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“Bacteria will inevitably find ways of resisting the antibiotics we develop.”
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1. CTRS. FOR DISEASE CONTROL & PREVENTION, ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE THREATS IN THE UNITED STATES, 2013, at 12 (2013) [hereinafter CDC, ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE].
I. INTRODUCTION

Antibiotic resistant “superbugs” are a concerning public health threat in the United States and worldwide. Antibiotic resistance refers to infections that are resistant to current antibiotics. The rise of these superbugs requires innovative public health responses to these emerging microbial threats. This article seeks to advocate for an innovative, twenty-first century solution using traditional health department responses: tracking, monitoring, and surveillance. These activities—which can be conducted through the existing infrastructure of Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs (PDMP)—would allow states, counties, and localities to track and monitor antimicrobial resistance.

II. ANTIBIOTICS AND RESISTANCE

Antibiotic resistance presents a complex multifaceted problem which requires groundbreaking solutions. To understand the underlying issues, this article begins by providing background on antibiotics and the rise of antibiotic resistant bacteria, followed by an overview of the existing federal legal landscape in this area. Next, this article looks at the historical goals and functions of State health departments regarding surveillance of emerging diseases. Then, this article seeks to explain the existing infrastructure of PDMPs and innovative uses of these programs.

2. Antibiotic Prescribing & Use in Doctor’s Offices: Antibiotic Resistance Q&As, CTRS. FOR DISEASE CONTROL & PREVENTION, https://www.cdc.gov/antibiotic-use/community/about/antibiotic-resistance-faqs.html (Aug. 23, 2021). “Antibiotic resistance happens when the germs no longer respond to the antibiotics designed to kill them. That means the germs are not killed and continue to grow . . . Antibiotic-resistant germs are difficult, and sometimes impossible, to treat.” Id.

3. See infra Parts II.A–C.

4. See infra Part II.D.

5. See infra Parts I.E–F.
A. Antibiotics: Past to Present

The modern era of antibiotics began in 1928 with Alexander Fleming’s discovery of penicillin.\(^6\) Even after this momentous discovery, by the 1950s, penicillin resistant infections began to emerge.\(^7\) We now see antibiotic resistance in almost all known antibiotics.\(^8\) In response to this problem, various new antibiotics were introduced from the 1960s through the early 1980s. Now, however, fewer new antibiotics are being introduced.\(^9\) Since the 1970s, no new antibiotic classes have been discovered.\(^10\) Major pharmaceutical companies have reduced their antibiotic development because antibiotics are curative and often not used for chronic conditions and are therefore less profitable than other pharmaceuticals innovations.\(^11\) Further contributing to lack of profitability is that the emerging best practice is to hold a new antibiotic in reserve for only severely resistant cases.\(^12\) The World Health Organization (WHO) has classified antibiotics in three groups: access, watch, and reserve.\(^13\) This classification serves as guidance on which antibiotics should be used day-to-day (access), which ones should be used cautiously (watch), and which ones should be used only as the last resort (reserve).\(^14\) Even with the emerging problem of resistance, antibiotics play a pivotal role in modern medicine and remain important in treating infections which were once considered deadly.\(^15\)

---

7. Id.
8. Id.
9. Id. at 278.
12. Id. at 279–80.
15. See Ventola, *supra* note 6, at 278 (“Antibiotics have also helped to extend expected life spans by changing the outcome of bacterial infections. In 1920, people in the U.S. were expected to live to only be 56.4 years old; now, however, the average U.S. life span is nearly 80 years.”).
B. Antibiotic Resistant “Superbugs”

Antibiotic resistant bacteria are considered by the WHO to be “one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development.”16 The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) views antibiotic resistance as one of the biggest modern public health challenges.17 Each year in the United States, over 2.8 million people contract an antibiotic-resistant infection, and “[m]ore than 35,000 people die.”18 Alexander Fleming, upon winning the Nobel Prize for his discovery of penicillin, cautioned of the dangers of misuse of his antibiotic which could lead to organisms that resist penicillin.19 Currently, “methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus Aureus (MRSA), kills more Americans every year than emphysema, HIV/AIDS, Parkinson’s disease, and homicide combined.”20 While extremely difficult to calculate the total economic cost of these infections, estimates indicate the cost could be as high as $20 billion a year in direct healthcare related costs and additional costs to society for loss of productivity as high as $35 billion a year.21 Antibiotic resistance has caused devastation for many individuals and families including: nine year-old Kenna who faced necrotizing pneumonia, a heart valve infection, an abscess in her thigh, and ten days on a ventilator from a MRSA infection; fifty seven year-old George who faced six surgeries related to an infection resistant to virtually every antibiotic; and eleven year-old Addie who spent five months in the hospital, three months on a machine which circulated her blood and added oxygen to it, and ultimately required a double lung transplant due to a resistant infection.22

18. Id.
21. CDC, ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE, supra note 1, at 11; see also Ventola, supra note 6, at 283 (explaining that “the medical cost per patient with an antibiotic resistant infection range[s] from $18,588 to $29,069.”).
While antibiotics have saved countless lives since their discovery in the 1940s, any use of antibiotics can also result in antibiotic resistance. While antibiotic resistance cannot be attributed to a single cause, there are significant human-caused factors that contribute to their resistance, including: (1) overuse through over-prescription, (2) misuse through failure to complete the course of treatment, (3) failure to contain antibiotic-resistant infections in healthcare settings, (4) factory farming and sub-therapeutic use in meat products, and (5) barriers to pharmaceutical innovation.

As such, “[w]hile superbugs are a frightening reminder of the adaptability and ingenuity of microorganisms, they are also the direct result of mankind’s chronic misuse and persistent overuse of antibiotics.” Since antibiotic resistance is a complex, multifaceted issue, some of these factors are outside the scope of this article, which focuses on antibiotic misuse and overuse.

Antibiotic misuse involves two distinct sub-sets of activities: (1) when an antibiotic is properly prescribed by a clinician and then is not taken as prescribed or completed by the patient, and (2) when an antibiotic is improperly prescribed by a clinician. Antibiotic overuse occurs when stronger, broad-spectrum antibiotics are used to treat an infection that could be treated with a much weaker, narrow-spectrum antibiotic.

A strong correlation exists between the level of antibiotic resistant infections and the level of antibiotic use. The magnitude of the problem becomes apparent through the CDC’s estimation that thirty percent of all antibiotics prescribed are for conditions that do not require their use. In some states, there are more antibiotics prescribed per year than there are people. To further understand the complexity of

23. CDC, ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE, supra note 1, at 41.
25. Fox, supra note 19, at 36.
26. See id. at 68 (explaining that the article addresses antibiotic resistance and makes recommendations to reduce overuse, misuse, and encourage novel antibiotic drug development).
27. LaMontagne, supra note 20, at 303–04.
28. Id. at 304. Antibiotics include a range of spectrums: broad spectrum, intermediate spectrum, or narrow spectrum. Antibiotic Resistance Learning Site: Spectrum of Activity, UNIV. OF MN. https://amrls.umn.edu/pharmacology (last visited Jan. 28, 2022). As the name suggests, a broad spectrum antibiotic can work against a variety of bacterium. In contrast, narrow spectrum antibiotics are typically only effective against specific microorganisms. Id.
31. Id. at 5. For example, providers in urgent care settings prescribe antibiotics unnecessarily in forty six percent of the respiratory infections they treat. Id. Additionally, urgent cares also have the largest percentage for visits resulting in an antibiotic prescription. Id.
32. Ventola, supra note 6, at 278.
antibiotics and their governance it is important to acknowledge the existing legal landscape within the United States.

C. Existing Legal Landscape

Within the United States, powers are separated between the state and federal governments. While the United States has a system of federalism, however, “[t]here is no bright line separating federal and state authorities. In reality, governments’ respective powers have historically overlapped, especially in areas like public health.” Antibiotic resistance can also implicate international concerns which further blurs the lines between state and federal responsibility. Traditionally, however, antibiotic resistance has been largely monitored by federal agencies due to their greater institutional competencies.

1. Existing Federal Law Combatting Antibiotic Resistance

While various congressional proposals have been introduced to address antibiotic resistance, these proposals largely have failed. Nevertheless, on September 18, 2014, President Obama issued Executive Order 13676 which sought to address antibiotic resistance. Among other things, the Executive Order established antibiotic-resistant bacteria as a national security priority and created a Task Force for Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria, which endeavored to improve antibiotic stewardship, strengthen national surveillance, and promote new antibiotic development and international cooperation. Alongside the Executive Order, the United States National Strategy for Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria was released. While there is limited codified law, various agencies have begun to promulgate regulations and engage in activities designed to combat antibiotic resistance. For example, the Federal Health and Human Services’ Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response focuses on the national security threat caused by antibiotic-

34. Id.
35. See Antibiotic Resistance, supra note 16 (outlining the severe impact antibiotic resistance has on global health, food security, and the healthcare system).
38. Id.
39. Antibiotic/Antimicrobial Resistance: National Strategy, CTRS. FOR DISEASE CONTROL & PREVENTION (Sept. 2014), https://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/us-activities/national-strategy.html. The national strategy outlines five goals which include: (1) slowing and preventing the spread of resistant bacteria and infections, (2) strengthening surveillance efforts, (3) advancing development of diagnostic testing for identification of resistant bacteria, (4) accelerating research and development for new antibiotics, other therapeutics, and vaccines, and (5) improving international collaboration. Id.
resistance.\textsuperscript{40} The remainder of Part II.C.1. will highlight the work of the two Federal agencies who are most closely involved in this issue: The CDC and The Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

\textit{a. Efforts by the CDC}

The CDC is tasked with being “the lead agency for prevention, health data, epidemic investigation, and public health measures aimed at disease control and prevention.”\textsuperscript{41} The CDC seeks to combat antibiotic resistance with various programs and initiatives.\textsuperscript{42} In fiscal year 2016, Congress appropriated $160 million to the CDC to fight antibiotic resistance with an additional $163 million and $168 million provided in fiscal years 2017 and 2018, respectively.\textsuperscript{43} Some of the programs administered by the CDC include: the AR Solutions Initiative; an antibiotic stewardship program; the National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN); and other tracking and surveillance programs.\textsuperscript{44}

\textit{i. AR Solutions Initiative}

The AR Solutions Initiative is a CDC program that seeks to empower the country to adequately respond to the emerging threat of antibiotic resistance.\textsuperscript{45} In addition, the “[i]nitiative invests in national infrastructure to detect, respond, contain, and prevent resistant infections across healthcare settings, food, and communities.”\textsuperscript{46} The AR Solutions Initiative has also established the AR Lab Network which is a network of CDC labs that have expanded the testing capacity of all state and local health departments.\textsuperscript{47} This expanded testing capacity fills data gaps and allows better-informed responses to best determine treatment for emerging resistant bacteria.\textsuperscript{48} Additional functions of the AR Lab Network include rapid detection of antibiotic resistant infections to inform the local defense.
response teams, DNA sequencing, and the use of data to drive infection prevention.  

ii. CDC Antibiotic Stewardship

The CDC also administers a guidance program for medical providers on how they should prescribe and use antibiotics. Changing the way antibiotics are used can drastically slow the spread of antibiotic resistance. Antibiotic stewardship refers to the promotion of the correct use of antibiotics, a reduction in resistance, and a decrease in the spread of resistant infections. The CDC identifies the four core elements of antibiotic as: (1) commitment, (2) action for policy and practice, (3) tracking/reporting, and (4) education. Through this initiative, the CDC seeks to maximize the benefit of antibiotics while minimizing harm to individuals and the public through its various educational, tracking, and antibiotic stewardship programs that seek to educate providers and individuals regarding the correct use of antibiotics.

iii. CDC’s National Healthcare Safety Network

The National Healthcare Safety Network is an important CDC tracking tool that collects and tracks data on resistant infections that occur in health care facilities. NHSN allows for facility-specific tracking that can assist individual facilities in combatting these infections and choosing the right antibiotics in the future. Unfortunately, this tracking only focuses on healthcare-associated infections and does not provide data for community-associated infections. Nevertheless, “NHSN provides facilities, states, regions, and the nation with data needed to identify problem areas, measure progress of prevention efforts, and


51. CDC, ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE, supra note 1, at 31.

52. CTRS. FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVS., A FIELD GUIDE TO ANTIBIOTIC STEWARDSHIP IN OUTPATIENT SETTINGS 3 (2018).


54. Id. at 6.

55. CDC, ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE, supra note 1, at 40.

56. Id.

ultimately eliminate healthcare-associated infections.” For fiscal year 2020, Congress has provided $21 million to the CDC for NHSN to increase hospital reporting of antibiotic use and resistance. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) has also made certain incentive-based payments contingent on reporting these measures to the CDC. Overall, the CDC has found that tracking and reporting clinician antibiotic prescribing “can guide changes in practice and can be used to assess progress in antibiotic prescribing.”

b. Efforts by the FDA

The FDA is another pivotal player in combatting antibiotic resistance. The FDA is committed to addressing antibiotic resistance through the following strategies: (1) facilitating product development for new antibiotics, diagnostic tests, and vaccines; (2) promoting appropriate use of antibiotics, education, and other resources; (3) supporting the development of surveillance tools; and (4) advancing regulatory science. To encourage new development, the FDA uses a variety of tools including fast track designation, priority review, and breakthrough therapy designation. In addition to addressing antibiotic resistance on humans, the FDA works to promote the appropriate use of antibiotics in veterinary settings to complement the work of other federal agencies in healthcare settings. As such, in 2003, the FDA established industry-wide guidance for assessing antibiotic resistance in the FDA approval process for animal drugs.

58. Id.
60. CTRS. FOR DISEASE CONTROL & PREVENTION & CTRS. FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVS., Adherence to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC’s) Infection Definitions and Criteria is Needed to Assure Accuracy, Completeness, and Comparability of Infection Control, https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/pdfs/cms/NHSN-Reporting-signed.pdf.
63. Id.
64. Id.
65. Id.; see also FOOD & DRUG ADMIN., SUPPORTING ANTIMICROBIAL STEWARDSHIP IN VETERINARY SETTINGS: GOALS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2019-2023 (2018) (discussing actions being taken by the FDA’s Center for Veterinary Medicine and other stakeholders to support antimicrobial stewardship in veterinary settings).
D. State and Local Health Departments: Objectives and Activities

Public health has traditionally been a state law objective since it falls under the scope of states’ police power.67 Generally, the role of State and local Departments of Health includes screening for diseases, treatment, training programs, state laboratory services, epidemiology, and surveillance.68 There are ten essential public health services established by The Core Public Health Functions Steering Committee in 1994.69 Of these ten services, the most important for the purposes of this article include: monitoring to address community health problems, diagnosing and investigating health concerns in the community, and providing information and education to the public about public health concerns.70 These essential public health services denote some of the traditional areas in which state and local health departments have engaged and deployed their resources.

1. Surveillance, Monitoring, and Educational Activities

Surveillance and monitoring activities have rapidly evolved in a changing data-driven world, specifically with the rise of public health informatics.71 Public health surveillance activities are now able to provide scientific data to guide public health decision-making.72 Surveillance data can “inform policy changes, guide new proven interventions, sharpen public communication, and help agencies assess research investments.”73 Surveillance can also act as a warning system, track progress of goals, and monitor emerging concerns.74 Through the

---


70. Id.

71. Peter Nsubuga et al., Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries, CH. 53: Public Health Surveillance: A Tool for Targeting and Monitoring Interventions 1000 (2d ed. 2006). “The rapidly evolving field of public health informatics, which deals with collection, classification, storage, retrieval, analysis, and presentation of large amounts of health data, offers the potential for truly integrated public health surveillance based on data standardization, a communications infrastructure, and policies on data access and sharing.” Id.

72. Id. at 998.


use of new data systems, public health experts can begin to harness and react to more data than ever before.\textsuperscript{75} The CDC also provides grants to state and local health departments to support state and local surveillance activities.\textsuperscript{76}

Another important aspect of state and local health departments is their educational and community outreach activities. The surveillance and monitoring activities of the state and local health departments can then lead educational activities of state and local health departments. Major services of health departments include professional education and public health education.\textsuperscript{77} These educational functions are incredibly important on the state and local levels due to the close nature of state and local governments to the people.\textsuperscript{78} An important extension of these activities with twenty-first century solutions is PDMPs.

\textit{E. Existing Prescription Drug Monitoring Infrastructure}

PDMPs are state-run electronic databases that track and monitor prescriptions for controlled substances.\textsuperscript{79} Currently, all fifty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico have operational PDMPs.\textsuperscript{80} These programs were implemented as a way to control the opioid epidemic and alter prescriber and patient behaviors around opioids.\textsuperscript{81} Through these programs, states can “collect, monitor, and analyze . . . data . . . to support states’ efforts in education, research, enforcement, and abuse prevention.”\textsuperscript{82} Effective PDMPs feature four promising elements: (1) universal utilization by prescribers and pharmacists, (2) real-time data submission by pharmacists, (3) active management by state health departments, and (4) ease of usage and accessibility.\textsuperscript{83}

---

\textsuperscript{75.} See NSUBUGA ET AL., supra note 71, at 997 (explaining that health agencies around the world have started using data during the COVID-19 pandemic to create better public health outcomes).

\textsuperscript{76.} Public Health Surveillance and Data, supra note 73. “Nearly one third of CDC extramural grant awards and dollars support surveillance related programs, with the majority of support going to state and local health departments.” Id.


\textsuperscript{78.} HODGE, supra note 33, at 59–62.


\textsuperscript{81.} See Opioid Overdose: What States Need to Know, supra note 79 (noting that improvements have been made to opioid prescribing by providing data such as patient prescription histories).


\textsuperscript{83.} Opioid Overdose: What States Need to Know, supra note 79.
Currently, PDMPs monitor controlled substances based on the schedules established by the Federal Controlled Substances Act (CSA).\textsuperscript{84} Each state has autonomy in setting up its PDMP program as it sees fit with differences in various program aspects, such as the time requirements for reporting, who is able to access the data, and other reporting and use requirements.\textsuperscript{85} PDMP best practices include interstate data sharing, integration with health information exchanges, delegate access, user education, and the timeliness of data.\textsuperscript{86} From a public health standpoint, PDMPs can be incredibly useful in the areas of education, epidemiologic surveillance, prevention, and early intervention.\textsuperscript{87} Another promising feature of PDMPs is the ability to send unsolicited reports to prescribers.

1. Unsolicited Reporting Notifications

Unsolicited reporting, a notification to prescribers regarding patients with high utilization of controlled substances, is considered a PDMP best practice.\textsuperscript{88} Unsolicited reporting can serve the following important goals: “informing prescribers and pharmacists that patients may be abusing or diverting controlled substances; helping prescribers make better decisions about prescribing controlled substances, thus improving patient care; and informing potential end users about the PDMP and its value.”\textsuperscript{89} In the context of PDMPs, most of the data provided is solicited, meaning that the prescriber must request the information to see it.\textsuperscript{90} By providing only solicited data, however, there is a wealth of helpful information that is potentially not reviewed or acted upon.\textsuperscript{91} To provide this useful information and data to prescribers, there must be an

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{85} AM. SOC'Y OF ADDICTION MED., PUBLIC POLICY STATEMENT ON PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAMS (PDMPs) 1 (2018), https://www.asam.org/docs/default-source/public-policy-statements/2018-statement-on-pdmps406229472bc604ca5b7f00030b21a.pdf?sfvrsn=63ba42c2_0 [hereinafter AMAS, PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAMS].
  \item \textsuperscript{86} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{87} PDMP CTR. OF EXCELLENCE AT BRANDEIS, BRIEFING ON PDMP EFFECTIVENESS 9 (Sept. 2014), https://dhhs.ne.gov/DOP%20document%20library/PDMP%20Center%20of%20Excellence%20Briefing.pdf [hereinafter PDMP EFFECTIVENESS].
  \item \textsuperscript{88} PDMP CTR. OF EXCELLENCE AT BRANDEIS, GUIDANCE ON PDMP BEST PRACTICES: OPTIONS FOR UNSOLICITED REPORTING 4 (2014), https://www.ojp.gov/pdfs/bja/247135.pdf [hereinafter GUIDANCE ON PDMP BEST PRACTICES].
  \item \textsuperscript{89} ASS'N. STATE & TERRITORIAL HEALTH OFFS., PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAMS: TOOLS FOR EDUCATION, EPIDEMIOLOGICAL SURVEILLANCE, PREVENTION, AND EARLY INTERVENTION 4, http://www.astho.org/Rx/Brandes-PDMP-Report/.
  \item \textsuperscript{91} Id.
\end{itemize}
underlying analysis of PDMP data “to identify patients meeting criteria for possible inappropriate use[s] of controlled substances or for receiving possibly dangerous quantities and/or combinations of prescription drugs.” In unsolicited reporting, it is important that false positives—which could reduce the effectiveness of the program—are not over-produced. Therefore, a threshold that would trigger a reporting requirement must be established. Unfortunately, among the states that utilize unsolicited reporting, no such consensus on a common threshold has been recognized. Unsolicited reporting has been found to be beneficial, for example, in Maine, where a substantial portion of the prescribers who received unsolicited reports relating to opioids responded and acted upon the notification.

F. Innovative Uses of PDMP and Other Health Information Exchange Programs

Through the creation of PDMP Programs, various states have also created innovative uses of the PDMP infrastructure with the integration of other health data services. Part II.F. highlights two states and their efforts in the health Information Technology (IT) space: Maryland and Utah.

1. Maryland’s Chesapeake Regional Information System for our Patients (CRISP)

Maryland has established a state-wide Health Information Exchange (HIE) known as “CRISP” which provides a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to PDMP and various other health data points. CRISP was designated by the Maryland Health Care Commission as the statewide HIE. CRISP seeks to foster innovative uses of health data throughout the state through “safer, timelier, efficient, effective, equitable, patient centered care.” CRISP includes a variety of health information services, including:

92. GUIDANCE ON PDMP BEST PRACTICES, supra note 88, at 7.
93. Id. at 7.
94. ASS’N. STATE & TERRITORIAL HEALTH OFFS., supra note 89, at 4.
95. GUIDANCE ON PDMP BEST PRACTICES, supra note 88, at 8.
96. See generally MD. CODE ANN., HEALTH–GEN. § 21-2A-01 et seq. (West 2020) (codifying Maryland’s PDMP law and outlining its requirements).
(1) Clinical Query Portal, which provides real time clinical information including labs, radiology reports, operative reports, and other clinical notes;\textsuperscript{100}

(2) Encounter Notification Service (ENS), which provides real-time alerts to providers when one of their patients is hospitalized;

(3) PDMP;

(4) Direct Messaging through CRISP DIRECT, which provides a secure and encrypted e-mail service for health care providers;

(5) Image Exchange, which provides providers with high-quality radiograph images;

(6) CRISP Reporting Service, which provides healthcare data and analytics to improve patient care;\textsuperscript{101} and

(7) Single Sign-On, which provides integration into medical office software to access CRISP services.\textsuperscript{102}

The Maryland CRISP system, through these various programs, shares data with health care providers to facilitate care, reduce costs, and improve health outcomes.\textsuperscript{103}

The PDMP program is administered by CRISP and is overseen by the Maryland Department of Health, Behavioral Health Administration.\textsuperscript{104} The Maryland PDMP was created to reduce abuse and diversion of prescription drugs.\textsuperscript{105} Participation in the Maryland PDMP is mandatory for prescribers and pharmacists.\textsuperscript{106}

2. Utah’s Health Information and PDMP Infrastructure

Like Maryland’s use of CRISP, Utah has established comprehensive, linked databases that includes PDMP, All Payer Claims Database, Emergency Department Encounter, and Hospital Inpatient Discharge, among others.\textsuperscript{107}


\textsuperscript{102} See For Patients: What is CRISP?, CRISP, https://www.crisphealth.org/for-patients/#what-is-crisp (last visited Feb. 2, 2022) (discussing integration between hospitals and medical professionals to ease access to clinical information).

\textsuperscript{103} Id.


\textsuperscript{105} Id.

\textsuperscript{106} Md. Code Ann., Health–Gen. § 21-2A-02(c) (West 2019).

\textsuperscript{107} See COMagine Health & Utah Dept. of Health, Levels of Care for Treating Overdose and Opioid Use Disorder in Utah Emergency Departments and Hospitals 3, 10,13 (2020) (describing Utah’s efforts to address overdose and opioid use in hospitals). Additional linked data bases
Utah’s PDMP (also known as the Controlled Substance Database Program) tracks: morphine milligram equivalents of the patient’s current level of opioid use,\(^\text{108}\) the number of pharmacies visited in the last month, and if there are any overlapping opioid and benzodiazepine prescriptions.\(^\text{109}\) Additionally, Utah has established licensure penalties for failure to register with the program.\(^\text{110}\)

Utah also uses a patient review and restriction program (PRR) to encourage the safe use of opioid prescriptions.\(^\text{111}\) An individual can be identified as at-risk, thereby triggering the program, by satisfying one or more of the following criteria:

1. Filling six or more abuse-potential medications in a twelve-month period;
2. Utilizing four or more pharmacies in a twelve-month period;
3. Visiting: “[f]our or more nonaffiliated primary care providers and/or four or more specialists . . . outside a normal range of utilization in a 12-month period, and/or three or more nonaffiliated providers prescribing abuse-potential medications in a 12-month period”;
4. Having “five or more nonemergent emergency department visits in 12-months”;
5. Providing cash payments for prescriptions;
6. Exhibiting “patterns of early refills or attempted early refills for abuse-potential medications”; or
7. Providing “concurrent prescriptions of abuse-potential medications written by nonaffiliated prescribers.”\(^\text{112}\)

Once a PRR is triggered, patients are required to receive controlled substances from a designated prescriber and pharmacist.\(^\text{113}\)
Utah also maintains the Utah Health Information Network (UHIN) which operates the Clinical Health Information Exchange (CHIE). The CHIE includes various features such as:

1. **CHIE Alerts**, which provides a notification when patients are admitted or discharged from a hospital or emergency department;
2. **Direct Secure Messaging**, which allows secure communications between healthcare professionals;
3. **Results Delivery**, which provides laboratory, radiology, clinical notes, poison control, and EMS reports; and
4. **Historical Look-backs**, which are triggered when a patient is admitted, discharged, or transferred from a hospital or emergency department and provide an overview of the patient’s previous admissions.

UHIN works toward securely harnessing healthcare data to create innovative software solutions for the healthcare community.

### III. LEVERAGING PDMPs FOR ANTIBIOTIC TRACKING

This article, while applauding the work that the CDC and other governmental agencies have done, suggests a new state surveillance and education program using the existing PDMP infrastructure. Managing and utilizing state PDMP infrastructure is beneficial since “[s]tates tend to have closer connections to the problems they regulate, which allow them to adapt to local conditions and to improve both compliance and enforcement.” States also have authority to regulate in this area.

Part III.A begins with a theoretical approach on how surveillance programs could be deployed through PDMP programs. Then, Part III.B discusses the legal approach to implement such a program considering federal and state level requirements.

---

115. Id.
119. *See infra* Part III.A.
120. *See infra* Part III.B.
A. Surveillance Programs Through the Use of PDMP

This proposal seeks to broaden the surveillance ability of state and local health departments by expanding upon the existing infrastructure of PDMPs. Since all states and the District of Columbia have existing PDMP programs, the infrastructure for establishing this kind of antibiotic surveillance is already in place. Currently, PDMPs are administered by various state agencies including pharmacy boards, departments of health, professional licensing agencies, law enforcement agencies, and substance abuse agencies. Various states also track information through their PDMP that is not specific to controlled substance prescribing including: drug-related arrests, drug-related convictions, child welfare case information, criminal court case information, drug court case information, medical marijuana dispensing, naloxone prescription/administration, and overdoses. The integration of this additional information within the PDMP software demonstrates the feasibility of extending this software to include antibiotic related prescriptions and data.

Interestingly, one state, Nebraska, currently monitors all prescription drugs through their PDMP. On January 1, 2018, Nebraska began monitoring all dispensed prescriptions so that clinicians could better monitor the care and treatment of their patients. The shift towards tracking all prescriptions in Nebraska was focused on patient safety and the need for accurate medication reconciliation. The Nebraska PDMP allows prescribers and dispensers to sort through controlled and non-controlled prescriptions. Nebraska’s comprehensive PDMP provides “10 x more data than traditional PDMP’s that include controlled substances only.” Upon implementation from January 1 through June 30, 2018, there were 15,795,016 dispensed prescriptions—90% of these were non-controlled substances. The enabling statute, while not

122. Id.
123. See DEPT. OF JUST., BUREAU OF JUST. ASSISTANCE, JUSTICE SYSTEM USE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAMS 8–9 (2015) (discussing the intersection between PDMP programs and the criminal justice system).
124. NEB. REV. STAT. § 71-2454(2) (2020).
127. See id. (explaining that a new law in Nebraska will compel dispensers to report to the State’s PDMP both controlled and non-controlled prescriptions).
129. Id. at 23.
specifically focusing on antibiotics, states a purpose of “allowing prescribers and dispensers to . . . ensure that the prescription drugs are used for medically appropriate purposes.” Nebraska has gone above and beyond the data requirements advocated for in this article, but for full effectiveness of this proposal, the data also must be acted upon.

1. Establishing a Surveillance Threshold

Since the infrastructure necessary for PDMPs to track antibiotic prescriptions is already in place, the hurdle will be in programming the data tool to identify significant information. To clear this hurdle, a threshold—which will identify the information that is significant enough to trigger an additional review by an expert within the Department of Health—must be established. As with the original PDMP infrastructure, parallels can be made between opioids and the thresholds established for unsolicited reports and PRRs. Upon discussion of these parallels, the following Part concludes with suggested features of a threshold that would be best suited to combat antibiotic resistance.

a. Parallels to Opioids with Unsolicited Reports

Unsolicited reports can provide prescribers with important, clinically relevant information. To send an unsolicited report, the PDMP data must be programmed to identify specific criteria that is suspect of inappropriate use of controlled substances. Criteria can include actions such as: receiving prescriptions of the same drug type from multiple prescribers or multiple pharmacies in a relatively short period of time, being prescribed higher than a certain number of morphine milligram equivalents, and receiving prescriptions for opioids and benzodiazepines. For instance, Maine’s regulatory requirements for PDMP-related unsolicited reporting provide that threshold levels may include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- High number of prescribers in a short period of time as determined by the office;
- High number of doses during a short period of time, as determined by the office;
- Days Supply of prescriptions for the same drug overlapping by more than a few days;

---

131. See supra text accompanying notes 121–123.
132. See infra Part III.A.1.a.
133. See GUIDANCE ON PDMP BEST PRACTICES, supra note 88, at 5 (“A growing body of evidence supports unsolicited reporting as a PDMP best practice.”).
134. Id. at 7.
135. Id.
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• Inappropriate combinations of controlled substances, as determined by the Office;
• More than one method of payment within a short time period;
• More than one out of state prescriber for the same patient, during a short time period, as determined by the Office;
• More than one pharmacy in the same day; or
• More than one pharmacy in different public health districts within one month; and/or

As of April 2022, thirty-seven jurisdictions had PDMP systems that provided unsolicited reports to prescribers, and twenty-six jurisdictions had PDMP systems that sent unsolicited reports to dispensers. Among these jurisdictions, there is no consensus as to what triggers a report. Therefore, in the context of antibiotics, it is important to establish a threshold at which review would be triggered in the State Department of Health for high utilization patients and providers.

b. Parallels to Opioids and PRRs

Also in the context of opioids, PRRs are widely used by Medicaid plans and commercial insurers. Forty-nine state Medicaid plans operate PRRs; Utah is one such jurisdiction. These programs, once identifying a patient, restrict their access to controlled substances by limiting their ability to procure controlled substances to a single designated prescriber, pharmacy, or both. The criteria used is largely up to the state’s discretion and “var[ies] from [a] simple numeric threshold to an extensive list of criteria that includes a wide variety of behaviors indicative of over-utilization or fraud.” The intent of these programs is to
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137. PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAM & TRAINING & TECH. ASSISTANCE CTR., PDMPs AUTHORIZED AND ENGAGED IN SENDING SOLICITED AND UNSOLICITED REPORTS TO HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS AND PATIENTS (2020), https://www.pdmpassist.org/pdf/Health_Care_Entity_Table.pdf [hereinafter PDMP, SOLICITED AND UNSOLICITED REPORTS].
138. Id.
139. ASS’N. STATE & TERRITORIAL HEALTH OFFS., supra note 89, at 4.
141. Id.; see also supra Part II.F.2 (explaining Utah’s PRR program).
identify those who are at risk of an overdose—based on certain established factors—and ensure that they receive care coordination.144

c. Suggested Features of a Threshold

While “doctor shopping”145 is less of a concern with antibiotic prescriptions (than with opioids or other controlled substances), monitoring and surveillance is still essential. As previously demonstrated, not all PDMPs are alike.146 Thus, it would likely be difficult to achieve a uniform threshold. Nevertheless, suggestions can be made through model legislation.147 Model legislation has been used in the field of public health as early as 1907.148 In this context, model legislation should be proposed to create a threshold for triggering review. Using opioids as guidance, the following factors should be considered in the threshold:

1. Use of a certain number of antibiotics within a twelve-month period;
2. Multiple antibiotic prescriptions by multiple prescribers;
3. Use of two or more antibiotics on the WHO’s watch list149 in a six-month period; and
4. Use of any antibiotic which is on the WHO’s reserve list.150

While it would be challenging to establish a threshold to determine when a particular prescriber is overprescribing, a simple numerical analysis could be conducted to identify the highest prescribers. This identification could then trigger a review which considers other factors such as the prescriber’s specialty and the number of patients he or she typically services. Providers in certain specialties will ultimately produce more antibiotic prescriptions than others simply because of their chosen specialty. However, these providers could be compared to other providers within the same specialty to compare utilization.

---
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B. Legal Approach

As is evident from the varying natures of PMDP programs across the country, the legal approach to establishing this sort of monitoring system will require a state level legislative approach. Nevertheless, federalism requires both federal and state considerations.

1. Federal Level Considerations

The major federal consideration is what sort of support the federal government would be willing to provide to states looking to establish antibiotic tracking programs through PDMP. Since 2016, the CDC AR Solutions Initiative has provided “$241 million to 57 state and local health departments.” Moreover, federal grants were essential to the original creation of PDMPs through the Harold Rogers PDMP Grant Program administered by the Federal Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance. Since most current federal grants for PDMPs involve substance abuse monitoring, different considerations would arise if federal grants were to be extended to PDMPs for antibiotic resistance and tracking. Another potential federal approach would be to reschedule all antibiotics or certain high-risk antibiotics as Schedule V Substances under the CSA. This could, however, potentially require states to begin tracking antibiotics without state initiative since many state PDMPs track prescriptions based on the Federal Controlled and Dangerous Substances schedule.

2. State Level Considerations

At the state level, there will be three major policy considerations when developing a program for tracking and monitoring antibiotic prescriptions. These considerations include: (1) amending existing PDMP laws; (2) establishing thresholds to trigger review by the state health department; and (3) observing federal and state privacy laws.

151. See PDMP, Maps and Tables, supra note 146 (displaying the varying nature of different PDMP programs in different states).


154. Currently eleven jurisdictions only monitor Schedules II-IV, which would mean reclassifying antibiotics into Schedule V would not be tracked in these eleven jurisdictions. PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAM & TRAINING & TECH. ASSISTANCE CTR., MANDATORY PDMP ENROLLMENT (2022), https://www.pdmpassist.org/pdf/Mandatory_Enrollment_Conditions.pdf [hereinafter PDMP, MANDATORY PDMP ENROLLMENT].
Since states already have existing PDMPs the authorizing legislation must be amended to include the provision of antibiotics. Alternatively, states could take Nebraska’s approach and include all prescription medications. To address these amendments, a state would require support from both chambers of its legislature. Additionally, law and policy concerning the threshold requirement could be established through the legislative process or through agency regulations. Moreover, state legislatures would need to consider federal and state privacy protections, which most PDMPs already include protections for; current PDMP statutes include privacy clauses and penalties for violations of confidentiality. These protections will likely remain if existing PDMP laws are simply amended. Therefore, in order to address these concerns, legislatures would need to ensure that the existing protections apply when amendments are made to include antibiotic tracking.

IV. Conclusion

In the age of big data, as antibiotic resistance is growing, it is important to consider the data analytics tools we already have at our fingertips. Through legislative changes to existing PDMP statutes, states could begin tracking their antibiotic prescriptions to anticipate emerging microbial concerns and trends. These new tracking and monitoring programs could allow public health experts to turn the tides in terms of antibiotic resistance. Antibiotics present a paradox: while antibiotic-use is necessary to treat certain illnesses, every use can cause bacteria to evolve, rendering that antibiotic essentially useless. Tracking is a core element of antibiotic stewardship, as defined by the CDC. Through the use of tracking, monitoring and surveillance, state health departments can begin to combat antibiotic resistance within their jurisdictions.
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