects such as dust, particulates and volatile organic compounds causing cardiorespiratory illness, and regional effects on farmland and water quality suggest that we should move away from fossil fuels.5

The publication of Pitney’s letter raises two questions. First, did the editorial team decide that in this case free speech should trump science? Was the letter reviewed? If so, what is the position of the Journal on providing “balance” by publishing the views of vaccination opponents and those sceptical that AIDS is caused by HIV?

---

The G20, human health and sustainability: an interview with Jeffrey D Sachs

To the Editor: Pitney has strongly rebutted the views of Sachs (on development) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (on climate science).1 While we agree that free speech is vital, we also assert that science, however flawed, is preferable to dogma and opinion, whether held and expressed by followers of Galen, any religion, or a master under whose tutelage someone studied long ago.

Medical science has seen anaesthesia trump physical restraint, hygiene defeat puerperal fever, and the smallpox virus isolated in secure laboratories. We consider that we have an obligation to regard the findings of climate scientists as serious and credible, just as, a priori, we should not dismiss (especially without deep knowledge) the central findings of any sphere of science, medical or otherwise. We accept the principal findings of climate science. While Pitney may have knowledge of the field, his conclusions do not appear to be based on published scientific literature, which is clear.2
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