Quick BSI Score to Identify Bloodstream Infection at the Emergency Department

Pariwat Phungoen
Khon Kaen University Faculty of Medicine
Nunchalit Lerdprawat
Khon Kaen University Faculty of Medicine
Kittisak Sawanyawisuth
Khon Kaen University Faculty of Medicine
Verajit Chotmongkol
Khon Kaen University
Kamonwon Ienghong
Khon Kaen University Faculty of Medicine
Sumana Sumritrin
Khon Kaen University Faculty of Medicine
Korakot Apiratwarakul (korakot@kku.ac.th)
Khon Kaen University Faculty of Medicine https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1984-0865

Research article

Keywords: bloodstream infection, bacteremia, blood cultures, rapid diagnosis, emergency department

Posted Date: June 9th, 2020

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-33769/v1

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published on March 12th, 2021. See the published version at https://doi.org/10.1186/s12873-021-00426-2.

Abstract

Background

Bloodstream infection (BSI) is a common and urgent condition at the emergency department (ED). In order to diagnose BSI, the current guideline fails to mention the juncture at which blood cultures ought to be taken. The decision whether or not to obtain hemoculture is solely based upon clinical judgment and outcomes pertaining to inappropriately ordered blood culture. This study aimed to develop predictive bloodstream infection scoring at the ED employing only clinical factors presented on ED arrival.

Methods

This study was conducted retrospectively at the ED, Khon Kaen University Hospital, Thailand. Inclusion criteria encompassed adult patients suspected of infection defined by blood culture collection presented at the ED with intravenous antibiotics initiated during ED visits. Independent positive predictors for positive blood culture were used to create the Quick Bloodstream Infection score (qBSI score) through logistic regression analysis.

Results

A total of 169578 patients visited the ED during the study period. Of those, 12556 patients (7.40%) were suspected of infection. 8177 cases met the study criteria and were categorized according to positive blood culture results, i.e. bloodstream infection (741 patients; 9.06%). Probability of positive blood culture was calculated via aged over 55 years + moderate to severe CKD + solid organ tumor + (2 x liver disease) + (2 x history of fever with chills) + (2 x body temperature of over 38.3^{o}C). A score of 1 or over rendered 92.98% sensitivity and negative predictive value of 95.65%.

Conclusions

The qBSI score presented effective sensitivity and negative predictive value amid positive blood culture in patients at the ED suspected of infection. Resultant of employing this score may facilitate in the determining of those exhibiting the need for blood culture at the ED.

Background

Bloodstream infection (BSI) is a common as well as urgent condition at the emergency department (ED) [1, 2]. Incidence of bloodstream infection increased to 38.1 persons per 100,000 per year in 2010, while mortality rate may be as high as 50% [3]. Early diagnosis and appropriate antimicrobial therapy are a key to improve patient outcomes [4], particularly among individuals displaying either septic shock or sepsis [5, 6].

Current guidelines advise on obtaining hemoculture in patients suspected of sepsis in order to diagnose BSI [5, 7]. Positive blood culture is an important yield in terms of the appropriate antibiotics in sepsis patients [5, 8]. However, the guideline fails to mention when blood cultures ought to be procured. Furthermore, the decision of whether or not to take hemoculture is based solely upon clinical judgment which could result in wastefulness resultant of inappropriately requested blood cultures [8–10]. Notwithstanding, there are several predictors of bloodstream infection at the ED, such as blood pressure less than 60 mmHg, a high procalcitonin level of over 2 μg/L, or C-reactive protein > 10 mg/dL [11]. Shapiro et al reported clinical scoring for bloodstream infection at the ED with a decent validation of 83% [12]. However, these previous reports may call for laboratory results to predict bloodstream infection at the ED. Unfortunately, this may result in delays in sepsis management on waiting for laboratory tests [6]. Hence, this study aimed to develop bloodstream infection predictive scoring at the ED using only clinical factors presented on ED arrival.

Methods

Study design and Ethical Approval

This study was conducted retrospectively at the ED, Khon Kaen University Hospital, a tertiary care hospital with approximately 60000 annual ED visits. Moreover, this study formed part of an ED infection project. Inclusion criteria were adult patients suspected of infection defined by blood culture collection at the ED with intravenous antibiotics initiated during ED visits. Cases demonstrating cardiac arrest or trauma; those referred from other hospitals; those who had received antibiotics prior; and those missing clinical data were excluded. The study period took place between January 1st, 2016 and December 31st, 2018 with study protocol approved by the ethics committee in human research, Khon Kaen University (HE631115). Informed consents were waived.

Source Of Data And Microbiology Methods

Blood cultures at the ED comprised of two aerobic bottles. Bloodstream infections were defined as positive blood culture with a similar pathogen to at least one sample with clinical relevance. The contaminated pathogens (e.g. coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Corynebacterium spp., Propionibacterium spp., Viridans group streptococci, Micrococcus spp. and Bacillus spp.) were considered as such if they were isolated from a patient twice or more consecutively with clinical relevance [7, 13, 14]. Clinical data of eligible patients were retrieved from the computerized hospital database and chart records. Data were subsequently categorized as comorbid conditions, ED arrival parameters, and beyond the initial hour following ED visit. Comorbid conditions were defined according to the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) [15]. ED arrival parameters were history of fever, the chills, vital signs, and sepsis scores including Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome (SIRS), quick Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA) and National Early Warning Score (NEWS). For parameters

beyond the initial hour post ED visit, laboratory results incorporated white blood cell count and lactate level.

Statistical Analysis

In regards statistical analyses eligible patients were categorized into two groups with respect to blood culture results: positive blood culture and negative blood culture groups. Descriptive statistics were used to compare differences in studied variables between both groups. Factors associated with positive blood culture were calculated via logistic regression analysis. A univariate and multivariate logistic regression was applied to calculate unadjusted/adjusted odds ratio (95% confidence interval) of each factor. Independent positive predictors for positive blood culture were utilized to create the Quick blood stream infection score (qBSI score). Clinical factors excluding laboratory results were used for the qBSI score with the aim of identifying bloodstream infections faster minus the wait for laboratory results. Each predictor presented a clinical score based on the coefficient yielded by the final model for positive blood culture. The qBSI score revealed summation of each predictor. Various qBSI score cutoff points were executed and reported along with diagnostic properties including sensitivity, specificity, positive/negative predictive values (PPV/ NPV), and positive/negative likelihood ratios (LR+/LR-). A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve of the qBSI score was computed and compared with other sepsis scores. All statistical analyses were performed using STATA software, version 10.1 (College Station, Texas, USA).

Results

Patient Characteristic and Microbiology Data

A total of 169578 patients visited the ED during the study period as retrieved from the hospital database. Of those, 12556 (7.40%) were suspected of infection. After exclusion, 8177 individuals met the study criteria and were categorized according to blood culture results as follows: positive bloodstream infection (741 patients; 9.06%) and negative blood culture or non-pathogen bacteremia (7,436 patients; 90.94%) as shown in Fig. 1. Among the variables studied, almost all were significantly different between both groups (Table 1). Merely proportion of AIDS was not significantly different between groups (2.16% in positive blood culture group and 1.44% in negative blood culture group; p 0.125). The most com–mon Gram negative and positive pathogens were Escherichia coli (274 patients; 36.98%) and Streptococcus (76 patients; 10.26%).

Table 1
Baseline characteristics of patients with suspected infection presenting at the emergency department categorized by blood culture results.

	ALL patients	**Positive blood culture**	**Negative blood culture**	**p-value**
	(n = 8177)	**(n = 741)**	**(n = 7436)**	
	n (%)	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	
Demographics				
Age, yrs. –median (range)	62 (18–100)	62 (18–100)	64 (18–100)	< 0.001
Male	4275 (52.28)	415 (56.01)	3860 (51.90)	0.030
CCI –median (range)	3 (0–13)	4(0–13)	3(0–13)	< 0.001
Comorbidity				
Age > 55 years	5231 (63.97)	537 (72.47)	4694 (63.13)	< 0.001
Hypertension	2149 (26.28)	235 (31.71)	1914 (25.74)	< 0.001
Solid organ malignancy	1878 (22.97)	231 (31.17)	1647 (22.15)	< 0.001
Diabetes mellitus	1729 (21.14)	194 (26.18)	1535 (20.64)	< 0.001
Liver disease	1190 (14.55)	191 (25.78)	999 (13.43)	< 0.001
Moderate to severe CKD	639 (7.81)	86 (11.61)	553 (7.44)	< 0.001
AIDS	123 (1.50)	16 (2.16)	107 (1.44)	0.125
History of chills	515 (6.30)	101 (13.63)	414 (5.57)	< 0.001
Clinical presentation at triage zone				
Respiratory rate > 22/min	5369 (65.66)	573 (77.33)	4796 (64.50)	< 0.001
Temperature > 38.3 °C	2658 (32.51)	349 (47.10)	2309 (31.05)	< 0.001

CKD: chronic kidney disease; SBP: systolic blood pressure; MAP: mean arterial pressure; SIRS: Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome; qSOFA: quick Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment; NEWS: National Early Warning Score.

	ALL patients (n = 8177) n (%)	Positive blood culture (n = 741) n (%)	Negative blood culture (n = 7436) n (%)	p-value
Heart rate > 120/min)	921 (11.26)	105 (14.17)	816 (10.97)	< 0.001
Hypotension (SBP > 90 or MAP < 65 mmHg)	611 (7.47)	96 (12.96)	515 (6.93)	< 0.001
Met Sepsis criteria				
SIRS ≥ 2	6149 (75.20)	651 (87.85)	5498 (93.94)	< 0.001
qSOFA ≥ 2	1230 (15.04)	140 (18.89)	1060 (14.25)	< 0.001
NEWS ≥ 7	2917 (35.67)	259 (34.95)	1759 (23.66)	< 0.001
Lactate values	(n = 4694)	(n = 575)	(n = 4119)	
First lactate, mmol/L-median	1.88 (0.01–28.33)	2.50 (0.01–18.71)	1.80 (0.01–28.33)	< 0.001
First lactate > 2 mmol/L	2193 (46.72)	383 (51.69)	1810 (23.34)	< 0.001

CKD: chronic kidney disease; SBP: systolic blood pressure; MAP: mean arterial pressure; SIRS: Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome; qSOFA: quick Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment; NEWS: National Early Warning Score.

Clinical factors and calculation of Quick Bloodstream Infection score (qBSI score)

Among three categories of studied variables, there were four significant factors in comorbid conditions, two factors at ED, and three factors beyond the 1st hour (Table 2). The six significant predictors for positive blood cultures were age over 55 years, moderate to severe CKD, solid organ tumor, liver disease, history of chills, and body temperature of over 38.3oC. The scores of each parameter were shown in Table 3 with the total score of 9. The probability of positive blood culture calculated by age over 55 years + moderate to severe CKD + solid organ tumor + (2 x liver disease) + (2 x history of fever with chills) + (2 x body temperature of over 38.3oC). If the parameter was absent or present, the values of the parameter were 0 or 1, respectively. The sum of all parameters represented probability of positive blood culture. A cutoff point of this qBSI score of 1 or over had sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, LR+, and LR- of 92.98%, 15.40%, 9.87%, 95.65%, 1.09, and 0.45, respectively (Table 4). The ROC of qBSI score (65.8%) was higher than the SIRS (61.8%), qSOFA (58.6%), and NEWS score (60.8%) as shown in Fig. 2.

Table 2
Factors associated with positive blood culture in patients suspected of infection presenting at the emergency department.

Factors	Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Comorbid conditions			
Age > 55	1.54 (1.30–1.81)	1.33 (1.04–1.72)	0.02
Sex	0.84 (0.73–0.99)	0.94 (78.1–1.13)	0.52
Emergency severity index level	0.62 (0.55–0.70)	0.87 (0.71–1.13)	0.18
CCI	1.13 (1.09–1.06)	0.98 (0.92–1.04)	0.46
Liver disease	2.24 (1.87–2.67)	2.04 (1.59–2.61)	< 0.01
Diabetes mellitus	1.36 (1.15–1.62)	1.08 (0.89–1.30)	0.45
Moderate to severe CKD	1.63 (1.28–2.08)	1.68 (1.22–2.32)	0.01
Solid organ tumor	1.59 (1.35–1.87)	1.40 (1.09–1.80)	0.01
Hypertension	1.34 (1.13–1.57)	1.14 (0.92–1.41)	0.24
On arrival parameter			
History of Chills	2.67 (2.12–3.38)	1.94 (1.43–2.62)	< 0.01
Temperature > 38.3 °C	1.40 (1.32–1.50)	1.77 (1.39–2.25)	< 0.01
Heart rate > 120 /min	1.01 (1.00-1.01)	0.96 (0.73–1.26)	0.76
SBP < 90 or MAP < 65	2.01 (1.59–2.54)	1.22 (0.86–1.71)	0.26
Respiratory rate > 22/min	1.03 (1.02–1.04)	0.89 (0.71–1.26)	0.32
SIRS criteria ≥ 2	2.5 (2.03–3.20)	1.21 (0.94–1.53)	0.26
qSOFA criteria ≥ 2	1.79 (1.49–2.15)	1.20 (0.94–1.53)	0.15
NEWS ≥ 7	1.73 (1.47–2.04)	0.93 (0.73–1.18)	0.53
Beyond first hour parameter			
Lactate level	1.13 (1.10–1.16)	1.10 (1.07–1.14)	< 0.01
WBC > 11,000 /microliter	1.31 (1.12–1.52)	1.28 (1.03–1.59)	0.03
WBC < 3,000 /microliter	2.30 (1.70–3.13)	2.48 (1.68–3.66)	< 0.01

Note. CCI: Charlson Comorbidity Index; CKD: chronic kidney disease; SBP: systolic blood pressure; MAP: mean arterial pressure; SIRS: Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome; qSOFA: quick Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment; NEWS: National Early Warning Score; WBC: white blood cell.

Table 3
Individual and adjusted odds ratio of component of the Quick Bloodstream Infection score (qBSI score) predicting positive blood culture in patients with suspected infection presenting at the emergency department.

Factors	Score	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)	p-value
Comorbid conditions			
Age > 55	1	1.33 (1.04–1.72)	0.02
Moderate to severe CKD	1	1.68 (1.22–2.32)	0.01
Solid organ tumor	1	1.40 (1.09–1.80)	0.01
Liver disease	2	2.04 (1.59–2.61)	< 0.01
On arrival parameter			
History of chills	2	1.94 (1.43–2.62)	< 0.01
Temperature > 38.3^{o}C	2	1.77 (1.39–2.25)	< 0.01
Note. CKD: chronic kidney disease.			

Table 4
diagnostic properties of the Quick Bloodstream Infection score (qBSI score) predicting positive blood culture in patients with suspected infection presenting at the emergency department.

Scores	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	+LR	-LR
Score ≥ 0	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	1.00	0.00
Score ≥ 1	92.98%	15.40%	9.87%	95.65%	1.10	0.46
Score ≥ 2	75.30%	44.67%	11.94%	94.78%	1.36	0.55
Score ≥ 3	55.60%	68.89%	15.12%	93.97%	1.79	0.64
Score ≥ 4	34.68%	85.06%	18.79%	92.89%	2.32	0.77
Score ≥ 5	18.62%	95.19%	27.82%	92.15%	3.87	0.85
Score ≥ 6	8.23%	98.36%	33.33%	91.49%	5.02	0.93
Score ≥ 7	1.89%	99.68%	36.84%	91.07%	5.85	0.98
Score ≥ 8	0.94%	99.88%	43.75%	91.00%	7.80	0.99
Score 9	0.00%	100.00%	-	-	-	0.9973
Note. PPV: positive predictive value; NPV: negative predictive value; +LR: positive likelihood ratio, -LR: negative likelihood ratio						

Discussion

The qBSI score, to our knowledge, is the first score to quickly identify bloodstream infection at the ED minus the wait for additional laboratory results. The advantage of this score is that the risk of bloodstream infection at the ED can be calculated speedily and easily using clinical formulae mentioned in the results. Also, it demonstrated an ample sensitivity of 92.98% with high negative predictive value. These results may indicate that with a qBSI score of 1 or over, the likelihood of bloodstream infection stands at 92.98%. Meanwhile, a qBSI score of less than 1 presents a 95.65% chance of not having a positive blood culture. The qBSI score can be calculated within minutes at the ED in patients at risk of bloodstream infection once a complete medical history has been obtained and a physical examination has occurred.

Even though sepsis scores SIRS, qSOFA, and NEWS score exhibit high accuracy [16, 17] amid the identifying of sepsis patients, these scores were not an effective indicator in terms of bloodstream infection. The qBSI score displayed superior prediction of bloodstream infection when compared with sepsis scores (Fig. 2). As the qBSI score demonstrated a greater area under the ROC curve than others, this may indicate that emergency physicians could feasibly apply the qBSI score to identify sepsis patients who may be exhibiting bloodstream infection. Despite some laboratory tests including lactate or white blood cells, they were independent factors in terms of bloodstream infection (Table 3), and they were not included in the qBSI score to save time amid the identifying of patients at risk of bloodstream infection. These results also indicate that laboratory tests for sepsis scores were ample parameters amid bloodstream infection. Yet, once again, this may delay the sepsis treatment bundle [6].

In accordance with our outcomes, employing this score could prove effective in determining cases calling for blood culture at the ED. In those suspected of infection, cases with a qBSI score of 1 or over they require blood culture which is attributable to a high chance of exhibiting bloodstream infection. Conversely, those recording a qBSI score of 0 present a low chance of bloodstream infection (NPV 95.65%). Thus, this patient group probably do not need blood cultures. A more appropriate blood culture order may be reached as an outcome of abiding by this decision rule.

The positive blood culture rate in this study was comparable with previous studies: 9.06% (up to 12.4%) [11, 18]. Inappropriate blood cultures obtained from patients at a low risk may yield false positives as well as antibiotic overuse [18]. Besides that, the qBSI score may be a helpful tool in correctly identifying patients likely to display positive blood culture, as previously discussed. Even though this study revealed different predictors to previous studies [19, 20], these factors were reported to be associated with positive blood cultures [21, 25]. For example, cirrhosis patients demonstrated a superior incidence of bloodstream infection over non-cirrhotic patients throughout ten instances [24]. As this study included only comorbid conditions and ED factors, these may result in different predictors of positive blood culture to other studies.

Strengths And Limitations

There are some limitations in this study. Even though the study incorporated quite a large sample size, some clinical data may be missing due to the retrospective study design. Second, the qBSI score did not include laboratory results. Finally, score specificity was not high as previously reported by Shapiro et al. [12]. Still, sensitivity is of superior importance in this situation and those with bloodstream infection ought not be overlooked. Additionally, the qBSI score is a speedier clinical tool than the Shapiro report, that is to say the qBSI score can be calculated within minutes following ED arrival.

Conclusions

The qBSI score had good sensitivity and negative predictive value for positive blood culture in patients presenting at the ED with suspicious of infection. The score comprised of six clinical variables without laboratory results. Using this score may facilitate in the determining of those exhibiting the need for blood culture at the ED.

Abbreviations

AUROC: associated area under the ROC

BSI: bloodstream infection (BSI)

CCI: Charlson Comorbidity Index

CKD: chronic kidney disease

ED: emergency department

+LR: positive likelihood ratio

-LR: negative likelihood ratio

MAP: mean arterial pressure

NEWS: National Early Warning Score

qBSI score: Quick Bloodstream Infection score

ROC curve; receiver operating characteristic curves

SIRS: Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome (SIRS)

SBP: systolic blood pressure.

Declarations

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Ross Lacey for his editing of this manuscript.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization and Methodology: P.P., N.L. and K.A.; data validation: P.P., N.L. and K.I.; data curation and investigation: P.P., K.A. and S.S.; writing—original draft and formal analysis: P.P., K.S. and V.C.; writing—review and editing: All authors; supervision: P.P. and K.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This study was funded by a grant from the Khon Kaen University Faculty of Medicine (Thailand; Grant Number MN63202).

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study period took place between January 1st, 2016 and December 31st, 2018 with study protocol approved by the ethics committee in human research, Khon Kaen University (HE631115). Informed consents were waived.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Author details

[1] Department of Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen 40002, Thailand

[2] Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen 40002, Thailand

[3] Accidental and Emergency Unit, Division of Nursing, Srinagarind Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen 40002, Thailand

References

1. Boyles TH, Davis K, Crede T, Malan J, Mendelson M, Lesosky M. Blood cultures taken from patients attending emergency departments in South Africa are an important antibiotic stewardship tool, which directly influences patient management. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2015;15.

2. Anderson DJ, Moehring RW, Sloane R, Schmader KE, Weber DJ, Fowler VG, et al. Bloodstream Infections in Community Hospitals in the 21st Century: A Multicenter Cohort Study. PLoS ONE. 2014;9.
3. Cheung Y, Ko S, Wong OF, Lam HSB, Ma HM, Lit CHA. Clinical experience in management of bloodstream infection in emergency medical ward: A preliminary report. Hong Kong Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2019;:102490791989049.
4. Timsit J-F, Ruppé E, Barbier F, Tabah A, Bassetti M. Bloodstream infections in critically ill patients: an expert statement. Intensive Care Med. 2020;46:266–84.
5. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, Levy MM, Antonelli M, Ferrer R, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock: 2016. Intensive Care Med. 2017;43:304–77.
6. Levy MM, Evans LE, Rhodes A. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign Bundle: 2018 update. Intensive Care Med. 2018;44:925–8.
7. Miller JM, Binnicker MJ, Campbell S, Carroll KC, Chapin KC, Gilligan PH, et al. A Guide to Utilization of the Microbiology Laboratory for Diagnosis of Infectious Diseases: 2018 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the American Society for Microbiologya. Clin Infect Dis. 2018;67:813–6.
8. Long B, Koyfman A. Best Clinical Practice: Blood Culture Utility in the Emergency Department. J Emerg Med. 2016;51:529–39.
9. Lamy B, Dargère S, Arendrup MC, Parienti J-J, Tattevin P. How to Optimize the Use of Blood Cultures for the Diagnosis of Bloodstream Infections? A State-of-the Art. Frontiers in Microbiology. 2016;7.
10. Coburn B, Morris AM, Tomlinson G, Detsky AS. Does this adult patient with suspected bacteremia require blood cultures? JAMA. 2012;308:502–11.
11. Chase M, Klasco RS, Joyce NR, Donnino MW, Wolfe RE, Shapiro NI. Predictors of bacteremia in emergency department patients with suspected infection. Am J Emerg Med. 2012;30:1691–7.
12. Shapiro NI, Wolfe RE, Wright SB, Moore R, Bates DW. Who needs a blood culture? A prospectively derived and validated prediction rule. J Emerg Med. 2008;35:255–64.
13. Dargère S, Cormier H, Verdon R. Contaminants in blood cultures: importance, implications, interpretation and prevention. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2018;24:964–9.
14. Manian FA. IDSA Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Intravascular Catheter-Related Bloodstream Infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2009;49:1770–1.
15. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. J Chronic Dis. 1987;40:373–83.
16. Usman OA, Usman AA, Ward MA. Comparison of SIRS, qSOFA, and NEWS for the early identification of sepsis in the Emergency Department. Am J Emerg Med. 2019;37:1490–7.
17. Mellhammar L, Linder A, Tverring J, Christensson B, Boyd JH, Sendi P, et al. NEWS2 Is Superior to qSOFA in Detecting Sepsis with Organ Dysfunction in the Emergency Department. Journal of Clinical

Medicine. 2019;8:1128.

18. Lindvig KP, Nielsen SL, Henriksen DP, Jensen TG, Kolmos HJ, Pedersen C, et al. Mortality and prognostic factors of patients who have blood cultures performed in the emergency department: a cohort study. Eur J Emerg Med. 2016;23:166–72.
19. Jessen MK, Mackenhauer J, Hvass AMSW, Ellermann-Eriksen S, Skibsted S, Kirkegaard H, et al. Prediction of bacteremia in the emergency department: an external validation of a clinical decision rule. Eur J Emerg Med. 2016;23:44–9.
20. Su C-P, Chen TH-H, Chen S-Y, Ghiang W-C, Wu GH-M, Sun H-Y, et al. Predictive model for bacteremia in adult patients with blood cultures performed at the emergency department: a preliminary report. J Microbiol Immunol Infect. 2011;44:449–55.
21. Lim CJ, Cheng AC, Kong DCM, Peleg AY. Community-onset bloodstream infection with multidrug-resistant organisms: a matched case-control study. BMC Infect Dis. 2014;14:126.
22. Lee JH, Kim ET, Shim DJ, Kim IJ, Byeon JH, Lee IJ, et al. Prevalence and predictors of peripherally inserted central catheter-associated bloodstream infections in adults: A multicenter cohort study. Plos One. 2019;14.
23. Wan Q, Ye Q, Zhou J. Mortality predictors of bloodstream infections in solid-organ transplant recipients. Exp Clin Transplant. 2013;11:211–4.
24. Zhao H, Gu X, Zhao R, Shi Y, Sheng J. Evaluation of prognostic scoring systems in liver cirrhosis patients with bloodstream infection. Medicine. 2017;96.
25. Thulstrup AM, Sørensen HT, Schønheyder HC, Møller JK, Tage-Jensen U. Population-Based Study of the Risk and Short-Term Prognosis for Bacteremia in Patients with Liver Cirrhosis. Clin Infect Dis. 2000;31:1357–61.

Figures



Figure 1

Study flow of patients with suspected infection presenting at the emergency department and blood culture results.



Figure 2

The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves and associated area under the ROC (AUROC) of the Quick Bloodstream Infection score (qBSI score) and other sepsis scores predicting positive blood culture in patients with suspected infection presenting at the emergency department.