What lies beneath: impact of an expanded screening program to control spread of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae

Thean Yen Tan, Jie Li, Qiu Sha Meng, Maria Theresa Cabahug, Wang Ying, Mui Mui Tang, Shi Yun Foo, Tuodi Wu Department of Infection Prevention and Control, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

11th HIS International Conference 26-28 November, 2018 Poster 34: Outbreaks

INTRODUCTION

Control of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae (CPE) is one of the most important infection control issues facing healthcare organisations today. In early 2017, our 1000 bed hospital noted an increase in hospital-acquired infections with CPE.

RESULTS

The number of monthly CPE screens rose from 488 tests in Jan 2017 to a maximum of 1,956 tests in May 2018.





This presentation describes the interventions carried out and the consequent impact on infections.

METHODS

Screening program: An existing CPE screening program was in place at that time. An expanded CPE screening program was instituted in March 2017. During both periods, contact screening of patients detected with CPE carriage was always performed.

Existing screening criteria
(prior March 2017)Expanded screening criteria
(after March 2017)history of foreign healthcare
recent admission (< 6months) admission
to other healthcare institutionshistory of foreign healthcare
recent admission (< 6months) admission
to other healthcare institutionsrenal dialysis
admission to intensive care unit

The rate of detected CPE carriage was 1.09/10,000 inpatient days in Jan 2017, abruptly rose to 8.37 following implementation of the expanded screening criteria and reached a maximum of 10.64 in Oct 2017, before eventually stabilising at ~4.0 in 2018. The rate of hospital-acquired CPE in clinical samples peaked at 1.13/10,000 inpatient days in Jan 2017, but fell in 2018.



Rate of hospital-acquired CPE screening & clinical samples by 10,000 patient days

weekly screen if inpatient in multibedded ward

admission to high dependency unit

Laboratory testing: Perianal screening swabs were cultured on chromogenic screening agar (CHROMID[™] Carba Smart, bioMerieux, France), with the addition of a selective enrichment step. Characterisation of carbapenemase genes was performed by in-house realtime PCR. Culture results were available 2-3 days after specimen receipt.

Infection control measures: Patients with CPE carriage were placed into single room or cohort ward isolation within one day of a positive CPE result. Screening of contacts of CPE patients was performed using culture (x1 sample) and PCR (Cepheid, USA) (x1 sample).

The predominant CPE genes were NDM (n=160), OXA-48-like (n=61), IMI (n=40) and KPC (n=26).

Distribution of CPE genes isolated from screening samples over study period



The expanded screening program showed multiple crosstransmission episodes, with the initial outbreak caused by NDM®, and subsequent low-level transmission®®. OXA-48 accounted for two episodes ®®, while an episode of IMI increased acquisition was detected®. KPC was present at low levels throughout the study period.

CONCLUSION

An expanded screening program following a rise in clinical infections identified an initial large circulating pool of occult carriers. Continuation of the screening program detected multiple episodes of silent CPE transmission, which allowed investigation and identification of transmission sources and implementation of control measures. However, nursing and laboratory workload was significantly increased. Reduction in CPE acquisition and carriage was slow, but eventually translated to a reduction in CPE infections. Control of CPE transmission is difficult in a hospital with multibed units, and a horizontal infection control strategy is likely to fail.



Delivering Care that Matters.