# **ORIGINAL RESEARCH**

### Geographic Distribution of Nontuberculous Mycobacterial Species Identified among Clinical Isolates in the United States, 2009–2013

Alicen B. Spaulding<sup>1</sup>, Yi Ling Lai<sup>2</sup>, Adrian M. Zelazny<sup>3</sup>, Kenneth N. Olivier<sup>4</sup>, Sameer S. Kadri<sup>5</sup>, D. Rebecca Prevots<sup>2</sup>, and Jennifer Adjemian<sup>2,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Acute Care Outcomes, Children's Minnesota Research Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota; <sup>2</sup>Laboratory of Clinical Infectious Diseases, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Bethesda, Maryland; <sup>3</sup>Department of Laboratory Medicine and <sup>5</sup>Critical Care Medicine Department, National Institutes of Health Clinical Center, Bethesda, Maryland; <sup>4</sup>Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Branch, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Bethesda, Maryland; and <sup>6</sup>United States Public Health Service Commissioned Corps, Rockville, Maryland

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4687-3259 (A.B.S.).

#### Abstract

**Rationale:** Nontuberculous mycobacteria are an important cause of morbidity in the United States, although patient outcomes vary greatly by species. Currently, nationally representative data on the distribution of mycobacterial species from clinical isolates are limited.

**Objectives:** Using a national hospitalization database capturing microbiologic data for nearly 6 million patient encounters, we describe the geographic distribution of, and patient demographic features associated with, clinical mycobacterial isolates in the United States.

**Methods:** Linked demographic and microbiologic data from the *Premier* Healthcare Database were extracted for all patient encounters from 2009 to 2013. Patients with at least one positive potentially pathogenic nontuberculous mycobacterial culture were identified as cases. The period prevalence was calculated, and patient-, encounter-, and hospital-level factors were analyzed. Regional differences in species distribution were analyzed; a subanalysis was conducted among patients with *International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision*, codes for pulmonary nontuberculous mycobacterial disease. Significant differences were assessed (P < 0.05).

**Results:** Of 5,928,830 unique patients included during the 5-year study period, 7,812 (0.13%) had at least one positive nontuberculous mycobacterial culture. The mean age of cases was 64 years (range, <1–89 yr), and most were female (52%) and white (70%). Hospitals with cases were more often labeled "urban" (96%), "teaching" (56%), and had at least 500 beds (78%). Species distribution differed significantly by geographic area. *Mycobacterium avium* complex ranged from 61 to 91% of isolates and were most frequent in the South and Northeast regions; *M. abscessus/M. chelonae* ranged from 2 to 18% of isolates and were most frequent in the West; and other species, including *M. fortuitum* and *M. kansasii*, ranged from 7 to 26% and were also most frequent in the West.

**Conclusions:** Significant geographic variation exists in the distribution of nontuberculous mycobacterial species in the United States. Whereas *M. avium* complex was the most common species isolated in the South, *M. abscessus/M. chelonae* was proportionately higher in the West. Greater clinical awareness in regions with increased levels of harder-to-treat mycobacteria are needed, given differences in treatment options and implications for patient outcomes.

**Keywords:** nontuberculous mycobacteria; United States; hospital database

(Received in original form November 8, 2016; accepted in final form August 16, 2017)

Supported by the Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center. The opinions expressed in this article are the authors' own and do not reflect the views of the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, or the U.S. government.

Author Contributions: A.B.S.: contributed to the concept of the work as well as the analysis and interpretation of the data for the work, drafted the work, and approved the final version to be published; Y.L.L. and J.A.: contributed to the analysis and interpretation of the data for the work, critically revised the draft of the work, and approved the final version to be published; and A.M.Z., K.N.O., S.S.K., and D.R.P.: contributed to the design of the work and interpretation of the data for the work, and interpretation of the data for the work, critically revised the draft of the work, and approved the final version to be published; and A.M.Z., K.N.O., S.S.K., and D.R.P.: contributed to the design of the work and interpretation of the data for the work, critically revised the draft of the work, and approved the final version to be published.

Correspondence and requests for reprints should be addressed to Alicen B. Spaulding, Ph.D., M.P.H., Center for Acute Care Outcomes, Children's Minnesota Research Institute, 2525 Chicago Avenue South, MS 40-460, Minneapolis, MN 55404. E-mail: alicen.spaulding@childrensmn.org

This article has an online supplement, which is accessible from this issue's table of contents at www.atsjournals.org

Ann Am Thorac Soc Vol 14, No 11, pp 1655–1661, Nov 2017

Copyright © 2017 by the American Thoracic Society DOI: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201611-860OC Internet address: www.atsjournals.org Nontuberculous mycobacteria (NTM) represent a group of environmental bacteria commonly found in water and soil (1-4). Infections due to NTM are increasingly recognized as an important cause of morbidity and mortality in the United States; however, treatment options and subsequent patient outcomes vary greatly by species (4, 5). Although some studies have identified regional differences in NTM prevalence as well as associations with environmental factors (6), recent studies focused on variations in the distribution of NTM species in the general population are limited (7). Given the implications for therapy and infection control measures, knowledge of national species-specific patterns is important to further understanding the epidemiology of NTM in the United States.

In a recent study, researchers found higher NTM-related mortality in the southern United States (8), and studies of Medicare beneficiaries showed that pulmonary nontuberculous mycobacteria (PNTM) rates were highest in the West and Southeast and lowest in the Midwest (5, 6). However, the investigators lacked speciesspecific information to understand how mycobacterial species varied geographically. In another study, among patients with cystic fibrosis (CF), investigators observed geographic differences in the state-level distribution of Mycobacterium avium complex (MAC) versus Mycobacterium abscessus, with more M. abscessus identified in traditionally "high-prevalence" NTM areas, such as in the southern United States (9), although these findings in the high-risk CF population may not be generalizable. Two studies have provided estimates of national species distribution. The first, a study conducted in four health maintenance organizations, revealed that MAC predominated in all regions sampled (7). Authors of a national survey of physicians also found that the majority of species across all regions of the United States were MAC; however, the proportion of *M. abscessus* was slightly higher in the West than in other regions (10).

Using a large, nationally distributed, hospital-based patient dataset with patient-, isolate-, and facility-level information, we describe trends in the distribution of mycobacterial species obtained from clinical samples throughout the United States. Improving understanding of the distribution of mycobacterial species, as well as identifying geographic variations in NTM species, including regions with a higher burden of harder-to-treat mycobacteria such as *M. abscessus*, is critical for informing clinical practice and improving patient outcomes. Preliminary results of this work were previously presented in the form of a poster (11).

#### Methods

#### Data Source

We conducted a retrospective cohort study using the Premier Healthcare Database, which is managed by Premier, Inc. (Charlotte, NC). The Premier Healthcare Database is a U.S. national database with demographic and microbiologic data, which are linked by unique patient identifiers, derived from 176 United States hospitals distributed throughout the country (38% in the South, 30% in the Midwest, and 16% each in the Northeast and West), which is similar to the overall distribution of U.S. hospitals (12). Information provided in the Premier Healthcare Database is collected as part of voluntary reporting done by participating hospitals, and patients are tracked over multiple encounters, including as both inpatients and outpatients, using unique patient identifiers, and it has been used in multiple epidemiologic studies to date (13). This dataset uniquely links microbiologic, demographic, and clinical data for millions of inpatient and outpatient encounters, facilitating the detection of epidemiologic trends of rare diseases using microbiologic results rather than billing codes. However, limitations of this dataset include the lack of information regarding the body site of specimen collection or the specific laboratory methods used.

#### Study Population and Case Definition

Our study population comprised all unique patients with an inpatient or outpatient encounter in the *Premier* Healthcare Database from 2009 to 2013 at hospitals with microbiologic data reported; detailed laboratory methods used at each facility for species identification were not available. For all unique patients present, we extracted demographic, comorbidity, facility-level, and microbiologic data; comorbidities were identified using *International Classification of Diseases*, Ninth Revision (ICD-9), codes. Patients with mycobacterial cultures performed were identified, and results were recorded, including any species identified. NTMpositive cases were defined as those with at least one mycobacterial culture growing a pathogenic NTM species, regardless of body site sampled for culture. Only the first positive NTM test per patient in the dataset was analyzed, and all species isolated from the first positive test were included. For noncases (including those patients who were tested and had a negative result for NTM as well as those not tested), we used data from their first encounter in the database.

#### Data Analysis

All mycobacterial species identified were classified into one of six groups: (1) MAC, (2) M. abscessus/M. chelonae, (3) M. fortuitum, (4) M. kansasii, (5) other rapidly growing mycobacteria, or (6) other potentially pathogenic NTM species (see Table E1 in the online supplement). Tests with mycobacterial species unidentified or considered nonpathogenic (M. gastri, M. gilvum, M. gordonae, M. kubicae, M. murale, M. paraffinicum, M. sphagni, and M. vaccae/vanbaalenii) were excluded. Patient, encounter, and hospital factors were analyzed by NTM case status and by mycobacterial species group. Geographic regions were defined according to United States Census boundaries (14). NTM-specific ICD-9 codes for pulmonary (031.0), cutaneous (031.1), and disseminated (031.2) NTM were analyzed, and a subgroup analysis was conducted including only patients with an ICD-9 code for PNTM. Differences were assessed using the chi-square test or Student's *t* test, with significance evaluated at P < 0.05. All analyses were performed using SAS version 9.3 software (SAS Institute, Carv, NC). In this study, we used only de-identified patient data, and thus the study was considered exempt from National Institutes of Health Institutional Review Board review.

#### Results

Among the 176 hospitals in the *Premier* Healthcare Database with microbiologic data, 151 (86%) reported at least one NTM isolation. Overall, 5,928,830 unique patients were evaluated during the 5-year study

period, of whom 7,812 (0.13%) had at least one NTM-positive culture (Table 1). Of these, 1,360 (17%) had at least two positive NTM cultures within the same encounter, and 7,118 (91%) had at least one positive acid-fast bacilli test result. When evaluating ICD-9 codes for other comorbidities occurring in five or more patients, 76% (n = 5,069) of NTM cases had a principal diagnosis associated with a respiratory condition. A minority of the NTM isolates identified had an ICD-9 code for PNTM (n = 487 [6%]) or nonpulmonary NTM (n = 397 [5%]). Of 7,812 patients with NTM infection, 7,941 potentially pathogenic NTM isolates representing 55 different NTM species were identified; 124 patients (2%) had more than one NTM species isolated from the same culture, and 111 isolates were nonpathogenic NTM species. MAC was most commonly identified (76%), followed by M. abscessus/ *M. chelonae* (9%) (which were frequently grouped together in laboratory results), M. fortuitum (6%), M. kansasii (3%), other rapidly growing mycobacteria (1%), and other potentially pathogenic NTM species (5%). Among patients with an ICD-9 code for PNTM (n = 487), MAC was the most common NTM species identified (77%), followed by M. abscessus/M. chelonae (9%) (Table 2). For disseminated NTM, MAC was also the most common species identified (93%), followed by M. abscessus/ *M. chelonae* (3%). For patients with an ICD-9 code for cutaneous NTM, M. abscessus/M. chelonae (50%) was most common. The 78 patients with an ICD-9 code for CF also had MAC most often identified (50%); however, M. abscessus/ M. chelonae was also five times more common (45%) than in non-CF NTM cases. A majority of patients with M. fortuitum (88%) had this as their only species identified.

## Characteristics of Patients with NTM Infection and Hospitals

The median age of patients with NTM infection was 67 years (range, <1-89 yr), and 55% were at least 65 years of age (Table 1). Most patients with NTM infection were white (70%), and half were female (52%). Patient encounters were most often inpatient (60%), and the median length of hospital stay for NTM-associated inpatient encounters was 8 days (interquartile range, 5–13), compared with 4 days (interquartile range, 2–7) for other

 Table 1. Baseline patient-, encounter-, and hospital-level proportions comparing nontuberculous mycobacteria-positive with non-nontuberculous mycobacteria-positive patients in *Premier* Healthcare Database, 2009–2013

Patient-level characteristics Year isolated Year isolated 2009 21 2010 23 2011 21 201 201 201 21 201 201 21 201 20		NTM-Positive Patients ( <i>n</i> = 7,812)	Non-NTM-Positive Patients (n = 5,921,012)
Year isolated       2009       21       21         2010       23       23         2011       21       21         2012       19       18         2013       16       17         Age categories"	Patient-level characteristics		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Year isolated		
2010       23       23         2011       21       21         2012       19       18         2013       16       17         Age categories"	2009	21	21
2011       21       21         2012       19       18         2013       16       17         Age categories"       1       18         <18 yr	2010	23	23
2012       19       18         2013       16       17         Age categories"       1       18         -18 yr       1       18         18-44 yr       13       34         45-64 yr       31       23         >e65 yr       55       25         Sex*t       62       62*         Male       48       38         Female       52       62*         Black       14       16         Hispanic/other       16       20         Encounter-level characteristics       20         Hospital encounter type*       14       16         Inpatient       60       40         Outpatient       60       40         Outpatient       60       40         Outpatient       60       40         Upatient       60       40         Death       1-1.463       66         Hospital-level characteristics       30       0         Geographic region*       5       5         New England*       5       5         Middle Atlantic*       16       16         East South Central**       3       3	2011	21	21
2013       16       17         Age categories"       1       18         <18 yr	2012	19	18
Age catagones         1         18           18-44 yr         13         34           18-44 yr         13         23           >e65 yr         55         25           Male         48         38           Female         52         62*           Race"         0         64           White         70         64           Black         14         16           Hispanic/other         16         20           Encounter-level characteristics         0         40           Hospital encounter type"         1–439         1–1.463           Inpatient         60         40           Outpatient         40         60           Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*         1         4           Median (IQR)         8 (5–13)         4 (2–7)           Range         1–439         1–1.463           Discharge status (among inpatients)*         1         4           Death         11         4           Institution*         35         30           Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported         54         66           Hospital-level characteristics         5         5	2013	16	17
10  yl       1       10 $18 - 44  yr$ 13       34 $45 - 64  yr$ 31       23 $= 65  yr$ 55       25         Sex <sup>+1</sup> 7       64         Male       48       38         Female       52       62 <sup>1</sup> Race'       64       64         White       70       64         Black       14       16         Hispanic/other       16       20         Encounter-level characteristics       7       60         Hospital encounter type*       1       1         Inpatient       60       40       0         Outpatient       40       60       60         Length of stay, d (anong inpatients)*       1       4       4         Discharge status (among inpatients)*       1       4       4         Death       11       4       4       4         Institution*       35       30       0       0         Others <sup>4</sup> discharge status/not reported       54       66       66         Hospital level characteristics       5       9       10         Geographic region*	Age categories	1	10
10       13       23 $365 \text{ yr}$ 31       23 $365 \text{ yr}$ 55       25         Sext <sup>+</sup>	< 18 yi 18-44 yr	13	34
The description         Display         Display <thdisplay< th=""> <thdisplay< th=""> <thdisplay< th=""></thdisplay<></thdisplay<></thdisplay<>	45-64 yr	31	23
Sex*1         10           Male         48         38           Female         52         62 <sup>-1</sup> Race*         ************************************	≥65 vr	55	25
Male         48         38           Fernale         52         62 <sup>†</sup> Race*          62 <sup>†</sup> White         70         64           Black         14         16           Hispanic/other         16         20           Encounter-level characteristics          40           Hospital encounter type*         16         20           Inpatient         60         40           Outpatient         40         60           Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*         11         4           Median (IQR)         8 (5–13)         4 (2–7)           Range         1–439         1–1,463           Discharge status (among inpatients)*         1         4           Death         11         4           Institution <sup>‡</sup> 35         30           Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported         54         66           Hospital-level characteristics         6         6           Geographic region*         5         5           New England <sup>[1]</sup> 5         5           Middle Atlantic <sup>††</sup> 29         27           West South Central <sup>#‡</sup> 12	Sex* <sup>†</sup>	00	20
Fenale         52         62 <sup>†</sup> Race*	Male	48	38
Race*         K           White         70         64           Black         14         16           Hispanic/other         16         20           Encounter-level characteristics         20           Hospital encounter type*         60         40           Outpatient         60         40           Outpatient         40         60           Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*         8 (5–13)         4 (2–7)           Mage         1–439         1–1,463           Discharge status (among inpatients)*         11         4           Institution*         35         30           Other <sup>8</sup> discharge status/not reported         54         66           Hospital-level characteristics         66         66           Hospital-level characteristics         5         5           Geographic region*         8         3         3           New England <sup>II</sup> 5         5         5           Middle Atlantic*         12         10         10           Mountain <sup>§15</sup> 3         3         3           South Atlantic***         12         10         10           Mountain <sup>§15</sup> 3         <	Female	52	62 <sup>†</sup>
White         70         64           Black         14         16           Hispanic/other         16         20           Encounter-level characteristics         20           Hospital encounter type*         40         60           Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*         40         60           Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*         8 (5–13)         4 (2–7)           Range         1–439         1–1,463           Discharge status (among inpatients)*         0         40           Death         11         4           Institution <sup>‡</sup> 30         0           Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported         54         66           Hospital-level characteristics         66         66           Geographic region*         5         5           New England <sup>II</sup> 5         5           Middle Atlantic <sup>®</sup> 16         16           East South Central**         29         27           West South Central**         13         10           Mountain <sup>§§</sup> 3         3           Pacific <sup>III</sup> 13         10           East North Central***         5         9           H	Race*		
Black       14       16         Hispanic/other       16       20         Encounter-level characteristics       1       40       60         Hospital encounter type*       40       60       40         Outpatient       40       60       60         Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*       4(2-7)       Range       1–439       1–1,463         Discharge status (among inpatients)*       0       60       60       60         Death       11       4       4       1         Institution*       35       30       0       66         Hospital-level characteristics       66       66       66         Hospital-level characteristics       5       5       5         Geographic region*       5       5       5         New England <sup>10</sup> 16       16       6         East South Central**       29       27       27         West South Central**       13       10       10         Mountain <sup>58</sup> 3       3       3         Pacific <sup>10</sup> 13       10       10         East North Central***       5       9       9         Hospital location*	White	70	64
Hispanic/other       16       20         Encounter-level characteristics       40         Hospital encounter type*       60       40         Outpatient       40       60         Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*       4(2-7)       8(5-13)       4(2-7)         Range       1-439       1-1,463         Discharge status (among inpatients)*       1       4         Death       11       4         Institution <sup>‡</sup> 35       30         Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported       54       66         Hospital-level characteristics       66         Geographic region*       7       8         New England <sup>11</sup> 5       5         Middle Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 16       16         East South Central**       3       3         South Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 29       27         West South Central**       13       10         Mountain <sup>§§</sup> 3       3         Pacific <sup>111</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>411</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>411</sup> 4       9         Urban       96       91         Hospital bed size*	Black	14	16
Encounter-level characteristics Hospital encounter type* Inpatient 60 40 Outpatient 40 60 Length of stay, d (among inpatients)* Median (IQR) 8 (5–13) 4 (2–7) Range 1–439 1–1,463 Discharge status (among inpatients)* Death 11 4 Institution <sup>‡</sup> 35 30 Other <sup>‡</sup> discharge status/not reported 54 66 Hospital-level characteristics Geographic region* New England <sup>  </sup> 5 5 Middle Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 16 16 East South Central <sup>**</sup> 29 27 West South Central <sup>**</sup> 12 10 Mountain <sup>Sis</sup> 3 3 South Atlantic <sup>1†</sup> 14 16 East North Central <sup>‡‡</sup> 12 10 Mountain <sup>Sis</sup> 3 9 Hospital location* Rural 4 9 Urban 96 91 Hospital location* Rural 4 9 Urban 96 Hospital bed size* 0–99 2 4 100–499 20 32 >500 78 64 Hospital teaching status* Nonteaching 44 52 Teaching 66 48 Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*	Hispanic/other	16	20
Hospital encounter type'6040Inpatient6060Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*60Median (IQR)8 (5–13)4 (2–7)Range1–4391–1,463Discharge status (among inpatients)*0Death114Institution‡3530Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported5466Hospital-level characteristics66Geographic region*55New England <sup>III</sup> 1616East South Central**33South Atlantic <sup>††</sup> 2927West South Central**33Pacific <sup>IIII</sup> 1310East North Central**59Hospital location*99Hospital bed size*78640-992032 $20$ 32 $42$ $10-499$ 2032 $>$ 5007864Hospital bed size*7864Hospital teaching status*4452Teaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*44	Encounter-level characteristics		
Inpatient         60         40           Outpatient         40         60           Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*         4 (2–7)           Range         1–439         1–1,463           Discharge status (among inpatients)*         1         4           Death         11         4           Institution*         35         30           Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported         54         66           Hospital-level characteristics         66           Geographic region*         5         5           New England <sup>1</sup> 5         5           Middle Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 29         27           West South Central**         3         3           South Atlantic <sup>11+</sup> 29         27           West South Central**         10         10           Mountain <sup>§§</sup> 3         3           Pacific <sup>[11]</sup> 13         10           East North Central <sup>1***</sup> 5         9           Hospital location*         4         9           Urban         96         91           Hospital bed size*         -         4           O         78         64	Hospital encounter type <sup>*</sup>	69	40
Durbatient4060Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*8 (5-13)4 (2-7)Range1-4391-1,463Discharge status (among inpatients)*0Death114Institution*3530Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported5466Hospital-level characteristics66Geographic region*55New England*1616East South Central**33South Atlantic**2927West South Central**33Pacific***1310East North Central***59Hospital location*49Rural49Urban9691Hospital bed size*240-992032>5007864Hospital teaching status*4452Nonteaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*1	Outpatient	60	40
Median (IQR)8 (5–13)4 (2–7)Range1–4391–1,463Discharge status (among inpatients)* $1$ 4Death114Institution‡3530Othef* discharge status/not reported5466Hospital-level characteristics $6$ Geographic region* $5$ $5$ New England! $5$ $5$ Middle Atlantic <sup>¶</sup> 1616East South Central** $3$ $3$ South Atlantic <sup>††</sup> $29$ $27$ West South Central** $1$ $1$ Hospital location* $1$ $1$ Rural $1$ $1$ Hospital location* $1$ $1$ Rural $4$ $9$ Urban $96$ $91$ Hospital bed size* $2$ $4$ $00-499$ $20$ $32$ $\geq 500$ $78$ $64$ Hospital teaching status* $44$ $52$ Nonteaching $44$ $52$ Teaching $56$ $48$ Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)* $1$	Length of stay, d (among inpatients)*	40	80
Notice (i) $(-1,4)$ Range $1-39$ Discharge status (among inpatients)* $11$ Death1114Institution <sup>‡</sup> 35Other <sup>5</sup> discharge status/not reported54Hospital-level characteristicsGeographic region*New England <sup>III</sup> 5New England <sup>III</sup> 1616East South Central**333South Atlantic <sup>1†</sup> 2927West South Central**131013East North Central**59Hospital lecation*Rural49Urban9691Hospital bed size*0-992025007864Hospital teaching status*Nonteaching4452Teaching64Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*	Median (IOR)	8 (5-13)	4 (2-7)
Discharge status (among inpatients)*114Death114Institution†3530Other§ discharge status/not reported5466Hospital-level characteristics5466Geographic region*1616East South Central**33South Atlantic††2927West South Central**33South Central**1010Mountain <sup>\$§</sup> 33Pacific <sup>[1]</sup> 1310East North Central <sup>\$††</sup> 1416West North Central <sup>\$††</sup> 99Hospital location*9Rural49Urban9691Hospital bed size*2032 $O-99$ 24100-4992032>5007864Hospital teaching status*4452Teaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*44	Bange	1-439	1-1 463
Death114Institution*3530Other* discharge status/not reported5466Hospital-level characteristics66Geographic region*55New England*55Middle Atlantic*1616East South Central**33South Atlantic**2927West South Central**1210Mountain**33Pacific**1310East North Central**59Hospital location*79Rural49Urban9691Hospital bed size*70-992032> 5007864Hospital teaching status*78Nonteaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*11	Discharge status (among inpatients)*	1 400	1 1,100
Institution <sup>†</sup> 3530Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported5466Hospital-level characteristics6Geographic region*5New Englandi55Middle Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 1616East South Central**33South Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 1210Mountain <sup>§5</sup> 33Pacific <sup>    </sup> 1310East North Central <sup>1*1</sup> 1416West South Central**59Hospital location*79Rural49Urban9691Hospital bed size*70-9924100-4992032≥5007864Hospital teaching status*4452Nonteaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*1	Death	11	4
$\begin{array}{c c c c c } \hline Other^{\$} discharge status/not reported & 54 & 66 \\ \hline Hospital-level characteristics & & & & & \\ \hline Hospital-level characteristics & & & & & \\ \hline Geographic region* & & & & & \\ \hline New England & 5 & 5 & & \\ \hline Middle Atlantic^{11} & 16 & & 16 & & \\ \hline East South Central^{**} & 3 & & 3 & & \\ \hline South Atlantic^{11} & 29 & & 27 & & \\ \hline West South Central^{**} & 12 & & 10 & & \\ \hline Mountain^{\$\$} & 3 & & 3 & & \\ \hline Pacific^{   } & 13 & & 10 & & \\ \hline East North Central^{11} & 14 & & 16 & & \\ \hline West North Central^{11} & 14 & & 16 & & \\ \hline West North Central^{11} & 14 & & 16 & & \\ \hline West North Central^{11} & 14 & & & \\ \hline Hospital location* & & & & \\ \hline Rural & 4 & 9 & & \\ \hline Urban & 96 & 91 & & \\ \hline Hospital bed size* & & & & \\ \hline 0-99 & 2 & 4 & & \\ \hline 100-499 & 20 & & 32 & & \\ \hline Pogotial bed size* & & & & \\ \hline 0-99 & 20 & & 32 & & \\ \hline So00 & 78 & & 64 & & \\ \hline Hospital teaching status* & & & & \\ \hline Nonteaching & 44 & 52 & \\ \hline Teaching & 56 & 48 & & \\ Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)* & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	Institution <sup>‡</sup>	35	30
Hospital-level characteristics Geographic region* New England <sup>11</sup> 5 5 Middle Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 16 East South Central** 3 3 South Atlantic <sup>1+†</sup> 29 27 West South Central <sup>±+</sup> 12 10 Mountain <sup>\$§</sup> 3 3 Pacific <sup>111</sup> 13 10 East North Central <sup>***</sup> 5 9 Hospital location* Rural 4 9 Urban 96 91 Hospital location* Rural 4 9 Urban 96 91 Hospital bed size* 0–99 2 4 100–499 20 32 >500 78 64 Hospital teaching status* Nonteaching 44 52 Teaching 56 48	Other <sup>§</sup> discharge status/not reported	54	66
Geographic region*       5       5         New England <sup>II</sup> 5       5         Middle Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 16       16         East South Central**       3       3         South Atlantic <sup>11</sup> 29       27         West South Central <sup>‡†</sup> 12       10         Mountain <sup>\$§</sup> 3       3         Pacific <sup>III</sup> 13       10         East North Central <sup>1†1</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>1†1</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>1†1</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>1†11</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>1†11</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>1†11</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>1***</sup> 5       9         Hospital location*       7       7         Rural       4       9       9         Hospital bed size*       7       7         O-99       20       32       3         >500       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       7       64         Nonteaching       44       52         Teaching       56       48 <td>Hospital-level characteristics</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Hospital-level characteristics		
New England <sup>II</sup> 5       5         Middle Atlantic <sup>1I</sup> 16       16         East South Central <sup>1++</sup> 29       27         West South Central <sup>++</sup> 12       10         Mountain <sup>\$5</sup> 3       3         Pacific <sup>IIII</sup> 13       10         East North Central <sup>1++</sup> 5       9         Hospital location*       7       9         Rural       4       9         Hospital bed size*       9       9         O-99       2       4         100–499       20       32         ≥500       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       44       52         Nonteaching       44       52         Teaching       56       48         Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*       44       52	Geographic region*		
Middle Atlantic "       16       16         East South Central**       3       3         South Atlantic <sup>††</sup> 29       27         West South Central**       12       10         Mountain <sup>§§</sup> 3       3         Pacific <sup>[II]</sup> 13       10         East North Central <sup>¶¶</sup> 13       10         East North Central <sup>¶¶</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>¶¶</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>¶¶</sup> 4       9         Hospital location*       9       9         Hospital bed size*       9       9         0-99       20       32         >500       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       56       48         Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*       56       48	New England	5	5
Least South Central <sup>**</sup> 3       3         South Atlantic <sup>††</sup> 29       27         West South Central <sup>#‡</sup> 12       10         Mountain <sup>§§</sup> 3       3         Pacific <sup>[11]</sup> 13       10         East North Central <sup>¶¶</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>¶¶</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>¶¶</sup> 4       9         Hospital location*       9       9         Hospital bed size*       7       4         0-99       2       4         100-499       20       32         ≥500       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       7       64         Hospital teaching statust       4       52         Teaching       56       48         Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*       56       48	Middle Atlantic"	16	16
South Atlantic"       29       27         West South Central <sup>#‡</sup> 12       10         Mountain <sup>§§</sup> 3       3         Pacific <sup>[11]</sup> 13       10         East North Central <sup>111</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>111</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>111</sup> 14       9         Hospital location*       7       9         Rural       4       9         Urban       96       91         Hospital bed size*       7       4         0-99       20       32         >500       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       7       64         Nonteaching status*       44       52         Teaching       56       48         Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*       44       52	East South Central <sup>**</sup>	3	3
West Sound Central**       12       10         Mound Central**       12       10         Pacific <sup>    </sup> 13       10         East North Central***       12       10         East North Central***       5       9         Hospital location*       7       9         Rural       4       9         Urban       96       91         Hospital bed size*       7       64         0-99       20       32         >500       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       64         Nonteaching       44       52         Teaching       56       48         Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*       44	South Atlantic''	29	27
Pacific <sup>[1]</sup> 13       10         East North Central <sup>11</sup> 14       16         West North Central <sup>111</sup> 4       9         Hospital location*       9       9         Hospital bed size*       9         0-99       2       4         100-499       20       32         >500       78       64         Hospital teaching status*       7       64         Nonteaching       44       52         Teaching       56       48         Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*       44	Mountain <sup>§§</sup>	3	10
Last1016East North Central1416West North Central59Hospital location*7Rural49Urban9691Hospital bed size*70-9924100-4992032≥5007864Hospital teaching status*64Nonteaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*10	Pacific	13	10
West North Central***59Hospital location*49Rural49Urban9691Hospital bed size*20-9924100-4992032 $\geq 500$ 7864Hospital teaching status*4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*44	Fast North Central <sup>11</sup>	14	16
Hospital location*49Rural49Hurban9691Hospital bed size*70-9924100-4992032≥5007864Hospital teaching status*7864Nonteaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*1	West North Central***	5	9
Rural49Hurban9691Hospital bed size* $-99$ $0-99$ 2 $2 > 500$ 32 $2500$ 78 $20$ 64Hospital teaching status* $-1000$ Nonteaching44 $20$ 56 $20$ 48Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)* $-1000$	Hospital location*		
Urban         96         91           Hospital bed size*         -         -           0-99         2         4           100-499         20         32           ≥500         78         64           Hospital teaching status*         -         -           Nonteaching         44         52           Teaching         56         48           Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*         -         -	Rural	4	9
Hospital bed size*240-992032≥5007864Hospital teaching status*64Nonteaching4452Teaching5648Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*100	Urban	96	91
0-99         2         4           100-499         20         32           ≥500         78         64           Hospital teaching status*         78         52           Nonteaching         44         52           Teaching         56         48           Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*         44         52	Hospital bed size*		
100-499     20     32       ≥500     78     64       Hospital teaching status*     78     52       Nonteaching     44     52       Teaching     56     48       Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*     56     56	0-99	2	4
>>000     78     64       Hospital teaching status*     78     64       Nonteaching     44     52       Teaching     56     48       Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*     56     56	100-499	20	32
Nonteaching     44     52       Teaching     56     48       Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*     56     56	≥500 Heenitel teaching status*	78	64
Teaching 56 48 Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*	Nontoaching	4.4	50
Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)*	Teaching	56	18
Autorians physician operative (among inpatients)	Attending physician specialty (among inpatients)	*	40
Pulmonary 11 2	Pulmonary	11	2
Infectious disease 2 0.4	Infectious disease	2	0.4
General/internal medicine 44 23	General/internal medicine	44	23
Other specialty 43 75	Other specialty	43	75

*Definition of abbreviations*: IQR = interquartile range; NTM = nontuberculous mycobacteria. Data are percentages unless otherwise indicated.

\**P* < 0.05.

<sup>†</sup>Sex was not reported for 940 patients in this group.

<sup>§</sup>Includes discharged to home, left against medical advice, discharged to law enforcement, still a patient and expected to return, and information not available.

<sup>II</sup>Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

<sup>¶</sup>New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

\*\*Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

<sup>++</sup>District of Columbia, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia.

<sup>‡‡</sup>Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

<sup>\$\$</sup>Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming.

III Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.

<sup>11</sup>Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

\*\*\*lowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, and South Dakota.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>Patient was discharged or transferred to another hospital, healthcare facility, or home health organization.



	Mycobacterium avium Complex (%)	Mycobacterium abscessus/Mycobacterium chelonae (%)	Mycobactenum fortuitum (%)	Other Kapidiy Growing Pathogenic Mycobacteria (%)	Mycobacterum kansasii (%)	Other Potentially Pathogenic NTM Species Not Otherwise Specified (%)
All NTM isolates identified	76	σ	Q	٣	ო	Ŋ
Age category <18 yr	67	20	4	3	2	4
18–44 yr	69	12	ø	2	ო	9
45–64 yr	74	8	7	-	4	9
≽65 yr	79	6	5	-	0	4
Pulmonary NTM ICD-9 code statu	SI					
Present (n = $487$ )	77	6	5	√	9	ς
Absent $(n = 397)$	74	16	5	₽	-	4
Hospital-encounter type						
Inpatient	76	8	7	-	ი	5
Outpatient	77	11	4	۴	2	5
Dafinition of abbraulations: I	- 0 - Internationa	I Classification of Discasso Mint	b Davision: NTM – Davis	them in its my cobacteria		

inpatient encounters (P < 0.0001). Hospitals with patients with NTM infection were more often labeled as "urban" (96%) or "teaching" (56%) and had a hospital bed size greater than or equal to 500 (78%). Patients with NTM infection were significantly more likely to have a general medicine physician (44%) than a pulmonary specialist (11%) as their attending physician. Among patients with NTM infection, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease was the most commonly reported comorbidity (28%), followed by bronchiectasis (11%); malignant neoplasms of the trachea, bronchus, and lung (6%); and HIV (6%).

M. abscessus/M. chelonae was significantly more common among those younger than 18 years of age than among persons aged 45-64 years (20% vs. 8%), whereas MAC was significantly more common among patients older than 64 years of age than among those younger than 18 years of age (79% vs. 67%) (Table 2). M. fortuitum was slightly more common among persons aged 18-44 years than among those older than 64 years of age (8% vs. 5%), as were other potentially pathogenic NTM species (7% vs. 4%) (P = 0.003). Of the 105 patients aged less than 18 years, 23 (22%) had an ICD-9 code for CF. Among patients with an ICD-9 code for PNTM, M. kansasii was more common among 18- to 44-year-olds than among persons older than 64 years of age (15% vs. 2%).

NTM species identified via an inpatient or outpatient encounter also differed. The proportion of patients with M. fortuitum was significantly higher for inpatient (7%) than for outpatient (4%) encounters (P < 0.05). In contrast, the proportion of M. abscessus/M. chelonae was significantly higher for outpatient (11%) than for inpatient (8%) isolates (P < 0.05). Among patients with an ICD-9 code for PNTM, MAC was more common among outpatients than among inpatients (83% vs. 74%), whereas M. kansasii was more common among inpatients than among outpatients (8% vs. 1%).

### Geographic Distribution of NTM Species

Species distribution differed significantly by geographic area (Figures 1 and 2). MAC ranged from 61% of NTM isolates in the West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana,

Oklahoma, and Texas), to 78% in the South Atlantic (Washington, DC; Delaware; Florida; Georgia; Maryland; North Carolina; South Carolina; Virginia; and West Virginia) and the East North Central (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin), and to 91% in the East South Central (Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee). M. abscessus/M. chelonae ranged from 2% in the East South Central to 18% in the West South Central. Other NTM species, including M. fortuitum, M. kansasii, other rapidly growing mycobacteria, and other potentially pathogenic NTM species, comprised only 7% of NTM isolates in the East South Central, compared with 16% in the Pacific (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington), 21% in the West South Central, and 26% in the West North Central (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, and South Dakota).

Among patients aged 65 years or older, the distribution of MAC was the same as in the overall population, ranging from 66% of NTM isolates in the West South Central to up to 93% of isolates in the East South Central, and the distribution of *M. abscessus/M. chelonae* was also the same, ranging from 2% in the East South Central to 18% in the West South Central. Among patients with an ICD-9 code for PNTM, MAC ranged from 57% in the East South Central, to 94% in the Mountain (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming), and to 69% in the West North Central and Pacific. M. abscessus/M. chelonae ranged from no cases identified in the East South Central and West North Central regions to 15% in the Pacific and 11% in the South Atlantic.

#### Discussion

We provide current estimates of the distribution of NTM species in the United States using a large national sample of hospital-based encounters with microbiologic test results. Specifically, we identified different geographic patterns by NTM species, as well as variations among demographic and facility-level features of the affected patients. Geographic variations may be due to a number of factors, including climatic and environmental differences affecting the



Figure 1. Distribution of *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) by U.S. geographic region in the *Premier* Healthcare Database, 2009–2013 (11). NTM = nontuberculous mycobacteria.

types of mycobacteria present in soil and water sources (6, 15).

In the present study, MAC was the most commonly isolated NTM species, followed by M. abscessus/M. chelonae and *M. fortuitum*; this pattern is consistent with previous findings (7, 16). However, NTM species frequencies varied by U.S. region. Although MAC was most commonly isolated overall, M. abscessus/M. chelonae was proportionately highest in the South. Other studies looking at NTM isolated from all body sites found similar species distributions in the United States (17, 18), although in state-specific studies, the proportion of NTM isolates identified as MAC ranged greatly, from only 40% in Virginia to over 84% in New York City (19-22). M. abscessus/M. chelonae was the second most common isolate in our study (9%), as well as in studies conducted nationwide (5%) (17) and in Oregon (5%) (20, 23), North Carolina (18%) (21), New York City (6%) (19), and Virginia (7%). It is important to note also that because M. abscessus is harder to treat (4), clinical outcomes may be disproportionally impacted in areas with higher frequencies of this species.

Most patients had only a single positive NTM culture, and few had corresponding ICD-9 codes for NTM, which is consistent with an estimated sensitivity of 27 to 50% for these codes (7, 24). Also consistent with prior studies

were the reported frequencies of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; bronchiectasis; malignant neoplasms of the trachea, bronchus, and lung; and HIV (7). A higher proportion of patients with NTM infection younger than 18 years of age in this study population also had an ICD-9 code for CF (22%) than in a previous study (25). Notably, only 11% of inpatients with NTM infection had a pulmonologist as their attending physician. Pulmonologists may have been involved in a consultant capacity, which was not discernible in the dataset. Hospitals with NTM-positive patients were more likely to be larger, to be located in urban areas, and to be teaching hospitals than were hospitals without NTM cases. This may be reflective of NTM being more common in urban areas or may potentially be due in part to differences in referral patterns, with more ill patients being referred to larger medical centers in urban areas, as well as those with a greater capacity for diagnostic mycobacterial testing and species identification.

This study was subject to several limitations. We were unable to identify the source of the NTM infection as respiratory, skin and soft tissue, or disseminated in nature, owing to the lack of data available on specimen collection site. However, the distribution of species that we report is similar to what is often detected in other studies on PNTM cases (18-23). Additionally, we conducted a subanalysis limited to patients with NTM infection with the ICD-9 code for PNTM and found that the species distribution and other patient and hospital factors were similar between patients with and those without a corresponding NTM ICD-9 code, suggesting that most isolates were likely respiratory isolates. We also were limited to species results as reported in the database, which frequently grouped M. abscessus and M. chelonae together despite their clinical differences. We also lacked data on laboratory procedures used for species identification, limiting our ability to assess the impact of changes in methodology over time on species-level patterns and trends. It is also possible that some patients classified as noncases did in fact have NTM infection and remained untested. Conversely, patients with a single positive NTM culture may not have clinical disease, though these results still reflect potential geographic differences in isolates circulating in the environment. Another key limitation is that smaller facilities or those located in more rural areas may differ from larger and more urban institutions in ways that impact the data available for analysis and epidemiologic trends observed, including differences in referral patterns, testing procedures, patient access to care, and clinical awareness of NTM. However, this would likely have a



Figure 2. Distribution of nontuberculous mycobacteria species identified by United States geographic area in *Premier* Healthcare Database, 2009–2013. MAC = *Mycobacterium avium* complex.

greater impact on prevalence assessments by demographic features and less so on geographic differences in mycobacterial species isolated.

In summary, significant geographic variation exists in the distribution of NTM species in the United States. Whereas MAC is the most frequently isolated species in the South and Northeast, *M. abscessus/M. chelonae* is proportionately higher in the West and South relative to other geographic regions of the country. Greater clinical awareness in geographic areas with increased levels of harder-to-treat mycobacteria are needed, given differences in treatment options and implications for patient outcomes.

Author disclosures are available with the text of this article at www.atsjournals.org.

#### References

- 1 Maekawa K, Ito Y, Hirai T, Kubo T, Imai S, Tatsumi S, Fujita K, Takakura S, Niimi A, Iinuma Y, et al. Environmental risk factors for pulmonary *Mycobacterium avium-intracellulare* complex disease. *Chest* 2011; 140:723–729.
- Primm TP, Lucero CA, Falkinham JO III. Health impacts of environmental mycobacteria. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2004;17:98–106.
   Falkinham JO III. Current epidemiologic trends of the nontuberculous
- S Faikinitarii JO III. Current epidemiologic trends of the nontuberculous mycobacteria (NTM). Curr Environ Health Rep 2016;3:161–167. Criffith DE Alegamit T Brown Elliott BA Containing Containing
- 4 Griffith DE, Aksamit T, Brown-Elliott BA, Catanzaro A, Daley C, Gordin F, Holland SM, Horsburgh R, Huitt G, Iademarco MF, et al.; ATS Mycobacterial Diseases Subcommittee; American Thoracic Society; Infectious Disease Society of America. An official ATS/IDSA statement: diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of nontuberculous

1660

mycobacterial diseases. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2007;175: 367–416. [Published erratum appears in *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2007;175:744–745.]

- 5 Adjemian J, Olivier KN, Seitz AE, Holland SM, Prevots DR. Prevalence of nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease in U.S. Medicare beneficiaries. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2012;185:881–886.
- 6 Adjemian J, Olivier KN, Seitz AE, Falkinham JO III, Holland SM, Prevots DR. Spatial clusters of nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease in the United States. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2012;186: 553–558.
- 7 Prevots DR, Shaw PA, Strickland D, Jackson LA, Raebel MA, Blosky MA, Montes de Oca R, Shea YR, Seitz AE, Holland SM, *et al.* Nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease prevalence at four integrated health care delivery systems. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2010;182:970–976.

- 8 Mirsaeidi M, Machado RF, Garcia JG, Schraufnagel DE. Nontuberculous mycobacterial disease mortality in the United States, 1999–2010: a population-based comparative study. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e91879.
- 9 Adjemian J, Olivier KN, Prevots DR. Nontuberculous mycobacteria among patients with cystic fibrosis in the United States: screening practices and environmental risk. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2014; 190:581–586.
- 10 Adjemian J, Prevots DR, Gallagher J, Heap K, Gupta R, Griffith D. Lack of adherence to evidence-based treatment guidelines for nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2014;11:9–16.
- 11 Spaulding AB, Lai YL, Olivier KN, Zelazny A, Kadri SS, Prevots DR, Adjemian J. Prevalence of nontuberculous mycobacterial infections among patients at 151 US hospitals, 2009–2013 [abstract]. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2016;193:A3014.
- 12 American Hospital Association. AHA hospital statistics. 2017 ed. Chicago: American Hospital Association; 2017 [accessed 2017 Mar 2]. Available from: http://www.aha.org/products-services/ aha-hospital-statistics.shtml
- 13 Premier. Premier healthcare database: data that informs and performs. Charlotte, NC: Premier, Inc.; 2017 [accessed 2017 Mar 2]. Available from: https://www.premierinc.com/transforminghealthcare/healthcare-performance-improvement/premier-researchservices/
- 14 United States Census Bureau. Maps & data, 2010. Washington, DC: Author; 2010 [accessed 2016 Jul 1]. Available from: https://www. census.gov/geo/maps-data/
- 15 Prevots DR, Marras TK. Epidemiology of human pulmonary infection with nontuberculous mycobacteria: a review. *Clin Chest Med* 2015; 36:13–34.
- 16 Adjemian J, Frankland TB, Daida YG, Honda JR, Olivier KN, Zelazny A, Honda S, Prevots DR. Epidemiology of nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease and tuberculosis, Hawaii, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2017;23:439–447.

- 17 Good RC, Snider DE Jr. Isolation of nontuberculous mycobacteria in the United States, 1980. *J Infect Dis* 1982;146:829–833.
- 18 O'Brien RJ, Geiter LJ, Snider DE Jr. The epidemiology of nontuberculous mycobacterial diseases in the United States: results from a national survey. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1987;135: 1007–1014.
- 19 Bodle EE, Cunningham JA, Della-Latta P, Schluger NW, Saiman L. Epidemiology of nontuberculous mycobacteria in patients without HIV infection, New York City. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2008;14:390–396.
- 20 Cassidy PM, Hedberg K, Saulson A, McNelly E, Winthrop KL. Nontuberculous mycobacterial disease prevalence and risk factors: a changing epidemiology. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;49:e124–e129.
- 21 Smith GS, Ghio AJ, Stout JE, Messier KP, Hudgens EE, Murphy MS, Pfaller SL, Maillard J-M, Hilborn ED. Epidemiology of nontuberculous mycobacteria isolations among central North Carolina residents, 2006–2010. J Infect 2016;72:678–686.
- 22 Satyanarayana G, Heysell SK, Scully KW, Houpt ER. Mycobacterial infections in a large Virginia hospital, 2001–2009. *BMC Infect Dis* 2011;11:113.
- 23 Henkle E, Hedberg K, Schafer S, Novosad S, Winthrop KL. Populationbased incidence of pulmonary nontuberculous mycobacterial disease in Oregon 2007 to 2012. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2015;12: 642–647.
- 24 Winthrop KL, Baxter R, Liu L, McFarland B, Austin D, Varley C, Radcliffe L, Suhler E, Choi D, Herrinton LJ. The reliability of diagnostic coding and laboratory data to identify tuberculosis and nontuberculous mycobacterial disease among rheumatoid arthritis patients using anti-tumor necrosis factor therapy. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2011;20:229–235.
- 25 Olivier KN, Weber DJ, Wallace RJ Jr, Faiz AR, Lee JH, Zhang Y, Brown-Elliot BA, Handler A, Wilson RW, Schechter MS, et al.; Nontuberculous Mycobacteria in Cystic Fibrosis Study Group. Nontuberculous mycobacteria. I: Multicenter prevalence study in cystic fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2003;167: 828–834.