Article:
Ahmed, S, Bonnett, L, Melhuish, A et al. (50 more authors) (2021) Development of clinical prediction models for outcomes of complicated intra-abdominal infection. British Journal of Surgery. ISSN 0007-1323

https://doi.org/10.1093/bjs/znaa117

Title: Development and internal validation of clinical prediction models for relapse and death in patients treated for complicated intra-abdominal infections in the United Kingdom.

CABI authorship group: Shadia Ahmed[a], Laura Bonnett[b] Anne Melhuish[a], MdTanveer Adil[c], Ila Aggarwal[d], Wadah Ali[e], John Bennett[f], Emma Boldock[g], Flora Agnes Burns[a], Elzbieta Czarniak[h], Robert Dennis[i], Barnaby Flower[j], Rosemary Fok[k], Anna Goodman[j], Sonal Halai[l], Thomas Hanna[k], Mohamed Hashem[m], Susanne H Hodgson[n], Gareth Hughes[o], Katherine-Helen Hurndalm[m], Rachel Hyland[a], Muhammad Rafaih Iqbal[m], Anna Jarchow-MacDonald[d], Mithun Kailavasan[p], Michail Klimovskij[q], Aggelos Laliotis[f], Jonathan Lambourne[r], Samuel Lawday[s], Fred Lee[t], Benjamin Lindsey[u], Jonathan N Lund[v], Diana A Mabayoje[r], Kamran I Malik[w], Alison Muir[x], Harjeet S Narula[y], Ugochinyerem Ofor[e], Helena Parsons[t], Tom Pavelle[z] Katherine Prescott[aa], Anupama Rajgopal[bb], Iain Roy[i], Jayesh Sagar[c], Claire Scarborough[n], Shafaque Shaikh[cc], Christopher J Smart[dd], Susan Snape[aa], Mohamed Tabaqchali[ee], Athula Tennakoon[e], Robert Tilley[k], Elen Vink[h], Leila White[x], Dermot Burke[a, ff], Andrew Kirby[a, ff]

Author Affiliations:

a. Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds, UK
b. Department of Biostatistics, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
c. Luton and Dunstable University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Luton, UK
d. Ninewells Hospital, Tayside NHS Board, Dundee, UK
e. Pilgrim Hospital, United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust, Lincolnshire, UK
f. Cambridge oesophago-gastric centre, Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge, UK
g. Royal United Hospitals Bath NHS Foundation Trust, Bath, UK
h. Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, NHS Lothian, Edinburgh, UK
i. North West Anglia NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridgeshire, UK
j. Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
k. University Hospitals Plymouth NHS Trust, Plymouth, UK
l. Lister hospital, East and North Hertfordshire NHS Trust, Stevenage, UK

m. Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells NHS Foundation Trust, Kent, UK

n. Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Oxford, UK

o. Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust, Worcester, UK

p. University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust, Leicester, UK

q. Conquest Hospital, East Sussex NHS Healthcare Trust, East Sussex, UK

r. Whipps Cross Hospital, Barts Health NHS Trust, London, UK

s. Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust, Exeter, UK

t. Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK

u. The Whittington Hospital, Whittington Health NHS Trust, London, UK

v. Division of Medical Sciences and Graduate Entry Medicine, Royal Derby Hospital, University of Nottingham, Derby, UK

w. University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK

x. Royal Preston Hospital, Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Preston, UK

y. Chesterfield Royal Hospital NHS Trust Hospital, Chesterfield, UK

z. Shrewsbury and Telford NHS Trust, Shrewsbury, UK

aa. Queen's Medical Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK

bb. Huddersfield Royal Infirmary, Calderdale and Huddersfield NHS Trust, Huddersfield, UK

cc. Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, NHS Grampian, Aberdeen, UK

dd. Macclesfield District General Hospital, East Cheshire NHS Trust, Cheshire, UK

ee. University Hospital of North Tees, Stockton on Tees, UK

ff. University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Corresponding author: Shadia Ahmed. Old Medical School, Leeds General Infirmary, Leeds, LS1 3EX. E-mail: shadiaahmed@nhs.net, Telephone: +44 (0)113 3923929

Acknowledgements to the CABI Collaborative:

Shadia Ahmed, Andrew Kirby, Dermot Burke, Shafaque Shaikh, Rachel Hyland, Anne Melhuish, Laura Bonnett, Martin Michel, Anu Rajgopal, Arin Saha, John Bennett, Aggelos Laliotis, Alexander Walker, Harjeet Singh Narula, Helen Perera, Catherine Boereboom, Abigail Harlock, Jon Lund, Jenny Wright, Sonal Halai, Geraint Lloyd, Christopher J Smart, Kamran I Malik, Pradeep Basnyat, Prashant Naik, Kaushiki Singh, Petya Deleva, Michail Klimovskij, Andrew Sandison, Kam Khalsa, Mairi Macleod, Barnaby Flower, Anna Goodman, John Canny, David McArthur, Peter Mitchell, Alison Muir, Leila White, Flora Agnes Burns, Mithun Kailavasan, Agamemnon Pericleous, Wadah Ali, U Ofor, Athula Tennakoon, Md Tanveer Adil, Jayesh Sagar, Yasser Abdulaal, Mohamed Hashem, Katherine-Helen Hurndall, Muhammad Rafaih Iqbal,, Euan MacDonald, Iain Roy, Elzbieta Czarniak, Elen Vink, Ila Aggarwal, Sahar Eldirdiri, Anna Jarchow-MacDonald, Katherine Prescott, Susan Snape, Robert Dennis, Ishtiyaq Bukhari, Rosemary Fok, Thomas Hanna, Thomasin Heggie, Tom Pavelle, David Stell, Robert Tilley, Susanne H Hodgson, Claire Scarborough, Matt Scarborough, Cressida Auckland, Aiden Plant, Koza Agha, Andrew Torrance, Emma Boldock ,Helena Parsons, Gabriele Marangoni, Kate Carney, Mohamed Tabaqchali, Micheal Kelsey, Benjamin Lindsey, Furqan Amjad, Mary Ashcroft, Gareth Hughes, Caoimhe Nic Fhogartaigh, Diana A Mabayoje, Jonathan Lambourn

Keywords

Complicated intra-abdominal infections; prediction models; relapse; death;

Abstract

Objectives: Complicated intra-abdominal infections (cIAIs) are associated with significant morbidity and mortality. Here the clinical characteristics of patients with cIAIs in the UK are described, and clinical prediction models (CPMs) developed to help identify patients at risk of death or relapse.

Methods: A multi-centre observational study was conducted from August 2016-February 2017. Adult patients diagnosed with cIAI were included. Multivariable logistic regression was performed to develop CPMs for mortality and cIAI relapse. C-statistic was used to test model discrimination. Model calibration was tested using calibration slopes and calibration in the large (CITL). The CPMs were then presented as point score systems and further validated.

Results: In total, 417 patients were included from 31 centres. At 90 days following diagnosis 17.3% had a cIAI relapse and the mortality rate was 11.3%. Predictors in the mortality model were age, cIAI aetiology, perforated viscus and source control procedure. Predictors for cIAI relapse included collections, outcome of initial management and antibiotic duration. The c-statistic adjusted for model optimism (95% CI) was 0.79 (0.75, 0.87) and 0.74 (0.73, 0.85) for the mortality and cIAI relapse CPMs. Adjusted calibration slopes were 0.88 (0.76, 0.90) for the mortality model and 0.91 (0.88, 0.94) for the relapse model; CITL was -0.19 (-0.39, -0.12) and -0.01 (-0.17, -0.03) respectively.

Conclusion: Relapse of infection and death following cIAI are common. These CPMs can identify patients at an increased risk of cIAI relapse or death after treatment, thus informing subsequent management and follow up. External validation of these CPMs is needed.

Introduction

Complicated intra-abdominal infections (cIAIs) are defined as intra-abdominal infections that have extended beyond the hollow viscus of origin into the peritoneal space and are associated with either abscess formation or peritonitis(1). One in five patients with cIAI fail treatment (2, 3) and in high-risk groups such as the elderly and those with severe sepsis, mortality has been reported up to 50 to 80%(4, 5).

Treatment of cIAIs includes source control and administration of antibiotic therapy. Guidelines recommend that source control procedures should be the least invasive method able to obtain adequate source control, and antibiotics be limited to 4 to 7 days(6). Despite the current recommended treatment strategies, patients still suffer high rates of relapse and mortality after cIAI treatment. Additional strategies are therefore required to help optimise the care of patients with cIAI. Use of clinical prediction models may be able to optimise the care of patients with cIAI by identifying patients who have the highest risk of cIAI relapse or death. Currently, disease specific prediction models for cIAI exist, which are designed to be used peri-operatively in patients undergoing source control but are rarely used in routine clinical care. These identify patients at the highest risk of death, so the aggressiveness of treatment can be decided early(4, 7). However, these models are restricted to patients who undergo a source control procedure. Additionally, they do not predict the risk of relapse, one of the most common adverse events after cIAI treatment. We undertook a multicentre observational study to describe the cIAI patient population in the UK and developed clinical prediction models (CPMs) to determine the probability of relapse and death in patients with cIAI, managed with and without source control procedures. To facilitate interpretation and use of the CPMs they have been presented as point score systems(8). These systems assign values to the identified clinical predictors in order to allow a risk score to be calculated and are designed to be used in the clinical setting.

Methods

A multicentre observational study was performed between August 2016 and February 2017. The study was classed as a service evaluation, registered at participating sites and information governance approval was obtained. Data were collected prospectively and recorded using Microsoft® Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, Washington, USA), and anonymised before centralisation.

Centre eligibility

All hospitals in the UK were eligible to enter patients. Invitations to participate were distributed via trainee-led, surgical and infection research collaboratives.

Patient eligibility

Patients were screened prospectively on inpatient wards, including intensive care units. To reduce bias, investigators were asked, where possible, to recruit consecutively identified eligible patients. Patients were included if they were >18 years old with confirmed cIAIs. Patients were excluded if they had a cIAI diagnosed within the previous year; or their cIAI was diagnosed >7 days prior to screening to ensure only primary episodes of CABI were included and that the cases included were not biased towards more complicated cases. Patients were also excluded if they had primary appendicitis managed surgically, active necrotising pancreatitis (not excluding discrete pancreatitis infections e.g. abscess, infected pseudocyst), primary (spontaneous) bacterial peritonitis, and continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis peritonitis, as these were considered to be distinct clinical conditions with specific management protocols.

Outcome measures

The major outcomes assessed were the presence of cIAI relapse, and all-cause mortality both within 90 days of cIAI diagnosis. These same outcomes were considered when generating the

clinical prediction models. Additional outcome measures under investigation included the number of days hospitalised, time to relapse or death, and time to clinical improvement.

Definitions

A diagnosis of cIAI was based on either a) a combination of radiological and clinical features consistent with cIAI including a fluid collection and/or perforated viscus, a temperature of ≥38°C or <35°C degrees and a neutrophil count >7.5 x 10*9/L) or b) intra-operative confirmation of an abscess or perforated abdominal viscus. Additionally, the diagnosis was confirmed by a consultant surgeon.

A cIAI relapse could only occur after source control and/or antibiotic therapy to manage the primary cIAI was considered to have been successful. This would be demonstrated by the cessation of antibiotics and there being no further source control procedures planned. The diagnosis of cIAI relapse was made using the same criteria as a cIAI but could also include probable cIAIs, where, in the absence of radiological imaging no other source was identified and a diagnosis was confirmed by a consultant surgeon as a cIAI relapse.

Change of antibiotic treatment due to clinical failure was defined as a change of antibiotic therapy where the clinician collecting the data had determined failure of the previous antibiotic regimen. Where there was failure of primary treatment of cIAI, the reason was taken as the main factor to which the clinician collecting the data attributed responsibility.
Finally, failure of initial management was defined as requiring an additional unplanned source control procedure and/or a change of antibiotics due to either failure of antibiotics or presence of resistance.

Statistical analysis

Clinical prediction models were developed in accordance with the Transparent Reporting of a Multivariable Prediction Model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD) statement(9), see supplementary material.

Demographic, clinical and treatment characteristics of patients who died were compared with those who survived; and those who had a cIAI relapse were compared with those who did not have a cIAI relapse. Categorical data are presented as proportions. Continuous data were tested for normality by visual assessment of the histogram and then summarised as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR). Comparisons were tested using either a Chi-square test (or Fisher exact test if appropriate) for categorical data or the Mann-Whitney U test for continuous skewed variables.

Multivariable logistic regression was used to develop prediction models to determine which characteristics were associated with either death, or with cIAI relapse. Variables included in the pool of potential predictors were identified a priori based on their clinical importance and likelihood (based on existing evidence) to affect outcomes(4, 10). The variables assessed for potential inclusion in the models for relapse and mortality were: age, gender, underlying pathology, site of cIAI, presence of perforation, presences of collection(s), presence of anastomotic leak and if there was failure of initial management. Treatment variables which comprised of duration of antibiotic therapy and type of source control procedure performed were also included.

Missing data in the dataset, were assumed to be missing at random. Multiple imputation via chained equations was therefore undertaken to account for missing data. A set of 20 imputed datasets was created using predictive mean matching with the outcomes and all variables in the pool of potential prognostic factors included in the imputation procedure(11). Functional form for continuous variables was assessed via fractional polynomials within each imputed dataset. Diagnostic plots were used for checking the fit of the imputation models(12). Variables were selected for inclusion in the final model within each imputed dataset via

backwards selection with a p-value of 0.10. Variables that featured in at least 10 of the 20 imputed models were selected for the final model. Pooled odds ratio and intercepts were calculated according to Rubin's rule.

Apparent measures of model performance were calculated for the final multiply imputed model. Discrimination was evaluated via the c-statistic and calibration was assessed via calibration slopes and calibration in the large (CITL). C-statistics resulting from the imputed dataset were pooled via robust methods and therefore the median of the imputed estimates is presented(13, 14). Calibration was also observed via a calibration plot for each imputed dataset separately and the median of the imputed estimates provided(14).

Non-parametric bootstrapping was used to estimate optimism, and examine model stability. In each of 500 bootstrap samples, the entire modelling process, including predictor selection, was repeated and the apparent model performance (calibration and discrimination in the bootstrap sample) was compared with the performance in the original sample per multiply imputed dataset.

The median optimism across all imputed samples was then used to calculate the optimism-adjusted c-statistic and optimism-adjusted calibration slope(15). Using the latter as a uniform shrinkage factor, all the predictor effects in the final developed model were penalised in order to account for over-fitting(16).

The pool of potential predictors for the backwards selection was any predictor in a final multivariable model for each imputed dataset (collection, source control, gender, duration of antibiotics, perforated viscus and failure of initial management).

The resulting optimism adjusted prediction models were then presented as a point score system by assigning integer scores to the coeffcients(8). Validation of the integer score was undertaken by evaluating discrimination (c statistic) and calibration (slope and calibration in the large) for a model containing only the total points score per person.

Subgroup analysis was performed to determine if specific microbiological data (when available) were associated with certain clinical outcomes.

Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 22.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp) and R Core Team, version 3.6.1.

Results

Participant characteristics

Data were collected on a total of 463 patients from 31 hospitals in the UK. In total, 417 patients were included in the final analysis; the data provided did not appear to meet the inclusion criteria in 41 patients and five patients died within 72 hours of diagnosis. Table 1 summarises the demographics and cIAI characteristics of included patients. Out of the 417 patients, 53.7% (224/417) were female and the mean age was 62.5 years (standard deviation [SD] 17.7 years). Diverticular disease and post-operative complications were the most common underlying aetiologies in patients with cIAI, accounting for 32.1% (134/417) and 21.8% (91/417) of cases respectively. The most common site of infection was the colorectum (56.6%, 236/417).

Radiological features of cIAI included perforated viscus (61.9%, 231/373), collections (57.7%, 232/402) and anastomotic leaks (10.1%, 41/406). Of the 232 patients with collections, 75.9% had a single abdominal collection on imaging and 24.1% patients had multiple collections. The median maximum depth of the largest collection present was 6cm (IQR 4.0 to 8.8cm).

Patient management

Source control procedures: 30.8% (128/416) of patients did not undergo a source control procedure, 14.2% (59/416) had percutaneous radiologically guided drainage and 55.0% (229/416) had a surgical procedure. Surgical resection and proximal diversion was the most frequently performed surgical procedure (44.1%, 101/229). A higher proportion of patients who had surgical source control had a perforated viscus (72.6% compared to 44.4% of patients

who had percutaneous drainage and 52.9% of patients who had no source control). Patients undergoing percutaneous drainage were more likely to have a collection (91.4% compared with 42.6% of patients undergoing a surgical procedure and 68.5% of patients who had no source control) (see supplementary material).

Antibiotic treatment: The median duration of antibiotic treatment in this cohort was 12 days (IQR 7 to 18.5 days). Median antibiotic duration exceeded seven days, irrespective of whether or not patients had a source control procedure. The antibiotic duration was a median of 10.9 days (IQR 7-17days) for those who had a surgical procedure, 14 days (IQR 10-24.5 days) for those who had percutaneous drainage only and 12 days (IQR 8.5-19 days) for those who had no source control procedure. Piperacillin-tazobactam and amoxicillin-clavulanic acid were the antibiotics most frequently used in the treatment of cIAI (see supplementary material).

An additional unplanned source control procedure was performed in 54.5% of patients who relapsed compared with 9.8% of patients who did not ($p =< 0.001$). Similarly, a change of antibiotics due to perceived clinical failure was required in 36.5% who relapsed compared with 14.7% of patients who did not ($p = < 0.001$).

Clinical outcomes

Overall, 17.3% (72/417) of patients had a cIAI relapse and 11.3% (47/417) of patients died after 72 hours (total mortality including patients who died within 72 hours of diagnosis 52/422; 12.3%). The median number of days in hospital was 17 days from date of cIAI diagnosis (IQR 9.0-29.0). The commonest reported cause of cIAI relapse was failure of source control (61.1%, 44/72). The median time to improvement (defined as: apyrexial (<38 °C) for > 24 hours and white cell count <11 x 10^9/L) from date of diagnosis was 7 days (IQR 3 to 14 days). Median time to death or to cIAI relapse from diagnosis was 23 days (IQR 12 to 51 days) and 18 days (13 to 30 days) respectively. The mortality rate in patients who had a cIAI relapse was 11.1% compared to 10.3% in those who did not have a cIAI relapse ($p = 0.837$). Median antibiotic treatment duration was longer in patients who survived to day 90, 12 days (IQR 8 to 19) vs 9

days (IQR 6 to 14.5 days), p = 0.007. Patients who had a cIAI relapse had longer antibiotic treatment durations for their initial cIAI compared to those who did not relapse (median duration 15 days (IQR 9.75 to 21.25) vs 11 days (IQR 7 to 17), p = 0.001). Median length of hospital stay for primary admission with cIAI was longer in patients who relapsed; 29 days (IQR 15-49 days) compared to 15 days (IQR 8 -25 days), p = < 0.001, in those who did not have a cIAI relapse. Of the patients who had collections associated with their cIAI, the rate of relapse in those with multiple collections was 41.2% (21/51) compared to 19.6% (35/179) of those who has single collections (p = 0.002).

Model development and model performance measures

Results for the univariable modelling of both outcomes are presented in the supplementary material. The full multivariable models are presented in Table 2. Following internal validation and imputation, the models showed good performance. The c statistic was 0.82 (0.76, 0.88) for the model predicting mortality and 0.78 (0.71, 0.84) for the model predicting relapse. These were 0.79 (0.75, 0.87) and 0.74 (0.73, 0.85) respectively after adjusting for model optimism. The calibration plots for the relapse and mortality CPMs can be found in the supplementary material and show good agreement between observed and predicted probabilities for both models. The calibration slopes were 1.00 (0.71, 1.32) for mortality and 1.01 (0.75, 1.28) for relapse. Calibration slopes adjusted for model optimism were 0.88 (0.76, 0.90) and 0.91 (0.88, 0.94) respectively. Calibration in the large (CITL) was 0.00 (-0.34, 0.32) for mortality and 0.01 (-0.28, 0.28) for relapse. After adjustment the CITL was -0.19 (-0.39, -0.12) and -0.01 (-0.17, -0.03) respectively.

For mortality, the predictors included in the parsimonious multivariable logistic regression model were age, cIAI due to cancer, type of source control procedure performed and the presence of a perforated viscus (Table 2).

Predictors included in the model for cIAI relapse were presence of a collection, antibiotic duration and whether or not there was failure of initial treatment (defined as ‘requiring an

additional unplanned source control procedure or a change of antibiotics due to either failure of antibiotics or presence of resistance') (Table 2).

The CPMs have been presented using a point score system (Tables 3 and 4). The point score system for mortality predicts probabilities between 0.1% and 70.6% and the scoring system for cIAI relapse between 0.3% and 52.4%. The scoring system was also validated. In particular, calibration and discrimination were evaluated when the model included the integer score as the only predictor. The c statistic for mortality was 0.84 (0.78, 0.91) and 0.72 (0.65, 0.79) for relapse. The CITL was 0.00 (-0.41, 0.38) and 0.00 (-0.30, 0.29) respectively. These results show good validity of the integer score.

Subgroup analysis

Sub-group analysis of patients who had samples sent for microbiological culture found that 58/273 (21%) patients had samples that grew antibiotic resistant organisms (amoxicillin-clavulanic acid/ piperacillin-tazobactam resistant/ ciprofloxacin resistant Enterobacteriaceae, Amp C or ESBL producers, vancomycin resistant enterococci and/or methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*). Organism data were missing in 13 patients. Patients who had antibiotic resistant bacteria isolated from their clinical samples had increased rates of cIAI relapse (33.3% vs 19.3%, p value 0.031), longer antibiotic treatment durations (median duration 16.5 days [IQR 10 to 29] vs 13 days [IQR 7 to 19], p 0.003) and longer hospital stays (median length of hospitalisation following cIAI diagnosis 26.5 days [IQR 14.75 to 42.25] vs 15 days [IQR 9 to 30], $p < 0.001$). The presence of resistant organisms was not associated with mortality (17.9% in those who died vs 22.8% in survivors, p 0.549).

Discussion

This is the largest study describing the clinical characteristics and management strategies of cIAIs in the United Kingdom. The data collected from this large UK cohort was used to develop clinical prediction models for cIAI relapse or death in patients who have been treated for cIAI.

These models have been presented as points scoring systems which provide a range of predicted probabilities that allow clear differentiation between patients' risks of relapse, and/or mortality, and so have potential clinical utility with regard to patient management decisions. These models use routinely collected clinical data and so are able to be used readily in standard clinical practice. Model performance tests indicate that both models have good model performance according to discrimination and calibration tests.

Prognostic scores for complicated intra-abdominal infections already exist, however these are primarily used to predict mortality. The Manheim Peritonitis Index (MPI) is a disease-specific severity score that has been previously established to be an effective prognostic marker in patients with peritonitis(7). It is a simple tool to use and calculates risk of death based on age, gender, presence of organ failure, presence of malignancy, the duration of peritonitis, origin of infection and type of exudate identified intra-operatively. The use of operative findings in this score, means it is unsuitable for the 30% of patients with cIAI who do not undergo any source control procedure. In 2015, the World Society of Emergency surgery (WSES) validated a sepsis severity score for patients with intra-abdominal infections. They conducted a prospective multicentre observational study and found that the severity score was useful in predicting survival (mortality 0.63% if score 0-3 and 41.7% if score >7) (4). This model includes sepsis severity, origin of cIAI, setting of cIAI acquisition, immunosuppression, age and time to source control as predictors. Model performance measures were not reported. These models are generally applied in research studies rather than in clinically.

In this study, the observed mortality rate was 11.3% and the rate of cIAI relapse was 17.3%.. The predictors we have identified for cIAI relapse and those for mortality are different, with the predictors for mortality largely comprising of non-modifiable risks. cIAI relapse was not associated with significantly increased mortality, however it was associated with antimicrobial resistance (AMR), longer antibiotic durations and increased length of hospital stays.

In this cohort, 7.7% of patients had an ESBL or Amp-C producing organism isolated, similar to figures reported in a European cohort(17). AMR was associated with a near doubling of the rate of relapse, from 19.3% to 33.3%. This highlights that ongoing monitoring for the presence of antimicrobial resistant bacterial infections should be considered important in optimising the care of patients with cIAI. This study does have limitations. Firstly, the number of outcome events was small and this restricted the number of variables included in the pool of potential predictors for the multivariable logistic regression model. Secondly, data for several variables were missing, however multiple imputation was conducted to mitigate for this. Thirdly, data were collected at a local level and the validity of the data provided was not audited. Fourthly, some relevant clinical data e.g. severity of sepsis, placement of drains and duration of drainage was not collected. In the no relapse group, patients who died were not excluded from the analysis when developing the relapse model. However, there were near equal proportions of patients who had died in the group of patients who had a relapse and those who did not and so the interpretation of the results was deemed to be appropriate. Finally, although point score systems facilitate the use of prediction models, they are only able to provide approximate predictions of risk compared to the full models and so are less accurate(8). However, the clinical predictors selected to be included in the final models are consistent with those described in the literature.

The presented CPMs and subsequent score systems have advantages over existing ones because they provide information on both the risk of cIAI relapse and mortality. For these scoring systems, clinical data collected at the point at which management of the cIAI has been completed are used to predict outcomes at the end of treatment for cIAI. Therefore they can guide decisions on patient follow-up or the need for further intervention at a clinically relevant time. They are simple to use and are based on easily accessible patient data. Furthermore, they can be used in all patients who have cIAIs, irrespective of whether or not they undergo source control procedures.

This study has highlighted that in the UK, there is variation in the management of cIAIs, one third of patients do not undergo a source control procedure and antibiotic durations are on average longer than those recommended in guidelines(1, 18). This is likely due to the high complication rate seen in this cohort. These prediction models can help identify patients who have a high risk of complications where deviation from guidelines may be warranted. Future work will involve the validation of both prediction models, and their integer score versions, in external data from existing cIAI studies. Following this assessment of external validity via discrimination and calibration, clinical utility studies will then be considered

Conclusion

With these data we have developed clinical prediction models for cIAI relapse and mortality in patients with cIAIs. These CPMs have been presented as scoring systems and have the potential to enable early identification of patients at increased risk of cIAI relapse or death. This may change patient management strategies and improve patient outcomes. External validation of these clinical prediction models are required, as are clinical utility studies.

Table 1. Demographics and clinical characteristics of patients with cIAI

Variable	Total, n 417 (%)
Gender: Female sex	224/417 (53.7)
Mean (SD) age (years)	62.5 (17.7)
Clinical characteristics	
Site (origin) of cIAI	
Colorectum	236/417 (56.6)
Small bowel	44/417 (10.6)
Gastro-oesophageal	41/417 (9.8)
Biliary	38/417 (9.1)
Other	31/417 (7.4)
Appendix	20/417 (4.8)
Unknown	7/417 (1.7)
Underlying pathology	
Diverticular disease	134/417 (32.1)
Post-operative complications	91/417 (21.8)
Other	77/417 (18.5)
Perforated peptic ulcer	37/417 (8.9)

Cancer	30/417 (7.2)
Inflammatory bowel disease	19/417 (4.6)
Biliary stones and/or cholecystitis	19/417 (4.6)
Appendicitis	10/417 (2.4)
Perforated viscus*	231/373 (61.9)
Collection present•	232/402 (57.7)
Single collection	176/232 (75.9)
Multiple collections	56/232 (24.1)
Median depth of biggest collection, n=213†, cm (IQR)	6.0 (4.0-8.8)
Anastomotic leak°	41/406 (10.1)

Data missing for *44 patients, •15 patients, †19 and °11 patients

395

396

397 **Table 2. Multivariable models adjusted for shrinkage**

Predictor	Comparison	OR* (95% CI)
Mortality model		
Intercept, log odds ratio (SE)		-7.53 (1.10)
Underlying pathology	Diverticular disease	1.00
	Cancer	4.07 (1.58, 10.48)
	Post-op complication	1.30 (0.46, 3.68)
	Other	2.04 (0.98, 4.21)
Source Control	Surgical	1.00
	Radiological drainage	0.33 (0.08, 1.30)
	No source control	1.58 (0.81, 3.09)
Age (years)	23.5-34.5	1.00
	34.5-55.5	2.80 (1.91, 4.12)
	55.5-65.5	7.61 (3.57, 16.22)
	65.5-75.5	14.49 (5.34, 39.29)
	75.5-85.5	27.59 (8.00, 95.17)
	85.5-95.5	52.54 (11.98, 230.49)
Perforated Viscus	Not present	1.00
	Present	2.40 (0.94, 6.11)
Relapse model		
Intercept, log odds ratio (SE)		-2.30 (0.35)
Collections	Not present	1.00
	Present	1.72 (0.93, 3.17)
Duration of antibiotics	< 5 days	1.00
	5-7 days	4.71 (0.90, 24.59)
	8-11 days	6.82 (0.88, 52.85)
	12-17 days	7.86 (0.87, 70.85)
	18-41 days	8.65 (0.87, 86.37)
	> 41 days	8.87 (0.86, 91.07)
Failure of initial management	Not present	1.00
	Present	5.27 (2.96, 9.40)

398 *Adjusted for shrinkage based on the median optimism-adjusted calibration slope

399

400

401 Table 3a. Points score system for probability of death after cIAI treatment

Points	
Age (years)	
< 34.5	-3

34.5-55.5	-2
55.5-65.5	0
65.5-75.5	1
75.5-85.5	2
> 85.5	3
Perforated viscus	1
Type of source control performed	
Percutaneous drainage	-2
Surgical source control	0
No source control	1
Aetiology of cIAI	
Cancer	2
Diverticular disease	0
Post-operative complication	0
Other	1

Table 3b.Estimate of risk based on score for mortality

Score	Estimate of risk of death after cIAI treatment
-5	0.1%
-4	0.2%
-3	0.4%
-2	0.7%
-1	1.4%
0	2.6%
1	4.8%
2	8.7%
3	15.4%
4	25.8%
5	39.8%
6	55.7%
7	70.6%

Table 4a. Points score system for probability of cIAI relapse after cIAI treatment

Predictor categories	Points
Treatment failure *	3
Collection(s) present	1
Antibiotic duration	
< 5 days	-6
5 – 7days	-1
8 -41 days	0
> 41 days	1

*** defined as requiring an additional unplanned source control procedure or a change of antibiotics due to either failure of antibiotics or presence of resistance.**

Table 4b. Estimate of risk for cIAI relapse after cIAI treatment based on score

Score	Estimate of risk for cIAI relapse after cIAI treatment
-6	0.3%
-5	0.5%
-4	0.9%
-3	1.4%
-2	2.5%
-1	4.1%
0	6.9%
1	11.3%
2	17.9%
3	27.2%
4	39.1%
5	52.4%

References

1. Solomkin JS, Mazuski JE, Bradley JS, Rodvold KA, Goldstein EJ, Baron EJ, et al. Diagnosis and management of complicated intra-abdominal infection in adults and children: guidelines by the Surgical Infection Society and the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2010;50(2):133-164.
2. Inui T, Haridas M, Claridge JA, Malangoni MA. Mortality for intra-abdominal infection is associated with intrinsic risk factors rather than the source of infection. Surgery. 2009;146(4):654-661; discussion 61-2.
3. Sawyer RG, Claridge JA, Nathens AB, Rotstein OD, Duane TM, Evans HL, et al. Trial of short-course antimicrobial therapy for intraabdominal infection. The New England journal of medicine. 2015;372(21):1996-2005.
4. Sartelli M, Abu-Zidan FM, Catena F, Griffiths EA, Di Saverio S, Coimbra R, et al. Global validation of the WSES Sepsis Severity Score for patients with complicated intra-abdominal infections: a prospective multicentre study (WISS Study). World journal of emergency surgery : WJES. 2015;10:61.
5. Dupont H, Friggeri A, Touzeau J, Airapetian N, Tinturier F, Lobjoie E, et al. Enterococci increase the morbidity and mortality associated with severe intra-abdominal infections in elderly patients hospitalized in the intensive care unit. The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy. 2011;66(10):2379-2385.
6. Mazuski JE, Tessier JM, May AK, Sawyer RG, Nadler EP, Rosengart MR, et al. The Surgical Infection Society Revised Guidelines on the Management of Intra-Abdominal Infection. Surgical infections. 2017;18(1):1-76.
7. V AM, C PM, S S, Srinivasarangan M. Efficacy of Mannheim Peritonitis Index (MPI) Score in Patients with Secondary Peritonitis. J Clin Diagn Res. 2014;8(12):NC01-3.
8. Bonnett LJ, Snell KIE, Collins GS, Riley RD. Guide to presenting clinical prediction models for use in clinical settings. BMJ. 2019;365:l737.
9. Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, Moons KG. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis Or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): the TRIPOD Statement. Br J Surg. 2015;102(3):148-158.
10. Chong YP, Bae IG, Lee SR, Chung JW, Jun JB, Choo EJ, et al. Clinical and economic consequences of failure of initial antibiotic therapy for patients with community-onset complicated intra-abdominal infections. PloS one. 2015;10(4):e0119956.
11. Graham JW, Olchowski AE, Gilreath TD. How many imputations are really needed? Some practical clarifications of multiple imputation theory. Prev Sci. 2007;8(3):206-213.
12. Su Y-S, Gelman A, Hill J, Yajima M. Multiple Imputation with Diagnostics (mi) in R: Opening Windows into the Black Box. Journal of Statistical Software. 2011;45(2):1-31.
13. Marshall A, Altman DG, Holder RL, Royston P. Combining estimates of interest in prognostic modelling studies after multiple imputation: current practice and guidelines. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2009;9:57.
14. Clark TG, Stewart ME, Altman DG, Gabra H, Smyth JF. A prognostic model for ovarian cancer. Br J Cancer. 2001;85(7):944-952.
15. Rubin DB. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. New York: John Wiley and Sons; 1987.
16. Van Houwelingen JC, Le Cessie S. Predictive value of statistical models. Stat Med. 1990;9(11):1303-1325.
17. Solomkin J, Hershberger E, Miller B, Popejoy M, Friedland I, Steenbergen J, et al. Ceftolozane/Tazobactam Plus Metronidazole for Complicated Intra-abdominal Infections in an Era of Multidrug Resistance: Results From a Randomized, Double-Blind, Phase 3 Trial (ASPECT-cIAI). Clinical

infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2015;60(10):1462-1471.
18. Sartelli M, Chichom-Mefire A, Labricciosa FM, Hardcastle T, Abu-Zidan FM, Adesunkanmi AK, et al. The management of intra-abdominal infections from a global perspective: 2017 WSES guidelines for management of intra-abdominal infections. World journal of emergency surgery : WJES. 2017;12:29.