pharmacist-led, pre-authorization process. The antimicrobial stewardship team prospectively reviewed all adult CDI-PCR cases sent to the laboratory prior to specimen processing twice daily, 7 days a week to assess for clinical appropriateness based on guideline criteria. Bone marrow transplant and pediatric patients were excluded. If a patient lacked appropriate CDI clinical criteria, the provider was contacted to discontinue the PCR. CDI-PCR appropriateness was assessed for all patients with a CDI-PCR during the preceding year as a retrospective, comparative cohort. The primary objective was to assess appropriateness of the CDI-PCR pre- and postintervention. Secondary objectives included intervention sensitivity, specificity, safety, total CDI-PCRs processed, and protocol adherence.

***Results.*** A total of 714 patients were included ($n$ = 360, preintervention; $n$ = 354, postintervention). There were significantly more hospital-onset CDI cases and antimicrobial use within the past 30 days in the preintervention group [(248 vs. 133, respectively; $P < 0.001$) and (277 vs. 197, respectively; $P < 0.0001$)]. Appropriateness of the CDI-PCR significantly improved postintervention [$n$ = 138 (38.3%) *vs.* $n$ = 209 (59.1%), respectively; $P < 0.001$]. Prospective pharmacist intervention was required for 146 inappropriate CDI-PCRs resulting in 79 discontinued and 66 processed CDI-PCRs ($n$ = 1 positive; $n$ = 65 negative). No patient with a cancelled CDI-PCR required additional testing or escalation of care. When compared with the preintervention, the CDI-PCRs with pharmacist intervention demonstrated a significant increase in the sensitivity (64.7% vs. 98%; $P < 0.0001$) and decrease in specificity (66% vs. 48.3%; $P = 0.015$) with an improved NPV (91.9% vs. 99.3%; $P = 0.035$) and PPV (23.9% to 24.6%; $P = 0.869$).

***Conclusion.*** Implementation of a pharmacist-led prospective CDI-PCR review improved PCR appropriateness and had no adverse clinical consequences although the PPV criteria remain low.

***Disclosures.*** **All authors:** No reported disclosures.

### 482. Association between Socioeconomic Status Factors and Incidence of Community-Associated *Clostridium difficile* Infection Utilizing Factor Analysis—United States, 2014–2015

Kimberly Skrobarcek, MD[1]; Yi Mu, PhD[1]; Jennifer Ahern, PhD[2]; Zintars Beldavs, MS[3]; Geoff Brousseau, MPH[4]; Ghinwa Dumyati, MD, FSHEA[5]; Monica M. Farley, MD, FIDSA[6]; Stacy Holzbauer, DVM, MPH[7]; Marion A. Kainer, MBBS, MPH[8]; James I. Meek, MPH[9]; Rebecca Perlmutter, MPH[10]; Erin C. Phipps, DVM, MPH[11]; Lisa G. Winston, MD[12] and Alice Y. Guh, MD, MPH[1]; [1]Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, [2]University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California, [3]Oregon Health Authority, Portland, Oregon, [4]Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Denver, Colorado, [5]NY Emerging Infections Program, Center for Community Health and Prevention, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, New York, [6]Department of Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine and Atlanta VA Medical Center, Atlanta, Georgia, [7]Minnesota Department of Health, Saint Paul, Minnesota, [8]Communicable and Environmental Diseases and Emergency Preparedness, Tennessee Department of Public Health, Nashville, Tennessee, [9]Connecticut Emerging Infections Program, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, [10]Maryland Department of Health, Baltimore, Maryland, [11]New Mexico Emerging Infections Program, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, [12]Medicine, University of California, San Francisco and Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center, San Francisco, California

**Session:** 59. Healthcare Epidemiology: Updates in *C. difficile*
*Thursday, October 4, 2018: 12:30 PM*

***Background.*** Traditionally a healthcare-associated infection, *Clostridium difficile* infection (CDI) is increasingly emerging in communities. Health disparities in CDI exist, but the social determinants of health that influence community-associated (CA) CDI are unknown. We used factor analysis and disparate data sources to identify area-based socioeconomic status (SES) factors associated with CA-CDI incidence.

***Methods.*** CDC's Emerging Infections Program conducts population-based CDI surveillance in 35 US counties. A CA-CDI case is defined as a positive *C. difficile* specimen collected as an outpatient or within 3 days of hospitalization in a person aged ≥1 year without a positive test in the prior 8 weeks or an overnight stay in a healthcare facility in the prior 12 weeks. 2014–2015 CA-CDI case addresses were geocoded to a 2010 census tract (CT) and incidence rates were calculated. CT-level SES variables were obtained from the 2011–2015 American Community Survey. The Health Resources and Services Administration provided medically underserved area (MUA) designations. Exploratory factor analysis transformed 15 highly correlated SES variables into threefactors using scree plot and Kaiser criteria: "Low Income," "Foreign-born," and "High Income." To account for CT-level clustering, a negative binomial generalized linear mixed model was used to evaluate the associations of these factors and MUA with CA-CDI incidence, adjusting for age, sex, race and diagnostic test.

***Results.*** Of 13,903 CA-CDI geocoded cases, 63% were female, 80% were white, and 36% were aged ≥65 years. Annual CA-CDI incidence was 63.4/100,000 persons. In multivariable analysis, "Low Income" (rate ratio [RR]: 1.09; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.05–1.13) and "High Income" (RR: 0.90; CI: 0.87–0.93) were significantly associated with CA-CDI incidence.

***Conclusion.*** Factor analysis was instrumental in identifying key drivers of disparities among interrelated SES variables. Low-income areas were surprisingly associated with higher CA-CDI incidence, given that known CDI risk factors include increased access to healthcare. Understanding how SES factors might impact CA-CDI incidence can inform prevention strategies in low-income areas.

***Disclosures.*** **G. Dumyati**, Seres: Scientific Advisor, Consulting fee.

### 483. Clinical Characteristics of Military Trauma Patients With *Clostridium difficile* Infections

Sarah Schall, MD[1], Ping Li, MS[2], Teresa Merritt, BS[3], Leigh Carson, MS[4], Timothy J. Whitman, DO[5], Joseph L. Petfield, MD[6], David R. Tribble, MD, DrPH[7] and Dana M. Blyth, MD[8]; [1]Internal Medicine, San Antonio Uniformed Services Health Education Consortium, San Antonio, Texas, [2]Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland, [3]Wilford Hall USAF Medical Center (WHMC), San Anotnio, Texas, [4]Preventive Medicine and Biostatistics, Infectious Disease Clinical Research Program, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, [5]Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, [6]Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, Landstuhl, Germany, [7]Infectious Disease Clinical Research Program, Uniformed Services University, Bethesda, Maryland and [8]Dept of Medicine, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Texas

**Session:** 59. Healthcare Epidemiology: Updates in *C. difficile*
*Thursday, October 4, 2018: 12:30 PM*

***Background.*** *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea (CDAD) is an important cause of nosocomial diarrhea with increasing morbidity, mortality, and healthcare costs. There is growing recognition that critically ill trauma patients comprise a unique at risk population. This study describes the clinical epidemiology of CDAD in military trauma patients.

***Methods.*** Through the Trauma Infectious Disease Outcomes Study (TIDOS), patients with a diagnosis of confirmed (laboratory supported) or presumptive (diarrhea with treatment for CDAD in absence of lab confirmation) CDAD (September 2009–February 2014) were analyzed. Patient demographic, injury, and infection data were evaluated. CDAD severity was defined per 2017 IDSA guidelines.

***Results.*** Of 2,660 patients, 19 and four patients with confirmed and presumptive CDAD, respectively, were identified with an incidence of 2.76/10,000 (95% CI: 1.75–4.15) occupied bed days. Sixteen (70%) had blast injuries, four had gunshot wounds, and threehad other injuries. Median age was 24 years (IQR 23, 31). Median injury severity score was 38 (IQR 26, 47). Severe and fulminant CDAD was diagnosed in 8 (35%) and six (26%), respectively. Patients had a median hospitalization of 12 days (IQR 9.5, 34) and threeOR visits (IQR 2, 6) prior to CDAD diagnosis. Nineteen (83%) patients were in the ICU and 17 (74%) were intubated prior to or upon diagnosis. Seventeen patients had ≥1 infection before CDAD diagnosis, largely pneumonia (47%) and skin and soft-tissue infections (47%). Most patients (96%) were on antibiotics pre-CDAD diagnosis: first generation cephalosporins (1GC; 96%), tetracyclines (87%), vancomycin (74%), carbapenems (70%), and fluoroquinolones (FQ; 57%). Five (22%) received clindamycin. Of the 2637 patients without CDAD, 91% received antimicrobials during hospitalization (86% a 1GC, 47% FQ, and 16% clindamycin). Median length of hospital stay after CDAD diagnosis was 34 days (IQR 16, 55). Treatment included only oral metronidazole in 15 patients, IV metronidazole in 2, and some combination of oral vancomycin, metronidazole, and IV metronidazole in 6. No patients died.

***Conclusion.*** Despite high rates of antimicrobial usage in this severely injured population, CDAD was uncommon. Though CDAD was severe or fulminant in >50%, no patients died.

***Disclosures.*** **All authors:** No reported disclosures.

### 484. A Severity Score for Predicting In-Hospital Death in Patients With *Clostridium difficile* Infection: A Hospital-Based Cohort Study

Hsiu-Yin Chiang, PhD[1]; Han-Chun Huang, MS[1]; Chih-Wei Chung, MS[1]; Yi-Chun Yeh, BSN[1]; Ni Tien, PhD[2]; Hsiu-Shan Lin, MS[2] and Chin-Chi Kuo, MD, PhD[1,3,4]; [1]Big Data Center, China Medical University Hospital, Taichung City, Taiwan, [2]Department of Laboratory Medicine, China Medical University Hospital, Taichung City, Taiwan, [3]Department of Medical Research, China Medical University Hospital, Taichung City, Taiwan, [4]Kidney Institute and Division of Nephrology, Department of Internal Medicine, China Medical University Hospital, Taichung City, Taiwan

**Session:** 59. Healthcare Epidemiology: Updates in *C. difficile*
*Thursday, October 4, 2018: 12:30 PM*

***Background.*** Current definitions for severe *C. difficile* infection (CDI) are based on populations of Western countries. We examined the predicting performance of existing definitions in Taiwanese population and developed a new severity score.

***Methods.*** We included adult patients who were admitted to China Medical University Hospital and had first-time positive *C. difficile* culture or toxin test during 2012–2016. The index date was the sampling date of the specimen. Data were pulled from the electronic medical records. The primary outcome was in-hospital death during the index admission. Variables that were significantly associated with in-hospital death in the bivariable analyses were included in a multivariable logistic regression model. We assigned weight for each variable using the adjusted odds ratio (aOR) and summed up the weights to obtain a severity score.

***Results.*** Of 544 patients, median age was 71 years old and 70 patients (12.9%) died during the index admission. Patients did not differ in: gender, age, prior infection (−30 to 0 day of index date), prior admission, prior anti-peptic ulcer medication use, index (−3 to 3 days) glucose and kidney function except for blood urea nitrogen (BUN). Variables included in the multivariable model were: complicated diabetes (aOR 2.0; 0.8–5.2), malignancy (2.0; 1.1–3.7), prior use of second-generation cephalosporins (1.8; 0.9–3.7), use of loperamide (1.8; 1.0–3.4) or probiotics within −14 to 14 days (2.4; 1.0–5.5), index white blood cell count (WBC) > 15,000 cells/μL (1.9; 1.0–3.6), index serum creatinine (sCr) ≥1.5 times premorbid level (1.1; 0.6–2.1), index BUN >30 mg/dL (1.7; 0.9–3.5), and index BUN/sCr ratio > 20 (1.3; 0.7–2.5). The severity score was