

A Protocol For The Use Of Antifungals In An ICU: Funguria And Fungal Urinary Infection

J Nates, T Allison

Citation

J Nates, T Allison. *A Protocol For The Use Of Antifungals In An ICU: Funguria And Fungal Urinary Infection*. The Internet Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2001 Volume 2 Number 1.

Abstract

Fungal infections are one of the most serious problems in hospitals today. Among them, funguria and urinary infections account for 40% of all the nosocomial infections and over one million new infections in the United States each year. The increase incidence of funguria is associated with risk factors including urinary catheters, treatment with broad-spectrum antibiotics, age, gender, diabetes mellitus, and chronic renal failure. Currently the majority of fungal urinary tract infections involve *Candida albicans*, however, non-*albicans Candida* and non-*Candida* yeasts are increasing as the etiological cause. A protocol for the treatment of funguria and urinary infections based on current medical evidence and cost effective therapy for use in the ICU is discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Since the clinical introduction of penicillin, infections with rare or resistant organisms have become more frequent until today when they are considered the norm in infectious diseases.^{1,2,3,4} One complication observed in modern medicine is an increase rate of fungal infections, and most notably funguria.^{5,6} Urinary tract infections (UTI) are now among the most frequent nosocomial infections, and catheter associated urinary infections (CAUTI) account for up to 40% of all nosocomial infections in the United States.⁷ The incidence of all CAUTI caused by fungi in two recent studies has been reported to be 24.8% and 26.5%, respectively.⁸⁻⁹ Additionally, *Candida* is now reported to be the most frequently isolated organism from the urine of patients in surgical intensive care units.¹⁰ The rise in fungal infections is such that, candiduria essentially unknown before 1940 has become a nosocomial problem.⁵

The increase incidence of funguria is associated with the use of urinary catheters, treatment with broad-spectrum antibiotics, corticosteroids, immunosuppressive agents, and antineoplastics. Other risk factors include advanced age, female gender, diabetes mellitus, chronic renal failure and hemodialysis.^{11,12,13} The majority of fungal UTI involve *Candida* species. The most frequent organism is *Candida albicans* followed by *Candida glabrata*, *Candida tropicalis*, and *Candida krusei*.¹²⁻¹³ However, non-*albicans Candida* and non-*Candida* yeasts are increasing as the etiological

cause of fungal UTI.¹⁴⁻¹⁵

Despite an increase in the frequency of funguria, there is not a consensus in the literature as to the diagnosis and management of fungal UTI. There is still much discussion as to colonization versus infection along with the need and efficacy of treatment. Practice guidelines for the treatment of candidiasis by the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) as recent as April 2000 fail to clearly define funguria and fungal UTI.¹⁰ Additionally, the IDSA does not adequately address recent prospective randomized studies comparing amphotericin B bladder irrigation versus intravenous amphotericin B therapy or oral fluconazole therapy. Several therapeutic options have been discussed but no regimen appears superior. Presented below is a protocol for the management of funguria and fungal UTI in an intensive care unit. Treatment of ascending pyelonephritis and renal candidiasis is beyond the scope of this review and is discussed elsewhere.¹³

DEFINITION OF FUNGURIA AND URINARY TRACT INFECTION

The findings of fungus in the urine may represent contamination, colonization of the catheter, or infection.¹⁶ As of now, there is no reliable method for differentiating colonization from infection.^{13,17} It is not known whether quantitative urinalysis, presence of pyuria, or symptoms correlate with fungal infection. However, Tambyah and Maki found recently that there is a significant difference in

the urine white blood cell count between patients with and without bacterial CAUTI ($p=0.009$).¹⁸

An asymptomatic bacteriuria is defined by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) according to one of the following criteria:

According to the CDC a symptomatic UTI must meet at least one of the following criteria:

Other sources will traditionally define a UTI from a microbiological perspective when pathogenic microorganisms are detected in a properly collected urine sample at a concentration of 10⁵ organisms per milliliter. However, these same sources will acknowledge that a smaller number of bacteria (10² – 10⁴ organisms per milliliter) in some cases signify true urinary infection, especially in symptomatic patients.^{20,21} Some authors go even further, defining a CAUTI as less than 10³ organisms per milliliter urine without signs or symptoms, which is in disagreement with the above CDC definitions. Tambyah and Maki observed that 90% of patients diagnosed with a CAUTI (< 10³ organisms per milliliter) were asymptomatic and that only 52% of the so-called infections were diagnosed by physicians.¹⁸ Additionally, it has been shown that isolation of less than 10⁵ organisms per milliliter or colony forming units of yeast per milliliter progressed to concentrations above 10⁵ organisms per milliliter 96% of the time within three days of the initial culture in catheterized patients.⁷

For the purpose of this protocol we have extrapolated the CDC definitions used for bacteriuria and bacterial UTI to funguria and fungal UTI. It is not known if the threshold for bacterial urinary infections is the same for fungal infections. A funguria is defined as > 10² cfu fungi/ml in a properly collected urine sample and the patient is asymptomatic. A fungal UTI is defined as >10² cfu fungi/ml in two properly collected non-voided urine samples or 10⁵ cfu fungi/ml in a properly collected voided urine sample, and the patient presents with clinical signs and symptoms.

Figure 1

Table 1: Protocol for the treatment of funguria/urinary tract infection

	Definition	Treatment
Funguria Patient is not critically ill	> 10 ² cfu fungi/ml + asymptomatic	Discontinue or change urinary catheter Control risk factors (control blood glucose, tailor antibiotic therapy, discontinue corticosteroids when possible)
Patient is critically ill		Above interventions plus pharmacological options: Primary agent: Amphotericin B 0.3 mg/kg IV X 1 (cheapest and simplest) Alternative agent: Fluconazole 200mg PO/IV daily X 7-14 days (more expensive, less invasive) Second alternative agent: Amphotericin B bladder irrigation (Dose = 50 mg/1000 ml at 42 ml/hr) X 2 days (greater patient discomfort and risk of dissemination or secondary infection)
Patient is critically ill and at high risk		Above interventions plus pharmacological options: Combination therapy: Amphotericin B 0.3mg/kg IV X 1 with Amphotericin B bladder irrigation (Dose = 50 mg/1000 ml at 42 ml/hr) X 2 days Alternative agent: Fluconazole 200mg PO/IV daily X 7-14 days
Urinary Infection	>10 ² cfu fungi/ml in nonvoided samples + clinical signs and symptoms	Above interventions plus pharmacological options: Rule out urinary tract obstruction by ultra sound Primary agent: Amphotericin B 0.3 mg/kg IV X 1 Alternative agent: Combination therapy: Amphotericin B 0.3mg/kg IV X 1 with Amphotericin B bladder irrigation as above X 2 days Second alternative agent: Fluconazole 200mg PO/IV daily X 7-14 days

Note: This protocol was developed following the CDC definitions, current evidence-based literature, patient comfort issues, risk/benefits, and economical factors.

DISCUSSION OF PROTOCOL

The management of asymptomatic catheter-associated funguria is unclear. Many authors have concluded that asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic funguria is benign and should generally not be treated except for modification of risk factors and changing the urinary catheter.^{6,10,12,13} Funguria may clear without treatment over a time course of greater than a month.¹¹ Changing the urinary catheter will result in elimination of the funguria in less than 20% of the patients, while, discontinuation of the catheter alone may result in eradication of funguria in almost 40% of the patients.²² However, in some patients funguria may be the source of dissemination or a marker of acute hematogenous dissemination. Reported mortality rates of 46 –75% in patients with candidemia have led to recommendations that all patients with candidemia receive antifungal therapy.²³ Patient populations, in which treatment of funguria should be considered, include neutropenic patients, critically-ill patients in the intensive care units, low-birth weight infants, and transplant recipients.^{10,24} It is thought that in persistently febrile patients who only have funguria antifungal therapy may treat occult disseminated candidiasis.¹⁰

Options for patients who require treatment include local and

systemic drug regimens. Based on anecdotal experiences, amphotericin B bladder irrigation has generally been the standard of treatment for funguria. However, the efficacy of amphotericin B via continuous irrigation has been debated secondary to concerns that it may only reach organisms near the bladder trigone.⁵ In a randomized trial Fan-Havard and colleagues evaluated the efficacy and safety of amphotericin B bladder irrigation (50 mg/L) over 24 hours and over 7 days as compared to an oral regimen of fluconazole.²⁵ Eradication rates for funguria at 24 hours and 5-9 days after therapy were 82.4% and 75%, respectively with the 1-day amphotericin B irrigation; 94.4% and 78.6%, respectively with the 7-day amphotericin B irrigation; and 83.3% and 76.9%, respectively with fluconazole. There were no differences in the post-therapy eradication rates between the regimens at 24 hours ($p = 0.597$) and at 5-9 days ($p = 0.66$). Amphotericin B bladder irrigations and fluconazole appeared to be equally efficacious in the treatment of funguria. Adverse effects included bladder fullness in a patient receiving a bladder irrigation and hypoglycemia in a patient receiving fluconazole and glyburide concomitantly. However, in a randomized trial conducted by Jacobs and colleagues an increase in all-cause mortality (at one month) was observed in patients treated with amphotericin B bladder irrigation as compared to patients treated with oral fluconazole (41% versus 22%, $p < 0.05$), despite higher initial eradication rates with amphotericin B (96% versus 73%, $p < 0.05$).²⁶

Additionally, the optimal concentration has not been determined. Information suggesting that concentrations of 50 mcg/ml of amphotericin B are very toxic to mammalian cells has led Sanford to previously recommended concentrations of 5-10 mcg/ml for local irrigation with amphotericin B.⁵ However in the 31st edition of *Guide to Antimicrobial Therapy*- 2001, it is recommended to use a bladder irrigation with a concentration of 50 mcg/ml.²⁷ Leu and colleagues in a prospective, randomized, controlled study showed that local irrigation with amphotericin B has prompt effects on clearance of funguria and the urinary yeast count regardless of the concentrations (5 mcg/ml, 100 mcg/ml, or 200 mcg/ml) administered during intermittent irrigations.¹¹ Amphotericin B bladder irrigation appeared to more rapidly clear the funguria as compared to a single intravenous dose of amphotericin B and an oral 5-day regimen of fluconazole. However, these results were not sustained one week after the end of treatment.

Fisher and colleagues have suggested that a single

intravenous dose of amphotericin B (0.3 mg/kg) administered over four hours may be effective therapy.²⁸ It is suggest that the combination of local and systemic therapies may be useful in certain groups such as critically ill patients and patients with ascending pyelonephritis.^{11,13}

Oral fluconazole has been shown to be safe, effective, and as equally efficacious as amphotericin B bladder irrigation for short-term eradication of funguria, especially following catheter removal.^{22,25} Sobel and colleagues showed higher eradication rates in patients who were treated with a full 14 day- course of fluconazole 200mg po daily as compared to placebo ($p < 0.0001$). Fluconazole initially produced high eradication rates, but cultures at two weeks revealed similar funguria rates among treated and untreated patients. Finally, pretreatment serum creatinine levels were inversely related to funguria eradication. A possible explanation is the reduced fluconazole concentrations in the urine in association with reduced glomerular filtration. By reducing the doses in renal dysfunction subtherapeutic urinary concentrations may result.²² Because of the favorable ratio of therapeutic effectiveness to toxicity, we recommend maintaining conventional doses of fluconazole.

Even though these regimens have high rates of eradication initially, relapse in the presence of catheters and other risk factors is likely regardless of the therapy chosen. This leads one to believe that the treatment of funguria is extremely difficult. Another point of consideration is the development of resistance. Centers that have shown an increase in fluconazole use have also shown an increase in *Candida* species that are tolerant or resistant to fluconazole and a change in fungal flora.^{29,30} Furthermore, these medication regimens cost between \$22.00 and \$980.00 depending on the therapeutic regimen (table 2).

As of now, there are still unanswered questions as who to treat, when to treat, and for how long. In addition to the fact that therapy of asymptomatic funguria in the non-neutropenic catheterized patient has never been shown to be of value no one regimen has been show to be superior in efficacy. Additionally, we are subjecting patients to possible adverse reactions from these medications. These factors make it hard to justify the cost of some of the therapeutic regimens at this time patients with asymptomatic funguria. However, because there are many unanswered questions one must consider treating critically-ill patients with systemic antifungals for concern of disseminated candidemia that can not be discovered. Due to the proliferation of different definitions of urinary tract infection, we recommend

adherence to the CDC definitions of urinary tract infections.

Figure 2

Table 2: Cost of selected therapeutic regimens for the treatment of funguria

Medication Regimen	Route	Cost*
Amphotericin B 0.3mg/kg	IV	\$22.50 [#]
Amphotericin B 50mg/1000ml X 2 days	Bladder Irrigation	\$26.92 [#]
Combination therapy: Amphotericin B	IV and Bladder Irrigation	\$49.42 [#]
Fluconazole 200mg X 1 then 100mg qd X 4 days	PO IV	\$50.78 \$221.08
Fluconazole 200mg X 7 days	PO IV	\$84.58 \$498.63
Fluconazole 200mg x 14 days	PO IV	\$151.08 \$979.18

* Cost includes new foley

Based on 50mg vial

CORRESPONDENCE TO

Dr. Joseph L. Nates Associate Professor Departments of Neurosurgery and Anesthesia-Critical Care Medicine The University of Texas-Houston, Health Science Center Medical School 6410 Fannin, HPB 1020 Houston, Texas 77030 USA Phone: (713) 704-6445, Fax (713) 704-6462 E-mail: Joseph.L.Nates@uth.tmc.edu

References

1. BBC-Education. Medicine through time. The modern world- Disease and its treatment. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/education/medicine/nonint/modern/dt/modtbi3.shtml>
2. Bergogne-Bérézin E, Decré D, Joly-Guillou ML. Opportunistic nosocomial multiply resistant bacterial infections- their treatment and prevention. J Antimicrob Chemo 1993; 32 (A): 39-47.
3. Komshian SV, Uwaydah AK, Sobel JD, Crane LR. Fungemia caused by candida species and torulopsis glabrata in the hospitalized patient. Rev Resp Dis 1989; 11: 379-390.
4. Slotman GJ, Shapiro E, Moffa SM. Fungal sepsis: Multisite colonization versus fungemia. Am Surg 1994; 60: 107-113.
5. Sanford JP. The enigma of candiduria: Evolution of bladder irrigation with amphotericin B for management-From anecdote to dogma and a lesson from Machiavelli. Clin Inf Dis 1993; 16:145-147.
6. Fisher JF, Chew WH, Shadomay S, Duma RJ, Mayhall CG, House WC. Urinary tract infections due to Candida albicans. Rev Infect Dis 1982; 4:1107-18.
7. Stark RP, Maki DG. Bacteriuria in the catheterized patient: What quantitative level of bacteriuria is relevant. NEJM 1994;311:560-4.
8. Hsu CCS, Ukleja B. Clearance of candida colonizing the urinary bladder by a two-day amphotericin B irrigation. Infection 1990;18:280-282.
9. Platt R, Polk BF, Murdock B, et al. Risk factors for nosocomial urinary tract infection. Am J Epidemiol

1986;124:977-985.

10. Rex JH, Walsh TJ, Sobel JD, et al. Practice guidelines for the treatment of candidiasis. Clin Infect Dis 2000;30: 662-78.
11. Leu HS, Huang CT. Clearance of funguria with short-course antifungal regimens: a prospective, randomized, controlled study. Clin Infect Dis 1995; 20 (5): 1152-7.
12. Kremery S, Dubrava M, Kremery Jr. V. Fungal urinary tract infections in patients at risk. International J Antimicrob Agents 1999;11:289-91.
13. Lundstrom T, Sobel J. Nosocomial candiduria: a review. Clin Infect Dis 2001;32:1602-7.
14. Oravcova E, Lacka J, Drgona L, et al. Funguria in cancer patients: analysis of risk factors, clinical presentation and outcome. Infection 1996;24:319-23.
15. Sobel JD. Management of asymptomatic candiduria. International J Antimicrob Agents 1999;11:285-288.
16. Fisher JF, Newman CL, Sobel JD. Yeast in the urine: solutions for a budding problem. Clin Infect Dis 1995;20:183-9.
17. Wong-Beringer A, Jacobs RA, Guglielmo BJ. Treatment of funguria. JAMA 1992; 267:2780-5.
18. Tambyah PA, Maki DG. Catheter-associated urinary tract infection is rarely symptomatic: A prospective study of 1497 catheterized patients. Arch Inter Med 2000;160:678-82.
19. Garner J, Jarvis W, Emori T, et al. CDC definitions for nosocomial infections, 1988. J Infect Control. 1988;16:128-140.
20. Warren JW. Nosocomial urinary tract infections. In: Mandell, Douglas, and Bennett's Principles and practice of infectious diseases. 5th ed. Mandell GL, Bennett JE, Dolin R, eds. Philadelphia: Churchill Livingstone;2000:3028-39.
21. Stamm WE. Urinary tract infections and pyelonephritis. In: Harrison's principles of internal medicine. 14th ed. Fauci AS, Braunwald E, Isselbacher KJ, et al., eds. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1998:817-22.
22. Sobel JD, Kauffman CA, McKinsey D, et al. Candiduria: a randomized, double-blind, study of treatment with fluconazole and placebo. Clin Infect Dis 2000;30:19-24.
23. Rex JH, Bennett JE, Sugar AM, et al. A randomized trial comparing fluconazole with amphotericin B for the treatment of candidemia in patients without neutropenia. NEJM 1994;331:325-30.
24. Nassoura Z, Ivatury RR, Simon RJ, et al. Candiduria as an early marker of disseminated infection in critically ill surgical patients : the role of fluconazole therapy. J Trauma 1993;35:290-95.
25. Fan-Harvard P, O'Donovan C, Smith SM, et al. Oral fluconazole versus amphotericin B bladder irrigation for treatment of candidal funguria. CID 1995;21:960-5.
26. Jacobs, LG, Skidmore EA, Freeman K, et al. Oral fluconazole compared with bladder irrigation with amphotericin B for treatment of fungal urinary tract infections in elderly patients. Clin Infect Dis 1996 ;22 :30-5.
27. Sanford JP. Treatment of fungal, actinomycotic, and nocardial infections- antimicrobial agents of choice. In: Guide to Antimicrobial Therapy 2001. West Bethesda. Maryland: Antimicrobial Therapy, 2001:72.
28. Fisher JF, Hicks BC, Dipper JT, et al. Efficacy of a single intravenous dose of amphotericin B in urinary tract infections caused by Candida [letter]. J Infect Disent 1987; 156:685-7.
29. Rocco TR, Reinert SE, Simms HH. Effects of fluconazole administration in critically ill patients : Analysis of bacterial and fungal resistance. Arch Surg 2000;135:160-5.
30. Gleason TG, May AK, Caparelli, D, et al. Emerging

evidence of selection of fluconazole-tolerant fungi in surgical intensive care units. Arch Surg

1997;132:1197-1202.

Author Information

Joseph L. Nates, M.D., Associate Professor

Director Neurosciences ICU, Neurosurgery and Anesthesiology/Critical Care, University of Texas Medical School at Houston

Teresa A. Allison, , Pharm D

Clinical Pharmacist, Neurosciences , Pharmacy, Memorial Hermann Hospital