

REVIEW ARTICLE

Dan L. Longo, M.D., *Editor**Clostridium difficile* Infection

Daniel A. Leffler, M.D., and J. Thomas Lamont, M.D.

CLOSTRIDIUM DIFFICILE IS AN ANAEROBIC GRAM-POSITIVE, SPORE-FORMING, toxin-producing bacillus that is transmitted among humans through the fecal-oral route. The relationship between the bacillus and humans was once thought to be commensal,¹ but *C. difficile* has emerged as a major enteric pathogen with worldwide distribution. In the United States, *C. difficile* is the most frequently reported nosocomial pathogen. A surveillance study in 2011 identified 453,000 cases of *C. difficile* infection and 29,000 deaths associated with *C. difficile* infection; approximately a quarter of those infections were community-acquired.² Nosocomial *C. difficile* infection more than quadruples the cost of hospitalizations,³ increasing annual expenditures by approximately \$1.5 billion in the United States.⁴ In this article, we review the changing epidemiology of this infection, discuss risk factors and preventive strategies, outline current recommendations for treatment, and highlight developing strategies for disease control.

From the Division of Gastroenterology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston. Address reprint requests to Dr. Leffler at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, 330 Brookline Ave., Boston, MA 02215, or at dleffler@bidmc.harvard.edu.

N Engl J Med 2015;372:1539-48.


DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra1403772

Copyright © 2015 Massachusetts Medical Society.

PATHOGENESIS AND EPIDEMIOLOGY

C. difficile colonizes the large intestine and releases two protein exotoxins (TcdA and TcdB) that cause colitis in susceptible persons. Infection is transmitted by spores that are resistant to heat, acid, and antibiotics. The spores are plentiful in health care facilities and are found in low levels in the environment and food supply, allowing for both nosocomial and community transmission.⁵ Colonization is prevented by barrier properties of the fecal microbiota; weakening of this resistance by antibiotics is the major risk factor for disease (Fig. 1). Advanced age, antineoplastic chemotherapy, and severe underlying disease also contribute to susceptibility. Symptoms of colitis do not develop in all colonized persons. For example, the majority of infants are colonized with *C. difficile* but are asymptomatic,⁶⁻⁸ possibly owing to the lack of toxin-binding receptors in the infant gut, as shown in animal models⁹ and as suggested by the common development of antibodies to *C. difficile* toxins in infants without clinical infection.⁷

C. difficile diarrhea is mediated by TcdA and TcdB, which inactivate members of the Rho family of guanosine triphosphatases (Rho GTPases), leading to colonocyte death, loss of intestinal barrier function, and neutrophilic colitis. The organism itself is noninvasive, and infection outside the colon is extremely rare. The two factors that exert a major influence on clinical expression of disease are the virulence of the infecting strain and the host immune response. In the early 2000s, hospitals began reporting dramatic increases in severe *C. difficile* infection. Isolates were characterized by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as toxinotype III, restriction endonuclease analysis group BI, North American pulsed-field gel electrophoresis type NAP1, and polymerase-chain-reaction (PCR) type 027 and were subsequently known as BI/NAP1/027.¹⁰ The BI/NAP1/027 strain is characterized by high-level fluoroquinolone resistance, efficient sporulation, markedly high



toxin production,^{11,12} and a mortality rate three times as high as that associated with less virulent strains, such as the 001 or 014 ribotypes.^{13,14}


Asymptomatic colonization with toxigenic *C. difficile* in infants stimulates a durable immune response that appears to protect against symptomatic infection later in life.⁷ For example, high titers of serum IgG antitoxins to TcdA and TcdB are associated with asymptomatic colonization in hospitalized patients exposed to antibiotics.¹⁵ Immunization of experimental animals with TcdA is also protective,¹⁶ and passive immunization with monoclonal antibodies directed at TcdA and TcdB in patients who have acute *C. difficile* infection reduces the overall recurrence rate.¹⁷

The incidence of *C. difficile* infection among hospitalized patients varies widely from year to year and in different locations but has generally been increasing, to almost 15 cases per

1000 hospital discharges¹⁸ and approximately 20 cases per 100,000 person-years in the community¹⁹ (Fig. 2). *C. difficile* infection was first recognized in Western Europe and North America, where the BI/NAP1/027 strain originated. However, *C. difficile* now has global reach, and epidemic strains can be found in diverse hospital settings.²⁰

RISK FACTORS

The most important risk factor for *C. difficile* infection remains antibiotic use. Ampicillin, amoxicillin, cephalosporins, clindamycin, and fluoroquinolones are the antibiotics that are most frequently associated with the disease, but almost all antibiotics have been associated with infection (Table 1). Paradoxically, many predisposing antibiotics show at least some in vitro activity against *C. difficile*, and regimens including metronidazole can both incite the disease and provide effective treatment.²¹ In hospitals and long-term care facilities, environmental contamination and frequent antibiotic usage are risk factors for infection.²² The risk of *C. difficile* infection and the severity of infection increase as age increases^{23,24} (Fig. 2). In one study, the risk of contracting *C. difficile* during an outbreak was 10 times as high among persons older than 65 years of age as among younger inpatients.²⁵ The majority of *C. difficile* infections are hospital-acquired, but community-acquired infection has increased dramatically in the past decade²⁶ and may now account for up to a third of new cases.²⁷ Community-acquired *C. difficile* is defined as disease onset in a person who had no overnight stay in a health care facility within 12 weeks before infection; the definition does not rule out acquisition in a health care facility. As compared with nosocomial infection, community-acquired *C. difficile* infection occurs in patients who are younger and more often have had no clear exposure to antibiotics or other known risk factors; major modes of acquisition of community-acquired infection remain to be elucidated. Furthermore, morbidity and mortality associated with community-acquired *C. difficile* infection are lower than those associated with nosocomial infection, because of the younger age and fewer coexisting conditions of the nonhospitalized population; however, up to 40% of patients with community-acquired infection require hospitalization, and



rates of recurrence are similar among the two populations.^{19,27}

The influence of acid suppression in *C. difficile* infection remains uncertain. In theory, gastric acid suppression should allow more vegetative organisms to reach the colon; however, *C. difficile* spores, the vectors for infection, are acid-resistant and remain viable at gastric pH. Some investigators have reported an increased risk of infection in association with acid suppression,²⁸ whereas others, after adjusting for coexisting conditions, have not confirmed an increased risk.^{22,29,30} Other documented risk factors for infection include advanced age, inflammatory bowel disease, organ transplantation, chemotherapy, chronic kidney disease, immunodeficiency, and exposure to an infant carrier or infected adult.^{19,31}

C. difficile infection is associated with severe illness, infection-related mortality of 5%, and all-cause mortality of 15 to 20%.^{3,32} Severe *C. difficile* infection, identified by a white-cell count greater than 15,000 per cubic millimeter, hypoalbuminemia, and acute kidney injury, is an independent predictor of urgent colectomy and death.^{32,33} Risk factors are similar to those for recurrent *C. difficile* infection and include advanced age, a severe initial episode of *C. difficile* infection, and ongoing use of antibiotics not directed at *C. difficile*.^{34,35}

DIAGNOSIS

C. difficile infection is currently diagnosed either by enzyme immunoassay for toxins in stool or by DNA-based tests that identify the microbial toxin genes in unformed stool. Stool culture for *C. difficile* requires anaerobic culture and is not widely available. Enzyme immunoassay used to be the mainstay of testing for *C. difficile* infection, since it is rapid and easily performed. Recently, many hospital laboratories have adopted DNA-based tests that detect toxigenic strains and provide higher sensitivity and specificity than does enzyme immunoassay. Some DNA-based tests also detect the presence of the BI/NAP1/027 strain, a finding that may influence the choice of therapy, since fidaxomicin is associated with a reduction in the risk of recurrence of non-BI/NAP1/027 strains only, as compared with vancomycin. DNA assays for *C. difficile* infection may appear to show a higher incidence of infection than earlier tests³⁶ because the high sensitivity of DNA assays allows for low levels of toxigenic organisms of uncertain clinical significance. The concern that DNA assays can detect clinically insignificant infections is supported by the results of recent studies that suggest that detection of toxigenic *C. difficile* by DNA testing in the absence of free toxin in the stool does not influ-

Table 1. Antibiotic Classes and Their Association with *Clostridium difficile* Infection.*

Class	Association with <i>C. difficile</i> Infection
Clindamycin	Very common
Ampicillin	Very common
Amoxicillin	Very common
Cephalosporins	Very common
Fluoroquinolones	Very common
Other penicillins	Somewhat common
Sulfonamides	Somewhat common
Trimethoprim	Somewhat common
Trimethoprim–sulfamethoxazole	Somewhat common
Macrolides	Somewhat common
Aminoglycosides	Uncommon
Bacitracin	Uncommon
Metronidazole	Uncommon
Teicoplanin	Uncommon
Rifampin	Uncommon
Chloramphenicol	Uncommon
Tetracyclines	Uncommon
Carbapenems	Uncommon
Daptomycin	Uncommon
Tigecycline	Uncommon

* Specific antibiotics are listed if their association with *C. difficile* infection differs from that of most other antibiotics in their class.

ence clinical outcomes.^{33,37} In the future, highly sensitive quantitative toxin assays may also contribute to diagnostic algorithms.

Conversely, heterogeneous diagnostic tests and lack of clinical suspicion contribute to delayed diagnosis.³⁸ Sequential testing with the use of PCR and enzyme immunoassay has been advocated,³⁹ but in clinical practice, in a patient with diarrhea, positive results of either enzyme immunoassay or PCR assay should prompt treatment. Endoscopy is rarely required but may be helpful in patients with an overlapping condition such as inflammatory bowel disease. Conversely, the negative predictive value of PCR assay and enzyme immunoassay is more than 95% in average-risk groups, and negative results should prompt evaluation for other causes.³⁹

Stool testing for *C. difficile* toxins should be confined to patients with diarrhea. Although a

substantial proportion of at-risk, hospitalized patients may be colonized, the testing and treatment of persons with solid stools is not recommended. Similarly, posttreatment testing has no role in confirming eradication. Many successfully treated patients will continue to test positive for weeks or months after the resolution of symptoms; additional treatment is neither required nor effective.⁴⁰ More difficult is the decision of when to test and treat patients who have mild ongoing or recurrent diarrhea after initial treatment. In such patients, stool testing can be helpful in differentiating recurrent *C. difficile* infection from postinfectious irritable bowel syndrome or inflammatory bowel disease that can be triggered by acute enteric infections.

PREVENTION

In the absence of an effective vaccine, infection control has focused on antibiotic stewardship, prevention of spread in health care facilities, and probiotics. Minimizing antibiotic use has been successful in decreasing *C. difficile* infection in hospitalized patients.⁴¹ The prohibiting of the routine use of ceftriaxone and ciprofloxacin accompanied by an educational campaign reduced the rate of *C. difficile* infection by 77% in a 450-bed hospital in Scotland.⁴² However, strict stewardship of antibiotics is labor-intensive and may not be effective in all settings.⁴¹

C. difficile is nearly ubiquitous in health care facilities, and viable spores can be identified on the hands and stethoscopes of health care workers, on bedding, on telephones, in bathrooms, and on bedside furniture.⁴³ Using alcohol-based hand sanitizers does not reduce the number of viable *C. difficile* spores, whereas washing with soap and water does.⁴⁴ However, because the availability and convenience of hand-sanitizer solutions greatly increases overall adherence to hand hygiene,⁴⁵ alcohol-based preparations are likely to remain standard. Patients with known or suspected *C. difficile* infection should be isolated in a single room, and health care professionals should wear gloves and gowns and wash hands with soap and water; postdischarge disinfection of the room is also recommended.⁴⁶

The use of probiotics to prevent *C. difficile* colonization could be a safe and easily adoptable control strategy. Various strains of probiotics are effective for the prevention of noninfectious,

antibiotic-associated diarrhea.⁴⁷ Initial studies evaluating the use of probiotics for control of antibiotic-associated diarrhea were underpowered for the detection of protection against *C. difficile* infection. More recent studies have shown mixed results, with a few studies showing that probiotics conferred significant protection in cohorts with unusually high rates of *C. difficile* infection^{48,49} and another study showing no protection in hospital inpatients who had low rates of infection.⁵⁰ At present, probiotics have an uncertain effect on the prevention of *C. difficile* infection, and their routine use for the prevention or treatment of active infection is not recommended.

TREATMENT OF ACUTE INFECTION

Metronidazole and oral vancomycin have been the mainstays of treatment for *C. difficile* infection since the 1970s, and despite their use by millions of patients, clinically important resistance to either vancomycin or metronidazole has not been reported. For the treatment of severe disease, vancomycin is better than metronidazole, but for mild-to-moderate infection, the two antibiotics have been considered to be equivalent.⁵¹ However, a marked rise in clinical failure associated with metronidazole, especially in patients with the BI/NAP1/027 strain, has been seen in the past decade.⁵² Previous studies were underpowered to evaluate differences between metronidazole and vancomycin in cases of nonsevere infection, but recent data suggest an overall superiority of vancomycin. Studies of tolevamer, a toxin-binding polymer, showed that with respect to curing acute *C. difficile* infection, tolevamer was inferior to vancomycin and to metronidazole, but the studies also showed that clinical success, defined as resolution of diarrhea, was lower with metronidazole than with vancomycin (73% vs. 81%, $P=0.02$).⁵³ The superiority of vancomycin was observed in patients with mild disease, those with moderate disease, and those with severe disease.⁵³ These factors, along with the more frequent side effects associated with metronidazole and the decreasing cost of generic vancomycin, have led to increasing use of vancomycin.^{54,55} (Table 2).

In 2011, fidaxomicin, a poorly absorbed, bactericidal, macrocyclic antibiotic with activity against specific anaerobic gram-positive bacteria, was approved by the Food and Drug Admin-

istration (FDA) for the treatment of *C. difficile* infection. In phase 3 clinical trials, the cure rate for acute infection was nearly equivalent among patients receiving fidaxomicin and those receiving vancomycin (approximately 90% for each), but the risk of recurrence was 15% among patients receiving fidaxomicin, as compared with 25% among those receiving vancomycin.^{56,57} However, a reduced risk of recurrence was not seen among patients infected with the BI/NAP1/027 strain, which was found in 38% of isolates. The markedly higher cost of fidaxomicin has limited its use, despite its superiority to vancomycin in reducing the risk of recurrence (Table 1).

TREATMENT OF RECURRENT INFECTION

The risk of *C. difficile* recurrence ranges from 20% after an initial episode to 60% after multiple prior recurrences.^{58,59} The costs associated with recurrent infection may exceed those associated with primary infection.⁶⁰ Recurrence is most often due to reexposure to or reactivation of spores in patients who have an impaired immune response to infection and weakened barrier function of the colonic microbiota.

ANTIBIOTIC TREATMENT

Treatment of a first episode of recurrent infection with a repeat course of either metronidazole or vancomycin for 10 to 14 days is successful in approximately 50% of patients.^{31,34} Second and subsequent recurrences can be difficult to cure, primarily because of the persistence of spores in the bowel or environment and the inability of the patient to mount an effective immune response to *C. difficile* toxins, rather than to antibiotic resistance.⁶¹ Second recurrences can be treated with fidaxomicin (200 mg twice a day for 10 days) or by a vancomycin regimen involving tapered (decreased over time) and pulsed (intermittent [i.e., every few days]) dosing (Table 2). Recent data suggest that fidaxomicin may be more effective than vancomycin at preventing further episodes of *C. difficile* after an initial recurrence.⁶²

Options are limited for patients with severe colitis in whom vancomycin and fidaxomicin are ineffective. Emergency colectomy for fulminant *C. difficile* infection is associated with mortality as high as 80%, although a diverting ileostomy and a colonic lavage with vancomycin may be an

Table 2. Treatment of *Clostridium difficile* Infection.*

Severity	Clinical Manifestations	Treatment
Asymptomatic carrier	No symptoms or signs	No treatment indicated
Mild†	Mild diarrhea (3 to 5 unformed bowel movements per day), afebrile status, mild abdominal discomfort or tenderness, and no notable laboratory abnormalities	Predisposing antibiotic cessation, hydration, monitoring of clinical status, and either administration of metronidazole (500 mg three times per day) or close outpatient monitoring without the administration of antibiotics
Moderate	Moderate nonbloody diarrhea, moderate abdominal discomfort or tenderness, nausea with occasional vomiting, dehydration, white-cell count >15,000/mm ³ , and blood urea nitrogen or creatinine levels above baseline	Consideration of hospitalization and cessation of predisposing antibiotics; hydration, monitoring of clinical status, and either administration of oral metronidazole (500 mg three times per day) or first-line therapy with oral vancomycin (125 mg four times per day for 14 days)
Severe	Severe or bloody diarrhea, pseudomembranous colitis, severe abdominal pain, vomiting, ileus, temperature >38.9°C, white-cell count >20,000/mm ³ , albumin level <2.5 mg/dl, and acute kidney injury	Hospitalization; oral or nasogastric vancomycin (500 mg four times per day) with or without intravenous metronidazole (500 mg three times per day), or oral fidaxomicin (200 mg twice a day for 10 days) instead of vancomycin if the risk of recurrence is high
Complicated	Toxic megacolon, peritonitis, respiratory distress, and hemodynamic instability	Antibiotics as for severe infection, and surgical consultation for subtotal colectomy or a diverting ileostomy with vancomycin colonic lavage; consideration of fecal microbial transplantation or additional antibiotics
First recurrence		Oral vancomycin (125 mg four times per day for 14 days) or oral fidaxomicin (200 mg twice a day for 10 days)
Second or further recurrence		Vancomycin in a tapered and pulsed regimen‡, fecal microbial transplantation, or fidaxomicin (200 mg twice a day for 10 days)

* Some data are from Debast et al.⁵⁴ and Cohen et al.⁵⁵

† *C. difficile* infection should be considered mild only if it occurs in outpatients.

‡ A tapered and pulsed regimen involves the administration of vancomycin as follows: 125 mg four times a day for 1 week, 125 mg three times a day for 1 week, 125 mg twice a day for 1 week, 125 mg daily for 1 week, 125 mg once every other day for 1 week, and 125 mg every 3 days for 1 week.

effective alternative.⁶³ Other antibiotics that have activity against *C. difficile* are rifaximin, nitazoxanide, ramoplanin, teicoplanin, and tigecycline. However, because of limited data, high cost, an unfavorable adverse-event profile, and resistance to *C. difficile* (associated with rifaximin in particular), the use of these agents is not recommended except in cases of unacceptable adverse effects associated with standard therapy, the need for salvage therapy for fulminant disease when surgery is not possible, and intractable recurrent infection (Table 2).

FECAL MICROBIAL TRANSPLANTATION

The human colonic microbiota, which provides colonization resistance against bacterial patho-

gens, is considered to be a key determinant in the pathogenesis of *C. difficile*. After a patient has had brief exposure to oral antibiotics, a rapid decline in fecal microbial diversity is common and may last many months.^{64,65} Stopping the administration of all antibiotics is the best way to eliminate *C. difficile* from the colon and allow the fecal microbiota to recover spontaneously. However, recovery may take 12 weeks or longer, during which patients may have a relapse. Fecal microbial transplantation, a procedure that was first reported in 1958,⁶⁶ has recently emerged as an accepted, safe, and effective treatment for recurrent *C. difficile* infection. The FDA initially suggested that an investigational new drug (IND) application would be necessary before treatment


of *C. difficile* infection with fecal microbial transplantation but later ruled that it would allow fecal microbial transplantation for this indication without an IND application, although informed consent is still required.⁶⁷

The precise components of the fecal microbiome that provide resistance against *C. difficile* are not known, but the phyla Bacteroidetes and Firmicutes are thought to comprise critical components of the material that needs to be transplanted.^{68,69} The oral or rectal transplantation of feces from a healthy, pretested donor and the simultaneous cessation of all antibiotic use in the recipient are successful in treating more than 90% of patients with recurrent *C. difficile* infection.⁷⁰ Although the transmission of an undetected or unidentifiable pathogen from the donor is a possibility, there are no known reports of serious infectious complications resulting from fecal microbial transplantation that was performed with appropriate donor screening. In 2013, the results of a randomized, controlled trial of fecal microbial transplantation were reported.⁷¹ The trial showed that the administration of vancomycin followed by an infusion of donor feces delivered by nasoduodenal tube was safe and superior to vancomycin alone for recurrent *C. difficile* infection (Fig. 3).

Given the efficacy of fecal microbial transplantation for recurrent infection, there has been growing interest in its use for severe primary disease.⁷² To date, there are few studies about this treatment approach, and although case series are promising,^{72,73} more work is needed to understand the possible role of fecal microbial transplantation in primary *C. difficile* infection. In addition, efforts to develop a suitable mixture of cultured fecal bacteria as a substitute for stool in fecal microbial transplantation are under way. Capsules administered orally that contain the spores of fecal bacteria have shown efficacy in treating recurrent disease and warrant further testing as a substitute.⁷⁴

IMMUNIZATION

Results of the immunization of animals with toxoids TcdA and TcdB⁷⁵ and findings showing the protective effect of naturally acquired serum IgG antitoxins in patients colonized with *C. difficile* suggest the potential for vaccination of humans against *C. difficile* infection.^{15,76} Passive



immunization with monoclonal antibodies to *C. difficile* toxins also provides substantial protection from recurrence after acute infection and may be cost-effective in patients who are at high risk for recurrence.¹⁷

Vaccination against the toxins of *C. difficile* offers the possibility of an effective and rela-

tively inexpensive approach to prevention. Initial phase 1 studies have shown strong antitoxin responses in healthy volunteers immunized with toxoids of TcdA and TcdB.⁷⁷ At least two international, placebo-controlled studies are currently under way to test the immunogenicity, safety, and efficacy of vaccination for the prevention of nosocomial *C. difficile* infection (ClinicalTrials.gov numbers, NCT01887912 and NCT02117570). The larger of these trials involves the administration of three doses of toxoid vaccine or placebo in 15,000 study participants and an evaluation of the risk of acute disease over the course of 3 years. It is unclear whether vaccination will be used for primary or secondary prevention and whether vaccination will prevent or lessen the severity of clinical infection. Clinical use will depend on numerous variables, including safety, efficacy, and cost-effectiveness, as well as improved ability to predict the risk of *C. difficile* infection. In addition, neither vaccination nor the administration of monoclonal antibodies is likely to eliminate colonization, so isolation of patients will still be necessary to prevent transmission. Nevertheless, if studies are positive, it is likely that vaccination will become prevalent.

SUMMARY

Despite concerted efforts to improve the prevention and treatment of *C. difficile* infection, this infection remains common and serious in both hospitals and the community. In recent years, fecal microbial transplantation has emerged as a safe and very effective strategy for the treatment of recurrent infection. With further refinement, fecal microbial transplantation will most likely become the standard of care for recurrent infection. Newer antibiotics with clinical activity against *C. difficile* are now available, but widespread use has been limited by their cost, which is higher than the cost of vancomycin. Although antibiotic stewardship and decontamination in health care settings remain essential for infection control, effective probiotics and vaccination will most likely become important tools for the prevention of *C. difficile* infection in the future. Until such time, *C. difficile* infection will continue to be a common and highly morbid consequence of antibiotic use.

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org.

REFERENCES

- Hall IC, O'Toole E. Intestinal flora in newborn infants with a description of a new pathogenic anaerobe, *Bacillus difficilis*. *Am J Dis Child* 1935;49:390-3.
- Lessa FC, Mu Y, Bamberg WM, et al. Burden of *Clostridium difficile* infection in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:825-34.
- Lofgren ET, Cole SR, Weber DJ, Anderson DJ, Moehring RW. Hospital-acquired *Clostridium difficile* infections: estimating all-cause mortality and length of stay. *Epidemiology* 2014;25:570-5.
- Zimlichman E, Henderson D, Tamir O, et al. Health care-associated infections: a meta-analysis of costs and financial impact on the US health care system. *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173:2039-46.
- Rupnik M. Is *Clostridium difficile*-associated infection a potentially zoonotic and foodborne disease? *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2007;13:457-9.
- Jangi S, Lamont JT. Asymptomatic colonization by *Clostridium difficile* in infants: implications for disease in later life. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2010;51:2-7.
- Viscidi R, Laughon BE, Yolken R, et al. Serum antibody response to toxins A and B of *Clostridium difficile*. *J Infect Dis* 1983;148:93-100.
- Rousseau C, Poilane I, De Pontual L, Maherault AC, Le Monnier A, Collignon A. *Clostridium difficile* carriage in healthy infants in the community: a potential reservoir for pathogenic strains. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012;55:1209-15.
- Eglow R, Pothoulakis C, Itzkowitz S, et al. Diminished *Clostridium difficile* toxin A sensitivity in newborn rabbit ileum is associated with decreased toxin A receptor. *J Clin Invest* 1992;90:822-9.
- O'Connor JR, Johnson S, Gerding DN. *Clostridium difficile* infection caused by the epidemic BI/NAP1/027 strain. *Gastroenterology* 2009;136:1913-24.
- McDonald LC, Killgore GE, Thompson A, et al. An epidemic, toxin gene-variant strain of *Clostridium difficile*. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353:2433-41.
- Akerlund T, Persson I, Unemo M, et al. Increased sporulation rate of epidemic *Clostridium difficile* type 027/NAP1. *J Clin Microbiol* 2008;46:1530-3.
- Loo VG, Poirier L, Miller MA, et al. A predominantly clonal multi-institutional outbreak of *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea with high morbidity and mortality. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353:2442-9.
- Warny M, Pepin J, Fang A, et al. Toxin production by an emerging strain of *Clostridium difficile* associated with outbreaks of severe disease in North America and Europe. *Lancet* 2005;366:1079-84.
- Kyne L, Warny M, Qamar A, Kelly CP. Asymptomatic carriage of *Clostridium difficile* and serum levels of IgG antibody against toxin A. *N Engl J Med* 2000;342:390-7.
- Ghose C, Kalsy A, Sheikh A, et al. Transcutaneous immunization with *Clostridium difficile* toxoid A induces systemic and mucosal immune responses and toxin A-neutralizing antibodies in mice. *Infect Immun* 2007;75:2826-32.
- Lowy I, Molrine DC, Leav BA, et al. Treatment with monoclonal antibodies against *Clostridium difficile* toxins. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:197-205.
- Steiner C, Barrett M, Weiss A. HCUP projections: *Clostridium difficile* hospitalizations 2001 to 2013. HCUP Projections Report #2014-01. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2014 (<http://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/reports/projections/2014-03.pdf>).
- Chitnis AS, Holzbauer SM, Belflower RM, et al. Epidemiology of community-associated *Clostridium difficile* infection, 2009 through 2011. *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173:1359-67.
- He M, Miyajima F, Roberts P, et al. Emergence and global spread of epidemic

- healthcare-associated *Clostridium difficile*. *Nat Genet* 2013;45:109-13.
21. Bingley PJ, Harding GM. *Clostridium difficile* colitis following treatment with metronidazole and vancomycin. *Postgrad Med J* 1987;63:993-4.
 22. Pépin J, Saheb N, Coulombe MA, et al. Emergence of fluoroquinolones as the predominant risk factor for *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea: a cohort study during an epidemic in Quebec. *Clin Infect Dis* 2005;41:1254-60.
 23. Carignan A, Allard C, Pépin J, Cossette B, Nault V, Valiquette L. Risk of *Clostridium difficile* infection after perioperative antibacterial prophylaxis before and during an outbreak of infection due to a hypervirulent strain. *Clin Infect Dis* 2008;46:1838-43.
 24. Lessa FC, Gould CV, McDonald LC. Current status of *Clostridium difficile* infection epidemiology. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012;55:Suppl 2:S65-S70.
 25. Pépin J, Valiquette L, Cossette B. Mortality attributable to nosocomial *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease during an epidemic caused by a hypervirulent strain in Quebec. *CMAJ* 2005;173:1037-42.
 26. Wilcox MH, Mooney L, Bendall R, Settle CD, Fawley WN. A case-control study of community-associated *Clostridium difficile* infection. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2008;62:388-96.
 27. Khanna S, Pardi DS, Aronson SL, et al. The epidemiology of community-acquired *Clostridium difficile* infection: a population-based study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2012;107:89-95.
 28. Dial S, Delaney JA, Barkun AN, Suissa S. Use of gastric acid-suppressive agents and the risk of community-acquired *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease. *JAMA* 2005;294:2989-95.
 29. Kyne L, Sougioultzis S, McFarland LV, Kelly CP. Underlying disease severity as a major risk factor for nosocomial *Clostridium difficile* diarrhea. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2002;23:653-9.
 30. Novack L, Kogan S, Gimpelevich L, et al. Acid suppression therapy does not predispose to *Clostridium difficile* infection: the case of the potential bias. *PLoS One* 2014;9(10):e110790.
 31. Leffler DA, Lamont JT. Treatment of *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease. *Gastroenterology* 2009;136:1899-912.
 32. Feuerstadt P, Das R, Brandt LJ. The evolution of urban *C. difficile* infection (CDI): CDI in 2009-2011 is less severe and has better outcomes than CDI in 2006-2008. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2014;109:1265-76.
 33. Planche TD, Davies KA, Coen PG, et al. Differences in outcome according to *Clostridium difficile* testing method: a prospective multicentre diagnostic validation study of *C. difficile* infection. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2013;13:936-45.
 34. Hu MY, Katchar K, Kyne L, et al. Prospective derivation and validation of a clinical prediction rule for recurrent *Clostridium difficile* infection. *Gastroenterology* 2009;136:1206-14.
 35. Shivashankar R, Khanna S, Kammer PP, et al. Clinical predictors of recurrent *Clostridium difficile* infection in out-patients. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2014;40:518-22.
 36. Longtin Y, Trottier S, Brochu G, et al. Impact of the type of diagnostic assay on *Clostridium difficile* infection and complication rates in a mandatory reporting program. *Clin Infect Dis* 2013;56:67-73.
 37. Koo HL, Van JN, Zhao M, et al. Real-time polymerase chain reaction detection of asymptomatic *Clostridium difficile* colonization and rising *C. difficile*-associated disease rates. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;35:667-73.
 38. Davies KA, Longshaw CM, Davis GL, et al. Underdiagnosis of *Clostridium difficile* across Europe: the European, multicentre, prospective, biannual, point-prevalence study of *Clostridium difficile* infection in hospitalised patients with diarrhoea (EUCLID). *Lancet Infect Dis* 2014;14:1208-19.
 39. Crobach MJ, Dekkers OM, Wilcox MH, Kuijper EJ. European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID): data review and recommendations for diagnosing *Clostridium difficile*-infection (CDI). *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2009;15:1053-66.
 40. Sethi AK, Al-Nassir WN, Nerandzic MM, Bobulsky GS, Donskey CJ. Persistence of skin contamination and environmental shedding of *Clostridium difficile* during and after treatment of *C. difficile* infection. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31:21-7.
 41. Vonberg RP, Kuijper EJ, Wilcox MH, et al. Infection control measures to limit the spread of *Clostridium difficile*. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2008;14:Suppl 5:2-20.
 42. Dancer SJ, Kirkpatrick P, Corcoran DS, Christison F, Farmer D, Robertson C. Approaching zero: temporal effects of a restrictive antibiotic policy on hospital-acquired *Clostridium difficile*, extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing coliforms and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2013;41:137-42.
 43. Otter JA, Yezli S, French GL. The role played by contaminated surfaces in the transmission of nosocomial pathogens. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2011;32:687-99.
 44. Jabbar U, Leischner J, Kasper D, et al. Effectiveness of alcohol-based hand rubs for removal of *Clostridium difficile* spores from hands. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31:565-70.
 45. Bischoff WE, Reynolds TM, Sessler CN, Edmond MB, Wenzel RP. Handwashing compliance by health care workers: the impact of introducing an accessible, alcohol-based hand antiseptic. *Arch Intern Med* 2000;160:1017-21.
 46. Muto CA, Blank MK, Marsh JW, et al. Control of an outbreak of infection with the hypervirulent *Clostridium difficile* BI strain in a university hospital using a comprehensive "bundle" approach. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007;45:1266-73.
 47. Hempel S, Newberry SJ, Maher AR, et al. Probiotics for the prevention and treatment of antibiotic-associated diarrhea: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2012;307:1959-69.
 48. Gao XW, Mubasher M, Fang CY, Reifer C, Miller LE. Dose-response efficacy of a proprietary probiotic formula of *Lactobacillus acidophilus* CL1285 and *Lactobacillus casei* LBC80R for antibiotic-associated diarrhea and *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea prophylaxis in adult patients. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2010;105:1636-41.
 49. Hickson M, D'Souza AL, Muthu N, et al. Use of probiotic *Lactobacillus* preparation to prevent diarrhoea associated with antibiotics: randomised double blind placebo controlled trial. *BMJ* 2007;335:80.
 50. Allen SJ, Wareham K, Wang D, et al. *Lactobacilli* and bifidobacteria in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhoea and *Clostridium difficile* diarrhoea in older inpatients (PLACIDE): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *Lancet* 2013;382:1249-57.
 51. Zar FA, Bakkanagari SR, Moorthi KM, Davis MB. A comparison of vancomycin and metronidazole for the treatment of *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea, stratified by disease severity. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007;45:302-7.
 52. Pépin J, Valiquette L, Gagnon S, Routhier S, Brazeau I. Outcomes of *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease treated with metronidazole or vancomycin before and after the emergence of NAP1/027. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2007;102:2781-8.
 53. Johnson S, Louie TJ, Gerding DN, et al. Vancomycin, metronidazole, or tolevamer for *Clostridium difficile* infection: results from two multinational, randomized, controlled trials. *Clin Infect Dis* 2014;59:345-54.
 54. Debast SB, Bauer MP, Kuijper EJ. European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases: update of the treatment guidance document for *Clostridium difficile* infection. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2014;20:Suppl 2:1-26.
 55. Cohen SH, Gerding DN, Johnson S, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for *Clostridium difficile* infection in adults: 2010 update by the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA) and the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA). *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31:431-55.
 56. Louie TJ, Miller MA, Mullane KM, et al. Fidaxomicin versus vancomycin for *Clostridium difficile* infection. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364:422-31.
 57. Cornely OA, Crook DW, Esposito R, et al. Fidaxomicin versus vancomycin for

- infection with *Clostridium difficile* in Europe, Canada, and the USA: a double-blind, non-inferiority, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2012;12:281-9.
58. McFarland LV, Surawicz CM, Rubin M, Fekety R, Elmer GW, Greenberg RN. Recurrent *Clostridium difficile* disease: epidemiology and clinical characteristics. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1999;20:43-50.
59. Fekety R, McFarland LV, Surawicz CM, Greenberg RN, Elmer GW, Mulligan ME. Recurrent *Clostridium difficile* diarrhea: characteristics of and risk factors for patients enrolled in a prospective, randomized, double-blinded trial. *Clin Infect Dis* 1997;24:324-33.
60. Bouza E. Consequences of *Clostridium difficile* infection: understanding the healthcare burden. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2012;18:Suppl 6:5-12.
61. Maroo S, Lamont JT. Recurrent *Clostridium difficile*. *Gastroenterology* 2006;130:1311-6.
62. Cornely OA, Miller MA, Louie TJ, Crook DW, Gorbach SL. Treatment of first recurrence of *Clostridium difficile* infection: fidaxomicin versus vancomycin. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012;55:Suppl 2:S154-S161.
63. Neal MD, Alverdy JC, Hall DE, Simmons RL, Zuckerbraun BS. Diverting loop ileostomy and colonic lavage: an alternative to total abdominal colectomy for the treatment of severe, complicated *Clostridium difficile* associated disease. *Ann Surg* 2011;254:423-7.
64. Dethlefsen L, Huse S, Sogin ML, Relman DA. The pervasive effects of an antibiotic on the human gut microbiota, as revealed by deep 16S rRNA sequencing. *PLoS Biol* 2008;6(11):e280.
65. Jernberg C, Löfmark S, Edlund C, Jansson JK. Long-term ecological impacts of antibiotic administration on the human intestinal microbiota. *ISME J* 2007;1:56-66.
66. Eiseman B, Silen W, Bascom GS, Kauvar AJ. Fecal enema as an adjunct in the treatment of pseudomembranous enterocolitis. *Surgery* 1958;44:854-9.
67. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. Draft guidance for industry: enforcement policy regarding investigational new drug requirements for use of fecal microbiota for transplantation to treat *Clostridium difficile* infection not responsive to standard therapies, March 2014 (<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/BiologicsBloodVaccines/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/Vaccines/UCM387255.pdf>).
68. Antharam VC, Li EC, Ishmael A, et al. Intestinal dysbiosis and depletion of butyrogenic bacteria in *Clostridium difficile* infection and nosocomial diarrhea. *J Clin Microbiol* 2013;51:2884-92.
69. Song Y, Garg S, Girotra M, et al. Microbiota dynamics in patients treated with fecal microbiota transplantation for recurrent *Clostridium difficile* infection. *PLoS One* 2013;8(11):e81330.
70. Kassam Z, Lee CH, Yuan Y, Hunt RH. Fecal microbiota transplantation for *Clostridium difficile* infection: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:500-8.
71. van Nood E, Vrieze A, Nieuwdorp M, et al. Duodenal infusion of donor feces for recurrent *Clostridium difficile*. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:407-15.
72. Zainah H, Hassan M, Shiekh-Sroujeh L, et al. Intestinal microbiota transplantation, a simple and effective treatment for severe and refractory *Clostridium difficile* infection. *Dig Dis Sci* 2015;60:181-5.
73. Kelly CR, Ihunnah C, Fischer M, et al. Fecal microbiota transplant for treatment of *Clostridium difficile* infection in immunocompromised patients. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2014;109:1065-71.
74. Youngster I, Russell GH, Pindar C, Ziv-Baran T, Sauk J, Hohmann EL. Oral, capsulized, frozen fecal microbiota transplantation for relapsing *Clostridium difficile* infection. *JAMA* 2014;312:1772-8.
75. Siddiqui F, O'Connor JR, Nagaro K, et al. Vaccination with parenteral toxoid B protects hamsters against lethal challenge with toxin A-negative, toxin B-positive *Clostridium difficile* but does not prevent colonization. *J Infect Dis* 2012;205:128-33.
76. Kyne L, Warny M, Qamar A, Kelly CP. Association between antibody response to toxin A and protection against recurrent *Clostridium difficile* diarrhoea. *Lancet* 2001;357:189-93.
77. Kotloff KL, Wasserman SS, Losonsky GA, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of increasing doses of a *Clostridium difficile* toxoid vaccine administered to healthy adults. *Infect Immun* 2001;69:988-95.

Copyright © 2015 Massachusetts Medical Society.

IMAGES IN CLINICAL MEDICINE

The *Journal* welcomes consideration of new submissions for Images in Clinical Medicine. Instructions for authors and procedures for submissions can be found on the *Journal's* website at NEJM.org. At the discretion of the editor, images that are accepted for publication may appear in the print version of the *Journal*, the electronic version, or both.