UC Irvine UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Randomized Double-Blinded Placebo-Controlled Trial to Assess the Effect of Retapamulin for Nasal Decolonization of Mupirocin-Resistant Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Nasal Carriers

Permalink https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8gj4p67n

Journal Open Forum Infectious Diseases, 3(suppl 1)

ISSN

2328-8957

Authors

Singh, Raveena Gombosev, Adrijana Dutciuc, Tabitha <u>et al.</u>

Publication Date 2016-12-01

DOI

10.1093/ofid/ofw172.167

Peer reviewed

POSTER ABSTRACTS

301. Randomized Double-Blinded Placebo-Controlled Trial to Assess the Effect of Retapamulin for Nasal Decolonization of Mupirocin-Resistant Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Nasal Carriers

Raveena Singh, MA¹; Adrijana Gombosev, MS¹; Tabitha Dutciuc, MPH¹; Kaye Evans, BA²; Lena M. Portillo, BS, MT (ASCP)³; Mary K. Hayden, MD³; Daniel Gillen, PhD⁴; Ellena Peterson, PhD²; Thomas Tjoa, MPH, MS¹; Chenghua Cao, MPH¹; Eric Cui, BS¹; Claudia Cervantes, BA¹; Justin Chang, BS¹; Brian Lewis, BS¹; Diane Kim, BS¹; Loren Miller, MD, MPH²; Susan S. Huang, MD, MPH, FIDSA, FSHEA¹; ¹Division of Infectious Diseases and Health Policy Research Institute, University of California Irvine School of Medicine, Irvine, California; ²Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of California Irvine School of Medicine, Orange, California; ³Division of Infectious Diseases, Rush University School of Medicine, Irvine, California; ⁵Infectious Disease Clinical Outcomes Research, LA Biomed at Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Torrance, California

Session: 54. HAI: MSSA, MRSA, and other Gram-Positives *Thursday, October 27, 2016: 12:30 PM*

Background. Mupirocin is commonly used for nasal clearance of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in carriers during high risk situations such as pre-operatively, during ICU stays, and to prevent recurrent disease. Low level (LL) and high level (HL) mupirocin resistance have been reported and may warrant evaluation of alternative therapies.

Methods. We conducted a double-blinded randomized controlled trial (RCT) of retapamulin versus placebo for patients with confirmed nasal mupirocin-resistant methicillin-resistant *S aureus* (Mup-R MRSA). Subjects were identified from MRSA aamples tested for Mup-R from the UC Irvine Medical Center microbiology laboratory and from samples from participants who completed a separate clinical trial (Project CLEAR) from September 2012 to August 2015. Randomization was stratified by LL versus HL Mup-R. Subjects used a 5-day twice daily course of assigned product (D1-5) followed by nasal sampling one week later (D12). If still positive, subjects were given another 5-day course of the assigned product. Primary outcome was MRSA nasal carriage at D12. Unadjusted trial course (D47). Secondary outcome was MRSA nasal carriage at D12. Unadjusted trial results were based upon Fisher's exact tests. Adjusted results used logistic regression models that selected from a priori variables (recent hospitalization, recent ICU stay, bathing frequency, skin infection, steroid use, and college education) to minimize Akaike's Information Criterion.

Results. A total of 4394 MRSA isolates were screened to find 294 (6.7%) patients with Mup-R isolates. Of these, 95 were contacted and 53 were randomized (Table 1). Three dropped out prior to any follow up visit, leaving 25 subjects per group to complete both visits with high adherence. Reduction in MRSA nasal carriage was found at Day 12, but not Day 47 (Table 2). Case counts by HL and LL Mup-R are found in Table 3. No change in estimated effects was seen in adjusted models. No adverse events

Some abstract images in the OFID IDWeek 2016 Abstract Supplement may be unclear. In those instances, it is recommended that you use the IDWeek Interactive Program Planner to view the abstract and images. The Program Planner can be found here: https://idsa.confex.com/idsa/2016/webprogram/start.html.

Open Forum Infectious Diseases 2016;1(S1):S1-285

© The Author 2016. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial reproduction and distribution of the work, in any medium, provided the original work is not altered or transformed in any way, and that the work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact journals.permissions@oup.com. D0I: 10.1093/ofid/ofw172

were reported.

	Retapamulin (n=27)	Placebo (n=26)	Overall (n=53)
Age (years)	60.3 (16.9)	59.0 (16.2)	59.7 (16.4)
Female	17 (63%)	11 (42%)	28 (53%)
White	24 (89%)	23 (88%)	47 (89%)
Hispanic	5 (19%)	4(15%)	9 (17%)
High school graduate	23 (85%)	20 (77%)	43 (81%)
Nursing home resident	2 (7%)	2 (8%)	4 (8%)

* Mean (sd) for continuous characteristics and N (%) for discrete characteristics Table 1: Baseline Patient Characteristics by Treatment Arm

Table 1: Baseline Patient Characteristics by Treatment Ar

Table 2: Primary and Secondary Efficacy Endpoint Analyses

THE AND THE ADDRESS	Observed Proportion of MRSA		Risk Difference ¹	Odds Ratio ²	
Emcacy Endpoint	Retapamulin (R) (N=25)	Placebo (P) (N=25)	(R – P; 95% Cl)	(R : P; 95% CI)	P-value*
Primary Endpoint					
MRSA status at D47	0.68	0.84	-0.16 (-0.43, 0.11)	0.41 (0.08, 1.86)	0.320
Secondary Endpoint					
MRSA status at D12	0.32	0.76	-0.44 (-0.73, -0.15)	0.16 (.04, 0.60)	0.004

Confidence interval for risk difference is based upon the asymptotic normal approximation

3: P-value for difference based on Fisher's Exact Test

Table 3: Analysis of MRSA-micro results at Visit 1 and Visit 2

Outcome	Retapamulin (N=25)	Placebo (N=25)	P-value ¹
	Enrollme	ent (D0)	
- LL Mup-R	10 (40%)	10 (40%)	
- HL Mup-R	15 (60%)	15 (60%)	
Visit 1 (D12)			0.018
- LL Mup-R	2 (8%)	7 (28%)	
- HL Mup-R	5 (20%)	10 (40%)	
- MRSA not Mup-R	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	
- MRSA negative	17 (68%)	6 (24%)	
	0.590		
- LL Mup-R	5 (20%)	7 (28%)	
- HL Mup-R	10 (40%)	11 (44%)	
- MRSA not Mup-R	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	
- MRSA negative	8 (32%)	4 (16%)	

1: P-value for test of difference by treatment group based upon Chi-squared test with continuity correction.

Conclusion. This RCT found that nasal retapamulin significantly reduced Mup-R nasal MRSA 1 week following a 5-day application, but reductions were not sustained at 6 weeks. Retapamulin may be a viable alternative to mupirocin for temporary risk periods such as surgery and ICU stays, but long-lived benefit may require alternative agents or longer therapeutic duration.

Disclosures. R. Singh, Sage Products: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. 3M: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. Clorox: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product; A. Gombosev, Sage Products: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. Molnlycke: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. 3M: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. Clorox: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product; T. Dutciuc, Sage Products: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. 3M: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. Clorox: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product; M. K. Hayden, Sage Products: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. Molnlycke: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product; D. Kim, Sage Products: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. 3M: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. Clorox: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product; L. Miller, Sage Products: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. 3M: Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product, Conducting studies in healthcare facilities that are receiving contributed product. Clorox: Conducting studies