

Full paper

The challenge of infectious diseases consultations in the emergency department: an Italian nationwide survey.

Niccolò Riccardi^{1,2¶}, Roberta Maria Antonello^{2¶}, Andrea Giacomelli^{2,3¶}, Laura Saderi⁴, Diana Canetti^{2,5}, Carlo Pallotto⁶, Fulvia Mazzaferri⁷, Anna Maria Degli Antoni⁸, Chiara Cardellino⁹, Iaria Motta¹⁰, Andrea Calcagno¹⁰, Marco Falcone¹¹, Michele Trezzi¹², Agnese Comelli¹³, Renato Pascale¹⁴, Marco Merli¹⁵, Francesca Binda¹⁶, Andrea Angheben⁹, Giovanni Sotgiu^{2,17&}, Federico Gobbi^{9&}, Silvia Nozza^{5&}

¹Infectious Diseases Unit, Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Pisana, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

²StopTB Italia Onlus, Milan, Italy

³Department of Biomedical and Clinical Sciences DIBIC L. Sacco, University of Milan, 20157 Milan, Italy

⁴Clinical Epidemiology and Medical Statistics Unit, Department of Medical, Surgical and Experimental Sciences, University of Sassari, 07100 Sassari, Italy

⁵Department of Infectious and Tropical Diseases San Raffaele Hospital, 20132 Milan, Italy

⁶Infectious Diseases Unit, Santa Maria Annunziata Hospital, Azienda USL Toscana Centro, 50012 Bagno a Ripoli, Florence, Italy

⁷Infectious Diseases Section, Department of Diagnostic and Public Health, University of Verona, 37129 Verona, Italy

⁸Department of Infectious Diseases and Hepatology, Azienda Ospedaliera di Parma, 34126 Parma, Italy

⁹Department of Infectious - Tropical Diseases and Microbiology, IRCCS Sacro Cuore Don Calabria Hospital, 37024 Valpolicella di Negrar, Verona, Italy

¹⁰University of Turin, AO "Amedeo di Savoia", Department of Medical Sciences, Infectious Diseases, 10149 Turin, Italy

¹¹Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, University of Pisa, 56126 Pisa, Italy

¹²Division of Infectious Diseases, Azienda USL Toscana Centro, Hospital of Pistoia, 51100 Pistoia, Italy

¹³Department of Infectious & Tropical Diseases, Spedali Civili, 25123 Brescia, Italy

¹⁴Infectious Diseases Unit, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum University of Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy

¹⁵Infectious Diseases, ASST Grande Ospedale Metropolitano Niguarda, 20162 Milan, Italy

¹⁶Division of Infectious Diseases, ASST Papa Giovanni XXIII, 24127 Bergamo, Italy

¹⁷. Department of Medical, Surgical and Experimental Sciences, University of Sassari, 07100 Sassari, Italy

[†]These authors contributed equally.

[&]These authors also contributed equally to this work. G.S., F.G. and S.N. are Joint Senior Authors.

Running title: Infectious diseases consultations in the emergency room

SUMMARY

Diagnosis and management of infectious diseases (ID) at the emergency department (ED) are challenging due to the peculiar setting and the available diagnostic tools. The involvement of an ID consultant has been described to improve clinical outcomes and antimicrobial stewardship (AMS) programs.

An online survey was sent to 100 Italian Departments of Infectious Diseases affiliated with the Italian Society of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine (SIMIT).

The primary objective of our study was to describe the characteristics of ID services in Italian EDs to identify possible challenges and shortcomings and provide tips to improve the management of patients. Secondary objectives included the evaluation of diagnostic capability and the management of patients with suspected or confirmed ID.

Seventy-six out of the 100 SIMIT centers, 32 (42.1%) of which were teaching hospitals, answered the survey. In 62 (82.7%) centers, consultations were performed by the IDs specialist on call. In 29 (38.2%) centers, there was a formal AMS program, and 32 (42.7%) had protocols for antibiotic use in the ED. Microbiological tests to be performed before starting antibiotic treatment in the ED were clearly defined in 44 (57.9%) hospitals.

This survey highlighted several challenges in the current organization of ID consultations in Italian EDs.

Keywords: Infectious Diseases, Consultant, Emergency Room, Diagnostic, Antimicrobial stewardship.

Corresponding Author: Niccolò Riccardi, MD. Infectious Diseases Unit, Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria Pisana, Pisa, Italy; Tel. +393333618694; E-mail: niccolo.riccardi@yahoo.it; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2947-4707

INTRODUCTION

How can infectious diseases (ID) consultations in the emergency department (ED) be improved in quality and efficacy? The heterogeneous clinical presentation of ID at the ED can be challenging in terms of diagnosis and treatment. Indeed, the choice of the most appropriate diagnostic tools and treatment, considering the increasing rate of antimicrobial resistant bacteria, have led to growing demand for ID consultancy (Kawamura et al., 2015; Hamandi et al., 2014; Farmakiotis et al., 2015; Yapar et al., 2006).

The role of ID consultants is the key to improve clinical management of patients with a suspected ID (Vehreschild et al., 2013; Fariñas et al., 2012; Kerremans et al., 2012; Sellier et al., 2009): a significant reduction of 30-day mortality and clinical failure of patients with *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia and infective endocarditis have been observed (Hadano et al., 2021; Abraham et al., 2020; Kawasuji et al., 2019; Sherbuk et al., 2019; Okura et al., 2021) after establishment of ID consultation. Similar results were shown for patients with enterococcal bacteremia, candidemia, and septic shock (Kawamura et al., 2015; Kaya et al., 2021; Kobayashi et al., 2020; Mohr et al., 2020; Madaline et al., 2019; Mejia-Chew et al., 2019; Conant et al., 2016).

Implementation of an ID consultant service in the ED resulted in a reduction of 14-day mortality in case of severe sepsis or septic shock (Viale et al., 2017).

Moreover, the involvement of an ID specialist in antimicrobial stewardship (AMS) programs is associated with reduction in antibiotic consumption and optimized antibiotic use (Bouchet et al., 2020; Mani et al., 2021; Kishida et al., 2020; Tagashira et al., 2016; Jump et al., 2012; Menichetti et al., 2018; Falcone et al., 2019).

The implementation of AMS strategies in the ED may improve appropriate antibiotic prescribing, promote beneficial collaborative relationships between ID specialists and ED colleagues, and reduce unnecessary admissions to medical wards. In the ED, the ID consultant frequently deals with issues regarding available diagnostic tools and treatments, which can be different from those encountered in ID outpatient services or ID wards. Due to the unavailability of culture results, antimicrobial susceptibility tests, serological and molecular tests that can support the initial clinical evaluation, diagnoses in the ED are typically presumptive, and therefore seeking the advice of an ID specialist may be strongly recommended. Unfortunately, the daily presence of ID consultants in the ED and the availability of microbiological diagnostic tools 24 hours a day/7 days a week (24/7) are not guaranteed in every hospital, depending on local resources and organization (Sexton, 1991).

The Coronavirus Disease-19 (COVID-19) pandemic posed further challenges to ID management in the ED. In particular, ID consultants had a key role in deciding for hospitalization, giving indications

for home care, and limiting irrational use of antibiotics (Giacomelli et al., 2021; Nguyen et al., 2020; Abelenda-Alonso et al., 2020).

The aim of the present study is to evaluate the current organization of ID services and diagnostic and therapeutic tools available in Italian EDs. The present survey was encouraged by the limited available evidence on the role of ID specialists in ERs in Italy. We also aimed to provide some essential suggestions to overcome this gap and improve ID consultations in the ED.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design

This is an observational study conducted through an anonymous web-based survey. The survey was designed according to methodological recommendations for surveys (Pulcini et al., 2016). In particular, we specified the design of the study (“nationwide survey”) in the title and abstract, defined clear and relevant questions, and presented the results with reference to the study objectives. The sample selection and the method used for data analysis are specified in the following paragraphs.

Setting and sampling strategy

We inquired about Italian hospitals whose ID Departments are affiliated with the Italian Society of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine (SIMIT). Both teaching (university) and non-teaching hospitals were invited to participate. The survey was conducted from November 9, 2020 to the December 9, 2020. The survey was sent by e-mail to all SIMIT members.

Participants

For each center, only one ID physician serving as a consultant in the ED was invited to respond to the survey.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was to evaluate the current characteristics of ID consultations in the ED (number of ID consultations performed per year, employment of an ID specialist for consultations in the ED, organization of follow up service, and related issues).

Secondary outcomes were: 1) to describe the number of AMS programs in the ED; 2) to describe the available diagnostic tools for specific IDs in the ED; 3) to evaluate the management paths for patients with suspected or confirmed infectious diseases followed by ID consultants in the ED (availability of rooms for respiratory isolation, possibility to increase the number of hospital beds in case of an epidemic caused by emerging pathogens, and related issues); 4) to evaluate the possibility to perform clinical trials in the ED for ID consultants.

Survey design

The questionnaire was designed with closed-ended questions and is available here as Supplementary Material (Tables S1-S4). It was pre-tested at the coordinating site for clarity and technical functionality.

The questionnaire included 66 items, divided into 9 sections. The nine sections of the survey were: I) Demographic information of the ID specialist filling in the survey (two questions); II) Characteristics of the hospital (sixteen questions); III) AMS programs in the hospital (twelve questions); IV) Travel medicine (four questions); V) Management of contagious patients in the ED (five questions); VI) Virological diagnostic capability (eleven questions); VII) Bacterial diagnostic capacity (nine questions); VIII) Laboratory diagnostic capability at the ED (four questions); IX) Clinical trials at the ED (two questions).

Ethical approval and informed consent

This study was designed as a service evaluation.

No informed consent was needed due to the absence of sensitive information or patients' data. No ethical approval was needed due to the nature of the data. No remuneration was provided to participants.

Survey administration and response rate

The online survey was distributed to 100 SIMIT-affiliated centers. Response rates were calculated as the number of hospitals from which an answer was recorded/total number of participating hospitals. Information on hospital name and country was used to screen for duplicate entries, but all data remained anonymous and it was not possible to link the participant physicians to the given answers.

Statistical analysis

An ad hoc electronic form was adopted to collect the data. Categorical variables were reported as absolute and relative frequencies, whereas continuous variables as means (\pm standard deviations) or medians (interquartile ranges, IQR), depending on their normal distribution. Continuous variables were compared by the Student t-test or the Mann-Whitney U-test, as appropriate. Categorical data were compared using the chi-square test or Fisher exact test.

A comparison between the responses collected from teaching and non-teaching hospitals was performed. A two-tailed p-value (p) less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Given the lack of pre-study estimates for the outcome of interest, it was not possible to formulate the assumptions for sample size determination.

All statistical computations were performed with the statistical software STATA version 14 (StatsCorp, Texas, US).

RESULTS

Seventy-six out of the 100 sites responded to the invitation and filled in the questionnaire (response rate: 76%), with 42 (57.9%) non-teaching hospitals. Full details of survey items are presented in Tables S1-S4.

Section I. Demographic information of the ID specialist filling in the survey.

ID specialists answering the survey had a median age of 40 (IQR 34-51). Forty (52.6%) were male. The geographical distribution of the hospitals (34 teaching hospitals, 42 non-teaching hospitals) is shown in Figure 1. Centers from 17 out of 20 Italian regions answered the survey. The majority of data were retrieved from Northern Italy (57.9% participating centers), followed by Southern Italy and Islands (22.4%) and Central Italy (19.7%).

Section II. Characteristics of the Hospital.

Seventy-one out of 76 (93.4%) participants reported a median (IQR) of 600 (360-900) hospital beds. The median (IQR) number was higher in teaching (775 (600-1,200)) than in non-teaching hospitals (450 (350-600)); $p: 0.0002$). Seventy-three (96.1%) ID consultants worked in a hospital where the ED was present, and all of them regularly performed ID consultations there. Forty-seven out of 74 (63.5%) hospitals had a neurosurgical ward, 34/74 (46%) a cardio-surgical ward, 49/74 (66.2%) a hematology ward, 74/74 (100%) an orthopedic ward, 24/74 (33.8%) a solid organ transplantation team, and 68/74 (91.9%) a pediatric ward. The neurosurgical, cardio-surgical, and solid organ transplantation wards were more frequently present in teaching hospitals, reaching statistical significance ($p: 0.001$ for neurosurgery and $p < 0.0001$ for the other two units). The ID ward was present in 69 (90.8%) hospitals, with a median (IQR) number of 30 (22-40) hospital beds for teaching hospitals and 18 (14-23) for non-teaching hospitals ($p: 0.0001$). The ID specialist on call was in charge of ID consultation in ED for 62/75 (82.7%) sites. The ID consultant was specifically employed in the ED in 22 (29%) participating centers and in 17 (77.3%) the ID consultant was present 24/7. An ID or pediatric ID specialist was in charge of pediatric ID consultancies in 15/73 (20.6%) EDs, with a difference between teaching and non-teaching hospitals ($p: 0.03$). A median (IQR) of 42,468 (3,500-70,000) patients presented to the ED in 2019, and median (IQR) number of ID consultations was 1,100 (450-2,000). A median (IQR) of 5 (3-10) consultations per day was reported. An ID outpatient follow-up service was available in 32/75 (42.1%) hospitals.

Section III. AMS programs in the Hospital.

Formal AMS programs (which should always include the definition of an antimicrobial stewardship team, collaboration between physicians, pharmacy and therapeutics committees, and administrative support to measure and track antimicrobial prescription) (Mendelson et al., 2020; Dellit et al., 2007) were reported in 62.5% of teaching and 20.5% of non-teaching hospitals ($p < 0.0001$). Thirty-two out of 75 (42.7%) EDs followed local protocols for the use of antibiotics. Twenty-one (27.6%) sites

reported the use of an online platform to check antimicrobial therapy from hospital wards. Prescription of antibiotics on an online platform was present only in 17 (22.4%) hospitals.

A flow chart indicating the microbiological tests to be performed before starting antibiotics was available in 44 (57.9%) EDs.

“Infection-teams” for the management of frequent and life-threatening infections have been set up in <20% of hospitals. Significant differences were observed between teaching and non-teaching hospitals for “sepsis-team” (p: 0.01), “orthopedic-team” (p: 0.03) and “onco-hematology infection team” (p: 0.02) (Figure 2).

Section IV. Travel medicine.

Diagnosis of malaria relied mostly on rapid tests, which were available in 58/70 (82.9%) EDs. Thin and thick blood smears were performed in 41/70 (58.6%) and 35/70 (50%) EDs, respectively. Other less frequently used diagnostic tools for malaria included loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP), available in 4/70 hospitals, and quantitative buffy coat test (QBC), available in 2/70 hospitals. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for the diagnosis of Dengue, Zika, and Chikungunya infections was available in 14/74 (18.9%) EDs, whereas Dengue NS1 rapid antigen test was available in 10/74 (13.5%) EDs. Fecal samples were accepted 24/7 by laboratories for stool culture in 30/75 (40%) hospitals.

Section V. Suspected contagious patients in the ED.

60/75 (80%) participants reported the availability of a formal emergency plan in case of highly contagious infections. Formal emergency plans increasing the availability of hospital beds during seasonal influenza and in case of epidemics were reported by 41/73 (56.2%) and 34/74 (46%) ID consultants, respectively.

Section VI. Virological diagnostic capacity at the ED.

Rapid or serological tests for HIV were available in 51/74 (68.9%) EDs, and in 29/49 (59.2%) of them the result was available 24/7. Nasopharyngeal swabs for RSV or seasonal influenza virus could be performed in 38/74 (51.4%) and 49/74 (66.2%) EDs, respectively (Figure 3).

SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic capacity at the ED.

Nasopharyngeal swab for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was available 24/7 in 72/74 (97.3%) EDs. Serological test for SARS-CoV-2 was available 24/7 in 40/75 (53.3%) EDs. Twenty-nine participating consultants specified which serological test for SARS-CoV-2 was in use in their EDs: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and chemiluminescence sandwich-immunoassay (CLIA) were reported by 22/29 (75.9%) and 5/29 (17.2%) participating hospitals, respectively. One physician reported a combination of CLIA plus ELISA. One consultant reported a combination of a rapid test with a quantitative serological test.

Section VII. Bacterial diagnostic capacity at the ED.

Blood cultures could be performed in 70/75 (93.3%) EDs. Nasal swab for methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) and rectal swab for MDR Gram-negatives and vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* spp. were available in 38/75 (50.7%), 41/74 (55.4%) and 27/73 (37%) EDs, respectively. Detection of *M. tuberculosis* in sputum by molecular and acid-fast coloration was available in 43/74 (58.1%) EDs. The possibility of testing for urinary antigens for *Legionella* spp. and *S. pneumoniae* was reported in 53/74 (71.6%) EDs. Detection of pathogens typically involved in central nervous system infections (*N. meningitidis*, *S. pneumoniae*, *L. monocytogenes*) was performed with PCR on cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) in 60/74 (81.1%) EDs. Molecular tests for the detection of *C. difficile* and sexually transmitted pathogens (e.g., HIV, *C. trachomatis*, *N. gonorrhoeae*) were reported in 46/73 (63%) and 19/75 (25.3%) EDs, respectively (Figure 4).

Section VIII. Laboratory diagnostic capability at the ED.

Blood count at bedside at the ED was available in 72/75 (96%) hospitals, whereas dosage of C-reactive protein and procalcitonin in 75/75 (100%) and 63/75 (84%) EDs, respectively. Dosage of β -D-glucan was reported from 9/74 (12.2%) participants.

Section IX. Clinical Trials at the ED.

We investigated if there were ongoing clinical trials in the EDs of the participating centers. In particular, we addressed trials run by ID specialists and/or ED specialists about ID. Forty out of 71 (56.3%) hospitals reported the possibility of carrying out clinical trials in the ED setting, but only 13/67 (19.4%) reported ongoing clinical trials at the time the survey was completed.

DISCUSSION

This is the first Italian national survey investigating the organization of ID consultations in the ED of hospitals. Our study showed both strong and weak points of the current organization.

First, AMS programs were not clearly defined in all participating EDs, and informatic services can be enhanced in many EDs in order to ease the consultation of ongoing medications and laboratory findings. Second, although most EDs had formal emergency plans, these often did not include the possibility of increasing the number of hospital beds. Third, investigation of laboratory diagnostic capability showed some limits, with particular regard to fungal diagnostic tests and surveillance swabs. Finally, our survey highlighted statistically significant differences between teaching and non-teaching hospitals for several items. This can be partially explained by the fact that teaching hospitals usually receive more funds and their diagnostic capability and overall organization is enhanced compared to non-teaching hospitals.

We highlighted organizational aspects of ID consultation in ED that could be generally improved and issues that would make ID consultations more effective.

Six suggestions to improve organizational aspects.

- At least one ID consultant should be dedicated to the ED (71% of EDs do not formally have a consultant), better if officially employed and not on call.
- The number of ID consultations in the ED should be computed (77.6% cannot estimate).
- Implementation of information technology to keep track of medical records and antibiotic therapy is needed (online platforms are used for medical records in 60% and for antimicrobial therapy in 27.6% of hospitals).
- AMS programs and clear recommendations on microbiological tests to be performed before starting antimicrobial treatment are needed (they are lacking in 57.3% and 42.1% of EDs, respectively).
- “Infection-teams” for frequent and life-threatening infections should be regularly active (82.9% of hospitals do not have a “sepsis-team”). Specific services such as endocarditis-team should be implemented in reference hospitals with a cardiac surgery team (they are present in less than 16% of hospitals).
- Formal emergency plan in case of epidemic/pandemic is a key point in the ED organization (20% do not have any plan and 54% do not have a formal plan to increase the number of hospital beds in case of emergency).

Tailoring AMS programs in the ED (e.g., local epidemiology, type of patients, available antibiotics for empiric therapy) is an essential element for successful AMS programs (May et al., 2020). AMS programs and guidelines for the management of patients with confirmed or suspected infectious diseases should be clearly defined and shared by both ID specialists and ED physicians, in order to ensure a coherent approach to these patients.

The number of ID consultations and the type of infectious diseases should be considered to assess the cost-effectiveness of ID consultants specifically employed in the ED.

In addition, while the training course to become an ID specialist is clearly defined (a four-year postgraduate course), in Italy there is not an official training period for physicians willing to become part of the “infection teams” we investigated in our survey. This depends on each hospital organization, on the area of specialization of the physicians employed, and on the cost-effectiveness of the teams. The definition of a nationally standardized training course is likely to make “infection teams” more effective.

Five suggestions to make ID consultations more effective.

- Increase diagnostic capability for HIV, EBV, RSV, seasonal influenza virus (diagnostic tools for these infections are available 24/7 in 44.7% - 62.5% of hospitals).
- Upgrade diagnostic tools for imported diseases in ED to give timely and appropriate diagnosis to returning travelers, migrants and expats (only 18.9% of EDs have 24/7 availability of molecular test for Dengue virus, Zika virus and Chikungunya virus; thin and thick blood smears to diagnose malaria were performed in less than 60% of EDs).
- Increase diagnostic capability for colonization by MDR microorganisms (nasal swab for MRSA is available in 50.7% of EDs, rectal swab for MDR Gram negative bacteria in 55.4% of EDs and rectal swab for VRE in 37% of EDs).
- Enhance the possibility to dose β -D-glucan from venous blood in hospitals with a high flow of patients with suspected invasive fungal infections (this is possible only in 12.2% of hospitals).
- Improved patient isolation in case of contagious/highly contagious IDs or MDR microorganism colonization is recommended.

Finally, the possibility of carrying out clinical trials on infectious diseases in EDs was reported in only 56.3% of participating centers. Enhancing the possibility to perform clinical trials in EDs may be of great importance. Although performing clinical trials in EDs may be challenging, the ED is a unique setting for clinical trials. As a matter of fact, identification of patients in the early phase of an infectious disease when no other previous therapy has been administered may reduce potential bias. Moreover, the ED is the most appropriate setting to recruit patients for trials on septic shock. The presence of an ID consultant dedicated to the ED may allow the successful implementation of clinical trials in this setting.

Limitations

A number of limitations should be addressed. First, the survey was conducted only in SIMIT-affiliated hospitals with a relatively high proportion of teaching hospitals. Thus, it is not generalizable to settings where ID services are absent. Second, although only three regions did not participate in the survey, a north-to-south lower response gradient was observed. Third, a number of respondents were not able to answer several questions. Finally, the survey was conducted at the time of the “second COVID-19 pandemic wave.” This resulted, on the one hand, in limited availability of ID consultants to answer due to time constraints and, on the other, in partially different organizational issues.

The main strength of the survey is its user-friendly interface (web-based survey), which allowed a high response rate (76%) despite the dramatic pandemic situation.

Our survey also gives way to further studies. In fact, our study did not investigate the organization of ID consultations in Eds in other countries, so little is known about the gaps that remain internationally or about good organizations that could be an example for other countries.

CONCLUSIONS

Our survey highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of the current organization for ID consultations in Italian EDs, offering recommendations to improve the organization and make ID consultations more effective. An under-implementation of AMS programs challenging the efficacy of ID consultations was observed, with a worrisome low percentage of hospitals with formal guidelines for both microbiological test indication and empirical antimicrobial treatment. This gap was particularly evident in non-teaching hospitals. Our data reveal the need for urgent implementation of information technology for antimicrobial prescription and implementation of AMS principles in the EDs, which have been demonstrated to improve patient care.

Acknowledgements

The Authors are grateful to SIMIT and to all Colleagues answering the survey.

Financial support for the study being published was kindly offered by Ospedale San Raffaele srl.

REFERENCES

- Abelenda-Alonso G, Padullés A, Rombauts A, Gudiol C, Pujol M et al. (2020). Antibiotic prescription during the COVID-19 pandemic: A biphasic pattern. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 41(11):1371-1372
- Abraham L, Bamberger DM. (2020). *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: Contemporary Management. *Mo Med.* 117(4):341–345
- Bouchet F, Le Moing V, Dirand D, Cros F, Lienard A et al. (2020). Effectiveness and acceptance of multimodal antibiotic stewardship program: Considering progressive implementation and complementary strategies. *Antibiotics.* 9(12):1–13
- Conant MM, Vrasich CR, Wongsakhaluang JV, Ferenchak K, Asano MK et al. (2016). Role of the infectious disease consultant in management of patients with tuberculosis-associated ocular inflammation. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 3(1):ofv195
- Dellit TH, Owens RC, McGowan JE, Gerding DN, Weinstein RA et al. (2007). Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America guidelines for developing an institutional program to enhance antimicrobial stewardship. *Clin Infect Dis.* 44(2):159–77.
- Falcone M, Paul M, Yahav D, Orlando G, Tiseo G et al. (2019). Antimicrobial consumption and impact of antimicrobial stewardship programmes in long-term care facilities. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 25(5):562-569
- Fariñas MC, Saravia G, Calvo-Montes J, Benito N, Martínez-Garde JJ et al. (2012). Adherence to recommendations by infectious disease consultants and its influence on outcomes of intravenous antibiotic-treated hospitalized patients. *BMC Infect Dis.* 12:292
- Farmakiotis D, Kyvernitakis A, Tarrand JJ, Kontoyiannis DP. (2015). Early initiation of appropriate treatment is associated with increased survival in cancer patients with *Candida glabrata* fungaemia: A potential benefit from infectious disease consultation. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 21(1):79–86
- Giacomelli A, Ridolfo AL, Oreni L, Vimercati S, Albrecht M et al. (2021). Consumption of antibiotics at an Italian university hospital during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic: Were all antibiotic prescriptions appropriate? *Pharmacol Res.* 164:105403.
- Hadano Y, Kakuma T, Matsumoto T, Ishibashi K, Isoda M et al. (2021). Reduction of 30-day death rates from *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia by mandatory infectious diseases consultation: Comparative study interventions with and without an infectious disease specialist. *Int J Infect Dis.* 103:308-315
- Hamandi B, Husain S, Humar A, Papadimitropoulos EA. (2014). Impact of infectious disease consultation on the clinical and economic outcomes of solid organ transplant recipients admitted for

infectious complications. *Clin Infect Dis.* 59(8):1074–82

Jump RLP, Olds DM, Seifi N, Kyriotakis G, Jury LA et al. (2012). Effective Antimicrobial Stewardship in a Long-Term Care Facility through an Infectious Disease Consultation Service: Keeping a LID on Antibiotic Use. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 33(12):1185–92.

Kawamura I, Kurai H. (2015). Inpatient infectious disease consultations requested by surgeons at a comprehensive cancer center. *Support Care Cancer.* 23(10):3011–4

Kawasuji H, Sakamaki I, Kawamura T, Ueno A, Miyajima Y et al. (2020). Proactive infectious disease consultation at the time of blood culture collection is associated with decreased mortality in patients with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia: A retrospective cohort study. *J Infect Chemother.* 26(6):588–95

Kaya A, Kaya SY, Balkan II, Bayramlar OF, Mete B et al. (2021). Risk factors for development of vancomycin-resistant enterococcal bacteremia among VRE colonizers: A retrospective case control study. *Wien Klin Wochenschr.* 133(9-10):478-483

Kerremans JJ, Verbrugh HA, Vos MC. (2012). Frequency of microbiologically correct antibiotic therapy increased by infectious disease consultations and microbiological results. *J Clin Microbiol.* 50(6):2066–8

Kishida N, Nishiura H. (2020). Accelerating reductions in antimicrobial resistance: Evaluating the effectiveness of an intervention program implemented by an infectious disease consultant. *Int J Infect Dis.* 93:175–81

Kobayashi T, Marra AR, Schweizer ML, Ten Eyck P, Wu C et al. (2020). Impact of Infectious Disease Consultation in Patients With Candidemia: A Retrospective Study, Systematic Literature Review, and Meta-analysis. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 7(9):ofaa270

Madaline T, Wadskier MF, Eisenberg R, Mowrey W, Kaur J et al. (2019). Early Infectious Disease Consultation Is Associated with Lower Mortality in Patients with Severe Sepsis or Septic Shock Who Complete the 3-Hour Sepsis Treatment Bundle. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 6(10):ofz408

Mani NS, Lan KF, Jain R, Bryson-Cahn C, Lynch JB et al. (2021). Post-Prescription Review with Threat of Infectious Disease Consultation and Sustained Reduction in Meropenem Use Over Four Years. *Clin Infect Dis.* 73(11):e4515-e4520

May L, Martín Quir Os A, Oever JT, Oogerwerf J, Schoffelen T et al. (2020). Narrative review Antimicrobial stewardship in the emergency department: characteristics and evidence for effectiveness of interventions 2020. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 27(2):204-209

Mejia-Chew C, O'Halloran JA, Olsen MA, Stwalley D, Kronen R et al. (2019). Effect of infectious disease consultation on mortality and treatment of patients with candida bloodstream infections: a retrospective, cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 19(12):1336–44

Mendelson M, Morris AM, Thursky K, Pulcini C. (2020). How to start an antimicrobial stewardship programme in a hospital. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 26(4):447–53

Menichetti F, Falcone M, Lopalco P, Tascini C, Pan A et al. (2018) The GISA call to action for the appropriate use of antimicrobials and the control of antimicrobial resistance in Italy. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 52(2):127-134

Mohr A, Simon M, Joha T, Hanses F, Salzberger B et al. (2020). Epidemiology of candidemia and impact of infectious disease consultation on survival and care. *Infection.* 48(2):275–84

Nguyen CT, Olson G, Pho MT, Lew AK, Pitrak D et al. (2020). Automatic ID Consultation for Inpatients With COVID-19: Point, Counterpoint, and a Single-Center Experience. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 7(10):ofaa318

Okura T, Iwata K, Koyama T, Ebisawa K, Arakawa Y et al. (2021). Impact of Infectious Disease Consultation on Management and Outcomes of Infective Endocarditis. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 112(4):1228-1234

Pulcini C, Leibovici L. (2016). CMI guidance for authors of surveys. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 22(11):901-902

Sellier E, Pavese P, Gennai S, Stahl JP, Labarère J et al. (2009). Factors and outcomes associated with physicians' adherence to recommendations of infectious disease consultations for inpatients. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 65(1):156–62

Sexton DJ. (1991). Rates of Infectious Disease Consultations in Hospitals of Different Sizes and Types, 1986–1987. *Clin Infect Dis.* 13(3):527–527

Sherbuk JE, Mcmanus D, Topal JE, Malinis M. (2019). Improved mortality in *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia with the involvement of antimicrobial stewardship team and infectious disease consultation. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 40(8):932–5

Tagashira Y, Horiuchi M, Tokuda Y, Heist BS, Higuchi M et al. (2016). Antimicrobial stewardship for carbapenem use at a Japanese tertiary care center: An interrupted time series analysis on the impact of infectious disease consultation, prospective audit, and feedback. *Am J Infect Control.* 44(6):708–10

Vehreschild JJ, Morgen G, Cornely OA, Hartmann P, Koch S et al. (2013). Evaluation of an infectious disease consultation programme in a German tertiary care hospital. *Infection.* 41(6):1121–8


Viale P, Tedeschi S, Scudeller L, Attard L, Badia L et al. (2017). Infectious Diseases Team for the Early Management of Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock in the Emergency Department. *Clin Infect Dis.* 65(8):1253–9

Yapar N, Erdenizmenli M, Oğuz VA, Kuruüzüm Z, Senger SS et al. (2006). Infectious disease consultations and antibiotic usage in a Turkish university hospital. *Int J Infect Dis.* 10(1):61–5

Figure 1. Geographical distribution of the hospitals included in the survey. Thirty-four teaching hospitals (blue dots) and 42 non-teaching hospitals (green dots) answered the anonymous web-based survey.



Figure 2. Antimicrobial stewardship programs and Healthcare services in the participating Hospitals. Clearly-defined AMS programs were reported in 29 (38.2%) hospitals. Full application of guidelines for the use of antibiotics in the ED was reported by 32 (42.7%) ID consultants. Forty-four (57.9%) EDs had formal indications on fundamental microbiological tests to be performed before starting antibiotic treatment. Specialistic healthcare teams (sepsis-team, endocarditis-team, orthopedic-team, travel-team, onco-hematologic team) were reported in less than 20% of participating hospitals. Percentages are calculated on the total number of answers given to each question. AMS: antimicrobial stewardship; ED: emergency department; ID: infectious diseases.



AMEC

Figure 3. Virological diagnostic capability at the Emergency Department. Rapid or serological tests for HIV could be performed at the ED of 51 (68.9%) hospitals. Thirty-seven (50%) and 38 (51.4%) EDs reported the possibility to perform MonoTest and nasopharyngeal swab for RSV, respectively. Nasopharyngeal swab for seasonal influenza was performed in 49 (66.2%) EDs. All these tests were not available 24/7 in most EDs. With regard to the pandemic at the time the survey was conducted, nasopharyngeal swabs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 and serological tests for SARS-CoV-2 were performed in 72 (97.3%) and 40 (53.3%) EDs, respectively. Percentages are calculated on the total number of answers given to each question. HIV: *Human Immunodeficiency Virus*; EBV: *Epstein-Barr Virus*; RSV: *Respiratory Syncytial Virus*; SARS-CoV-2: *Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2*; ED: emergency department.





Figure 4. Bacterial and fungal diagnostic capability at the ED. The possibility to perform blood cultures in the ED was reported by 70 (93.3%) hospitals. Molecular tests to detect *N. meningitidis*, *S. pneumoniae* and *L. monocytogenes* on CSF were available in 60 (81.1%) EDs. Urinary antigen tests for *Legionella* spp. and *S. pneumoniae* were available in 53 (71.6%) EDs. *C. difficile* test on stool was available in 46 (63%) EDs. *M. tuberculosis* in sputum could be investigated in 43 (58.1%) EDs. Surveillance swabs could be performed in 37%-55% participating EDs. The possibility to test for sexually transmitted diseases was reported by 19 (25.3%) ID consultants. With regard to fungal diagnostic capability, 9 (12.2%) EDs reported the possibility to test for β -D-glucan from venous blood. Percentages are calculated on the total number of answers given to each question. MRSA: methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; MDR: multidrug-resistant; VRE: vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* spp.; CSF: cerebrospinal fluid; ED: emergency department.



Supplementary material

Table S1. Sections I and II: Demographic information of the Infectious Diseases specialist filling in the survey, Characteristics of the Hospital.

Percentages were calculated on the total number of answers given to each question. ID: infectious diseases; ED: emergency department; IQR: interquartile range.

QUESTION	ANSWERS		TEACHING HOSPITALS	NON-TEACHING HOSPITALS	P-VALUE
ID specialist gender	Male	40 (52.6%)	19 (59.4%)	21 (47.7%)	0.32
	Female	36 (47.4%)	NA	NA	NA
ID specialist age	Median age, years (IQR)	40 (34-51)	38.5 (34.0-48.5)	40.5 (34.5-53.5)	0.49
Geographical distribution	Northern Italy	44 (57.9%)	17 (53.1%)	27 (61.4%)	0.61
	Central Italy	15 (19.7%)	8 (25%)	7 (15.9%)	
	Southern Italy and Islands	17 (22.4%)	7 (21.9%)	10 (22.7%)	
Number of Hospital beds	Median value (IQR)	600 (360-900)	775 (600-1200)	450 (350-600)	0.0002
Hospital departments/services available	Neurosurgery	47 (63.5%)	26 (86.7%)	21 (47.7%)	0.001
	Heart surgery	34 (46%)	23 (76.7%)	11 (25%)	<0.0001
	Hematology	49 (66.2%)	24 (80%)	25 (56.8%)	0.4
	Orthopedics	74 (100%)	30 (100%)	44 (100%)	NA
	Solid organ transplantation	24 (33.8%)	18 (60%)	7 (15.9%)	<0.0001
	Pediatrics	68 (91.9%)	27 (90%)	41 (93.2%)	0.68
Is there an ED in the Hospital you work in?	Yes	73 (96.1%)	31 (96.9%)	42 (95.5%)	1.00
	No	3 (3.9%)	NA	NA	NA
	Yes	73 (100%)	31 (100%)	42 (100%)	NA

If “yes” to the previous, are you asked for ID consultations in the ED of your Hospital?	No	0 (0%)	NA	NA	NA
Are you asked for ID consultations in the ED of another Hospital?	Yes	26 (34.7%)	8 (25%)	18 (41.9%)	0.13
	No	49 (65.3%)	NA	NA	NA
Does your Hospital have an ID ward?	Yes	69 (90.8%)	30 (93.8%)	39 (88.6%)	0.69
	No	7 (9.2%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, how many hospital beds does the ID ward have?	Median value (IQR)	21 (16-34)	30 (22-40)	18 (14-23)	0.0001
How many patients accessed the ED of your Hospital in 2019?	Median value (IQR)	42467.5 (3500-70000)	35600 (43.1-65000)	45000 (10000-70000)	0.42
How many ID consultations were performed in the ED of your Hospital in 2019?	Median value (IQR)	1100 (450-2000)	900 (135-2500)	1250 (450-2000)	0.88
Is there at least one ID consultant specifically employed in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	22 (29%)	13 (40.6%)	9 (20.5%)	0.06
	No	54 (71%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, is the ID consultant present in the ED 24/7?	Yes	17 (77.3%)	10 (76.9%)	7 (77.8%)	0.96
	No	5 (22.7%)	NA	NA	NA
Is the ID consultant in the ED the same ID specialist on call?	Yes	62 (82.7%)	25 (78.1%)	37 (86.1%)	0.37
	No	13 (17.3%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there at least one ID/pediatric ID specialist specifically employed for pediatric ID consultations in your Hospital?	Yes	15 (20.6%)	10 (32.3%)	5 (11.9%)	0.03
	No	58 (79.4%)	NA	NA	NA
	Yes	32 (42.1%)	15 (46.9%)	17 (38.6%)	0.47

Is there an ID outpatient follow-up service for patients evaluated at the ED?	No	44 (57.9%)	NA	NA	NA
How many ID consultations do you make on average per day in the ED?	Median value (IQR)	5 (3-10)	5 (5-10)	4 (2-8)	0.02

Ahead of print

Table S2. Sections III: Antimicrobial stewardship programs in the Hospital. Percentages were calculated on the total number of answers given to each question. AMS: antimicrobial stewardship; ID: infectious diseases; ED: emergency department; IQR: interquartile range.

QUESTION	ANSWERS		TEACHING HOSPITALS	NON-TEACHING HOSPITALS	P-VALUE
Are medical records compiled on an online platform and visible to physicians of all hospital wards?	Yes	45 (60%)	22 (68.8%)	23 (53.5%)	0.18
	No	30 (40%)	NA	NA	NA
Is it possible to check antimicrobial therapy on an online platform from both medical and surgical wards?	Yes	21 (27.6%)	9 (28.1%)	12 (27.3%)	0.94
	No	55 (72.4%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there a formal AMS program in each ward of your Hospital?	Yes	29 (38.2%)	20 (62.5%)	9 (20.5%)	<0.0001
	No	47 (61.8%)	NA	NA	NA
Are there formal guidelines for the use of antibiotics in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	32 (42.7%)	12 (38.7%)	20 (45.5%)	0.56
	No	43 (57.3%)	NA	NA	NA
Are there formal indications on fundamental microbiological tests to be performed before starting antibiotic treatment in the ED?	Yes	44 (57.9%)	22 (68.8%)	22 (50%)	0.10
	No	32 (42.1%)	NA	NA	NA
Is the ED provided with formal guidelines on antibiotic therapy approved by ID specialists and physicians working in the ED?	Yes	38 (59.7%)	16 (50%)	22 (51.2%)	0.92
	No	37 (49.3%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED, is the antibiotic therapy prescribed on an online platform visible to physicians of all hospital wards?	Yes	17 (22.4%)	7 (21.9%)	10 (22.7%)	0.93
	No	59 (77.6%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there a “sepsis-team” for suspected or confirmed sepsis presenting in the ED?	Yes	13 (17.1%)	10 (31.3%)	3 (6.8%)	0.01
	No	63 (82.9%)	NA	NA	NA

Is there an “endocarditis-team” for suspected or confirmed endocarditis presenting in the ED?	Yes	12 (15.8%)	7 (21.9%)	5 (11.4%)	0.22
	No	64 (84.2%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there an “orthopedic-team” for suspected or confirmed orthopedic infections presenting in the ED?	Yes	4 (5.3%)	4 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	0.03
	No	72 (94.7%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there a “travel-team” for suspected or confirmed infections in travelers?	Yes	7 (9.2%)	4 (12.5%)	3 (6.8%)	0.45
	No	69 (90.8%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there an “onco-hematology infection team” for suspected or confirmed infections in onco-hematologic patients?	Yes	12 (16%)	9 (28.1%)	3 (7.0%)	0.02
	No	63 (84%)	NA	NA	NA

Table S3. Sections IV and V: Travel medicine, Suspected contagious patients in the ED. Percentages were calculated on the total number of answers given to each question. QBC: quantitative buffy coat test; LAMP: loop-mediated isothermal amplification; CLIA: chemiluminescent sandwich-immunoassay; ELISA: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome Coronavirus 2; ED: emergency department; IQR: interquartile range.

QUESTION	ANSWERS		TEACHING HOSPITALS	NON-TEACHING HOSPITALS	P-VALUE
In the ED of your Hospital, which of the following are available to diagnose malaria?	Rapid test	58 (82.9%)	22 (78.6%)	36 (85.7%)	0.44
	QBC	2 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.8%)	0.51
	Thin blood smear	41 (58.6%)	21 (75.0%)	20 (47.6%)	0.03
	Thick blood drop	35 (50%)	15 (53.6%)	20 (47.6%)	0.81
	LAMP	4 (5.7%)	3 (10.7%)	1 (2.4%)	0.29
Is molecular test for Dengue virus, Zika virus and Chikungunya virus available 24/7 in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	14 (18.9%)	8 (25.0%)	6 (14.3%)	0.24
	No	60 (81%)	NA	NA	NA
Is Dengue NS1 rapid antigen test available 24/7 in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	10 (13.5%)	6 (18.8%)	4 (9.5%)	0.31
	No	64 (86.5%)	NA	NA	NA
Is a microbiology laboratory available 24/7 to perform stool cultures?	Yes	30 (40%)	8 (25%)	22 (51.2%)	0.03
	No	45 (60%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there an emergency plan for infections by diffusive pathogens, taking charge of the patient from their arrival in the ED?	Yes	60 (80%)	29 (90.6%)	31 (72.1%)	0.08
	No	15 (20%)	NA	NA	NA
	Yes	58 (78.4%)	26 (81.3%)	32 (76.2%)	0.60

Is there at least one room for patients requiring respiratory isolation in your ED?	No	16 (21.6%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there a formal plan to increase the availability of hospital beds during seasonal influenza?	Yes	41 (56.2%)	22 (68.8%)	19 (46.3%)	0.06
	No	32 (43.8%)	NA	NA	NA
Is there a formal plan to increase the availability of hospital beds in case of epidemic caused by emerging pathogens?	Yes	34 (46%)	16 (50%)	18 (42.9%)	0.54
	No	40 (54%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, how many hospital beds?	Median value (IQR)	35 (10-100)	50 (4-100)	20 (13-110)	0.71

Table S4. Sections VI, VII, VIII and IX: Virological diagnostic capability in the ED for Infectious Diseases, Bacterial and fungal diagnostic capability in the ED for Infectious Diseases, Laboratory diagnostic capability in the ED, Clinical Trials in the ED. Percentages were calculated on the total number of answers given to each question. HIV: Human Immunodeficiency Virus; EBV: Epstein Barr Virus; RSV: Respiratory Syncytial Virus; MRSA: methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*; CSF: cerebrospinal fluid; MDR: multidrug-resistant; ED: emergency department.

QUESTION	ANSWERS		TEACHING HOSPITALS	NON-TEACHING HOSPITALS	P-VALUE
Is it possible to perform a rapid test or a serological test for HIV in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	51 (68.9%)	22 (68.8%)	29 (69.1%)	0.98
	No	23 (31.1%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, is it available 24/7?	Yes	29 (59.2%)	11 (52.4%)	18 (64.3%)	0.40
	No	20 (40.8%)	NA	NA	NA
Is it possible to perform a rapid test for EBV infection (MonoTest) in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	37 (50%)	15 (46.9%)	22 (52.4%)	0.64
	No	37 (50%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, is it available 24/7?	Yes	19 (51.4%)	6 (40.0%)	13 (59.1%)	0.25
	No	18 (48.6%)	NA	NA	NA
Is it possible to perform a nasopharyngeal swab for RSV in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	38 (51.4%)	18 (56.3%)	20 (47.6%)	0.46
	No	36 (48.6%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, is it available 24/7?	Yes	17 (44.7%)	7 (38.9%)	10 (50.0%)	0.49
	No	21 (55.3%)	NA	NA	NA
	Yes	49 (66.2%)	23 (71.9%)	16 (61.9%)	0.37

Is it possible to perform a nasopharyngeal swab for seasonal influenza virus in the ED of your Hospital?	No	25 (33.8%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, is it available 24/7?	Yes	30 (62.5%)	13 (56.5%)	17 (68.0%)	0.41
	No	18 (37.5%)	NA	NA	NA
Is molecular test for SARS-CoV-2 (nasopharyngeal swab) available 24/7 in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	72 (97.3%)	32 (100%)	40 (95.2%)	0.21
	No	2 (2.7%)	NA	NA	NA
Is serological test for SARS-CoV-2 available 24/7 in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	40 (53.3%)	21 (56.6%)	19 (44.2%)	0.07
	No	35 (46.7%)	NA	NA	NA
If “yes” to the previous, which serological test is available?	ELISA	22 (75.9%)	15 (75.0%)	7 (70.0%)	0.42
	CLIA	5 (17.2%)	4 (20.0%)	1 (10.0%)	
	CLIA + ELISA	1 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	
	Rapid test + quantitative serological test on venous blood	1 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	
Is it possible to perform blood cultures in the ED?	Yes	70 (93.3%)	29 (90.6%)	41 (95.4%)	0.65
	No	5 (6.7%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to perform a nasal swab to detect MRSA isolates?	Yes	38 (50.7%)	13 (40.6%)	25 (58.1%)	0.13
	No	37 (49.3%)	NA	NA	NA
	Yes	41 (55.4%)	17 (53.1%)	24 (57.1%)	0.73

In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to perform a rectal swab to detect MDR gram negative isolates?	No	33 (44.6%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to perform a rectal swab to detect vancomycin-resistant <i>Enterococcus</i> spp.?	Yes	27 (37%)	9 (28.1%)	18 (43.9%)	0.17
	No	46 (63%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to detect <i>M. tuberculosis</i> in sputum?	Yes	43 (58.1%)	18 (56.3%)	25 (59.5%)	0.82
	No	31 (41.9%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to search for urinary antigen tests for <i>Legionella</i> spp. and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> ?	Yes	53 (71.6%)	21 (65.6%)	32 (76.2%)	0.32
	No	21 (28.4%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to perform molecular tests to detect <i>N. meningitidis</i> , <i>S. pneumoniae</i> and <i>L. monocytogenes</i> on CSF?	Yes	60 (81.1%)	26 (83.9%)	34 (71.1%)	0.60
	No	14 (18.9%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to test for <i>C. difficile</i> ?	Yes	46 (63%)	21 (65.6%)	25 (61.0%)	0.68
	No	27 (37%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to test for sexually transmitted diseases?	Yes	19 (25.3%)	9 (28.1%)	10 (23.3%)	0.63
	No	56 (74.7%)	NA	NA	NA
For patients accessing the ED, is it possible to test blood count determinations?	Yes	72 (96%)	32 (100%)	40 (93.0%)	0.26
	No	3 (4%)	NA	NA	NA

In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to quantify C-reactive protein from venous blood?	Yes	75 (100%)	32 (100%)	43 (100%)	NA
	No	75 (100%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to quantify procalcitonin from venous blood?	Yes	63 (84%)	25 (78.1%)	38 (88.4%)	0.23
	No	12 (16%)	NA	NA	NA
In the ED of your Hospital, is it possible to test for β -D-glucan from venous blood?	Yes	9 (12.2%)	4 (12.5%)	5 (11.9%)	1.00
	No	65 (87.8%)	NA	NA	NA
Is it possible to carry out clinical trials in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	40 (56.3%)	22 (68.8%)	18 (46.2%)	0.06
	No	31 (43.6%)	NA	NA	NA
Are there ongoing clinical trials in the ED of your Hospital?	Yes	13 (19.4%)	10 (34.5%)	3 (7.9%)	0.01
	No	54 (80.6%)	NA	NA	NA