

HOSPITAL ACQUIRED PNEUMONIA

Supporting information

This guideline has been prepared with reference to the following:

NICE. Pneumonia: diagnosis and management. 2025. London. NICE

<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng250>

NICE. COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing COVID-19. 2023. London. NICE.

<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng191>

Kalil AC, Metersky ML, Klompas M et al. Management of Adults With Hospital-acquired and Ventilator-associated Pneumonia: 2016 Clinical Practice Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the American Thoracic Society. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2016;63:e61-e111

<https://www.thoracic.org/statements/resources/tb-opi/hap-vap-guidelines-2016.pdf>

Masterton RG, Galloway A, French G, et al. Guidelines for the management of hospital-acquired pneumonia in the UK: report of the working party on hospital-acquired pneumonia of the British Society for Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2008;62:5-34

<http://jac.oxfordjournals.org/content/62/1/5.long>

Immediate treatment

Indications of severity

A 2024 systematic review compared four severity assessment tools (PSI, A-DROP, I-ROAD, and CURB-65) and found that neither had enough ability to predict mortality in healthcare-associated pneumonia patients and there were no significant differences in predictive performance among them (Noguchi, 2024). Overall the summary area under the curves were 0.70 (0.68 to 0.72), 0.70 (0.63 to 0.76), 0.68 (0.64 to 0.73), and 0.67 (0.63 to 0.71), respectively, for PSI, A-DROP, I-ROAD, and CURB-65 ($p = 0.66$).

Noguchi S, Katsurada M, Yatera K et al. Utility of pneumonia severity assessment tools for mortality prediction in healthcare-associated pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Rep.* 2024;14:12964

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11153623/>

Evidence Level: I

NSAIDS (including indometacin) should be avoided in patients taking ACE inhibitors?

A cross-sectional study in 301 patients (Loboz, 2005) investigated impaired renal function in those taking diuretics, ACE inhibitors and NSAIDs (the “target” drugs). Of the 301 patients, 135 were on no prior target drugs, 87 on one, 60 on two and 19 on three. There was a significant ($P < 0.01$) correlation between both creatinine and creatinine clearance with male sex, age and number of target drugs. Multivariate analysis confirmed these associations but did not support associations between renal function and heart failure or total number of diagnoses. Increasing doses of diuretics, possibly because in many cases this included two drugs, but not the other drugs, were significantly ($P < 0.001$) associated with impaired renal function. For the other three drug groups patients on doses of any drug at lower than the defined daily dose (DDD) did not have significantly different creatinine or creatinine clearance from those on doses at or above the DDD

Loboz KK, Shenfield GM. Drug combinations and impaired renal function -- the 'triple whammy'. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2005;59:239-43

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1884747/>

Evidence Level: IV

Vancomycin or Gentamicin for MRSA?

Not found an answer to your question? Wish to suggest an edit to this document?

Please contact the BCGP Clinical Effectiveness Librarian at bedsideclinicalguidelines@uhnm.nhs.uk

Vancomycin is widely regarded as the antibiotic of choice for MRSA (Lowy, 1998). Neither vancomycin (Georges, 1997; Rello, 1994) nor gentamicin (Noone, 1994) penetrate infected lung tissue easily and higher than normal peak serum concentrations are needed for patients with pneumonia. Both drugs have the potential for nephrotoxicity (Chow, 1994), although in the case of vancomycin, preparations since 1980 have been purer and less of a problem (Chow, 1994). A prospective, cohort study (Welty, 1994) showed that therapeutic drug monitoring reduced the incidence of vancomycin-associated renal insufficiency (7% in the TDM group of 61 versus 24% in the non-TDM group of 55).

Chow AW, Azar RM. Glycopeptides and nephrotoxicity. *Intensive Care Med* 1994;20:S23-S29

Georges H, Leroy O, Alfandari S, et al. Pulmonary disposition of vancomycin in critically ill patients. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 1997;16:385-8

Lowy FD. *Staphylococcus aureus* infections. *New Engl J Med* 1998;339:520-32

Noone P, Parsons TM, Pattison JR, et al. Experience in monitoring gentamicin therapy during treatment of serious gram-negative sepsis. *BMJ* 1974;1:477-81

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1633521/pdf/brmedj02179-0023.pdf>

Rello J, Torres A, Ricart M, et al. Ventilator-associated pneumonia by *staphylococcus aureus*: comparison of methicillin-resistant and methicillin-sensitive episodes. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1994;150:1545-9

Welty TE, Copa AK. Impact of vancomycin therapeutic drug monitoring on patient care. *Ann Pharmacother* 1994;28:1335-9

Evidence Level: IV

Subsequent management

Duration of antibiotic treatment?

A 2015 systematic review of RCTs compared the effectiveness of short versus prolonged-course antibiotics for hospital acquired pneumonia in critically ill adults. Six relevant studies (1088 patients) were found. For patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP), overall a short seven- or eight-day course of antibiotics compared with a prolonged 10- to 15-day course increased 28-day antibiotic-free days (two studies; N = 431; mean difference (MD) 4.02 days; 95% confidence interval (CI) 2.26 to 5.78) and reduced recurrence of VAP due to multi-resistant organisms (one study; N = 110; odds ratio (OR) 0.44; 95% CI 0.21 to 0.95), without adversely affecting mortality and other recurrence outcomes. However, for cases of VAP specifically due to non-fermenting Gram-negative bacilli (NF-GNB), recurrence was greater after short-course therapy (two studies, N = 176; OR 2.18; 95% CI 1.14 to 4.16), though mortality outcomes were not significantly different.

Pugh R, Grant C, Cooke RP et al. Short-course versus prolonged-course antibiotic therapy for hospital-acquired pneumonia in critically ill adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015:CD007577
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD007577.pub3/full>

Evidence Level: I

Last amended November 2025
Last reviewed January 2026