

Resident	Email Address	Project Site	Research Title	Background	Methodology	Results	Conclusion
Caraniss, Taylor	tcaraniss10@gmail.com	Cleveland Clinic Indian River Hospital	Assessment of fluid-sensitive patient populations after fluid resuscitation in the setting of sepsis	The approach of fluid-sensitive strategy for septic patients has been to use a fluid-sparing strategy as a means of conserving. The Sepsis-2 Campaign recommends to give 4L of crystalloid fluid bolus to patients with sepsis/hypotension/hypoperfusion prior to shock. Criticism of this approach includes a concern that resuscitation in certain patient populations such as those with CVD, CHF, and obesity. More studies are needed to evaluate whether these patients would benefit from a different fluid resuscitation strategy. This study aims to evaluate the appropriateness of current guideline recommended fluid resuscitation strategy in CVD, CHF, and obese patients diagnosed with sepsis and administered the 30 mL/kg fluid bolus as the emergency requirement and subsequent assessment to the critical care unit at Cleveland Clinic Indian River Hospital.	This retrospective cohort study included patients admitted to the intensive care unit after receiving the 30 mL/kg sepsis fluid bolus in the emergency department in a community hospital. The study period was from July 1, 2023, to July 1, 2024. Patients were identified as EPIC data reporting. Manual chart review was conducted to assess inclusion criteria. The primary outcome was the number of patients who required the need for diuretic therapy or new start diuretic as a surrogate marker after receiving the sepsis guideline recommended 30 mL/kg bolus. Secondary outcomes included 30-days of stay, ICU mortality, and vasopressor requirements.	Of 337 sepsis patient encounters identified and screened for criteria, 180 encounters were excluded. This left 57 encounters that met the inclusion criteria. The primary outcome was identified in 31 of 57 total encounters (54%), only 1 encounter required new start diuretic. Secondary outcomes included 30-day mortality, ICU mortality, and vasopressor requirements. Diuretic was required in 20 of 29 (69%) encounters. The 30-day mortality was 29 (48%) encounters with 30-day mortality of 15% and overall 30-day ICU mortality of 52%. Secondary outcomes of 30-day mortality were 31 of 57 (23%). ICU mortality was 2 of 57 (3.5%) and overall median ICU length of stay was 3.5 days (IQR 4.4, range 37-23). Vasopressors were administered in 42 of 57 (74%) encounters.	The study highlights a potential association between the use of fluid-sparing strategy and increased ICU mortality and length of stay. CVD, particularly, with obesity demonstrated the highest incidence. This suggests that these comorbidities may necessitate careful consideration of the impact the 30 mL/kg fluid bolus has on their status. A higher rate of ICU mortality and prolonged ICU stay was observed in this cohort. Further research is needed to refine fluid resuscitation strategies and improve outcomes for these high-risk patient groups. Understanding the underlying pathophysiology of fluid resuscitation in these conditions and testing different therapeutic approaches could lead to more effective management strategies and potentially reduced mortality rates in septic patients with comorbidities.
Campbell, Tajera	campbellt96@aol.com	Holy Cross Health	Role of Pharmacist Follow-Up Calls in Addressing Medication-Related Problems	Medication-related problems (MRPs) are common during transitions of care, particularly at hospital discharge, when patients may face challenges understanding or accessing their medications. Recognizing the impact of these issues on patient outcomes, the institution is committed to identifying and mitigating MRPs during the critical post-discharge period. Medication-related problems can lead to non-compliance, medication errors, hospitalizations, and adverse events, limited clinical knowledge, absence of symptoms, medication availability, and mistrust of the healthcare system. Pharmacist-led follow-up calls have emerged as valuable interventions in supporting patients after discharge. The institution plans a pharmacy resident-led transition of care (TOC) project to evaluate the impact of post-discharge pharmacist follow-up phone calls on the identification and resolution of MRPs among patients discharged from the internal medicine service.	This retrospective descriptive cohort study was conducted over a six-month period, from September 2024 to February 2025, at a 550-bed medical community hospital in South Florida. Eligible patients were identified through a report generated by the electronic medical record (EMR) system. Eligible patients were identified through the EMR and met the following inclusion criteria: age 18 years or older, admitted to the hospital for an inpatient stay, and discharged home. Exclusion criteria included patients in law enforcement custody (e.g., incarcerated individuals), hospital stays of less than 24 hours, discharge to a facility (e.g., nursing or rehabilitation), discharged against medical advice, and patients who did not receive a follow-up call. The primary outcome was the number of patients who completed the intervention. Secondary outcomes included the type of MRPs identified and resolved, and confirmation of receiving medication from the pharmacy.	A total of 591 patients' charts were reviewed, of which 261 met the inclusion criteria and were contacted for follow-up. Of those, 98 (36.8%) successfully completed a phone interview with a pharmacist. Among the patients who completed the intervention, 100% received medication counseling, and 98% confirmed receipt of their discharge medications from the pharmacy. Medication-related problems were identified in 2 patients (2.0%) and were resolved during the follow-up call by the pharmacist.	Pharmacist-led follow-up calls can effectively extend the reach of TOC services. This study demonstrates that pharmacy residents, functioning as pharmacists extenders, were able to reach a greater number of patients and support safe transitions by confirming medication access and providing counseling. Among patients who completed follow-up, 98% had successfully obtained their discharge medication and received education on their proper use. Expanding the initiative to include additional pharmacists and extending the duration of the intervention may further enhance its impact on patient safety and post-discharge period. Future research should explore the scalability, sustainability, and long-term impact of pharmacist-led TOC interventions on clinical outcomes. Additional analyses could stratify the sample to those patients that were already reviewed by the TOC team and those who were not, as well as broaden the scope of MRPs evaluated.
Candelaria-Jimenez, Astrid	astrid.candelaria.jimenez@pxj.edu	UF Health Jacksonville	Impact of Med-to-Bed Program on Hospital Discharge Timing	Transitions of care (TOCs) programs are designed to ensure the continuity and coordination of healthcare as patients move between different sites of care. The primary outcome of TOCs is to reduce hospital readmissions and emergency department visits. Pharmacist-led interventions in TOC programs have been shown to improve patient outcomes, particularly by reducing 30-day hospital readmissions and emergency department visits. A growing intervention is med-to-bed (MTB) programs, which facilitate the transition of patients from inpatient admission to outpatient care without the need for an inpatient stay. Recent studies have demonstrated that MTB programs can reduce the rate of 30-day hospital readmissions. However, the effect of such programs on discharge timing remains unclear. The objective of this study is to assess the impact of the MTB program on discharge timing for patients discharged from inpatient admission at UF Health Jacksonville, Downtown.	This is an IRB-approved retrospective, single-center, observational cohort study evaluating the time interval between hospital admission and discharge for patients admitted for an inpatient stay in the MTB program. Patients discharge date was determined by the electronic medical record (EMR) system. The primary outcome was the time interval between hospital admission and discharge date. 2023 and April 2024, when the MTB service is pick-up the medication at the pharmacy window. Secondary outcomes included the time interval between hospital admission and discharge date, time interval between hospital admission and discharge date for patients who did not receive the medication at the MTB group received their medications before discharge when compared to patients picking up their medications at the pharmacy window (MTB 8 (5.9) vs Pick-up 42 (42.4); p	In total, 200 patients were included with 101 patients receiving MTB and 99 patients picking up their medications at the pharmacy window. Baseline characteristics are outlined in Table 1. There is no difference in the time it takes for patients to receive their medications using the MTB program compared to those patients who pick up the medication at the pharmacy window (MTB 8 (5.9) vs Pick-up 42 (42.4); p	Overall, although the MTB program was not associated with a faster process for patients to obtain their discharge medications, it proved to be a beneficial way to ensure that patients had their medications before discharge. This study was limited by not including the effect of the implementation of a community-based medication management program for patients who did not receive their medications at the MTB program. Future research should evaluate the impact of family members assisting patients in picking up their medications at the pharmacy window for patients before discharge. Further research is needed to investigate the impact of these limitations within our patient population.
Carter, Vivian	carterv@outlook.com	BayCare Saint Joseph's Hospital South	Acute pain in opioid-naïve patients: evaluating morphine dosing strategies in the emergency department	Acute pain is the most common reason for emergency department (ED) visits in the United States, accounting for approximately 24.8 million visits in 2020. Despite its prevalence, optimal opioid sparing strategies for opioid-naïve patients remain undefined. The 2022 CDC Pain Management Guidelines recommend initiating opioids only when necessary and at the lowest effective dose, emphasizing a clinical judgment and individualized care. Institutional policies at UF Health System support this approach. Individualized pain management can reduce opioid pain medication, pain intensity, opioid dependence, and increase socioeconomic benefit. With opioid-naïve patients, it is necessary to use subacute dosing and compare of opioid dosing present for further challenges. This retrospective analysis evaluated morphine dosing practices in opioid-naïve ED patients to support evidence-based prescribing protocols.	This IRB-approved, single-center retrospective study included opioid-naïve adults (≥18 years) who presented to the ED at St. Joseph's Hospital South between February 1, 2023, and July 31, 2024 and received intravenous (IV) morphine for acute pain. Patients were excluded if they had sickle cell disease, malignant, cancer-related pain, chest pain, were enrolled in a pain study, or had a history of chronic pain. Individualized pain management was used to reduce opioid pain medication, opioid dependence, and increase socioeconomic benefit. With opioid-naïve patients, it is necessary to use subacute dosing and compare of opioid dosing present for further challenges. This retrospective analysis evaluated morphine dosing practices in opioid-naïve ED patients to support evidence-based prescribing protocols.	The analysis included 284 observations from 142 patients. Pain intensity was categorized as high (1), moderate (2), or low (3). The primary outcome was starting morphine dose (mg/hr) (Y) = 49.28 + 0.0001 * age (X). There was no significant increase in pain intensity with age (p = 0.0001). Morphine dose was associated with a significant increase of reporting lower pain intensity (OR, 50.80; 95% CI, 36.96-152.2; p = 0.001). Age, BM, and sex were not independently associated with pain outcomes. Predicted probabilities showed a shift to lower pain categories post morphine administration. Morphine effects are dose-dependent. Individualized pain management was a 70.7% reduction in the reporting of high pain intensity (p < 0.001). Individualized pain management was a 23.8% increase in the probability of reporting moderate pain (p < 0.001), and a 33.9% increase in the probability of reporting low pain (p = 0.0001), demonstrating morphine effectiveness. The most frequently used dose of morphine was 4 mg/hr, irrespective of weight or BM. Use of adjuvant analgesics, repeat dosing, and naloxone was infrequent.	Through this study, data did not power, morphine administration demonstrated a marked decrease in pain intensity in patients who presented with high pain in comparison of BM, age, sex. No association was noted between BM and pain in intensity following morphine, indicating the need for further studies to validate these findings. Limitations include the single-center, retrospective design, relatively small sample size, provider variance in initial dosing, use of subjective self-reporting pain scale, interpatient variability of self-reported pain, and lack of long-term outcome data.
Chez, Carol	cchez21@gmail.com	Cleveland Clinic Tradition Hospital	Impact of Early Oral-Stop Down in Urinary Tract Infections Caused by ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae	Extended-spectrum beta-lactam (ESBL)-producing bacteria, primarily <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i> , are resistant to a broad range of beta-lactam antibiotics. While intravenous (IV) carbapenems are preferred for treatment of ESBL infections outside of the urinary tract, in the setting of urinary tract infections (UTIs), current guidelines prefer options when clinically appropriate. Oral stop-down therapy may reduce hospital length of stay and associated risks. The objective of this study was to compare the clinical outcomes of patients with ESBL-producing UTIs treated with either continuation of therapy or oral stop-down therapy at the Cleveland Clinic Tradition Hospital.	This multi-center, retrospective cohort study included patients ≥ 18 years of age treated for ESBL-producing urinary tract infections from August 31, 2023, and August 31, 2024. Exclusion criteria included patients with polymicrobial urinary tract infections, bacteremia, cultures demonstrating non-susceptibility to carbapenems, patients transferred to an intensive-care unit and hospital mortality. Patients were divided into two groups, and stop-down therapy within 48 hours of culture confirmation. The oral stop-down group received oral antibiotics for 3 days, followed by a 3-day oral antibiotic taper. The oral continuation group received oral antibiotics for 7 days. Secondary outcomes included 30- and 90-day readmissions, duration of antimicrobial therapy, adverse events, time to oral-stop down, and escalation of therapy or transition back to intravenous therapy after culture results. Categorical variables were analyzed using the Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. Continuous variables were reported as medians with interquartile ranges (IQR). A p value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.	A total of 277 patients were reviewed for 120 patients that met inclusion criteria. Of these, 57 received early oral-stop-down therapy and 63 continued IV therapy. Hospital length of stay was similar between the two groups (mean 5.4 days, p = 0.996). Readmission at 30 days (15% vs. 23%, p = 0.17) and 90 days (24% vs. 30%, p = 0.59) was numerically lower in the oral-stop down group but not statistically significant. There were no adverse events documented in either group. Total antibiotic duration was comparable (6 vs. 7 days, p = 0.218).	There is reduced length of stay when oral stop-down is used in the early oral-stop-down cohort. The early continuation was not found. There was no difference in hospital readmission, while contributing to reduced carbapenem antibiotic use. These findings support the use of oral-stop-down therapy in patients as a safe and effective strategy that aligns with antimicrobial stewardship goals. While the retrospective design and limited sample size, larger randomized controlled trials are needed to further validate these findings.
Chiassen, Brienne	brienne.chiassen@healthcare.com	HCA Florida Fort Walton-DeSoto Hospital	Comparison of piperacillin complex concentrate, human, to piperacillin complex concentrate, human-lans, for reversal of bleeding due to direct oral anticoagulants	Guideline-based therapy for the reversal of bleeding associated with direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) includes antedil and weight-based piperacillin complex concentrate (PCC). The management of DOAC-associated bleeds presents a unique challenge due to the high cost of brand name reversal agents, such as andexanet alfa. In clinical practice, antedil and weight-based PCC have been used to reverse DOAC-associated bleeds. Previous studies have demonstrated that fixed-dose four-factor PCC (4F-PCC) was associated with a higher likelihood of achieving hemostatic efficacy, quicker time to administration, and reduced cost compared to variable-dose 4F-PCC for warfarin reversal. These research questions were to compare the clinical outcomes of patients with DOAC-producing UTIs treated with either continuation of therapy or oral stop-down therapy at the Cleveland Clinic Tradition Hospital.	This retrospective analysis was conducted at a Level I Trauma Center. The study included patients ≥ 18 years and older with DOAC-associated bleeding who received either PCC, human, or PCC, human-lans. Exclusion criteria consisted of patients who were pregnant, incarcerated, recently treated with antedil and/or had contraindications to receiving PCC. The pre-intervention cohort consisted of PCC, human from November 1, 2023, through April 30, 2024, and the post-intervention cohort consisted of PCC, human-lans from May 1, 2024, through October 31, 2024. Descriptive and inferential statistics were performed to analyze the data.	Baseline characteristics are outlined in Table 1. Of the predictors evaluated, parameters leading to failure of hemostatic efficacy included reduced hemostatic function, observed in 40% (4/10) of PCC human patients and 100% (6/6) of PCC human-lans patients (OR = 1.20, 95% CI = 0.49-2.91, p = 0.0001). Additionally, bleed product administration after 30 minutes of PCC dose was also statistically significant, and occurred in 60% (6/10) of PCC human patients and none (0/6) of the PCC human-lans patients (OR = 0.08 - w, p = 0.04).	The analysis revealed that PCC, human-lans, demonstrated statistically significant improvements in hemostatic efficacy compared to PCC, human. Specifically, PCC, human-lans was more effective in the reversal of DOAC-associated bleeding than PCC, human in terms of hemostatic efficacy. These findings suggest that PCC, human-lans, may offer better clinical outcomes for the reversal of bleeding due to direct oral anticoagulant therapy. Further research with larger sample sizes is recommended to confirm these results and explore additional outcomes.
Cochrane, Britney	britney.cochrane@healthcare.com	HCA Florida Trinity Hospital	Comparison of clinical outcomes following implementation of a new diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) protocol	Diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) is an acute, life-threatening complication of diabetes. DKA is characterized by a triad of polyuria, polydipsia, ketosis, and metabolic acidosis. Prompt and effective treatment is critical to avoid complications. A protocol was implemented to adjust insulin not only according to the current blood glucose levels but also based on the change from the previous blood glucose check. This modification aims to prevent hypoglycemia in patients receiving an insulin drip.	This is an ethics committee-approved, single-center, retrospective chart review study, conducted at a 272-bed community teaching hospital. Patients were included if they were at least 18 years old and hospitalized with a diagnosis of DKA from October 2023 to September 2024. Patients were excluded if they were taking oral hypoglycemic agents at home, had a history of DKA, or were on a DKA protocol. The new protocol was introduced in March 2024, thus patients treated during this month were also excluded from this study. Patients were divided into two cohorts: the pre-implementation group, which received insulin adjustments based solely on the current blood glucose level, and the post-implementation group, which received insulin adjustments based on the change in blood glucose levels from the previous blood glucose check. The primary outcome is time to resolution of DKA defined by pH > 7, bicarbonate > 18 mmol, and BUN < 200 mg/dL. Secondary outcomes include time on insulin drip, incidence of hypoglycemia defined by blood glucose < 70 mg/dL, and length of ICU stay.	The study included 43 patients with a diagnosis of DKA. The primary outcome, time to resolution of DKA, showed no statistically significant difference between the groups (0.37 vs. 0.38 days, p=0.886). Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference in the secondary outcomes, including time on an insulin drip (0.68 vs. 0.78 days, p=0.384) and ICU length of stay (1.15 vs. 1.44 days, p=0.234). However, the modified protocol was associated with a significant reduction in hypoglycemic events, with 29 episodes in the pre-implementation group compared to 3 in the post-implementation group (p=0.027).	While the modified insulin-dosing protocol did not significantly impact the time to DKA resolution, time on insulin drip, or ICU length of stay, it was associated with a meaningful reduction in hypoglycemia, which was the main reason for this institution to modify their protocol. These findings suggest that incorporating prior blood glucose trends into insulin adjustments may be a safe and effective strategy. Future research with larger, multi-center cohorts and prospective study designs are needed to validate these findings and assess the broader impact of this protocol modification on DKA management.

Resident	Email Address	Practice Site	Research Title	Background	Methodology	Results	Description
Fukate, Rosie	rosie.dt.wilmo@gmail.com	Morton Plant North Bay Hospital	Use of Procalcitonin on the Reduction of Antibiotic Duration in Septic and Septic Shock Following a Human System Initiative: a Pre-Post Evaluation	Procalcitonin (PCT) is a biomarker that can be utilized as a tool to help guide antibiotic de-escalation when sepsis is monitored using institution-specific algorithms. However, it is often ordered incorrectly and misinterpreted. As a quality improvement antimicrobial stewardship intervention, the purpose of this study is to evaluate the length of antibiotic duration in sepsis and septic shock patients using procalcitonin as an infection marker along with clinical judgement to escalate therapy after the implementation of a guided CareSet for proper ordering and interpretation of PCT for the setting of sepsis. Utilizing the results of this study could help determine the effectiveness of utilizing procalcitonin on top of clinical judgement to help guide antimicrobial therapy.	This is an institutional review board approved, multicenter, pre-post cohort evaluation of the usage of procalcitonin as an infection marker to guide antibiotic de-escalation. The study was conducted at 10 sites across the country. Data collection began in January 1, 2023 – February 28, 2024, and October 1, 2023 – February 28, 2025. The primary outcome is the length of antibiotic duration (days) while using procalcitonin as an infection marker along with clinical judgement to escalate therapy after the implementation of a guided CareSet for proper ordering and interpretation of PCT for the setting of sepsis. Utilizing the results of this study could help determine the effectiveness of utilizing procalcitonin on top of clinical judgement to help guide antimicrobial therapy.	A total of 150 patients are included in this study, with 80 in the pre-PCT initiation group and 70 in the post-PCT initiation group. The groups are similar in baseline characteristics, except that the post group has significantly lower male patients (53% vs. 59%, P=0.24) and less need for vasopressors (24% vs. 44%, P=0.51). For the primary outcome, there is no statistically significant difference in the antibiotic duration time between the pre- and post-initiation groups (5.8 [QR 3.5-8.1] days vs. 6.8 [QR 4.8-8.4] days, P=0.16). The secondary outcome of antibiotic length of stay (7.0 [QR 5.6-9.5] days vs. 6.1 [QR 4.6-8.1] days, P=0.75) and the composite outcome of PCT antibiotic escalation (1.3 [QR 0.1, 2.5] vs. 1.0 [QR 0.2, 4.4], P=0.06) are not statistically significant. However, the ICU length of stay is statistically similar in the post group (2.2 [QR 1.0, 4.0] vs. 4.0 [QR 0.8, 1.2], P=0.05) and the composite mortality is lower (11% vs. 23%, P=0.05) after the PCT initiative was implemented.	There is no difference in antibiotic duration, hospital length of stay, time from follow up PCT to antibiotic de-escalation, or number of modifications to antibiotics between before and after the implementation of a guided CareSet for the proper ordering and interpretation of PCT in the setting of sepsis. However, there is a significant reduction in ICU length of stay and composite mortality after the implementation of the CareSet.
Fernandez, Jayna	jayna.fernandez@baptisthealth.net	South Miami Hospital	Implementation of a Pharmacist-Led Anti-methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus Therapy Bundle	Methicillin-resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (MRSA) is classified by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) as a serious antimicrobial resistance (AMR) threat. MRSA therapy is often associated with an increase in resistance, leading to increased costs and drug effects, such as adverse drug reactions. Antibiotic stewardship programs highlight the importance of pharmacists, education, and discontinuation of unnecessary interventions. The aim of this quality improvement project was to evaluate the impact of an anti-MRSA therapy bundle implementation on antibiotic stewardship and the use of anti-MRSA therapy.	This single-center retrospective quality improvement project evaluated antibiotic use (January 1, 2023 – March 31, 2024 and after March 1, 2023 – March 31, 2025) implementing an anti-MRSA therapy bundle. The bundle consisted of assessment and creation of additional vigilance (an electronic alert surveillance program) alerts, prompting MRSA nasal culture/chain reaction testing for all patients, and a daily report generated using Vigilant™. "Pharmacy Orders" search of active orders for dapoxetinib (IV), levofloxacin (IV), and vancomycin (IV) daily were checked. Designated pharmacists, a critical care pharmacist, and an infection preventionist (IP) were involved in the implementation. Baseline data were collected before implementation. Adult patients who were admitted to the hospital with orders for scheduled dapoxetin IV, levofloxacin IV, or vancomycin IV were included. The primary outcome was the number of patients with antibiotic use related to anti-MRSA therapy. Secondary outcomes included the total number of pharmacist interventions related to anti-MRSA therapy de-escalation, discontinuation, or optimization, pharmacist antibiotic intervention details, pharmacist intervention documentation, and antibiotic use. The secondary outcome was the number of patients with antibiotic use related to anti-MRSA therapy bundle implementation, antibiotic discontinuation, and the use of anti-MRSA therapy.	During the active intervention period, 852 patients were assessed for appropriate anti-MRSA therapy with 158 patients receiving at least one intervention and a total of 751 interventions completed. A total of 200 patients were included in the outcome assessment, with 100 patients per group. Baseline characteristics were evenly distributed. The number of patients who received at least one pharmacist intervention was 40% compared to 73% in the post-implementation group (P<0.001), and the number of interventions was 10% compared to 27% in the post-implementation group (P<0.001). The number of patients who received at least one pharmacist intervention was 40% compared to 73% in the post-implementation group (P<0.001), and the number of interventions was 10% compared to 27% in the post-implementation group (P<0.001).	Implementation of a pharmacist-led anti-MRSA therapy bundle can lead to a significant increase in pharmacist interventions related to de-escalation, discontinuation, and optimization, with a high provider acceptance rate.
Fernandez, Katherine	katherinefernandez@gmail.com	Baptist Hospital of Miami	Evaluation of a Low Dose Norepinephrine Protocol for Management of Septic Shock in a Progressive Care Unit	Norepinephrine is a potent vasoconstrictor commonly used for the management of acute hypotension, particularly in cases of septic shock. Norepinephrine stimulates alpha-adrenergic receptors, resulting in vasoconstriction and an increase in systemic vascular resistance, which elevates blood pressure. The Sepsis Guidelines emphasize early fluid resuscitation (up to 30 mL/kg) in septic patients with tactic grade 2 or 3 and early administration of norepinephrine in patients unresponsive to fluid resuscitation. Dopamine stimulates both adrenergic and dopaminergic receptors in a dose dependent manner and is only recommended as an alternative to norepinephrine in septic shock patients with bradycardia who are unresponsive to norepinephrine. The use of norepinephrine in septic shock is associated with increased mortality. The primary outcome of this study is to evaluate the impact of a non-thritable low dose norepinephrine protocol and secondary outcomes included mortality, adverse effects, midlineole, ICU length of stay, average time on vasopressors, and median ICU length of stay.	Single site, pre-implementation versus post-implementation review of 8461. The pre-implementation group included a retrospective review of patients who received norepinephrine empirically for septic shock in the PCU between January and May 2024. A non-thritable low dose norepinephrine protocol was implemented in February 2025, followed by a prospective review of patients receiving norepinephrine empirically for septic shock in the PCU between February and April 2025. Adult patients with septic shock and a systolic blood pressure less than 90 mmHg were included. The primary outcome was the number of patients transferred to the ICU post implementation of a non-thritable low dose norepinephrine protocol and secondary outcomes included mortality, adverse effects, midlineole, ICU length of stay, average time on vasopressors, and median ICU length of stay.	The number of patients transferred to the ICU post implementation of a non-thritable low dose norepinephrine protocol implementation was 33 (24%) in the pre-implementation group vs 51 (26%) in the post-implementation group (P=0.26). Mortality remained consistent in both groups with a rate of 37% vs 35% in the pre-implementation group compared to 37% in the post-implementation group (P=0.01) with a similar rate of 37% vs 35% in the pre-implementation group compared to 37% in the post-implementation group (P=0.01). The number of patients with adverse effects was 26% in the pre-implementation group compared to 26% in the post-implementation group (P=0.01) with a similar rate of 26% vs 26% in the pre-implementation group vs 26% in the post-implementation group (P=0.01) utilizing midlineole. The average ICU length of stay was 96 days in the pre-implementation group compared to 65 days in the post-implementation group (P<0.001). The average ICU length of stay was 96 days in the pre-implementation group compared to 65 days in the post-implementation group (P<0.001). Median vasopressor use was approximately 4 in the pre-implementation group vs 3 in the post-implementation group.	Implementation of a low dose norepinephrine protocol in the PCU showed no significant difference in the rate of ICU transfers, however there was a significant difference in the number of adverse effects, midlineole and ICU length of stay between both groups. The small sample size was the main limitation in this study. Future directions include expanding norepinephrine use to all PCUs for confirmed septic cases to continue optimizing care for septic patients using this therapy.
Finch, Lauren	lauren.fin@ufl.edu	UF Health - Shands Hospital	Evaluation of dosing strategies of ampicillin/sulbactam to treat <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> pneumonia	Ampicillin/sulbactam remains a first-line agent for <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> infections that are susceptible to the antimicrobial, however, its high dose and narrow therapeutic index should be avoided in these patients. Strategies to optimize dosing include the use of high dose ampicillin/sulbactam, the use of a narrow therapeutic index, and the frequency and the use of extended or continuous infusions. Our institution has integrated an order panel within the electronic health record that directs providers to implement high dose regimens of ampicillin/sulbactam for the treatment of <i>A. baumannii</i> pneumonia. This study aims to evaluate the impact of high dose ampicillin/sulbactam compared to standard doses of ampicillin/sulbactam for susceptible <i>A. baumannii</i> infections. This study also aims to evaluate the utilization of high dose ampicillin/sulbactam compared to standard dosing regimens for <i>A. baumannii</i> pneumonia in critically ill patients.	This single center, retrospective cohort study assessed critically ill patients with <i>A. baumannii</i> pneumonia from January 2018 to June 2024. Patients were included if they were 38 to 89 years old, were admitted to an ICU, and had at least one laboratory confirmed <i>A. baumannii</i> infection. The primary outcome was the number of patients who received ampicillin/sulbactam minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) > 4. Patients were excluded if they were treated with ampicillin/sulbactam for less than 72 hours or the isolated <i>A. baumannii</i> intermediate or resistant. The secondary outcome was the number of patients who received ampicillin/sulbactam for more than 72 hours or the isolated <i>A. baumannii</i> susceptible. The recommended daily dose for renal function, as specified in the package insert. The primary outcome of this study was to describe the utilization of different dosing strategies of ampicillin/sulbactam and to correlate with clinical outcome. A secondary outcome was to evaluate the utilization of high dose ampicillin/sulbactam for the treatment of <i>A. baumannii</i> pneumonia. The primary outcome included the duration of antimicrobial therapy, duration of mechanical ventilation, and intensive care unit (ICU) stay, ICU length of stay, and ICU mortality. Other factors that may have influenced the outcome were also evaluated. The secondary outcome included the duration of antimicrobial therapy, duration of mechanical ventilation and intensive care unit (ICU) stay, ICU length of stay, and ICU mortality.	A total of 37 patients met the inclusion criteria. Twenty-five patients were excluded due to not receiving at least 72 hours of ampicillin/sulbactam, inability to evaluate outcome due to duration exceeding beyond hospital discharge, or having only one laboratory confirmed <i>A. baumannii</i> infection. The remaining 22 patients were included. The primary outcome was the number of patients who received ampicillin/sulbactam for less than 72 hours or the isolated <i>A. baumannii</i> intermediate or resistant. The secondary outcome was the number of patients who received ampicillin/sulbactam for more than 72 hours or the isolated <i>A. baumannii</i> susceptible. The average age in the standard dose group was 83 years, compared to 53.5 years in the high dose cohort (P<0.0001). One patient in the high dose group had a MIC of 16. The primary outcome was the number of patients who received ampicillin/sulbactam for more than 72 hours or the isolated <i>A. baumannii</i> susceptible. The average age in the standard dose group was 83 years, compared to 53.5 years in the high dose cohort (P<0.0001). Significant differences were observed in the secondary outcomes of duration of mechanical ventilation and ICU length of stay (P<0.05). The average duration of mechanical ventilation for the high dose group was 3.5 days, while the high dose cohort had an average duration of mechanical ventilation of 20.0 days (P<0.05). The average ICU length of stay for the high dose cohort was 12.2 days, while the high dose cohort had an average ICU LOS of 37 days (P<0.0001).	Within this cohort, high dose strategies were employed more frequently than standard doses of ampicillin/sulbactam. The increased use of high dose regimens may be attributed to the institution's order panel, as well as factors such as enhanced renal clearance or younger patient age. No significant difference in clinical care was observed between patients who received high dose ampicillin/sulbactam and standard dose ampicillin/sulbactam. The small sample size and small cohort size limits the interpretability of these findings. Future research should directly compare clinical care rates and resistance outcomes between different dosing strategies for susceptible <i>A. baumannii</i> pneumonia to better assess any potential differences.
Flores Morales, Reynell	reynell.floresm@baycare.org	Turley Family Health Center	Optimizing low density lipoprotein cholesterol management in atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease patients: a pharmacist-physician collaborative protocol	Hypercholesterolemia is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality globally. Targeting pharmacists as a major component of managing patients with cardiovascular (CV) disease. Studies have shown the impact of a pharmacist-physician collaboration in optimizing guideline-directed, lipid-lowering therapies and improving overall LDL cholesterol levels in patients, though evidence in the United States is limited, particularly through the implementation of a collaborative care agreement. This study aims to evaluate the impact of such collaboration within the Turley Family Health Center and allow pharmacists to expand the reach of clinical interventions and follow-up with patients more frequently.	This is a prospective, cohort, single-arm study, that required an initial review of patients 18 years and older who were seen in the clinic in the past two years, had documented clinical ASCVD, and an LDL-C > 70 mg/dL. After identification, patients were able to schedule a visit with the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options. Patients will receive follow-up calls from the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options and to provide education on the importance of lipid-lowering therapy. This study will be called to a pharmacist with clinical ASCVD, and an LDL-C > 70 mg/dL. After identification, patients were able to schedule a visit with the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options. Patients will receive follow-up calls from the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options and to provide education on the importance of lipid-lowering therapy. This study will be called to a pharmacist with clinical ASCVD, and an LDL-C > 70 mg/dL. After identification, patients were able to schedule a visit with the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options. Patients will receive follow-up calls from the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options and to provide education on the importance of lipid-lowering therapy. This study will be called to a pharmacist with clinical ASCVD, and an LDL-C > 70 mg/dL. After identification, patients were able to schedule a visit with the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options. Patients will receive follow-up calls from the pharmacist to discuss lipid-lowering therapy options and to provide education on the importance of lipid-lowering therapy.	A patient list was obtained based on ICD-10 codes within the class 23H0 through 23H9 for the predetermined inclusion criteria. Data was pulled for lipid panels obtained from January 2023 to June 2024 for which a total of 349 patients were identified and screened for potential eligibility to meet study inclusion criteria. A total of 349 patients were excluded due to the following reasons: duplicate ICD-10 codes, criteria not met, or no lipid panel available. The remaining 20 patients qualified for the study and were included. The primary outcome was the number of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the number of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The primary outcome was the number of patients with 5 or more lipid panels. A patient was decreased during the study for reasons other than therapy and coronary thrombosis. The remaining 16 patients completed the study. Outcome data were as follows: 200% of patients received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and 0% did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The secondary outcome included the percentage of patients who received lipid-lowering therapy (ASCVD) and the percentage of patients who did not receive lipid-lowering therapy (non-ASCVD). The	

Resident	Email Address	Practice Site	Research Title	Background	Methodology	Results	Conclusion
Hong, Juan	hong.juan@maya.edu	Mayo Clinic Florida	Comparing the rates of hypersensitivity reactions in first dose Taxane patients utilizing a feed-rate versus stepwise titration	Taxanes are a commonly used class of chemotherapy agents due to a paucity of a variety of side-malignancies. Taxanes have a higher incidence of immediate hypersensitivity reactions when compared to other classes of chemotherapy agents, despite premedication. The polyvalent surfactants formulated with the taxanes activate the complement system leading to the production of anaphylatoxins and mast cell activation, ultimately leading to these reactions. Prolactin is a hormone that is released from the pituitary gland in response to a stimulus. It is a potent inhibitor of mast cell degranulation. We hypothesized that a feed-rate infusion of taxane with low lactotropin would reduce the rate of hypersensitivity reactions in first dose taxane patients. A total of 22 patients were included in this study, with 11 patients receiving taxane with low lactotropin and 11 patients with low lactotropin in non-PVC bags, depending on indication or treatment protocol. A 2023 study investigated whether a stepwise titration infusion of paclitaxel or docetaxel reduces the rate and severity of immediate hypersensitivity reactions during the first and second infusion exposures of a total of 22 patients with taxane, with a rate of 10% for the first exposure and 15% for the second exposure. Of the 30 reactions, 20 reactions occurred during the first dose, 13 (43%) of which with low lactotropin. There was no difference in the severity of reactions. These findings may have contributed to the similar outcomes in both reducing hypersensitivity reactions and decreasing delay in the treatment course. Our study aims to evaluate the findings of whether a titratable infusion of taxanes confers a lower rate of hypersensitivity reactions with a larger sample size.	Methodology This was a retrospective cohort study conducted at a single site hematology/oncology infusion center. Patients were included in the study if they were 18 years old or younger and were receiving taxane for the treatment of cancer. The cohort included patients who received taxane as a first dose. Patients were excluded if they were younger than 18 years old, were receiving taxane for non-oncology indications, or if they received taxane either prior to the study, or as part of research investigation drug. The feed-rate arm consisted of patients from January 2019 to July 2023. The stepwise titration arm consisted of patients from January 2020 to July 2023. The total number of patients from August 2023 to July 2024 who underwent a three-step titration protocol for their first dose of a prescribed taxane. The three-step titration protocol is detailed as below: 1/6 of the final rate infused for 15 minutes, THEN+ 10% of the final rate infused for 15 minutes. THEN+ 10% of the final rate infused for 15 minutes. The rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions were compared between the two groups. The primary endpoint was the rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions of either the first or second infusion exposure. Secondary endpoints included rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions during the first dose of taxane, rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions during the second infusion exposure, rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions during the first infusion exposure, rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions during the second infusion exposure, and rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions during the third infusion exposure. A sample size of 21 patients was calculated to achieve a 95% confidence interval (CI). A histogram was used to assess data distribution, revealing a normal distribution. A chi square test was performed to determine whether a Fisher's exact test or chi-square test was appropriate. Using BlueSky Blaster, a chi square test was performed for any categorical data with a calculated odds ratio (OR) and 95% CI and corresponding p-value. A t-test was performed for any continuous data with a mean.	A total of 22 patients were included in the study. 20 in the feed-rate and 22 in the titration arm. Baseline characteristics are outlined in Table 1. The rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions in the feed rate arm and the titration arm were 7.2% and 11.3%, respectively (OR 1.67, 95% CI 0.89-3.15, p= 0.116). Secondary endpoints are outlined in Table 2.	Patients receiving taxanes are at increased risk of immediate hypersensitivity reactions with the first dose. Titrating the infusion rate has been demonstrated in a prior study to reduce the incidence of these reactions. Based on this study, the rates of immediate hypersensitivity reactions were not statistically significant between the two groups. The total number of patients included in this study is small, and the duration is not 3-4 hour duration, the main difference is not statistically significant. Limitations of the study include the retrospective cohort design and ambiguity in the grading of reaction severity. This study contradicts a previous finding that suggests titrated infusions of taxanes reduces hypersensitivity reaction rates. Further investigation is warranted to validate these findings.
Hughes, Sarah	sofhughes@icloud.com	AdventHealth Celebration	Identifying common strengths and learning styles among pharmacy residents	The development of a pharmacist's attitude and job performance is cultivated through knowledge and skill building that takes place during pharmacy school. For some, personality traits come naturally whereas others develop strengths and learning habits based on a surrounding environment and/or influence of peers. Upon graduation, alternative methods such as the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) are used to identify personality traits of pharmacists through questionnaires based on perception and judgment. Each personality questionnaire focuses on a different aspect of learning. MBTI assesses a person's preference in four domains (focus, sensory, logic, and perception) while Clifton StrengthsFinder (CSF) identifies dominant strengths and individual weaknesses. Previous literature on the use of Clifton StrengthsFinder (CSF) is a great starting point for use in the classroom, describing learning styles and learning styles utilizing a 17-item inventory to determine dominant and secondary learning styles. Together, these three questionnaires can be used to facilitate learning and can be used as a predictor of performance and team dynamics.	A retrospective data review was completed utilizing previous ambulatory care pharmacy resident's responses to HMBI and Clifton StrengthsFinder. This study has 189 entries. The study population included a total of 40 ambulatory care pharmacy residents over a span of years (2016-2025). Previously collected data location on a shared drive from the three personality questionnaires were reviewed and results were placed in an Excel spreadsheet. The primary outcome was to identify any general changes in strengths and learning styles.	A total of forty-six ambulatory care pharmacy residents were identified and included in the study. The results were as follows: Myers-Briggs ESFJ 39% (n= 14); Clifton StrengthsFinder: 42% (n= 17), remaining 19% (n= 7). The results of the personality questionnaires were not statistically significant between the two groups. The total number of ambulatory care pharmacy residents remained consistent over the past ten years. A shift in Clifton StrengthsFinder results occurred post-COVID-19 pandemic with 42% (n= 18) identifying themselves as enterprising and 19% (n= 8) identifying themselves as conscientious. There are no significant differences in learning styles between the two groups. Overall, a majority of the respondents stayed high in categories that resemble individuals who are outgoing, supportive, observant, focused, and realistic.	Analyses results from the HMBI, PLS, and CSF. StrengthsFinder data over ten years showed several common trends among personality types, strengths, and learning styles of pharmacy residents. The predominant HMBI and CSF cycle of assimilator-producer has remained consistent over the past ten years. Interestingly, the Clifton StrengthsFinder results changed post-COVID-19 executing and away from relationship building. Taking results into account is invaluable when building relationships, building teams, providing feedback, and fostering an opportune environment for personal and professional growth.
Hummel, Blaine	hummeltb@comcast.net	Holmes Regional Medical Center	Outcomes of intra-operative administration of recombinant factor VIIa versus four-factor prothrombin complex concentrate in cardiothoracic surgery patients	The purpose of this study was to assess the safety and efficacy of recombinant factor VIIa and four-factor prothrombin complex concentrate in patients undergoing cardiothoracic surgery. There are few studies currently published that report similar outcomes between the two agents when assessing blood product utilization, however a significant reduction in hospital length of stay in favor of four-factor prothrombin complex concentrate was established.	This was a single-center, retrospective chart review of adult patients who underwent a cardiothoracic intervention and received either recombinant factor VIIa (rFVIIa) or four-factor prothrombin complex concentrate (4F-PCC) intra-operatively between January 2018 until July 2024. Patients were excluded if they received either agent pre-operatively for anticoagulation therapy or if they had a history of hemophilia. The primary outcome was to compare the total number of packed red blood cells administered prior to chest tube removal, total number of chest tube output, and total number of transfusions. The secondary outcome was to compare the operating period or if there was any religious/personal considerations preventing the administration of blood and blood products. The primary outcome of the study was total units of packed red blood cells administered prior to chest tube removal. The secondary outcome was the total number of transfusions. There were no significant differences in packed red blood cells administered prior to chest tube removal, total chest tube output, any chest tube event, intensive care unit length of stay and hospital length of stay. An exploratory analysis was conducted including patients that were given either rFVIIa or 4F-PCC post-operatively. The same outcomes were maintained from the primary analysis to assess this exploratory population.	This from January 2019 to September 2024, 92 patients were screened with 36 patients included in the primary study group and 16 patients in the exploratory group. Most patients were male (n=72) and white (n=71). The mean age was 51.5 years old (range 18-81). The mean operating time was 217.5 minutes (range 100-420). The mean number of packed red blood cells administered prior to chest tube removal was 1.5 (range 0-10). The mean number of transfusions was 1.2 (range 0-10). The mean intensive care unit length of stay was 1.2 days (range 0-10). The mean hospital length of stay was 4.2 days (range 1-10). There were no significant differences in intensive care unit length of stay or hospital length of stay between the rFVIIa and 4F-PCC group, albeit not statistically significant (median 17.7 versus 22.6, p= 0.075). Notably, there were no thromboembolic events or non-chest tube related bleeding events in the rFVIIa group, whereas there were two non-chest tube related bleeding events in the 4F-PCC group. Overall, a majority of the patients stayed high in categories that resemble individuals who are outgoing, supportive, observant, focused, and realistic.	
Hoyn, Laini	lphoyn.pharm@gmail.com	Tallahassee Memorial HealthCare	Enhancing Communication About Medicines in HCAPPS: Interprofessional Collaboration Between Internal Medicine Readiness Program Providers and Clinical Pharmacists	The Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAPPS) survey is a standard tool developed by the Centers for Medicare & Medical Services (CMS) to measure patients' perspectives on their understanding of their medications and has a direct impact on hospital reputation and CMS reimbursement through the Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) Program. Previous studies have shown that clinical pharmacy services can significantly contribute to improving patient satisfaction through more effective medication counseling.	The study was a single-center, RCT-exempt quality improvement project conducted in TMH. It utilized a prospective cohort design with data collected from April to June 2023. Two main data sources were used: patient electronic health records accessed through Epic, and HCAPPS data retrieved from Press Ganey. The intervention involved a structured discharge communication plan for patients on multiple medications. The plan included a summary of medications, a list of potential side effects, and a communication script for pharmacists to use when counseling patients prior to discharge. Patients in the intervention group received the explanations about their medications and side effects of the new medications, as required by CMS HCAPPS "Communication About Medicines" domain compared to 30.5 in the control group, a difference that was highly statistically significant (p= 0.05). The primary outcome of the study was the total number of medications included, HCAPPS top score, and satisfaction scores. Key variables included the number of medications included, HCAPPS top score, and satisfaction scores. Patients were asked to rate their satisfaction with the communication plan on a scale from 1 to 5. The intervention group had a higher satisfaction score compared to the control group, suggesting a dose-response effect of communication quality on patient perception. The HCAPPS top score in the intervention group exceeded the baseline Quarter 3 (2024) HCAPPS score by 42.26%, highlighting the clinical and operational impact of the initiative. All the box score improvements in the intervention cohort were statistically significant (p < 0.05), indicating the intervention's robustness across the study population.	A total of 46 patients were included in the analysis, with 21 receiving the physician-pharmacist dual counseling and 25 receiving the control. The intervention group demonstrated significantly higher satisfaction scores across the communication measures. Specifically, patients in the intervention group had a 10% satisfaction rate above the "Communication About Medicines" domain compared to 30.5 in the control group, a difference that was highly statistically significant (p= 0.05). The primary outcome of the study was the total number of medications included, HCAPPS top score, and satisfaction scores. Key variables included the number of medications included, HCAPPS top score, and satisfaction scores. Patients were asked to rate their satisfaction with the communication plan on a scale from 1 to 5. The intervention group had a higher satisfaction score compared to the control group, suggesting a dose-response effect of communication quality on patient perception. The HCAPPS top score in the intervention group exceeded the baseline Quarter 3 (2024) HCAPPS score by 42.26%, highlighting the clinical and operational impact of the initiative. All the box score improvements in the intervention cohort were statistically significant (p < 0.05), indicating the intervention's robustness across the study population.	This study demonstrated that a physician-pharmacist collaborative model significantly improves patient satisfaction in the "Communication About Medicines" domain of the HCAPPS survey. The 100% satisfaction rate achieved by the intervention group underscores the effectiveness of personalized medication counseling in enhancing the patient experience. These findings support the implementation of communication plans in hospital settings, particularly for clinical pharmacists providing pharmacy services within inpatient settings. Given the link between HCAPPS scores and hospital reimbursement, such interventions are not only beneficial for patient outcomes but also strategically important for healthcare systems under value-based care models.
Ibrahim, George	george.ibrahim@ascension.org	Ascension St. Vincent's Riverside Hospital	Comparison of low versus weight based dose of intravenous diltiazem for the management of atrial fibrillation with rapid ventricular response	According to the 2023 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) guidelines for the management of atrial fibrillation (AFib), diltiazem, a non-dihydropyridine calcium channel blocker, can be used for rate control in AFib with rapid ventricular response (RV). The recommended initial dose is an intravenous (IV) bolus of 2.5 mg/kg over 2 mins. Lower starting doses have been utilized as an alternative to decrease the incidence of hypotension, but current data examining its effectiveness shows conflicting results. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the safety and efficacy of low-dose I	This was a retrospective, observational, cohort study conducted across four hospitals. Subjects were included if they were >18 years of age, had AFib confirmed with either EKG or telemetry strip, heart rate (HR) greater than 120 beats per minute (bpm), and received at least one bolus of IV diltiazem. Subjects were excluded if they were hemodynamically unstable, in the ICU, or receiving IV diltiazem for ventricular tachycardia. The primary outcome was the incidence of HR 20% above baseline within 60 minutes, bradycardia, or asystole during the IV diltiazem dose. The primary outcome was the incidence of HR 20% above baseline within 60 minutes, bradycardia, or asystole in-hospital mortality, and in-hospital hypotension. The secondary outcome was the incidence of adverse drug reactions (ADR) with IV diltiazem to achieve 80% power with an alpha of 0.05. Student's t-test and Mann-Whitney U were used for the analysis of continuous and ordinal data. Chi-Square and Fisher's exact test were used for categorical and nominal outcomes. A multivariable logistic regression was used to adjust for confounding variables.	A total of 642 subjects were screened with 194 subjects meeting inclusion criteria (assigned in a 1:1 ratio). The most common reason for exclusion was no documentation of HR on EKG or telemetry. Baseline characteristics can be found in Table 1. The primary outcome, incidence of HR 20% in the low-dose group compared to the weight-based group (73.2% vs. 65.57%, p=0.033). There was also a significant difference in the incidence of SBP	In subjects with AFib with RV, there was no statistically significant difference in the incidence of HR >100 bpm within 60 minutes or the IV diltiazem bolus between the low-dose and weight-based dose groups. However, subjects in the weight-based group were found to have a higher incidence of hypotension. Therefore, these results show the feasibility and potential benefit of utilizing a low-dose strategy in patients with AFib with RV.
Itoel, Laura	laura.itoel17@gmail.com	St. Joseph's Hospital	Optimizing Antimicrobial Selection for Intrapartum Group B Streptococcus Prophylaxis in Penicillin Allergic Patients	Purpose/Background: Group B Streptococcus (GBS) is the most common cause of neonatal infections that is transmitted from mother to baby during labor or rupture of membranes. Pregnant women are screened between 36-67 and 37-67 weeks gestation to assess the need for GBS prophylaxis. Penicillin is the drug of choice for GBS prophylaxis and ampicillin is a common alternative. Other antibiotics include clindamycin or vancomycin. Penicillin allergies are the most commonly documented drug allergy, and patients with a penicillin allergy may receive alternative antibiotics that may be less effective. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the safety and efficacy of low-dose clindamycin or vancomycin in pregnant women who are allergic to penicillin. The R1 side-chain which contains vancomycin with no other drugs. This study is not due to the core beta-lactam ring but instead, the R1 side-chain which contains vancomycin with no other drugs. To optimize the use of first and second-line medications and reduce the use of last-line less favorable options, the GBS plan was updated. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the safety and efficacy of low-dose clindamycin or vancomycin in pregnant women who are allergic to penicillin. The study was provided to the physicians at St. Joseph's Women's Hospital on May 1, 2024. The purpose of this study is to assess the use of last-line agents (clindamycin or vancomycin) following plan revision and provider education for patients reporting a penicillin allergy.	Methodology: This was a single-center, retrospective chart review of patients admitted to St. Joseph's Women's Hospital comparing vancomycin selection for GBS prophylaxis in pregnant patients with documented penicillin allergy and other plan optimization and provider education. Patients were included if they were 37 weeks pregnant or greater, GBS positive or GBS status unknown, had a documented penicillin allergy, and received antibiotics for GBS prophylaxis. Patients were excluded if they were not pregnant, had a documented penicillin allergy, and did not receive antibiotics for GBS prophylaxis. The study period was from January 2023 to March 2024 and the post intervention group included patients from May 2024 to February 2025. The primary outcome was the use of clindamycin and vancomycin vs. vancomycin in penicillin allergic patients before and after provider education and plan optimization. The secondary outcomes included adverse drug reactions and drug allergy reactions in all patients.	Results: A total of 21 patients were included in the pre-intervention group, and 58 patients were included in the post intervention group. In the pre-intervention group, 23 patients received clindamycin, and 8 patients received vancomycin or clindamycin for GBS prophylaxis compared to 10 patients receiving clindamycin and 17 patients receiving vancomycin or clindamycin for GBS prophylaxis in the post-intervention group. There was no significant difference in the use of clindamycin or vancomycin in the post-intervention group. The secondary outcome, 1 patient that received vancomycin experienced an adverse drug reaction or drug allergy reaction in the pre-intervention group. There were no drug allergy reactions or adverse drug reactions in the post-intervention group.	Conclusion: Following plan revision and provider education for patients receiving GBS prophylaxis reporting a penicillin allergy, there was an increase in the number of patients that received last alternatives (clindamycin or vancomycin) compared to prior to education and plan optimization.
Jacimino, Gema	gmp6@med.miami.edu	University of Miami Hospital and Clinics - UHealth Tower	Evaluating digoxin therapeutic drug monitoring practices in an academic hospital	Digoxin is widely used for managing heart failure and atrial fibrillation due to its ability to enhance cardiac contractility by inhibiting the Na+K+ ATPase pump.1 Despite its benefits, digoxin has a narrow therapeutic range, making monitoring essential to balance efficacy and safety. Historically, monitoring for therapeutic drug levels was discouraged. However, recent guidelines emphasize the importance of therapeutic drug monitoring for high-risk patients.2 Inappropriate therapeutic levels, resulting in worsening heart failure or atrial fibrillation symptoms, are the purpose of this study was to evaluate the appropriateness of digoxin level monitoring and its impact on patient safety.	This retrospective, single-center chart review was conducted at the University of Miami Hospital and Clinics - UHealth Tower between July 2024 and October 2024. The study included inpatient adults who received at least two consecutive doses of digoxin. Ambulatory patients and those receiving fewer than two doses were excluded. A total of 30 patients met the inclusion criteria. The primary objective was to evaluate the use of therapeutic drug monitoring for digoxin. The secondary objective was to evaluate the impact of therapeutic drug monitoring on patient safety. Therapeutic drug monitoring is associated with increased risk of toxicity, leading to either toxicity, characterized by arrhythmias, nausea, vomiting, and visual disturbances, or subtherapeutic levels, resulting in worsening heart failure or atrial fibrillation symptoms. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of monitoring on patient safety by evaluating other therapeutic levels and examining renal function.	A total of 30 patients were included in the study. The results showed that 47% (n=14) of patients had inappropriate digoxin monitoring, while 53% (n=16) had appropriate monitoring. Patients with inappropriate monitoring had a 15% level of digoxin monitoring, while 85% had appropriate monitoring. 50% had baseline levels checked, 57% reached therapeutic levels, and 43% were classified as high-risk. Although daily monitoring is recommended for high-risk patients, only 17% (n=5) received the necessary frequent testing. Additionally, while 23 patients (77%) were on home therapy, only 12 (52%) had their digoxin levels checked. The remaining 10 patients (38%) were on inpatient therapy. The mean digoxin levels was 1.02 ng/mL, ranging from 0.3 to 8 ng/mL. Additionally, 60% (n=18) patients exhibited therapeutic drug reactions or drug allergy reactions during their hospital stay.	This study highlights substantial gaps in digoxin level monitoring, with more than half of the patients undergoing unnecessary or inappropriate monitoring. This study also found that therapeutic drug monitoring is associated with improved patient safety and the efficacy of digoxin therapy. Future initiatives should focus on integrating pharmacists into monitoring protocols and emphasizing appropriate timing and indications for digoxin level assessments.

Resident	Email Address	Practice Site	Research Title	Background	Methodology	Results	Description
Nguyen, Trist	tristnguyen108@gmail.com	Cleveland Clinic Martin Health - North Hospital	Evaluation of efficacy and safety of diresipidol for the relief of acute migraine headaches versus metoclopramide	Headaches account for approximately 3-8 million Emergency Department (ED) visits annually in the United States, with migraine responsible for about 10% of these cases. Although the American Headache Society currently recommends only intravenous (IV) prochlorperazine, IV metoclopramide, and subcutaneous sumatriptan for managing acute migraine headaches, some providers have increasingly utilized IV diresipidol due to its favorable pharmacokinetic profile. However, the comparative efficacy and risk of adverse reactions between diresipidol and metoclopramide for acute migraine treatment remain unclear.	This retrospective study compares the efficacy of diresipidol and metoclopramide in treating acute migraine or headache in the ED. Consecutive patients with a primary diagnosis of headache or migraine seen in the Cleveland Clinic Emergency Department between January 1, 2022, and September 31, 2024, were included. Patients receiving IV diresipidol or IV metoclopramide prior to May 1, 2023, and September 30, 2024, Patients who had any allergies or contraindications to the medications, were pregnant or lactating, or had recently used specific interacting medications. The primary predictor was the time to resolution of acute migraine headache. Secondary predictors included age, gender, race, ethnicity, and comorbidities. Demographic data were also collected (de-identified patients). The primary outcome measured was the change in pain scores (on a 0-10 scale) from medication administration to reassessment. Secondary outcomes included adverse effects, incidences of akathisia, drowsiness, QTc prolongation, need for additional doses, hospital admission rates, and ED length of stay. A sample size of 254 patients was calculated to ensure adequate power for stratification and inference between treatments.	Out of over 2,000 possible patient records, 210 were reviewed, and 226 met the criteria (99 per group). The mean reduction in numeric pain scores within two hours was 5.2 points for the diresipidol group and 4.8 points for the metoclopramide group (mean difference = 0.6, 95% confidence interval (CI), -0.70 to 1.43). This trend was statistically significant ($p = 0.03$). Adverse events were more common in the diresipidol group (41.1% vs. 27.3%, $p = 0.001$). The median time to resolution of acute migraine headache was 120 minutes for diresipidol and 140 minutes for metoclopramide ($p = 0.001$). Adverse admissions occurred in 2% (2/98) of diresipidol patients and 1% (1/98) of metoclopramide patients ($p = 0.96$). The median ED length of stay was 963 minutes for diresipidol patients and 932 minutes for metoclopramide patients ($p = 0.32$).	Diresipidol was not found to be non-inferior to metoclopramide in the treatment of acute migraine headaches in the ED. Both treatment groups showed similar rates of adverse reactions, need for a second dose, hospital admission, and median ED length of stay.
Noel, Elizabeth	lisaveneel@gmail.com	AdventHealth Tampa	Impact of Pharmacist Review of Admission Medication Reconciliations on 30-day Readmission Rates	Effective transitions between phases of care are critical to ensuring continuity and optimizing therapeutic outcomes. Previous studies have shown that medication reconciliation rates are associated with reduced 30-day readmission rates, better healthcare costs, and improved clinical outcomes. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact of a pharmacist-led initiative to retrospectively review completed admission medication reconciliations on 30-day readmission rates for patients 65 years and older with traditional Medicare insurance.	This single-center retrospective study evaluated the intervention of pharmacist review of admission medication reconciliations (AMRs) on patients 65 years and older with traditional Medicare insurance. An initial group of patients admitted between July 1, 2022, and September 1, 2023, and a comparison group of patients from the same period in 2023 who did not receive this intervention. Patients were excluded from the study if they expired within the study time. Most patients received a medication history from the following: pharmacy, physician, or family member. The primary outcome was the 30-day readmission rate for patients with a completed admission medication reconciliation. Patients in the intervention group had a pharmacist review their AMR for potential clinical improvement measures. Pharmacists received education on how to identify eligible patients through the electronic health record (EHR) and were encouraged to use a standard template to document the review of the admission medication reconciliation. The primary outcome was 30-day readmission rates. Secondary outcomes included readmission rates for each CMS Core Measure did not yield any statistically significant differences. A total of 1,000 patients received a completed admission medication reconciliation. The primary outcome was 30-day readmission rates. Secondary outcomes included readmission rates of Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Core Measure disease status (heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pneumonia, myocardial infarction, coronary artery bypass grafting and revascularization, total hip/knee arthroplasty) and the number of total interventions recommended with percentage of acceptances in the intervention group.	Of the 365 patients reviewed, 126 patients met the criteria for this study. For the primary outcome, 30-day readmissions occurred in 48 of 126 (34.4%) patients in the intervention group compared to 51 out of 412 (12.1%) patients in the control group ($p = 0.003$). There was no statistically significant difference in 30-day readmission rates amongst patients with CMS Core Measures ($p = 0.163$). Further review of 30-day readmission rates for each CMS Core Measure did not yield any statistically significant differences. A total of 1,000 patients received a completed admission medication reconciliation with an acceptance rate of 84.0% ($n = 28$).	Retrospective pharmacist reviewed AMRs showed no significant difference in 30-day readmission rates for Medicare patients age 65 years and older. Study limitations included a sample size insufficient to detect power, a retrospective design, and limited study duration. Further investigation through a larger, randomized controlled study could more adequately explore the impact of pharmacist involvement in medication reconciliation review programs.
Nunez-Medina, Ricardo H.	nunezrm@pdu.edu	Lee Health	Impact of Dihydropyridine Dehydrogenase Genetic Testing on Fluoropyrimidine Toxicity in a Multi-Center Health System	Fluoropyrimidines, including 5-fluorouracil, capecitabine and infusional, are oral treatments for various cancers but can cause severe toxicity due to genetic variations in the DPD enzyme, which is responsible for metabolizing these drugs. Genetic deficiencies in DPD can lead to prolonged exposure to toxic metabolites, increasing the risk of adverse effects like nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, neutropenia, hand-foot syndrome and neutropenia. Pharmacogenomic testing for DPD gene mutations can identify patients at risk for toxicity. This study aims to evaluate the impact of DPD testing on fluoropyrimidine dosages and alternative therapies. Despite evidence supporting the benefits of pre-treatment DPD testing, its adoption remains inconsistent due to barriers like limited provider familiarity and reimbursement issues. This study aims to evaluate the likelihood of toxicity in patients with and without DPD testing and assess healthcare providers' knowledge and confidence in implementing genetic testing.	This study was a mixed method retrospective medical chart review of clinical notes, conducted across 8 hospital system (four hospitals and two cancer centers) in the United States, aimed to assess the incidence of fluoropyrimidine-related toxicities in patients who received chemotherapy alone, with or without DPD genetic testing. The study included adults diagnosed with colon, esophageal, or pancreatic cancer between January 2018 and September 2024. For those receiving fluoropyrimidine, the primary outcome was the incidence of toxicities. This study also evaluated the incidence of toxicities in patients who received chemotherapy alone, with or without DPD testing and the incidence of toxicities in patients who underwent DPD testing. The primary outcome was to compare the toxicities experienced by patients who underwent DPD testing versus those who did not, while secondary outcomes included evaluating toxicity rates across cancer types and incident of hospitalizations. Additionally, healthcare providers' knowledge and confidence level regarding DPD genetic testing were assessed.	Of the 408 patients screened, 299 patients met inclusion criteria for the study, with 299 patients in the no-DPD test group and only 6 patients in the DPD test group. Among patients receiving fluoropyrimidine-based chemotherapy, no significant difference in toxicities was observed between the DPD test group (86.7%) and the no-DPD test group (82.4%) ($p = 0.24$). In conclusion, DPD testing did not reduce fluoropyrimidine-related toxicities in patients receiving fluoropyrimidine-based chemotherapy. This is the first study to most generally test conducted to evaluate effects rather than to implement genetic testing to reduce toxicities. The study is limited by its retrospective nature and lack of randomization. The average length of hospital stay, although the findings were not statistically significant due to low sample size in the DPD test group, over half of the patients still experienced fluoropyrimidine-related toxicities. These results highlight the importance of continued education and implementation of DPD testing to reduce fluoropyrimidine-related toxicities. However, the study has limitations, including difficulty in distinguishing whether observed adverse effects were due to fluoropyrimidine or other chemotherapy agents, and reliance on patient chart documentation for data collection. Survey results indicate that while most healthcare providers believe the use of DPD testing is important, there is a reduction in patient confidence and knowledge regarding the effective use of DPD test results. This emphasizes the need for targeted training to ensure the successful integration of DPD testing into clinical care.	
Ogleby, Jessica	jessica.ogleby@uva.edu	UVA Health Jacksonville	Rates of Euglycemia After Insulin Sliding Scale Order Patient Adjustment	Diabetes mellitus affects approximately 34.6 million Americans, making it one of the most widespread disease states in the United States. The goal of diabetes management is to maintain blood glucose levels within the target range while avoiding hypoglycemia. Among hospitalized individuals, hypoglycemia and hypoglycemia are associated with adverse outcomes, including increased morbidity and mortality. The 2024 American Diabetes Association (ADA) Standards of Care for Diabetes Management in Adults recommend that all patients with diabetes should be tested for hypoglycemia if patients experience 2 or more episodes ≥ 2 blood glucose readings ≤ 70 mg/dL within 24 hours. To go with the ADA recommendations, and as part of the UVA Health Jacksonville Glycemic Stewardship Initiative, the correction insulin protocols were rewritten on March 2023. The new protocol for insulin adjustment is as follows: 1. Assess for hypoglycemia. 2. If hypoglycemia is present, then the adjustments made to a sliding scale insulin will result in an increased percentage of patients who are euglycemic. The goal of this study will determine if the adjustment of insulin correction scale order parameters impacted overall glucose outcomes. Additionally, by investigating the outcomes of this new policy, we seek to contribute valuable evidence supporting safer and more effective insulin management for patients in the hospital.	This is a single-center, retrospective, observational study evaluating patients with a correctional insulin sliding scale ordered at UVA Health Jacksonville between January 1st - March 18th, 2024 compared to March 19th - June 30th, 2024. Patients will be included if they are at least 18 years of age, were admitted to a UVA ICU service, and received at least 2 doses of correctional insulin. The primary outcome is the percentage of patients who are euglycemic. Secondary endpoints include the percentage of patients who are at target glucose levels, the number of patients who required ICU admission, and the incidence of rates of hypoglycemia in hospitalized patients before and after insulin adjustment, whether or not patients required ICU admission or treatment for hypoglycemia. This study will determine if the adjustment of insulin correction scale order parameters impacted overall glucose outcomes. Additionally, by investigating the outcomes of this new policy, we seek to contribute valuable evidence supporting safer and more effective insulin management for patients in the hospital.	A total of 400 patients were included: 200 in pre-adjustment and 200 post-adjustment. Baseline characteristics were similar across the groups. The percentage of rates of euglycemia were similar in the pre-adjustment and post-adjustment groups. The incidence of rates of hypoglycemia in the post-adjustment group was statistically significant in comparison to the pre-adjustment group achieving euglycemia 54.4% of the time compared to 57.8% in the post-adjustment group ($p = 0.013$). Hypoglycemia rates were higher in the post-adjustment group ($p = 0.001$). A total of 20 patients required ICU admission, 10 in the pre-adjustment group compared to 4 days in the no-DPD test group ($p = 0.1$), and the total number of hospitalizations was one in both groups ($p = 0.39$). Additionally, an electronic survey of healthcare providers revealed that while 92% were familiar with the new policy, 52% reported difficulty in ordering or reading the new sliding scale insulin correction scale order. Survey results indicated that while most healthcare providers believe the use of DPD testing is important, there is a reduction in patient confidence and knowledge regarding the effective use of DPD test results. This emphasizes the need for targeted training to ensure the successful integration of DPD testing into clinical care.	
Okoli, Munachimso	muna.okoli@gmail.com	Tallahassee Memorial Healthcare	Comparison of furosemide and metolazone based regimens to furosemide drip in acute heart failure	Many heart failure (HF) patients are hospitalized for acute exacerbation. This presents as volume overload with symptoms of dyspnea, edema, and pulmonary congestion and diuretics are used to treat these symptoms. However, many patients who have inadequate diuretic doses experience dashes of diuresis. This scenario is known as diuretic resistance. The guidelines make two suggestions to overcome refractory volume overload, but there is no mention of a preferred method. The objective of this project is to compare the safety and efficacy of continuous infusion of furosemide (CF) to a combination of intermittent boluses of furosemide and metolazone (F+M) in HF patients with diuretic resistance.	This study was a retrospective chart review using the electronic medical records of patients at Tallahassee Memorial Hospital. Admissions of patients with a primary diagnosis of heart failure (HF) and a secondary diagnosis of acute exacerbation between August 1, 2022, and July 31, 2024, were identified via a Cerner-generated report. Patients who received a CF or F+M after failing two separate intermittent boluses of furosemide were included in the data analysis. The primary outcome was the total length of stay (LOS) and total urine output. Secondary endpoints were change in weight and change in serum, potassium, and magnesium levels from baseline to discharge. Secondary endpoints were change in weight and change in serum, potassium, and magnesium levels from baseline to discharge, and total urine output while on the diuretic medication regimen.	195 patient records were reviewed with 89 meeting the inclusion criteria for the study (F = 59 and F+M = 43). Majority of patients in both groups were males (52% F and 53% F+M) with mean age of 72 years (SD 13 years) for F and 70 years (SD 14 years) for F+M. There were no differences in LOS or F compared to F+M ($p = 1.6$, $p = 0.2$). There was no significant difference in total urine output between F and F+M ($p = 0.1$, $p = 0.2$). There was no significant difference between F and F+M for change in weight ($p = 0.1$, $p = 0.2$). There was no significant difference between F and F+M for change in serum potassium ($p = 0.3$, $p = 0.2$, $p = 0.5$), or magnesium ($p = 0.1$, $p = 0.1$, $p = 0.4$). The total urine output was significantly higher in patients on CF compared to F+M ($8,394$ vs. $5,205$, $p = 0.001$).	In this retrospective chart review, there were no significant differences in LOS, change in serum creatinine, weight, sodium, potassium, or magnesium when either CF or F+M was used in treatment of acute heart failure exacerbation with diuretic resistance. The use of a CF resulted in a greater amount of total urine output when compared to F+M.
Olowoemaine, Zenebia	zenobia2@live.com	Miami VA Healthcare System	Evaluation of the distribution of naloxone kits in patients diagnosed with opioid use disorder at the Miami Veterans Administration (VA) Healthcare System	United States (U) military veterans have been significantly affected by the opioid overdose crisis, with drug overdose mortality rates rising by over 50% between 2010 and 2019. Although opioid prescribing significantly declined between 2010 and 2019, trends still reflect those seen in the non-veteran U.S. population. One approach to reducing overdose risk is to focus on understanding high-risk subpopulations in order to decrease mortality and assist in harm reduction measures.	This IRB-approved retrospective chart review was performed using the Computerized Patient Record System (CPRS) and the Computerized Prescribing System (CPRS) and the prescription of controlled substances and naloxone at the Miami VA Healthcare System (VA). Patients identified as having OUD were reviewed to determine the need of a naloxone kit. Patients identified as in need of a naloxone kit were contacted to receive counseling on naloxone's role in overdose prevention. Patients were asked for consent to receive a naloxone kit in the mail. Those who consented had a naloxone order placed and documentation made in their chart. Patient data were collected and analyzed.	The study reviewed 88 patients diagnosed with opioid use disorder (OUD) to assess the distribution and acceptance of naloxone kits as part of a harm-reduction strategy. Of those patients contacted, 11 accepted the offer to receive a naloxone kit and 25 declined. F (by 2 patients were not able to be reached).	The preliminary findings of this study suggest that engaging veterans in naloxone distribution efforts presents significant challenges, with a notable portion of patients either declining to receive a naloxone kit or unable to be reached.
Osei-Arisby, Michael	michaelosaeiarsiibey@outlook.com	Tallahassee Memorial Healthcare	Evaluating the impact of haloperidol and diresipidol in treatment of cannabinoid hyperemesis syndrome in the emergency department	The prevalence of cannabinoid hyperemesis syndrome (CHS) has increased over the past decades due to increased cannabis use nationwide. Patients presenting to the emergency department (ED) with CHS symptoms are refractory to conventional first-line antihistamines, such as H1 and H2 antihistamines. The American Guidelines for the Treatment of Acute Cannabinoid Hyperemesis in the Emergency Department (DAG-CHS) recommends the use of haloperidol or diresipidol in the management of patients presenting with CHS. Various studies have compared haloperidol or diresipidol with different antihistamines, but none have compared both agents directly. This study evaluates the treatment impacts of diresipidol and haloperidol on CHS in the ED.	This retrospective chart review electronic medical records were reviewed for two ERs of 100-hour Tallahassee Memorial Healthcare (TMH). Adults aged 18 or older, presenting to the ED with signs and symptoms of CHS between January 1, 2022, and July 31, 2024, were identified via a Cerner-generated report. Patients with documented antihistamine use, including but not limited to H1 and H2 antihistamines, were excluded. The inclusion criteria for this study were patients who received either diresipidol or haloperidol for CHS treatment were included in the study. Patients were excluded if they were admitted to the hospital, pregnant or breastfeeding, allergic or intolerant to study drugs or received both diresipidol and haloperidol to manage CHS. The primary endpoint was the total ED length of stay (LOS). Secondary endpoints included use of other antihistamines, time from drug administration until ED discharge (LOS), and total daily administration median dose of study drugs and frequency of doses used.	2335 patient records were reviewed for 2024 meeting the inclusion criteria for the study. Diresipidol (n = 111) and haloperidol (n = 97). A numerically larger number of patients were in the diresipidol group (106 vs 96) and 59% of diresipidol users were female compared to 52% of haloperidol users. There was no difference in age between diresipidol and haloperidol users (7.9 vs. 7.02, $p = 0.283$). The total ED length of stay was not significantly different between haloperidol and diresipidol (5.41 vs. 5.46 hrs, $p = 0.873$). The median dose used was 50 mg for diresipidol and 10 mg for haloperidol. The total daily administration median dose of diresipidol was significantly lower in patients on diresipidol compared to haloperidol (0.9 vs. 1.4, $p = 0.005$). Antihistamines that were used the most in this retrospective chart review, there were no difference in LOS and TUD when either haloperidol or diresipidol was used in treatment of patients with CHS in the ED. The use of diresipidol resulted in lesser use of other antihistamines compared to haloperidol. Future studies should compare first and second-generation antihistamines at multiple study centers with option of switching patients from IV to PO for possible discharge for CHS treatment.	

Resident	Email Address	Practice Site	Research Title	Background	Methodology	Results	Description
Parsons, Sierra	ryleesara@gmail.com	Sarasota Memorial Hospital	Impact of a Clinical Decision Support Tool on Testing and Diagnosis of Hepatitis-Induced Thrombopenia in a Large Community Health Care System	Identification of hepatitis-induced thrombopenia (HIT) is a common problem presenting with a high rate of false positives and a high rate of false negatives. Guidelines recommend use of the 4T score to estimate the probability of HIT and assist in the decision for diagnostic testing. Patients with intermediate or high probability scores (≥4) should undergo further laboratory testing. A clinical decision support tool requiring the calculation of a 4T score was implemented in the hospital electronic medical record at Sarasota Memorial Hospital in June 2023. This study seeks to explore the impact of this clinical decision support tool on optimizing the evaluation and diagnosis of HIT in the institution.	This single-center, IRB-approved retrospective study included all inpatients ordered an inpatient HIT test as a result of physician variability testing (HIT) or functional assay such as a coagulation assay (aPTT) for suspected HIT. Patients who were younger than 18 years old were excluded. Patients ordered hepatic antibody testing between July December 2022 to June 2023 were assigned to the pre and post intervention groups, respectively. Overall, 145 patients were included in the study. The pre-intervention group included 74 patients and the post-intervention group included 71 patients. Hepatic antibody testing was performed using a commercial assay (INNO Diagnostics) and aPTT was performed using a commercial assay (INNO Diagnostics). HIT and SRBa were ordered in each group, number of specific HIT and/or SRBa ordered within a visit, number of HITs ordered with a low 4T score (0-3), versus retrospective investigator 4T scores, number of positive HITs and their associated laboratory test results, number of positive SRBa and their associated laboratory test results, hospital length of stay, and cost of laboratory test and alternative anticoagulation. Data was collected from the Clinical Data Mart, the Electronic Health Record (EHR) and HRM and collected using Excel and REDCap. Outcomes were analyzed using descriptive statistics with JMP® for inferential statistics. Inferential statistics included t-tests and Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate for interval, ratio, or ordinal data and Chi-Square for nominal data.	Of the 229 patients screened, 133 and 99 patients were included in the pre- and post-intervention group, respectively. There were 4,749 tests in total. There were 1000 admissions in the pre-group versus 2,686 in the post-group ($p < 0.001$). There was a 59% reduction in the rate of HIT tests ordered in the post-group per 1000 admissions (OR 0.44, 95%CI (0.33-0.56)). Overall, 145 patients were included in the study. The pre-intervention group included 74 patients and the post-intervention group included 71 patients. Hepatic antibody testing was performed using a commercial assay (INNO Diagnostics) and aPTT was performed using a commercial assay (INNO Diagnostics). HIT and SRBa were ordered in each group, number of specific HIT and/or SRBa ordered within a visit, number of HITs ordered with a low 4T score (0-3), versus retrospective investigator 4T scores, number of positive HITs and their associated laboratory test results, number of positive SRBa and their associated laboratory test results, hospital length of stay, and cost of laboratory test and alternative anticoagulation. Data was collected from the Clinical Data Mart, the Electronic Health Record (EHR) and HRM and collected using Excel and REDCap. Outcomes were analyzed using descriptive statistics with JMP® for inferential statistics. Inferential statistics included t-tests and Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate for interval, ratio, or ordinal data and Chi-Square for nominal data.	The implementation of the 4T clinical decision support tool significantly decreased HIT laboratory testing ordered in the post group compared to the pre group. This led to a more appropriate ordering of HIT testing and reduced expenditure on alternative anticoagulants, resulting in an estimated savings of \$63,507 in a 6-month period. Only patients with intermediate or high probability scores were included in this study. The study did not include patients with low probability scores. There was a 59% reduction in the rate of HIT tests ordered in the post-group per 1000 admissions (OR 0.44, 95%CI (0.33-0.56)). Overall, 145 patients were included in the study. The pre-intervention group included 74 patients and the post-intervention group included 71 patients. Hepatic antibody testing was performed using a commercial assay (INNO Diagnostics) and aPTT was performed using a commercial assay (INNO Diagnostics). HIT and SRBa were ordered in each group, number of specific HIT and/or SRBa ordered within a visit, number of HITs ordered with a low 4T score (0-3), versus retrospective investigator 4T scores, number of positive HITs and their associated laboratory test results, number of positive SRBa and their associated laboratory test results, hospital length of stay, and cost of laboratory test and alternative anticoagulation. Data was collected from the Clinical Data Mart, the Electronic Health Record (EHR) and HRM and collected using Excel and REDCap. Outcomes were analyzed using descriptive statistics with JMP® for inferential statistics. Inferential statistics included t-tests and Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate for interval, ratio, or ordinal data and Chi-Square for nominal data.
Pellett, Danielle	danielle.pellett@orlandohealth.com	Orlando Regional Medical Center-Orlando Health	Systolic blood pressure control in critically ill patients with spontaneous intracranial hemorrhage	Spontaneous intracranial hemorrhage (ICH) is a life-threatening condition accounting for 10-15% of all strokes, with high mortality and morbidity. Hypertension is the single most important risk factor, and systolic blood pressure (SBP) control is a common treatment. The 2020 SBP guidelines for intracranial hemorrhage (ICH) management recommendations clearly remain controversial. This study aims to compare the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association updated guidelines in 2022. Recommendations include initiating blood pressure lowering treatment 6 hours of ICH onset and reaching a target SBP of 140 mmHg. The 2020 guidelines recommend SBP control to 140 mmHg or less, but no more than 150 mmHg, but a target less than 130 mmHg is potentially harmful. In addition, avoiding peaks and large variability in SBP may improve functional outcomes. Gaps in knowledge remain. The safety and efficacy of early blood pressure lowering in patients with SBP greater than 150 mmHg is unclear. In October 2022, Orlando Health developed institutional guidelines for SBP management in critically ill patients with spontaneous ICH. In patients with an initial SBP between 150-220 mmHg, a SBP less than 150 mmHg is recommended. In patients presenting with a SBP greater than 220 mmHg, an SBP less than 170 mmHg is recommended. This study aims to compare the management and clinical outcomes of spontaneous ICH patients before and after guideline implementation.	This was a retrospective chart review of adult patients admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) at ORMC with spontaneous ICH. Patients were placed into one of two groups based on whether they were treated pre- or post-implementation of the spontaneous ICH guidelines (October 2022). Patients were categorized into pre-guideline (May 1, 2021 – September 30, 2022) and post-guideline (October 1, 2022 – April 30, 2023). Demographic data, SBP, and ICH characteristics were collected. Primary outcome was the incidence of hemotoma expansion, defined as worsening hemorrhage on repeat head computed tomography (CT) scan within 24 hours of the initial ICH. Secondary outcomes included neurological function, mortality, and hospital length of stay. SBP was recorded at time of admission (T0), 6 hours, 12 hours, 24 hours, and 48 hours post-admission, as well as a total in-hospital SBP. Mortality, incidence of additional hemorrhage, and hospital length of stay were recorded. SBP variability was calculated as the standard deviation of SBP recorded from the EHR and analyzed in SPSS software using Student's t-test, Mann-Whitney U test, Chi-squared, or Fisher's exact test as appropriate.	A total of 150 patients were included in the study, with 75 in the pre-guideline group and 75 in the post-guideline group. The incidence of hemotoma expansion was similar between the two groups, occurring in 27% of patients pre-guideline versus 26% post-guideline ($p = 0.72$). Neurologic deterioration was observed in 39% of patients in the pre-guideline group compared to 24% in the post-guideline group ($p = 0.17$). ICU and hospital length of stay were similar between groups, with means of 8.4 days and 10.4 days, respectively. Mortality was similar between groups, with 35% in the pre-guideline group and 36% in the post-guideline group ($p = 0.42$). SBP variability increased significantly post-guideline ($p < 0.001$). There was a trend toward less SBP variability in the post-guideline group (79 mmHg vs. 69 mmHg) ($p = 0.18$). The incidence of acute kidney injury (AKI) was 35% in the pre-guideline group and 36% in the post-guideline group ($p = 0.87$). Hypotension requiring vasopressors was significantly lower in the pre-guideline group (17%) compared to the post-guideline group (7%) ($p = 0.045$).	Implementation of an institutional SBP management guideline for spontaneous ICH patients was associated with no difference in the incidence of hemotoma expansion, neurologic deterioration, ICU/hospital length of stay, and in-hospital mortality. However, post-guideline patients demonstrated a significantly lower incidence of hypotension requiring the need for vasopressors, which may be a result of improved SBP management. Additionally, there was a trend toward less SBP variability and hypotension in the post-guideline group, although it did not reach statistical significance. One-third of the overall patients developed an AKI within 72 hours, underscoring a need for further research into the optimization of blood pressure management to avoid renal adverse events in patients with spontaneous ICH.
Pierce, Austin	Austin.Pierce@va.gov	Bay Pines VA Healthcare System	Evaluation of a Pharmacist-Led Weight Loss Clinic in an Outpatient Veterans Affairs (VA) Population	Obesity (BMI ≥ 30kg/m ²) is associated with increased morbidity, mortality, and burden of healthcare costs. Thus, clinical guidelines recommend pharmacotherapy in addition to diet, exercise, and behavioral modifications to those meeting the criteria for obesity. Additionally, the aforementioned therapies can be recommended in patients with a BMI ≥ 27 kg/m ² that have comorbidities such as diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, etc. Therapeutic success with pharmacotherapy is often limited due to side effects, cost, and lack of patient adherence. Weight loss is often recommended to be continued. Weight loss of at least 5% at three months signal potential failure and may warrant discontinuation and trial of alternative agents. A past quality improvement project on weight management medication use in the VA population was successful. This study aims to evaluate the implementation of a pharmacist-led weight loss clinic for VA patients with obesity. The goal of the clinic is to provide pharmacotherapy and behavioral modification to patients with obesity. The clinic will be staffed by a pharmacist and a dietitian. The dietitian will provide nutritional counseling and meal planning. The pharmacist will provide pharmacotherapy including: pharmacotherapy for obesity, behavioral modification, naltrexone, orlistat, semaglutide and tirzepatide to aid in improving patient outcomes related to weight management. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the pharmacist-led management of weight loss medications versus those of other providers.	This is a single-center retrospective cohort study conducted at the Bay Pines VA Healthcare System, utilizing the electronic health record (EHR) system. patients who have active prescriptions to one of the formulary approved weight management medications will be identified. A chart review of each patient will be completed and patients included in a pharmacist-led pilot program will be compared against patients who received the same medications managed by non-pharmacist providers. Efficacy will be measured by weight loss at 3 months. Safety will be measured by side effects, discontinuation, and patient satisfaction. Compliance and follow up will be compared between the pharmacist-led group versus the non-pharmacist led group. Reported adverse drug events will be recorded as safety data. Patients will be followed for 12 months. The primary outcome will be weight loss at 3 months. Secondary outcomes will be side effects, discontinuation, and patient satisfaction. White House and/or enrollment in a non-VA nutrition program will be used. Exclusion criteria will include pregnant patients.	Results and conclusions will be presented at the Florida Residency Conference	Results and conclusions will be presented at the Florida Residency Conference
Piene, Jude	Judeisdrpiere@gmail.com	Baptist Hospital of Miami	Improving Pharmacist Readiness in Transitioning to an Academic Medical Center	Pharmacists play an important role in optimizing medication therapy and supporting interprofessional care. As healthcare systems expand, pharmacists are increasingly expected to provide not only accurate medication dispensing, but also real-time clinical decision support. Preparing pharmacists for these evolving demands is essential, especially when transitioning from a community hospital setting to an academic medical center. To support this transition, a structured internal medicine pharmacotherapy curriculum has been designed to refresh clinical knowledge, review updated guidelines, and enhance confidence among experienced clinical pharmacists.	This was a single-site, IRB-exempt, qualitative improvement initiative that included a structured internal medicine pharmacotherapy curriculum. The primary objective of the pharmacotherapy curriculum was to refresh clinical knowledge and to assess the average score on a pre- and post-curriculum comfort level survey, while the secondary objective was to evaluate the average post-curriculum clinical competency score. The same pre- and post-curriculum comfort level survey was used to evaluate the average post-curriculum clinical competency score. The post-curriculum comfort level survey was developed in four near-peer blocks, with each presentation followed by a post-curriculum competency test consisting of 2-3 questions. Twenty-eight pharmacists were scheduled to participate in the curriculum, with pharmacists being included in 6 months, and 2 months thereafter, as well as reduction in total BME. Compliance and follow up will be compared between the pharmacists led group versus the non-pharmacist led group. Reported adverse drug events will be recorded as safety data. Patients will be followed for 12 months. The primary outcome will be weight loss at 3 months. Secondary outcomes will be side effects, discontinuation, and patient satisfaction. White House and/or enrollment in a non-VA nutrition program will be used. Exclusion criteria will include pregnant patients.	On the 28 pre-scheduled pharmacists, 22 completed both comfort level surveys and all post-curriculum competencies. Following the completion of the curriculum, pharmacists reported a mean increase of 2.8 points in comfort level on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. The mean increase in comfort level was statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). The average post-curriculum competency score across all participating pharmacists was 89%, with 87/92 (95%) achieving a score of 89%. Notably, six pharmacists (27%) achieved a perfect score of 100%.	The implementation of a structured internal medicine pharmacotherapy curriculum resulted in significant improvements in the clinical confidence of participating pharmacists, with post-curriculum competency scores reflecting a high level of pharmacotherapy knowledge. This study provides a model for the implementation of pharmacotherapy curriculum initiatives in transitioning pharmacy staff to academic clinical environments. Such programs may serve as a model for other institutions undergoing similar transformations, promoting high-quality care through improved pharmacist readiness.
Porben-Guzman, Laura	laura.porben-guzman@baptisthealth.net	Baptist Hospital of Miami	Evaluation of migraine treatment in the emergency department	Migraine has been recognized by the World Health Organization as a major public health concern due to its significant impact on individuals and the entire system. In the United States alone, migraine leads to approximately 1.3 million emergency department (ED) visits each year. Despite this high frequency, less than 25% of patients experience sustained headache relief following acute migraine treatment in the ED. This highlights a critical gap in effective management of acute migraine. The goal of this study is to evaluate the implementation of a migraine treatment algorithm to improve the rate of sustained headache relief following acute migraine treatment in the ED. Previous studies have shown that the implementation of an evidence-based treatment algorithm, a total of 120 adult patients presenting with chief complaint of migraine during the specified time frame were included, 50 in the pre-implementation and 50 in the post-implementation. Pregnant women were excluded. The primary outcome was the percentage of patients who received evidence-based migraine treatment. Secondary outcomes were the percentage of patients treated with episodic, percentage of patients admitted without migraine abortion and percentage of ED presentation due to migraine.	Single-site retrospective chart review of Baptist Hospital of Miami (BHM) from January 1st, 2023 pre and post implementation of an evidence-based treatment algorithm. A total of 120 adult patients presenting with chief complaint of migraine during the specified time frame were included, 50 in the pre-implementation and 50 in the post-implementation. Pregnant women were excluded. The primary outcome was the percentage of patients who received evidence-based migraine treatment. Secondary outcomes were the percentage of patients treated with episodic, percentage of patients admitted without migraine abortion and percentage of ED presentation due to migraine.	Algorithm implementation improved guideline-based migraine treatment adherence in the ED from 74% to 88%. The most used medications for migraine abortives were IV fluids, antiemetics and non-opioid analgesics. Utilization of algorithm led to about 40% improvement in the ED. Also, zero patients re-presented to the ED for migraine treatment following implementation of treatment algorithm.	The results of this study demonstrate the impact of migraine treatment optimization in the ED. By implementing an easy-to-follow, evidence-based algorithm, there was a significant decrease in unnecessary opioid prescriptions. Limitations include the small sample size, generalizability of findings, the subjectivity of patient reported pain severity and inability to capture re-admissions to other health care facilities. Future directions include developing an ED migraine treatment order set utilizing the treatment algorithm, emphasizing "treat to street" migraine care in the ED, and assessing inpatient prescribing trends for migraine management.
Prevost, Jacob	jacobprev@gmail.com	Bay Pines Veterans Affairs Healthcare System	Semaglutide in alcohol use disorder: a retrospective cohort study	Alcohol use disorder (AUD) is a prevalent substance use disorder leading to preventable death and comorbidity. Despite the availability of FDA-approved medications, including disulfiram, naltrexone, and acamprosate, as well as topiramate or latuda, less than 2% of the US population with AUD receive FDA-approved pharmacotherapy. Drug-drug interactions are a major concern in the treatment of AUD. Semaglutide is a once-weekly injectable GLP-1 receptor agonist with a low risk of drug-drug interactions, once-weekly dosing, and concurrent benefit in weight management, semaglutide may pose as a favorable alternative for patients receiving treatment for AUD. This study intends to build on preliminary evidence and drive hypothesis-generation support for the use of semaglutide in AUD.	This multi-center retrospective cross-sectional cohort study was conducted at the Bay Pines VA Healthcare system and included patients throughout the regional VA Healthcare System. The VA Corporate Data Mart (CDM) was queried for patients with a primary diagnosis of AUD and a secondary diagnosis of alcohol use disorder. A total of 1,267 VA patients were included in the study. The primary outcome was the percentage of patients with AUD who received semaglutide. Specifically included those with AUD-T scores reported both before and after an order for semaglutide. Additional data collected from identified patients included prescription information for semaglutide, AUD-T scores and presence of other comorbidities. The primary outcome was the percentage of patients with AUD-T scores at baseline and after semaglutide treatment, interactions, once-weekly dosing, and concurrent benefit in weight management, semaglutide may pose as a favorable alternative for patients receiving treatment for AUD. This study intends to build on preliminary evidence and drive hypothesis-generation support for the use of semaglutide in AUD.	Results and conclusions will be presented at the Florida Residency Conference.	Results and conclusions will be presented at the Florida Residency Conference.
Prosser, Maggie	maggiepr@prosperity.com	UF Health Jacksonville	Accuracy of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) Nasus Surveillance Tests in Below the Knee Skin and Soft Tissue Infections	Skin and soft tissue infections (SSTI), particularly those involving the lower extremities, are a leading cause of infections, as prevalent in hospitals and can result in significant morbidity and mortality. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) is a common pathogen in these infections. Current guidelines recommend empiric MRSA coverage for patients with specific risk factors; however, many patients are placed on this treatment even in the absence of such factors. Importantly, existing guidelines lack recommendations for de-escalation of therapy before confirming culture and sensitivity, which is ideal to reduce unnecessary antibiotic use. Nasus surveillance is a common method of screening for MRSA. The MRSA nasal polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test is increasingly used in hospitals to assess colonization. Studies have demonstrated a high negative predictive value (NPV) of 94.99%. The MRSA nasal PCR test, in conjunction with the use of the nasal culture, potentially improving outcomes and reducing adverse events associated with unnecessary antibiotic use.	This retrospective study examined adults that were admitted for any type of skin and soft tissue infection, including diabetic foot infections and osteomyelitis, that was occurring below the knee from January 1st, 2021 to October 1, 2024 at UF Health Jacksonville (Downsview and North Campuses). We included patients in the study if they had some type of culture done from their site of infection and they also had a MRSA nasal surveillance test done within 14 days of culture being collected.	There were a total of 258 cultures identified that were collected from a source that lies below the knee that were identified to be included in the study. Main reasons specified had to be excluded from the study was either due to duplicate cultures for a singular patient or the MRSA names were not collected within 14 days of the culture. In total, 117 patients were able to be included in the study after exclusion was completed. Out of the 117 patients, 90 of them had a negative MRSA nasal surveillance test, but only 85 of them were actually found to not have MRSA in their culture result. For the remaining 27 patients that tested positive on their MRSA nasal, 13 of the patients tested positive for MRSA in their collected cultures. From the data that was collected, a negative sensitivity of 95.58% and positive predictive value of 48.14% was found ($p < 0.001$). Also, the specificity and sensitivity of the collected data was 88.9% and 47% respectively.	This study discovered that when analyzing the utility of MRSA nasal for predicting the occurrence of MRSA infection in an area that lies below the knee that the negative predictive value of 95.58%. These results might show a slightly elevated negative predictive value due to the high occurrence of a culture negative result on cultures.

Resident	Email Address	Practice Site	Research Title	Background	Methodology	Results	Description
Tsakharis, Sherry	sherrytsakharis@comcast.net	Sarasota Memorial Hospital Venice	Amitodiazine, Diltiazem, or Metoprolol in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation and Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction in the Emergency Department	Atrial fibrillation (AF) is a common cardiac arrhythmia frequently seen in the hospital emergency department (ED). It is characterized by irregular and rapid heart rate, loss of normal heart rhythm (atrial fibrillation), and reduced heart function (HF), and can cause symptoms such as palpitations, chest pain, shortness of breath, dizziness, and heart failure. Managing atrial fibrillation (AF) and heart failure (HF) in the ED can be challenging, especially in patients with reduced ejection fraction (RVEF) which has been an ambiguous topic among emergency medicine providers. According to the 2023 American Heart Association (AHA) and American Stroke Association (ASA) guidelines, the primary goal of management is to achieve hemodynamic stability, and left ventricular systolic dysfunction, providers may elect to use a variety of rate control agents. This study aimed to assess and compare which intravenous rate control agent among amiodarone, diltiazem, and metoprolol achieved a faster time to target heart rate (HR) below 100 beats per minute (bpm) and which agent provided sustained control without compromising hemodynamic stability.	This is a multi-center, retrospective cohort, descriptive chart review study that included a total of 60 patients at Sarasota Memorial Hospital. Patients 18 years of age or older with a diagnosis of AF and HF and receiving either amiodarone, diltiazem, or metoprolol between January 2020 and January 2021. The primary outcome was time to target heart rate (HR) below 100 bpm. Secondary outcomes included duration of sustained HR control and duration of intravenous therapy. Other outcomes included rate control with oral agents, time to target heart rate (HR) below 90 bpm, and time to target heart rate (HR) below 80 bpm with a HR less than 60 bpm, administration of other cardiac medications (i.e., digoxin or loop diuretics), completion of a cardioversion or ablation, or admission to the intensive care unit. Data was collected from the institution's electronic medical record system, Altera Sunrise Clinical Manager, and recorded into REDCap.	A total of 60 patients were reviewed from January 2020 to March 2021. The median time required to achieve target HR control was 20 (IQR, 44-128) minutes for amiodarone, 40 (IQR, 37-70) minutes for diltiazem, and 34 (IQR, 1-24) minutes for metoprolol. Sustained rate control was maintained for 8.42 (IQR, 1.52-24.6) hours, and 3.47 (IQR, 1.82-2.0) hours for amiodarone and diltiazem, respectively. The median duration of infusion therapy for amiodarone was 1.25 (IQR, 0.25-2.25) hours, and 0.25 (IQR, 0.1-0.5) hours for diltiazem. The median duration of infusion therapy for metoprolol was 1.25 (IQR, 0.25-2.25) hours. The median time to target heart rate (HR) below 100 bpm required to achieve a target heart rate below 100 beats per minute (bpm) for each agent when used as a first line treatment. Secondary outcomes included duration of sustained HR control and duration of intravenous therapy. Other outcomes included rate control with oral agents, time to target heart rate (HR) below 90 bpm, and time to target heart rate (HR) below 80 bpm with a HR less than 60 bpm, administration of other cardiac medications (i.e., digoxin or loop diuretics), completion of a cardioversion or ablation, or admission to the intensive care unit. Data was collected from the institution's electronic medical record system, Altera Sunrise Clinical Manager, and recorded into REDCap.	Metoprolol had the shortest time to target HR, but had the least sustained control in patients with AF and RVEF. Metoprolol was associated with the highest incidence of adverse effects regarding hemodynamic instability (bradycardia and hypotension) and bradycardia. More patients in the amiodarone group were admitted to the intensive care unit than in the metoprolol or diltiazem groups. Healthcare systems should consider creating atrial fibrillation order sets specific to AF/EF as a strategy to encourage providers to select appropriate rate control agents for these patients. Further studies may consider comparing digoxin as an additional adjunct therapy for rate control amongst amiodarone, diltiazem, and metoprolol.
Tolayman, Ryan	ryan3247@yahoo.com	Holy Cross Health	Evaluating the Impact of Pharmacist-Led Heparin Infusion Monitoring	Unfractionated heparin (UFH) is classified as a high-alert medication by the Institute of Safe Medication Practices (ISMP) due to its potential to cause significant harm in error. Its narrow therapeutic window requires vigilant monitoring to prevent serious complications such as intravascular coagulation and hemorrhage. Anti-factor Xa monitoring is the preferred method of monitoring UFH. The Anti-Xa test is a quantitative assay that measures the concentration of UFH in the patient's blood. The Anti-Xa test is used to determine the therapeutic range of UFH. The Anti-Xa test is compared to aPTT monitoring. A quality improvement project led by a PGY1 Pharmacy Resident evaluated the impact of pharmacist-led heparin infusion monitoring on adherence to the institutional heparin infusion protocol aimed at optimizing anticoagulation therapy and enhancing patient safety.	This was a 4-month, single center, pre-post implementation cohort study. Eligible patients were ≥ 18 years of age and received UFH anticoagulation therapy for ≥ 24 hours. Patients receiving non-diluted infusion were excluded. The primary objective was to evaluate the impact of pharmacist-led UFH infusion monitoring on adherence to the institutional heparin infusion protocol and patient safety. Pharmacists identified patients on UFH and added them to a monitoring list in the electronic health record (EHR). Notifications were manually set for anti-Xa results. Upon availability, nursing staff were responsible for entering the anti-Xa results into the EHR. The primary outcome was the percentage of anti-Xa results that were within the therapeutic range. The secondary outcome was the percentage of anti-Xa results that were outside the therapeutic range. The primary outcome was adherence to the Heparin protocol, defined by appropriate bolus dosing and administration, correct adjustment, or no adjustment when the anti-Xa result was out of goal. The secondary outcomes included adjustment of the infusion rate, time to achieve therapeutic anti-Xa, a bolus dose, and time to achieve UFH-related delays-as well as the average time to action of infusion therapy. Sample characteristics collected and reported were age, weight, and sex. Categorical and continuous variables were analyzed using Chi-squared and t-test, respectively.	Baseline demographic characteristics were similar between groups. Mean age was 70.4 years (±1.5) in the pre-implementation group and 70.3 years (±1.3) post-implementation. Mean patient weight was 85 kg (±23.3) and 84.6 (±24.3) for the pre-implementation group and 86.8 (±26.9) of the post-implementation group. The anti-Xa levels reviewed, 467 (87.5%) were adhered to the protocol in the pre-implementation group, compared to 514 (92.3%) post-implementation (p=0.07). For secondary outcomes, 146 (31.3%) of the pre-implementation group and 120 (26.3%) of the post-implementation group had a bolus dose (p=0.63). There was a non-significant significant decrease in the average time to action of UFH (14.1 minutes in the post-implementation group (p=0.05), likely due to limited study power.	This study demonstrates that pharmacist-led UFH monitoring was associated with significantly improved adherence and safety. Future studies should evaluate the impact of pharmacist-led UFH monitoring on patient safety. Future research should investigate protocol adherence by patient location and time of day and explore the impact on patient-centered outcomes such as bleeding events and hospital length of stay.
Toledo, Ariana	ariana.toledo@orlandohealth.com	Orlando Health Bayfront Hospital	Evaluation and Comparison of a Clinical Intelligence Software vs Manual Data Analysis and its Impact on Assessing Surrounding Controlled Substance Practices	Drug diversion from healthcare workers poses immense safety threats to patients, potentially financial losses to the hospital, and can compromise patient care. The need for detection of drug diversion is critical to ensure the safety of patients. The use of manual data collection is time consuming and is currently the standard of care. As of September 2024, we will transition to a new artificial intelligence (AI) software that is designed to detect real-time incidents and notify pharmacy leadership immediately. The purpose of this study is to assess the time to detection of unreconciled incidents.	This study is a single center retrospective chart review of patients hospitalized at Orlando Health Bayfront Hospital who were prescribed a controlled substance followed by identification of an incident in our electronic health record or AI software. This study will be submitted to the Institutional Review Board for approval. Time to detection of an unreconciled incident will be measured from the time of prescription to the time of detection. The primary objective is to evaluate the time to detection of unreconciled incidents. All data will be reviewed to categorize the resources as appropriate, policy deviation, or inappropriate. Inappropriate will be defined as an unreconciled incident, policy deviation will be defined as a reconciled incident that deviated from standard protocol, and appropriate will be defined as a reconciled incident with no deviation from protocol.	236 detected incidents were reviewed and categorized into unreconciled and reconciled events. The primary objective was to average time to detection for a true unreconciled incident. Using our manual data analysis, time to detection was 34.7 hours and 83.9 hours using the AI software.	Based on the results, the AI software detects more incidents than the manual data analysis, and takes slightly longer to detect. A sample size of 400 incidents were needed to meet power, therefore power was not met.
Tones, Brian	brian592@hotmail.com	James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital	Pharmacists' role in the implementation and utilization of pharmacogenomics testing	Pharmacogenomics (PGx) is the study of genetic variations among an individual's drug metabolizing enzymes and drug targets. PGx can be used to predict how an individual will respond to a specific drug and can help to individualize treatment by optimizing patient therapy and minimizing the risk of adverse effects. Genetic variants not only impact the drug response, but can also influence drug interactions, particularly affecting the effectiveness of medications. As pharmacists, we are well-positioned to play a key role in the implementation and utilization of PGx. PGx can facilitate decision-making for a personalized approach to patient care. The Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) provides evidence-based guidance to support practices in the application and use of pharmacogenomic data for patients. The implementation of PGx in the clinical setting can improve patient outcomes and reduce costs in healthcare settings. This prospective quality improvement project aims to evaluate the clinical utility of the Pharmacogenomics Testing for Veterans (PHATeR) program across several pharmacy settings at the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital, including Pharmacy and Trauma and Acute Care (TAC) units. The goal is to expand the pharmacists' role in optimizing medication therapy by tailoring a patient's pharmacogenomic results.	In PACT, Clinical Pharmacist Practitioners (CPPs) identified patients currently prescribed or wanting to initiate statin therapy who are at higher risk for statin-related adverse effects. Eligible patients are included in the study by meeting one or more of the following: new statin initiation, advanced age (≥ 75 years old), recent statin dose increase, high BMI (≥ 35 kg/m 2), and/or high risk for statin-related adverse effects (e.g., history of hypertension, diabetes, or cardiovascular disease). Patients with Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease (ASCVD) or a ASCVD risk score greater than 20% on numeracy measures were excluded from this project. Patients previously enrolled in the PHATeR program were also excluded. Patients who were on a statin and had a statin dose increase were excluded from this project. All patients who were on a statin and were identified as being a potential drug-pump inhibitor for gastrointestinal-based prodrivatives were included in this project. CPPs alerted Clinical Pharmacy Technicians (CPTs) to eligible patients. The CPT obtained informed consent and performed a urine sample collection. The CPT then sent the sample to the PGx laboratory for analysis. The laboratory documented using "pharmacogenomic testing" in the electronic medical record. CPTs ordering pharmacogenomic testing for statins reviewed the results and made adjustments to the patient's statin. If a medication was found to be contraindicated, the CPT alerted the prescribing physician with a recommendation for change. A 10% rate of change benchmark was established to help determine clinical utility in PGx testing in the PACT and AC setting.	From December 2024 to April 2025, there were 8 pharmacogenomic tests that were ordered, and 54 test results that are available. There was 1 pharmacogenomic-related dose change out of 54 available test results. This change involved decreasing an antihypertensive dose. There were 5 potential pharmacogenomic-related dosing changes that involved 3 different statins. All of the changes were made by the CPT. The CPTs were able to identify the changes in the electronic medical record. CPTs were the drug class with the highest incidence of generic abnormalities (68.1%). The project results found that 68.1% of the patients using PGx testing had a change in their statin dose. The average time spent for the CPT to perform the test was 0.25 hours. The average time spent for the physician to analyze pharmacogenomic test results was 1.5 minutes. The average time spent for the CPT to consent a patient to pharmacogenomic testing was 0.12 minutes.	Based on the 8 completed tests (11.1%), hypothesized in the project, the addition of PGx testing in the PACT and AC setting is projecting to meet the 10% benchmark to show clinical utility. Some specific medications with potential benefit for PGx testing include clopidogrel and tacrolimus.
Traugott, Matthew	matthew.traugott@ascension.org	Ascension St. Vincent's Riverside Hospital	Comparison of vasopressin in obese versus non-obese patients in the management of septic shock	In patients with septic shock, the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines recommend the addition of vasopressin if an adequate mean arterial pressure (MAP) has not been achieved utilizing norepinephrine. These guidelines recommend that vasopressin should be used at a fixed dose of 0.03 units/min to reduce the incidence of VTE and its complications. Severe obesity in patients with septic shock is associated with a higher incidence of VTE and its complications. The purpose of this study was to compare the impact of fixed-dose vasopressin in obese versus non-obese patients with septic shock.	This was a retrospective, observational, IRB-approved, cohort study conducted across four hospitals. Subjects were included if they were ≥ 18 years of age or older, diagnosed with septic shock, and received vasopressin at a dose of 0.03 units/min for at least 48 hours. Subjects were excluded if they were diagnosed with shock from any other cause, transferred to another hospital, or had a history of VTE. The primary outcome of this study was change in vasopressin requirements 6 hours post vasopressin initiation, measured in norepinephrine equivalents (NE). Secondary outcomes included time to resolution of septic shock, time to resolution of septic shock, time to MAP \geq 65 mmHg, minimum number of vasopressors required, duration of vasopressin therapy, duration of vasopressin therapy, in-hospital mortality, and hospital ICU length of stay. To detect a difference of 0.1 mg/kg/min between NE groups, a sample size of 120 was calculated. The primary analysis was a paired t-test for continuous data, Chi-square or Fisher's exact test for categorical and nominal data. Furthermore, a multivariable linear regression was performed to adjust for potential confounding variables.	A total of 739 subjects underwent screening, of which 184 met inclusion criteria, equally distributed between groups. The primary reason for exclusion was failure to receive vasopressin (> 6 hours). Baseline characteristics can be found in Table 1. The primary analysis showed no significant difference in vasopressin requirements 6 hours post initiation between the non-obese group (mean 0.049 mg/kg/min, p=0.29) with a reduction in NE requirements in the non-obese group. A multivariable linear regression was conducted to adjust for potential confounders including SOFA score, baseline NE, history of chronic kidney disease, total bilirubin, and lactate. The primary analysis showed a significant reduction in NE at 6 hours in the non-obese group (p=0.21). Upon analysis of secondary outcomes, there was a statistically significant reduction in NE at 24 hours in the non-obese group compared to the obese group (p=0.28).	In obese subjects with septic shock, no significant difference was found in the change in vasopressin requirements at 6 hours post vasopressin initiation when compared to non-obese subjects. Likewise, no significant differences were found at 6 hours, 12 or 24 after vasopressin initiation. The results of this study reflect that fixed dose vasopressin is adequate in obese patients despite its hydrostatic pharmacokinetics.
Trinh, Quynh	qtrinh122@gmail.com	St. Joseph's Hospital North	Evaluating the Efficacy and Safety of Exenatide Dosing for Venous Thromboembolism Prophylaxis in Low Body Weight Patients	Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is a disease characterized by either deep vein thrombosis (DVT) or pulmonary embolism (PE). VTE is the third leading cause of cardiovascular death after a heart attack and stroke. About 200,000 VTE events happen every year in the United States, and they pose significant risks of morbidity and mortality. Pharmacologic prophylaxis with parenteral anticoagulants, such as enoxaparin, in higher risk hospitalized patients has been shown to reduce the incidence of VTE and its complications. Severe obesity during or after hospitalization has been shown to increase the risk of VTE and its complications. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of exenatide in low body weight patients with VTE prophylaxis. Previous studies have shown that exenatide is effective in reducing the risk of VTE in non-obese patients. However, there is limited data on appropriate dosing of exenatide for patients with low body weight. The purpose of this study is to			

Resident	Email Address	Practice Site	Research Title	Background	Methodology	Results	Conclusion
Zamora, Dajana	dayanazamora04@gmail.com	HCA Florida Mercy Hospital	Assessing clinical outcomes with thiamine as a therapeutic adjunct for septic shock in a community hospital intensive care unit: a pre and post observational study	Several studies have explored thiamine (Vitamin B1) as part of the Metabolic Resuscitation Protocol (hydrochloric acid, and thiamine) in septic shock. Given the severity of septic shock, its specific and associated therapy remains under-investigated. This study aims to evaluate thiamine as an effective therapy in patients receiving standard care for septic shock, focusing on its effects on clinical outcomes, 30-day mortality and vasopressor requirements.	We conducted a single-center, pre and post observational study in a 21-bed community hospital intensive Care Unit (ICU) to evaluate the effect of thiamine administration in patients diagnosed with septic shock. The study consisted of two 6-month recruitment periods. A retrospective cohort was studied from March 2024 to August 2024, where patients did not receive thiamine, and a prospective cohort was studied from September 2024 to February 2025, where patients received thiamine 100 mg intravenous, thiamine twice daily for 3 days within 48 hours of their septic shock diagnosis. Retrospective data was obtained from the Quality Department, who identified septic patients within the specified timeframe. Prospectively, data was extracted from the hospital's Electronic Health Record (EHR) system. We used the following inclusion criteria to identify patients receiving the specified thiamine dose. Patients with MeFitch, and positive symptoms to septic shock, who received a total of 300 mg of thiamine or older, presented with lactic acid levels > 2 mmol/L, and required at least one vasopressor for hemodynamic support. We excluded patients with allergies to thiamine, presented with anuria, patients with alcohol use disorder (AUD), and those who did not receive thiamine within the defined timeframe during their ICU stay. The primary outcomes were 30-day mortality, and the number of vasopressor-free days (VFD). Secondary outcomes included ICU length of stay, evidence of renal replacement therapy (RRT), and reduction in lactic acid levels.	Out of 144 patients assessed, 80 patients met inclusion criteria and were evaluated. Retrospective n = 66. Prospectively n = 78. We found that thiamine supplementation within 48 hours of septic shock diagnosis was associated with a 20% reduction in in-hospital mortality (46% vs 18%). Patients who received thiamine experienced more VFD (7.1 vs 4.8 days) and had greater reductions in lactate levels at 24–48 hours (3.2 vs 1.4 mmol/L). ICU length of stay was longer in the thiamine group (11 vs 9 days). No significant differences were noted in the need for RRT between groups. We further observed that patients requiring multiple vasopressors and those with positive cultures gained an additional 2.5 VFD on average.	In this pre and post observational study, adjunctive thiamine therapy was associated with reduced in-hospital mortality, more VFD, and improved lactate clearance in patients with septic shock. Although ICU length of stay was longer in the thiamine group, overall trends favor early administration of IV thiamine as a potentially beneficial adjunct in septic shock management.