Role of the Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission

William A. Rutala, Ph.D., M.P.H.

Director, Statewide Program for Infection Control and Epidemiology and Research Professor of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Former Director, Hospital Epidemiology, Occupational Health and Safety, UNC Health Care, Chapel Hill, NC

Role of Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission "No Touch" Technologies Reduce HAIs

- Review the role of environmental surfaces
- Review the use of low-level disinfectants and the selection of the ideal disinfectant
- Review "best" practices for environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss options for evaluating environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss new "no touch" technologies for room decontamination and reduction of HAIs

Role of Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission
“No Touch” Technologies Reduce HAIs

- Review the role of environmental surfaces
- Review the use of low-level disinfectants and the selection of the ideal disinfectant
- Review “best” practices for environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss options for evaluating environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss new “no touch” technologies for room decontamination and reduction of HAIs

Environmental Contamination Leads to HAIs

Weber, Kanamori, Rutala. Curr Op Infect Dis .2016. In press.

- Evidence environment contributes
- Role-MRSA, VRE, *C. difficile*
- Surfaces are contaminated-~25%
- EIP survive days, weeks, months
- Contact with surfaces results in hand contamination
- Disinfection reduces contamination
- Disinfection (daily) reduces HAIs
- Rooms not adequately cleaned

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION LEADS TO HAIs

- There is increasing evidence to support the contribution of the environment to disease transmission
- This supports comprehensive disinfecting regimens (goal is not sterilization) to reduce the risk of acquiring a pathogen from the healthcare environment/equipment


4850

KEY PATHOGENS WHERE ENVIRONMENTIAL SURFACES PLAY A ROLE IN TRANSMISSION

- MRSA
- VRE
- *Acinetobacter* spp.
- *Clostridium difficile*
- Norovirus
- Rotavirus
- SARS

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION ENDEMIC AND EPIDEMIC MRSA

	Outbreak	Endemic				Site estimated mean§
	Rampling et al[27]*	Boyce et al[48]*	Sexton et al[51]†	Lemmen et al[50]*‡	French et al[64]*	
Floor	9%	50–55%	44–60%	24%	..	34·5%
Bed linen	..	38–54%	44%	34%	..	41%
Patient gown	..	40–53%	..	34%	..	40·5%
Overbed table	..	18–42%	64–67%	24%	..	40%
Blood pressure cuff	13%	25–33%	..	..	..	21%
Bed or siderails	5%	1–30%	44–60%	21%	43%	27%
Bathroom door handle	..	8–24%	..	12%¶	..	14%
Infusion pump button	13%	7–18%	..	30%	..	19%
Room door handle	11%	4–8%	..	23%	59%	21·5%||
Furniture	11%	..	44–59%	19%	..	27%
Flat surfaces	7%	..	32–38%	..	..	21·5%
Sink taps or basin fitting	..	..	..	14%	33%	23·5%
Average quoted**	11%	27%	49%	25%	74%	37%

Dancer SJ et al. Lancet ID 2008;8(2):101-13

ENVIRONMENTAL SURVIVAL OF KEY PATHOGENS ON HOSPITAL SURFACES

Pathogen	Survival Time
S. aureus (including MRSA)	7 days to >12 months
Enterococcus spp. (including VRE)	5 days to >46 months
Acinetobacter spp.	3 days to 11 months
Clostridium difficile (spores)	>5 months
Norovirus (and feline calicivirus)	8 hours to >2 weeks
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	6 hours to 16 months
Klebsiella spp.	2 hours to >30 months

Adapted from Hota B, et al. Clin Infect Dis 2004;39:1182-9 and
Kramer A, et al. BMC Infectious Diseases 2006;6:130

FREQUENCY OF ACQUISITION OF MRSA ON GLOVED HANDS AFTER CONTACT WITH SKIN AND ENVIRONMENTAL SITES

No significant difference on contamination rates of gloved hands after contact with skin or environmental surfaces (40% vs 45%; p=0.59)



Stiefel U, et al. ICHE 2011;32:185-187

Admission to Room Previously Occupied by Patient C/I with Epidemiologically Important Pathogen

- Results in the newly admitted patient having an increased risk of acquiring that pathogen by 39-353%
- For example, increased risk for *C. difficile* is 235% (11.0% vs 4.6%)

RISK OF ACQUIRING PATHOGEN FROM PRIOR ROOM OCCUPANT~120%

JA Otter et al. Am J Infect Control 2013;41:S6-S11



* Prior room occupant infected; ^Any room occupant in prior 2 weeks infected

EVALUATION OF HOSPITAL ROOM ASSIGNMENT AND ACQUISITION OF CDI

- Study design: Retrospective cohort analysis, 2005-2006
- Setting: Medical ICU at a tertiary care hospital
- Methods: All patients evaluated for diagnosis of CDI 48 hours after ICU admission and within 30 days after ICU discharge
- Results (acquisition of CDI)
  - Admission to room previously occupied by CDI = 11.0%
  - Admission to room not previously occupied by CDI = 4.6% (p=0.002)

TABLE 3. Multivariate Analysis of Risk Factors for Acquisition of *Clostridium difficile* Infection (CDI)

Risk factor	HR (95% CI)	*P*
Prior room occupant with CDI	2.35 (1.21–4.54)	.01
Greater age	1.00 (0.99–1.01)	.71
Higher APACHE III score	1.00 (1.00–1.01)	.06
Proton pump inhibitor use	1.11 (0.44–2.78)	.83
Antibiotic exposure		
Norfloxacin	0.38 (0.05–2.72)	.33
Levofloxacin	1.08 (0.67–1.73)	.75
Ciprofloxacin	0.49 (0.15–1.67)	.23
Fluoroquinolones	1.17 (0.72–1.91)	.53
Clindamycin	0.45 (0.14–1.42)	.17
Third- or fourth-generation cephalosporins	1.17 (0.76–1.79)	.48
Carbapenems	1.05 (0.63–1.75)	.84
Piperacillin-tazobactam	1.31 (0.82–2.10)	.27
Other penicillin	0.47 (0.23–0.98)	.04
Metronidazole	1.31 (0.83–2.07)	.24
Vancomycin		
Oral	1.38 (0.32–5.89)	.67
Intravenous	1.55 (0.88–2.73)	.13
Aminoglycosides	1.27 (0.78–2.06)	.35
Multiple (≥3 antibiotic classes)	1.28 (0.75–2.21)	.37

NOTE. APACHE, Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio.

Shaughnessy MK, et al. ICHE 2011;32:201-206

TRANSMISSION MECHANISMS INVOLVING THE SURFACE ENVIRONMENT



Rutala WA, Weber DJ. In:"SHEA Practical Healthcare Epidemiology" (Lautenbach E, Woeltje KF, Malani PN, eds), 3rd ed, 2010.

TRANSMISSION MECHANISMS INVOLVING THE SURFACE ENVIRONMENT



Rutala WA, Weber DJ. In:"SHEA Practical Healthcare Epidemiology" (Lautenbach E, Woeltje KF, Malani PN, eds), 3rd ed, 2010.

ACQUISITION OF MRSA ON HANDS AFTER CONTACT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL SITES

ACQUISITION OF MRSA ON HANDS/GLOVES AFTER CONTACT WITH CONTAMINATED EQUIPMENT

TRANSFER OF MRSA FROM PATIENT OR ENVIRONMENT TO IV DEVICE AND TRANSMISSON OF PATHOGEN

TRANSMISSION MECHANISMS INVOLVING THE SURFACE ENVIRONMENT



Rutala WA, Weber DJ. In:"SHEA Practical Healthcare Epidemiology" (Lautenbach E, Woeltje KF, Malani PN, eds), 3rd ed, 2010.

ACQUISITION OF *C. difficile* ON PATIENT HANDS AFTER CONTACT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL SITES AND THEN INOCULATION OF MOUTH

American Journal of Infection Control xxx (2013) 1-8

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

American Journal of Infection Control

journal homepage: www.ajicjournal.org

Major article

Does improving surface cleaning and disinfection reduce health care-associated infections?

Curtis J. Donskey MD [a,b,*]

[a] Geriatric Research, Education, and Clinical Center, Cleveland Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Cleveland, OH
[b] Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, OH

Key Words:
Environment
Cleaning
Transmission

Contaminated environmental surfaces provide an important potential source for transmission of health care-associated pathogens. In recent years, a variety of interventions have been shown to be effective in improving cleaning and disinfection of surfaces. This review examines the evidence that improving environmental disinfection can reduce health care-associated infections.

Contaminated environmental surfaces provide an important potential source for transmission of many health care associated pathogens.[1-6] These include *Clostridium difficile*, methicillin resistant infected with health care associated pathogens shed organisms onto their skin, clothing, bedding, and nearby environmental surfaces.[12] In addition to surfaces in rooms, portable equipment

Environmental Disinfection Interventions

Donskey CJ. Am J Infect Control 2013;41:S12

- Cleaning product substitutions
- Improvements in the effectiveness of cleaning and disinfection practices
  - Education
  - Audit and feedback
  - Addition of housekeeping personnel or specialized cleaning staff
- Automated technologies
- Conclusion: Improvements in environmental disinfection may prevent transmission of pathogens and reduce HAIs

Alfa et al. AJIC 2015;43:141-146

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

American Journal of Infection Control

journal homepage: www.ajicjournal.org

Major article

Use of a daily disinfectant cleaner instead of a daily cleaner reduced hospital-acquired infection rates

Michelle J. Alfa PhD [a,b,*], Evelyn Lo MD [b,c], Nancy Olson BSc [a], Michelle MacRae [c], Louise Buelow-Smith RN [c]

[a] St Boniface Research Centre, Winnipeg, MB, Canada
[b] Department of Medical Microbiology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada
[c] St Boniface Hospital, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

Key Words:
Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
Vancomycin-resistant enterococci
Clostridium difficile
Housekeeping
Environmental cleaning

Background: Documenting effective approaches to eliminate environmental reservoirs and reduce the spread of hospital-acquired infections (HAIs) has been difficult. This was a prospective study to determine if hospital-wide implementation of a disinfectant cleaner in a disposable wipe system to replace a cleaner alone could reduce HAIs over 1 year when housekeeping compliance was ≥80%.
Methods: In this interrupted time series study, a ready-to-use accelerated hydrogen peroxide disinfectant cleaner in a disposable wipe container system (DCW) was used once per day for all high-touch surfaces in patient care rooms (including isolation rooms) to replace a cleaner only. The HAI rates for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE), and *Clostridium difficile* were stratified by housekeeping cleaning compliance (assessed using ultraviolet-visible marker monitoring).
Results: When cleaning compliance was ≥80%, there was a significant reduction in cases/10,000 patient days for MRSA ($P = .0071$), VRE ($P < .0001$), and *C difficile* ($P = .0005$). For any cleaning compliance level there was still a significant reduction in the cases/10,000 patient days for VRE ($P = .0358$).
Conclusion: Our study data showed that daily use of the DCW applied to patient care high-touch environmental surfaces with a minimum of 80% cleaning compliance was superior to a cleaner alone because it resulted in significantly reduced rates of HAIs caused by *C difficile*, MRSA, and VRE.

Use of a Daily Disinfectant Cleaner Instead of a Daily Cleaner Reduced HAI Rates

Alfa et al. AJIC 2015.43:141-146

- Method: Improved hydrogen peroxide disposable wipe was used once per day for all high-touch surfaces to replace cleaner
- Result: When cleaning compliance was ≥ 80%, there was a significant reduction in cases/10,000 patient days for MRSA, VRE and *C. difficile*
- Conclusion: Daily use of disinfectant applied to environmental surfaces with a 80% compliance was superior to a cleaner because it resulted in significantly reduced rates of HAIs caused by *C. difficile*, MRSA, VRE

It appears that not only is disinfectant use important but how often is important

Daily disinfection vs clean when soiled

Daily Disinfection of High-Touch Surfaces

Kundrapu et al. ICHE 2012;33:1039

Daily disinfection of high-touch surfaces (vs cleaned when soiled) with sporicidal disinfectant (PA) in rooms of patients with CDI and MRSA reduced acquisition of pathogens on hands after contact with surfaces and of hands caring for the patient



FIGURE 1. Effect of daily disinfection of high-touch environmental surfaces on acquisition of *Clostridium difficile* and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) on gloved hands of investigators after contact with the surfaces. *A*, Percentage of positive *C. difficile* cultures; *B*, mean number of *C. difficile* colony-forming units acquired; *C*, percentage of positive MRSA cultures; *D*, mean number of MRSA colony-forming units acquired.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION LEADS TO HAIs

- There is increasing evidence to support the contribution of the environment to disease transmission
- This supports comprehensive disinfecting regimens (goal is not sterilization) to reduce the risk of acquiring a pathogen from the healthcare environment/equipment

Role of Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission "No Touch" Technologies Reduce HAIs

- Review the role of environmental surfaces
- Review the use of low-level disinfectants and the selection of the ideal disinfectant
- Review "best" practices for environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss options for evaluating environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss new "no touch" technologies for room decontamination and reduction of HAIs

DISINFECTION AND STERLIZATION

- EH Spaulding believed that how an object will be disinfected depended on the object's intended use
  - CRITICAL - objects which enter normally sterile tissue or the vascular system or through which blood flows should be sterile
  - SEMICRITICAL - objects that touch mucous membranes or skin that is not intact require a disinfection process (high-level disinfection[HLD]) that kills all microorganisms; however, small numbers of bacterial spores are permissible.
  - NONCRITICAL -objects that touch only intact skin require low-level disinfection

Effective Surface Decontamination

Product and Practice = Perfection

Effective Surface Decontamination

Product and Practice = Perfection

LOW-LEVEL DISINFECTION FOR NONCRITICAL EQUIPMENT AND SURFACES

Exposure time ≥ 1 min

Germicide	Use Concentration
Ethyl or isopropyl alcohol	70-90%
Chlorine	100ppm (1:500 dilution)
Phenolic	UD
Iodophor	UD
Quaternary ammonium (QUAT)	UD
QUAT with alcohol	RTU
Improved hydrogen peroxide (HP)	0.5%, 1.4%
Peracetic acid with HP (*C. difficile*)	UD

UD=Manufacturer's recommended use dilution; others in development/testing-electrolyzed water; polymeric guanidine; cold-air atmospheric pressure plasma (Boyce Antimicrob Res IC 2016. 5:10)

REVIEW THE “BEST” PRACTICES FOR CLEANING AND DISINFECTING

Cleaning and disinfecting is one-step with disinfectant-detergent. No pre-cleaning necessary unless spill or gross contamination. In many cases “best” practices not scientifically determined.

PROPERTIES OF AN IDEAL DISINFECTANT

Rutala, Weber. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2014;35:855-865

- Broad spectrum-wide antimicrobial spectrum
- Fast acting-should produce a rapid kill
- Remains Wet-meet listed kill/contact times with a single application
- Not affected by environmental factors-active in the presence of organic matter
- Nontoxic-not irritating to user
- Surface compatibility-should not corrode instruments and metallic surfaces
- Persistence-should have sustained antimicrobial activity
- Easy to use
- Acceptable odor
- Economical-cost should not be prohibitively high
- Soluble (in water) and stable (in concentrate and use dilution)
- Cleaner (good cleaning properties) and nonflammable

Key Considerations for Selecting the Ideal Disinfectant for Your Facility

Rutala, Weber. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2014;35:855-865

Consideration	Question to Ask	Score (1-10)
Kill Claims	Does the product kill the most prevalent healthcare pathogens	
Kill Times and Wet-Contact Times	How quickly does the product kill the prevalent healthcare pathogens. Ideally, contact time greater than or equal to the kill claim.	
Safety	Does the product have an acceptable toxicity rating, flammability rating	
Ease-of-Use	Odor acceptable, shelf-life, in convenient forms (wipes, spray), water soluble, works in organic matter, one-step (cleans/disinfects)	
Other factors	Supplier offer comprehensive training/education, 24-7 customer support, overall cost acceptable (product capabilities, cost per compliant use, help standardize disinfectants in facility	

Note: Consider the 5 components shown, give each product a score (1 is worst and 10 is best) in each of the 5 categories, and select the product with the highest score as the optimal choice (maximum score is 50).

MOST PREVALENT PATHOGENS CAUSING HAI

Rutala, Weber. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2014;35:855-865

- Most prevent pathogens causing HAI (~75% easy to kill)
  - *S. aureus* (15.6%)
  - *E. coli* (11.5%)
  - Coag neg Staph (11.4%)
  - *Klebsiella* (8.0%)
  - *P. aeruginosa* (8.0%)
  - *E. faecalis* (6.8%)
  - *C. albicans* (5.3%)
  - *Enterobacter* sp. (4.7%)
  - Other *Candida* sp (4.2%)
  - *C. difficile* in top 2-3 past 5 years
- Common causes of outbreaks and ward closures (relatively hard to kill)
  - *C. difficile* spores
  - Norovirus
  - Rotavirus
  - Adenovirus

EFFECTIVENESS OF DISINFECTANTS AGAINST MRSA AND VRE

Rutala WA, et al. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2000;21:33-38

TABLE 2
DISINFECTANT ACTIVITY AGAINST ANTIBIOTIC-SUSCEPTIBLE AND ANTIBIOTIC-RESISTANT BACTERIA

	Log$_{10}$ Reductions							
	VSE		VRE		MSSA		MRSA	
Product	0.5 min	5 min	0.5 min	5 min	0.5 min	5 min	0.5 min	5 min
Vesphene IIse	>4.3	>4.3	>4.8	>4.8	>5.1	>5.1	>4.6	>4.6
Clorox	>5.4	>5.4	>4.9	>4.9	>5.0	>5.0	>4.6	>4.6
Lysol Disinfectant	>4.3	>4.3	>4.8	>4.8	>5.1	>5.1	>4.6	>4.6
Lysol Antibacterial	>5.5	>5.5	>5.5	>5.5	>5.1	>5.1	>4.6	>4.6
Vinegar	0.1	5.3	1.0	3.7	+1.1	+0.9	+0.6	2.3

Abbreviations: MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus;* MSSA, methicillin-susceptible *S aureus;* VRE, vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus;* VSE, vancomycin-susceptible *Enterococcus.* Data represent mean of two trials (n=2). Values preceded by ">" represent the limit of detection of the assay. Assays were conducted at a temperature of 20°C and a relative humidity of 45%. Results were calculated as the log of Nd/No, where Nd is the titer of bacteria surviving after exposure and No is the titer of the control.

.

Decreasing Order of Resistance of Microorganisms to Disinfectants/Sterilants

Most Resistant

Prions

Spores (*C. difficile*)

Mycobacteria

Non-Enveloped Viruses (norovirus)

Fungi

Bacteria (MRSA, VRE, *Acinetobacter*)

Enveloped Viruses

Most Susceptible

C. difficile
EPA-Registered Products

- List K: EPA's Registered Antimicrobials Products Effective Against *C. difficile* spores, April 2014
- http://www.epa.gov/oppad001/list_k_clostridium.pdf
- 34 registered products; most chlorine-based, some HP/PA-based

Role of Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission
“No Touch” Technologies Reduce HAIs

- Review the role of environmental surfaces
- Review the use of low-level disinfectants and the selection of the ideal disinfectant
- Review “best” practices for environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss options for evaluating environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss new “no touch” technologies for room decontamination and reduction of HAIs

Effective Surface Decontamination

Product and Practice = Perfection

SHOULD WE CONCENTRATE ON “HIGH TOUCH” OR “HIGH RISK” OBJECTS

No, not only “high risk” (all surfaces).
“High touch” objects only recently defined and “high risk” objects not scientifically defined.

DEFINING HIGH TOUCH SURFACES

ICU



Huslage K, Rutala WA, Sickbert-Bennett E, Weber DJ. ICHE 2010;31:850-853

DEFINING HIGH TOUCH SURFACES

Non-ICU



Huslage K, Rutala WA, Sickbert-Bennett E, Weber DJ. ICHE 2010;31:850-853



MICROBIAL BURDEN ON ROOM SURFACES AS A FUNCTION OF FREQUENCY OF TOUCHING

Huslage K, Rutala WA, Weber DJ. ICHE. 2013;34:211-212

Surface	Prior to Cleaning Mean CFU/RODAC (95% CI)	Post Cleaning (mean) Mean CFU/RODAC (95% CI)
High	71.9 (46.5-97.3)	9.6
Medium	44.2 (28.1-60.2)	9.3
Low	56.7 (34.2-79.2)	5.7

- The level of microbial contamination of room surfaces is similar regardless of how often they are touched both before and after cleaning
- Therefore, all surfaces that are touched must be cleaned and disinfected

TABLE. Rates of Cleaning for 14 Types of High-Risk Objects

Object	Percentage cleaned		95% CI
	Mean ± SD	Range	
Sink	82 ± 12	57-97	77-88
Toilet seat	76 ± 18	40-98	68-84
Tray table	77 ± 15	53-100	71-84
Bedside table	64 ± 22	23-100	54-73
Toilet handle	60 ± 22	23-89	50-69
Side rail	60 ± 21	25-96	51-69
Call box	50 ± 19	9-90	42-58
Telephone	49 ± 16	18-86	42-56
Chair	48 ± 28	11-100	35-61
Toilet door knobs	28 ± 22	0-82	18-37
Toilet hand hold	28 ± 23	0-90	18-38
Bedpan cleaner	25 ± 18	0-79	17-33
Room door knobs	23 ± 19	2-73	15-31
Bathroom light switch	20 ± 21	0-81	11-30

NOTE. CI, confidence interval.

ALL “TOUCHABLE” (HAND CONTACT) SURFACES SHOULD BE WIPED WITH DISINFECTANT

“High touch” objects only recently defined (no significant differences in microbial contamination of different surfaces) and “high risk” objects not epidemiologically defined.

BEST PRACTICES FOR ROOM DISINFECTION

- Follow the CDC Guideline for Disinfection and Sterilization with regard to choosing an appropriate germicide and best practices for environmental disinfection
- Appropriately train environmental service workers on proper use of PPE and clean/disinfection of the environment
- Have environmental service workers use checklists to ensure all room surfaces are cleaned/disinfected
- Assure that nursing and environmental service have agreed what items (e.g., sensitive equipment) are to be clean/disinfected by nursing and what items (e.g., environmental surfaces) are to be cleaned/disinfected by environmental service workers. Staff must have sufficient time. Increasing workload compromising infection control activities.
- Use a method (e.g., fluorescent dye, ATP) to ensure proper cleaning

Role of Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission
"No Touch" Technologies Reduce HAIs

- Review the role of environmental surfaces
- Review the use of low-level disinfectants and the selection of the ideal disinfectant
- Review "best" practices for environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss options for evaluating environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss new "no touch" technologies for room decontamination and reduction of HAIs

Thoroughness of Environmental Cleaning

Carling P. AJIC 2013;41:S20-S25



MONITORING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLEANING

Cooper et al. AJIC 2007;35:338

- Visual assessment-not a reliable indicator of surface cleanliness
- ATP bioluminescence-measures organic debris (each unit has own reading scale, <250-500 RLU)
- Microbiological methods-<2.5CFUs/cm^2-pass; can be costly and pathogen specific
- Fluorescent marker-transparent, easily cleaned, environmentally stable marking solution that fluoresces when exposed to an ultraviolet light (applied by IP unbeknown to EVS, after EVS cleaning, markings are reassessed)

DAZO Solution (AKA – Goo)

TARGET ENHANCED

TERMINAL ROOM CLEANING: DEMONSTRATION OF IMPROVED CLEANING

- Evaluated cleaning before and after an intervention to improve cleaning
- 36 US acute care hospitals
- Assessed cleaning using a fluorescent dye
- Interventions
  - Increased education of environmental service workers
  - Feedback to environmental service workers

†Regularly change “dotted” items to prevent targeting objects

Carling PC, et al. ICHE 2008;29:1035-41





SURFACE EVALUATION USING ATP BIOLUMINESCENCE

Swab surface → luciferace tagging of ATP → Hand held luminometer



→

Used in the commercial food preparation industry to evaluate surface cleaning before reuse and as an educational tool for more than 30 years.

Percentage of Surfaces Clean by Different Measurement Methods

Rutala, Gergen, Sickbert-Bennett, Huslage, Weber. 2013

Fluorescent marker is a useful tool in determining how thoroughly a surface is wiped and mimics the microbiological data better than ATP



These interventions not enough to achieve consistent and high rates of cleaning/disinfection

No Touch

(supplements but do not replace surface cleaning/disinfection)

Role of Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission

- Review the role of environmental surfaces
- Review the use of low-level disinfectants and the selection of the ideal disinfectant
- Review “best” practices for environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss options for evaluating environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss new “no touch” technologies for room decontamination and reduction of HAIs

“NO TOUCH” APPROACHES TO ROOM DECONTAMINATION

(will not discuss technology with limited data)

Rutala, Weber. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2013;41:S36-S41

Touch (Wiping) vs No-Touch (Mechanical)

No Touch

(supplements but do not replace surface cleaning/disinfection)


1


1


3325
Hill-Rom.
UPGRADEABLE
ADVANCE SERIES

Formica Placement in the Patient Room

- Toilet seat
- Back of head-of-the-bed
- Back-of-computer
- Bedside table (far side)
- Side of sink
- Foot of bed, facing the door
- Bathroom door

UV Room Decontamination

Rutala, Gergen, Weber, ICHE. 2010:31:1025-1029

- Fully automated, self calibrates, activated by hand-held remote
- Room ventilation does not need to be modified
- Uses UV-C (254 nm range) to decontaminate surfaces
- Measures UV reflected from walls, ceilings, floors or other treated areas and calculates the operation total dosing/time to deliver the programmed lethal dose for pathogens.
- UV sensors determines and targets highly-shadowed areas to deliver measured dose of UV energy
- After UV dose delivered (36,000μWs/cm^2 for spore, 12,000μWs/cm^2 for bacteria), will power-down and audibly notify the operator
- Reduces colony counts of pathogens by >99.9% within 20 minutes

EFFECTIVENESS OF UV ROOM DECONTAMINATION

Rutala, Gergen, Weber, ICHE. 2010:31:1025-1029

TABLE 1. UV-C Decontamination of Formica Surfaces in Patient Rooms Experimentally Contaminated with Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), Vancomycin-Resistant *Enterococcus* (VRE), Multidrug-Resistant (MDR) *Acinetobacter baumannii*, and *Clostridium difficile* Spores

		UV-C line of sight						
		Total		Direct		Indirect		
Organism	Inoculum	No. of samples	Decontamination, log_{10} reduction, mean (95% CI)	No. of samples	Decontamination, log_{10} reduction, mean (95% CI)	No. of samples	Decontamination, log_{10} reduction, mean (95% CI)	*P*
MRSA	4.88 log_{10}	50	3.94 (2.54–5.34)	10	4.31 (3.13–5.50)	40	3.85 (2.44–5.25)	.06
VRE	4.40 log_{10}	47	3.46 (2.16–4.81)	15	3.90 (2.99–4.81)	32	3.25 (1.97–4.62)	.003
MDR *A. baumannii*	4.64 log_{10}	47	3.88 (2.59–5.16)	10	4.21 (3.27–5.15)	37	3.79 (2.47–5.10)	.07
C. difficile spores	4.12 log_{10}	45	2.79 (1.20–4.37)	10	4.04 (3.71–4.37)	35	2.43 (1.46–3.40)	<.001

EFFECTIVENESS OF UV DEVICES ON REDUCING MDROs ON CARRIERS

Author, year	UV system	MDROs	Time (min)	Energy ($\mu W/cm^2$)	Log_{10} reduction direct (indirect)
Rutala, 2010[27]	UV-C, Tru-D	MRSA, VRE, A	~15	12,000	4.31 (3.85), 3.90 (3.25), 4.21 (3.79)
Rutala, 2010[27]	UV-C, Tru-D	Cd	~50	36,000	4.04 (2.43)
Boyce, 2011[28]	UV-C, Tru-D	Cd	67.8 (1 stage)	22,000	1.7-2.9
Havill, 2012[29]	UV-C, Tru-D	Cd	73 (mean)	22,000	2.2
Rutala, 2013[30]	UV-C, Tru-D	MRSA	25	12,000	4.71 (4.27)
Rutala, 2013[30]	UV-C, Tru-D	Cd	43	22,000	3.41 (2.01)
Mahida, 2013[31]	UV-C, Tru-D	OR: MRSA, VRE	49	12,000	≥4.0 (≥4.0), 3.5 (2.4)
Mahida, 2013[31]	UV-C, Tru-D	Single patient room: VRE, A, As	23-93	12,000	≥4.0 (>2.3), ≥4.0 (1.7), ≥4.0 (2.0)
Rutala, 2014[32]	UV-C, Optimum	MRSA	5	NS	4.10 (2.74)
Rutala, 2014[32]	UV-C, Optimum	Cd	10	NS	3.35 (1.80)
Nerandzic, 2015[33]	UV, PX, Xenon	Cd, MRSA, VRE	10 at 4 ft (2 cycles)	NS	0.55, 1.85, 0.6

A, *Acinetobacter* spp; *As*, *Aspergillus*; *Cd*, *Clostridium difficile*; *MDRO*, multidrug-resistant organism; *MRSA*, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; *NS*, not stated; *OR*, operating room; *PX*, pulsed xenon; *UV*, ultraviolet light; *VRE*, vancomycin-resistant enterococci.

Weber DJ, Rutala WA, et al. Am J Infect Control 2016;44:e77-e84

EFFECTIVENESS OF UV DEVICES ON REDUCING MDROs IN CONTAMINATED PATIENT ROOMS

Author, year	UV system	MDROs	Time (min); energy ($\mu W/cm^2$)	Positive sites (before and after) (%)	Log_{10} reduction
Rutala, 2010[27]	UV-C, Tru-D	MRSA	~15; 12,000	20.2, 0.5	1.30
Nerandzic, 2010[34]	UV-C, Tru-D	MRSA, VRE	20; 12,000	10.7, 0.8; 2.7, 0.38	0.68; 2.52
Nerandzic, 2010[34]	UV-C, Tru-D	Cd	45; 22,000	3.4, 0.38	1.39;
Stibich, 2011[35]	UV, PX, Xenex	VRE	12; NS	8.2, 0	1.36
Anderson, 2013[36]	UV-C, Tru-D	All, VRE, A	25; 12,000	NS; 11, 1; 13, 3	1.35; 1.68; 1.71
Anderson, 2013[36]	UV-C, Tru-D	Cd	45; 22,000	10, 5	1.16
Jinadatha, 2015[37]	UV, PX, Xenex	MRSA	15 (3 cycles of 5 min), NS	70, 8	2.0
Nerandzic, 2015[33]	UV, PX, Xenex	MRSA, VRE, Cd	10 (2 cycles of 5 min); NS	10, 2; 4, 0.9; 19, 8	0.90, 1.08, NS
Jinadatha, 2015[37]	UV-PX, Xenex	MRSA	15 (3 cycles of 5 min); NS	NS, NS	0.63

A, *Acinetobacter* spp; *All*, all target organisms; *Cd*, *Clostridium difficile*; *MDRO*, multidrug-resistant organism; *MRSA*, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; *NS*, not stated; *PX*, pulsed xenon; *UV*, ultraviolet light; *VRE*, vancomycin-resistant enterococci.

Weber DJ, Rutala WA, et al. Am J Infect Control 2016;44:e77-e84

Clinical Trials Using UV for Terminal Room Decontamination to Reduce HAIs

Weber, Rutala et al. Am J Infect Control. 2016;44:e77-e84.

Author, Year	Design	Pathogens	Reduction in HAIs
Levin, 2013	Before-After, Pulsed Xenon	CDI	Yes
Hass, 2014	Before-After, Pulsed Xenon	CDI, MRSA, VRE, MDRO-GNR	Yes
Miller, 2015	Before-After, Pulsed Xenon	CDI	Yes
Nagaraja, 2015	Before-After, Pulsed Xenon	CDI	Yes (p=0.06)
Pegues, 2015	Before-After, Optimum	CDI	Yes
Anderson, 2017	Randomized-controlled trial, Tru-D	MRSA, VRE, CDI	Yes

Enhanced terminal room disinfection and acquisition and infection caused by multidrug-resistant organisms and *Clostridium difficile* (the Benefits of Enhanced Terminal Room Disinfection study): a cluster-randomised, multicentre, crossover study

Deverick J Anderson, Luke F Chen, David J Weber, Rebekah W Moehring, Sarah S Lewis, Patricia F Triplett, Michael Blocker, Paul Becherer, J Conrad Schwab, Lauren P Knelson, Yuliya Lokhnygina, William A Rutala, Hajime Kanamori, Maria F Gergen, Daniel J Sexton; for the CDC Prevention Epicenters Program

Anderson DJ, et al. Lancet (epub ahead of print)

2x2 Factorial Design

	No UV Light	UV Light
Quat*	A	B
Bleach	C	D

*NOTE: Bleach always used in rooms of patients with suspected or confirmed *C. difficile*

DUKE/UNC BETR-D STUDY: MRSA, VRE, *MDR-Acinetobacter*



DUKE/UNC BETR-D STUDY: CDI



BETR RESULTS: INTENTION-TO-TREAT ANALYSIS

Conclusion: Enhanced terminal room disinfection strategies decreased the clinical incidence of target MDROs by 10-30%

	Reference	Quat + UV group	Bleach group	Bleach + UV group
Exposed patients	4916	5178	5438	5863
Incidence cases (%)	115 (2.3%)	76 (1.5%)	101 (1.9%)	131 (2.2%)
Exposure days	22,426	22,289	24,261	28,757
Rate (per 10,000 exposure-days)	51.3	33.9	41.6	45.6
Risk reduction	Reference	17.4	9.7	5.7
RR (p value)	Reference	0.70 (0.036)	0.85 (0.116)	0.91 (0.303)

Anderson DJ et al. Lancet (epub ahead of print)

Enhanced Disinfection Leading to Reduction of Microbial Contamination and a Decrease in Patient Col/Infection

Rutala, Kanamori, Gergen et al. 2017

	Standard Method		Enhanced method	
	Quat	Quat/UV	Bleach	Bleach/UV
EIP (mean CFU per room)[a]	60.8	3.4	11.7	6.3
Reduction (%)		94	81	90
Colonization/Infection (rate)[a]	2.3	1.5	1.9	2.2
Reduction (%)		35	17	4

All enhanced disinfection technologies were significantly superior to Quat alone in reducing EIPs. Comparing the best strategy with the worst strategy (i.e., Quat vs Quat/UV) revealed that a reduction of 94% in EIP (60.8 vs 3.4) led to a 35% decrease in colonization/infection (2.3% vs 1.5%). Our data demonstrated that a decrease in room contamination was associated with a decrease in patient colonization/infection. First study which quantitatively described the entire pathway whereby improved disinfection decreases microbial contamination which in-turn reduced patient colonization/infection.

HP Systems for Decontamination of the Hospital Environment

Falagas et al. J Hosp Infect. 2011;78:171

Author, Year	HP System	Pathogen	Before HPV	After HPV	% Reduction
French, 2004	VHP	MRSA	61/85-72%	1/85-1%	98
Bates, 2005	VHP	*Serratia*	2/42-5%	0/24-0%	100
Jeanes, 2005	VHP	MRSA	10/28-36%	0/50-0%	100
Hardy, 2007	VHP	MRSA	7/29-24%	0/29-0%	100
Dryden, 2007	VHP	MRSA	8/29-28%	1/29-3%	88
Otter, 2007	VHP	MRSA	18/30-60%	1/30-3%	95
Boyce, 2008	VHP	*C. difficile*	11/43-26%	0/37-0%	100
Bartels, 2008	HP dry mist	MRSA	4/14-29%	0/14-0%	100
Shapey, 2008	HP dry mist	*C. difficile*	48/203-24%; 7	7/203-3%; 0.4	88
Barbut, 2009	HP dry mist	*C. difficile*	34/180-19%	4/180-2%	88
Otter, 2010	VHP	GNR	10/21-48%	0/63-0%	100

Clinical Trials Using HP for Terminal Room Disinfection to Reduce HAIs

Weber, Rutala et al. Am J Infect Control, 2016;44:e77-e84

Author, Year	Design	Pathogen	Reduction in HAIs
Boyce, 2008	Before-After	CDI	Yes
Cooper, 2011	Before-After	CDI	Decrease cases (incidence not stated)
Passaretti, 2013	Prospective cohort	MRSA, VRE, CDI	Yes, in all MDROs
Manian, 2013	Before-After	CDI	Yes
Mitchell, 2014	Before-After	MRSA	Yes

This technology ("no touch"-UV/HP) should be used (capital equipment budget) for terminal room disinfection (e.g., after discharge of patients on Contact Precautions).

UV ROOM DECONTAMINATION: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

Rutala WA, Weber DJ. AJIC 2013;41:s36

- Advantages
  - Reliable biocidal activity against a wide range of pathogens
  - Studies demonstrating a reduction in HAIs
  - Surfaces and equipment decontaminated
  - Room decontamination is rapid (5-25 min) for vegetative bacteria
  - HVAC system does not need to be disabled and room does not need to be sealed
  - UV is residual free and does not give rise to health and safety concerns
  - No consumable products so operating costs are low (key cost = acquisition)
- Disadvantages
  - Can only be done for terminal disinfection (i.e., not daily cleaning)
  - All patients and staff must be removed from room
  - Substantial capital equipment costs
  - Does not remove dust and stains which are important to patients/visitors
  - Sensitive use parameters (e.g., UV dose delivered)

HP ROOM DECONTAMINATION: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

Rutala WA, Weber DJ. AJIC 2013;41:s36

- Advantages
  - Reliable biocidal activity against a wide range of pathogens
  - Studies demonstrate a reduction in HAIs
  - Surfaces and equipment decontaminated
  - Residual free and does not give rise to health and safety concerns (aeration units convert HPV into oxygen and water)
  - Useful for disinfecting complex equipment and furniture
  - Does not require direct or indirect line of sight
- Disadvantages
  - Can only be done for terminal disinfection (i.e., not daily cleaning)
  - All patients and staff must be removed from room
  - Decontamination takes approximately 2.0 hours
  - HVAC system must be disabled and the room sealed with tape
  - Substantial capital equipment costs
  - Does not remove dust and stains which are important to patients/visitors
  - Sensitive use parameters (e.g., HP concentration)

Selection of a UV or HP Device

Weber, Rutala et al. Am J Infect Control. 2016;44:e77-e84.

- Since different UV and hydrogen peroxide systems vary substantially, infection preventionists should review the peer-reviewed literature and choose only devices with demonstrated bactericidal capability as assessed by carrier tests and/or the ability to disinfect actual patient rooms
- Ideally, one would select a device that has demonstrated bactericidal capability and the ability to reduce HAIs

Role of Environmental Surfaces in Disease Transmission

- Review the role of environmental surfaces
- Review the use of low-level disinfectants and the selection of the ideal disinfectant
- Review “best” practices for environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss options for evaluating environmental cleaning and disinfection
- Discuss new “no touch” technologies for room decontamination and reduction of HAIs

Role of the Environmental in Disease Transmission

- Disinfection of noncritical environmental surfaces/equipment is an essential component of infection prevention
- Disinfection should render surfaces and equipment free of pathogens in sufficient numbers to cause human disease
- When determining the optimal disinfecting product, consider the 5 components (kill claims/time, safety, ease of use, others) and select the product with the highest score as the best choice for your healthcare facility
- Implement a method to improve the thoroughness of cleaning
- Goal: Product + Practice = Perfection
- An enhanced method of room decontamination is superior to a standard method
- "No touch" technology should be used at discharge for CP patients

THANK YOU!
www.disinfectionandsterilization.org