

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Establishing the prevalence of healthcare associated infections in Australian hospitals: Protocol for the Comprehensive Healthcare Associated Infection National Surveillance (CHAINS) study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024924
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Jun-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Russo, Philip; Deakin University, School of Nursing and Midwifery Stewardson, Andrew; Alfred Health, Infectious Diseases; Monash University, Medicine Cheng, Allen; Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine; Alfred Hospital, Infectious Diseases Unit Bucknall, Tracey; Deakin University, School of Nursing & Midwifery; Deakin University & Alfred Health, Nursing Services Marimuthu, Kalisvar; Ten Tock Hospital; National University Singapore Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine Mitchell, Brett; Avondale College for Higher Education, Faculty of Nursing and Health; Australian Catholic University, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Paramedicine
Keywords:	Healthcare associated infection, point prevalence surveillance, infection prevention, Infection control < INFECTIOUS DISEASES

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **ESTABLISHING THE PREVALENCE OF HEALTHCARE ASSOCIATED**  
5  
6 **INFECTIONS IN AUSTRALIAN HOSPITALS: PROTOCOL FOR THE**  
7  
8 **COMPREHENSIVE HEALTHCARE ASSOCIATED INFECTION NATIONAL**  
9  
10 **SURVEILLANCE (CHAINS) STUDY**

11  
12  
13  
14 *Russo PL<sup>1\*</sup>, Stewardson A<sup>2</sup>, Cheng A<sup>3</sup>, Bucknall T<sup>1</sup>, Marimuthu K<sup>4,5,6</sup>, Mitchell BG<sup>7</sup>*

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 <sup>1</sup> School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Health, Centre for Quality and Patient Safety  
20  
21 Research - Alfred Health Partnership, Deakin University, Victoria Australia

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>2</sup> Department of Infectious Diseases, Alfred Health and Monash University, Victoria Australia

27  
28  
29  
30  
31 <sup>3</sup> Infection Prevention and Healthcare Epidemiology Unit, Alfred Health; School of Public  
32  
33 Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Victoria Australia

34  
35  
36  
37  
38 <sup>4</sup> Department of Infectious Diseases, Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore

39  
40  
41 <sup>5</sup> National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore

42  
43  
44 <sup>6</sup> Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

45  
46  
47  
48  
49 <sup>7</sup> Faculty of Arts, Nursing and Theology, Avondale College of Higher Education, Wahroonga,  
50  
51 New South Wales, Australia

52  
53  
54 **\*Corresponding author**

55  
56 School of Nursing and Midwifery, Deakin University

1  
2  
3 221 Burwood Hwy  
4

5 Burwood 3125, Victoria Australia  
6

7 Email: [p.russo@deakin.edu.au](mailto:p.russo@deakin.edu.au)  
8

9  
10 PH: +61 411 659 486  
11

12  
13  
14 Word count: 2644  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

## ABSTRACT

### Introduction

A healthcare associated infection data (HAI) point prevalence study (PPS) conducted in 1984 in Australian hospitals estimated the prevalence of HAI to be 6.3%. Since this time, there have been no further national estimates undertaken. In the absence of a coordinated national surveillance program or regular PPS, there is a dearth of national HAI data to inform policy and practice priorities.

### Methods and Analysis

A national HAI PPS study will be undertaken based on the European Centres for Disease Control method. Nineteen public acute hospitals will participate. A standardised algorithm will be used to detect HAIs in a two stage cluster design, random sample of adult inpatients in acute wards and all ICU patients. Data from each hospital will be collected by two trained members of the research team. We will estimate the prevalence of HAIs, invasive device use, single room placement and deployment of transmission based precautions.

### Ethics and Dissemination

Ethics approval was obtained from the Alfred Health Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC/17/Alfred/203) via the National Mutual Assessment and the Tasmanian Health and Medical Human Research Committee (H0016978). Findings will be disseminated in individualised participating hospital reports, peer review publications and conference presentations.

## Keywords

Healthcare associated infection, point prevalence surveillance, infection prevention, infection control.

## Article Summary: Strengths and limitations of this study

- The study is based on validated methods within the European Centres for Disease Control (ECDC) PPS surveillance protocol, with the addition of device use prevalence estimates
- Data from all sites will be collected by two trained data collectors minimising variation between sites
- Restriction to adult acute inpatients in public facilities limits representativeness
- Some infections may be missed due to sampling process

## INTRODUCTION

Surveillance of healthcare associated infections (HAI) is a fundamental component of any infection prevention program.<sup>1</sup> National HAI point prevalence studies (PPS) provide a ‘snapshot’ of all HAI types and are used to identify priority areas for action and inform infection prevention recommendations and policy direction.<sup>2</sup> Many European countries regularly contribute HAI data to the European Centres for Disease Control (ECDC) PPS surveillance, and this is often in addition to existing, well established national HAI surveillance programs.<sup>3,4</sup>

Australia’s first and only HAI PPS was conducted in 1984 and estimated the prevalence of “nosocomial” infections to be 6.5%.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, many local HAI surveillance programs have evolved separately, resulting in broad variation in activity and methodology to the extent that data cannot be reliably collated to generate national Australian HAI data, with the exception of *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia.<sup>6-8</sup>

Despite strong support for a national surveillance program,<sup>9</sup> there has been no funding identified to achieve this goal. This means that Australian national infection prevention policy is not informed by sound national data, nor can national interventions be effectively evaluated. Further, where existence of HAI surveillance occurs at local hospital or State level, variations in methodologies means that it is not possible to meaningfully aggregate data.

We will undertake the first Australian HAI PPS in over 30 years, the Comprehensive Healthcare Associated Infection National Surveillance (CHAINS) study. The European

1  
2  
3 protocol provides a standardised methodology to European Member States and hospitals.  
4  
5 The current version 5.3 provides a framework to develop a PPS in Australia.<sup>3</sup> Whilst based  
6  
7 on the protocol developed by the ECDC, the CHAINS protocol differs in a number of areas  
8  
9 including participation and recruitment criteria, and does not include patient level risk  
10  
11 factors or antimicrobial prescribing data.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 The purpose of this study is to update our knowledge on the prevalence of HAIs and multi-  
17  
18 drug resistant organisms in Australia and provide stakeholders with national benchmarks  
19  
20 that can be used to identify areas for improvement, measure effectiveness of interventions,  
21  
22 and importantly use as a model for future national surveillance activities. We will also  
23  
24 determine the prevalence of device use, informing future research projects and providing  
25  
26 useful data for industry.  
27  
28

29  
30  
31 Whilst guidelines for describing point prevalence study protocols have not been published,  
32  
33 this paper describes the study protocol, and focuses on areas that vary from the ECDC  
34  
35 protocol.  
36  
37

## 38 39 40 41 **Study Objectives**

42  
43  
44 The primary objectives of the CHAINS study are:

- 45  
46 1. To estimate the total prevalence of HAIs among inpatients aged  $\geq 16$  in public acute  
47  
48 care hospitals in Australia
- 49  
50 2. To describe the HAIs by site, type of patient, specialty, type of facility and  
51  
52 geographical location  
53  
54

55  
56 The secondary objectives are:  
57  
58  
59  
60



1. To determine the prevalence of patients:
  - a. managed under transmission based precautions isolation in a single room
  - b. with an indwelling urinary catheter device
  - c. with vascular access device(s)
  - d. with a multidrug resistant organism (infection or colonisation)

## METHODS AND ANALYSIS

### Study Design

A rolling PPS across a sample of Australian public hospitals will be undertaken over a three month period. The PPS protocol is based on the ECDC standardised methodology for PPSs on HAIs,<sup>10</sup> with some modifications to the Standard Protocol option (see below and Table 1). The ECDC protocol was developed and tested extensively with reliable outcomes. It has been utilised across 29 European countries for national PPS, and has also been applied in several non-European countries<sup>11-13</sup>

**Table 1** – Summary of major differences in protocol

ECDC protocol	Deviations	Rationale
<b>Patient Inclusion and Exclusion</b>		
– All patients admitted to the ward before or at 8 a.m. and not discharged from the ward at the time	– 50% patients in acute wards and all ICU patients – Only adults ≥18-year-olds admitted to the ward	– Insufficient resources to sample every patient

of survey, including neonates on maternity and paediatric wards, will be included	before or at 8 a.m. and not discharged from the ward at the time of survey will be included	
<b>Data Collection Processes</b>		
– Composition of the team responsible for data collection varied from one hospital to another	– The same data collectors will be collecting data for all hospitals in the PPS	– To minimise variation and maximise consistency in classifying infections – Minimise the burden of data collection on participating hospitals
– Total time frame for data collection for all wards of a single hospital did not exceed two to three weeks	– Data to be collected during a one off hospital visit (1-3 days)	– Same data collectors used across all facilities – Smaller sample size
<b>Patient Data Fields (see supplementary table for all data fields)</b>		
– McCabe score was employed to classify the severity of underlying medical conditions	– No risk factor data will be collected	– Insufficient resources to collect risk factor data
– Antimicrobial use	– No antimicrobial use data will be collected	– Antimicrobial data already collected in

		annual point prevalence survey
<b>Data Validation</b>		
– Recommended sample size at the national level was 750 patients in 25 hospitals	– Records of 100% of patients identified as having an infection at the first hospital (up to a maximum of 40), and a random sample of 5% of those identified as not having an infection will be reviewed	– Same data collectors used across all facilities – Pragmatic validation within existing resources
– Validation team consisted was separate from the original data collection team	– Validation team members will consist of the chief investigators who cross-check the data	– Same data collectors used across all facilities
– Blinded data validation recommended	– Validation team will not be blinded	– Not practical for this study

### Hospital Selection

Public acute care hospitals categorised as a Principal Referral hospital or a Group A hospital as per the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare peer groupings will be eligible to participate.<sup>14</sup> These two peer groups are characterised by providing a broad range of services, include emergency and intensive care units, and have larger patient volumes than

1  
2  
3 other peer groups.<sup>14</sup> Because of anticipated heterogeneity and to maximise representation  
4  
5 of large acute care public facilities, specialist hospitals (e.g. maternity, cancer and paediatric  
6  
7 hospitals) and private hospitals will be excluded.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Limited resources for this PPS restricts the number of participating hospitals to a sample of  
13  
14 public acute care facilities. We will launch a call for expressions of interest for hospitals to  
15  
16 participate in the study to measure the appetite for participation. To best meet the  
17  
18 objectives of the study, 19 hospitals will be purposively selected to participate from those  
19  
20 who meet the selection criteria. Hospital selection numbers will be approximately  
21  
22 proportional to the size of the six States and one of Territories in Australia (the other  
23  
24 Territory will not be included due to logistical reasons)  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Ward Selection**

31  
32 In each participating hospital, all acute care inpatient wards will be included with the  
33  
34 exception of:  
35

- 36 • paediatric wards
- 37
- 38 • psychiatric wards (acute and non-acute)
- 39
- 40 • neonatal ICUs
- 41
- 42 • rehabilitation, palliative, sub-acute and long-term care wards in acute care facilities  
43  
44 (e.g. nursing homes, spinal rehabilitation wards);
- 45
- 46 • accident and emergency (A&E) departments (except for wards attached to A&E  
47  
48 departments where patients are monitored for more than 24 hours).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Patient sampling

Patients will be sampled in a two-stage cluster design, with a sample of patients in a sample of Principal Referral and Group A Hospitals. Patients will be systematically sampled on each eligible ward at participating hospitals by randomly selecting either odd or even numbered beds (50% sample). Randomisation will be achieved by the toss of a coin by the Lead Investigator (PLR) prior to the RAs visiting each site. If the bed is empty due to it not being used, then this is not counted in the denominator, and the next bed occupied within the random sample will be surveyed. As a high-risk group of interest, all patients in adult intensive care units (ICUs) will be surveyed.

We estimate that we will survey 50% of patients at 19 hospitals (estimated up to 5000 patients total). Assuming an intracluster correlation coefficient of 3% and a prevalence of hospital acquired infection of 7.5-10%, we will be able to estimate prevalence with a precision of +/- 2.2-2.5% (based on the 95% CI). Estimates of prevalence will account for the clustered design and oversampling in ICU (using inverse probability weighting).

## Patient Selection

Consistent with the ECDC protocol, in each ward meeting the above inclusion criteria, all patients admitted to the ward before or at 0800 on the first survey day, and not discharged from the ward at the time of the survey will be eligible. In practice, this means that patients transferred in or out after 0800 of the first survey day from or to another ward, or location outside the hospital, will not be included.

Patients who meet the following criteria on the eligible wards will be excluded:

- patients under 18 years of age (in any hospital ward or unit)
- patients undergoing same day treatment or surgery
- patients seen at outpatient department
- patients in the emergency room;
- dialysis patients (outpatients)

### Data collection and management

Data collection from 19 sites across Australia will occur over a 3-month period from August to October 2018. A specific date for each hospital visit will be coordinated with the hospital. The location and size of the facility will be considered when planning visits to maximise efficiency of data collection.

All data will be collected by two trained Research Assistants (RAs). As a condition of enrolment in the study, hospitals will be required to provide a hospital-based clinician, preferably a member of the infection prevention team, on the survey days. The role of the hospital clinician will be to accompany the RAs and to facilitate access to all wards and data.

The two RA's will be trained by the research team in data collection methodology, and use of data collection tools. The RA's will also undergo competency based assessment prior to data collection. A secure online web-based survey tool will be accessed for data entry.

We will collect four levels of data; hospital, ward, patient and HAI.

### *Hospital data*

General hospital demographic data will be collected based on the ECDC protocol. However the only indicator data similar to ECDC protocol is data on hand hygiene compliance, and the number of infection control FTE nurses. Further indicator data to be included are *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia rates (routinely reported to the Australian Health and Institute of Welfare) and intensive care unit central line-associated bloodstream infection rates if available. This data will be collected prior to the visit.

### *Ward Data*

Ward demographic data will be collected on the day of the survey. Data on the ward specialty, total number of beds and number of single rooms is the same as for ECDC. Different to ECDC protocol will be data collected on the number of patients placed in single room isolation and the type of isolation. No other ward level data will be collected.

### *Patient data*

Patient-level data is a modified version of the ECDC Standard Protocol. Two main differences are the omission of both risk factor data (McCabe) score and antimicrobial use data. The omission of risk factor data is to ensure patient data can be collected in a timely manner. Detailed antimicrobial data was omitted given that Australia has an annual national antimicrobial prescribing PPS which allows more thorough analysis of antimicrobial use in Australia than what was possible in this PPS.<sup>15</sup> As a screen to determine the presence of a HAI, data on the presence of fever and current antimicrobial therapy will be collected.

### *HAI data*

For each patient with a fever or currently receiving antimicrobial therapy, the RA's will work through an algorithm applying the HAI definitions in the ECDC protocol. Data on each HAI identified will be consistent with the ECDC protocol.

### *Data validation*

Data will be assessed for completeness and accuracy at the first hospital to undergo the survey. Records of 100% of patients identified as having an infection (up to a maximum of 40), and a random sample of 5% of those identified as not having an infection will be reviewed by two chief investigators. Findings will be discussed with the research team prior to the survey proceeding.

### *Data Analysis*

The prevalence of HAI will be estimated from the proportion with infection in the sample (correcting for oversampling of ICU patients) with confidence intervals corrected for the clustered design. This will be performed using the svy module in Stata 14.2 (College Station, Texas 2017). The analysis will consider each hospital as a cluster, and adjust for oversampling in ICU using inverse probability weights. Logistic regression will be used to examine factors associated with infection. These factors will include:

- Location of hospital: metro, remote etc.
- Age
- Gender
- Ward type



- Intubation
- Presence of peripheral vascular access device
- Presence of central vascular access device
- Indwelling urinary catheter

### Outcome measures

The outcomes for each objective of the study are outlined in Table 2.

**Table 2** Key outcome measures

	Objective	Outcome measure
Primary objectives	To estimate the total prevalence of HAIs among inpatients aged $\geq 18$ in public acute care hospitals in Australia	Total number of patients classified as having a HAI divided by the total number of patients surveyed, weighted by the probability of sampling
	To describe the HAIs by site, type of patient, specialty, type of facility and geographical location	Of the patients with a HAI, the proportion by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• infection site</li> <li>• elective or emergency</li> <li>• gender</li> <li>• age</li> <li>• ward specialty</li> <li>• facility type</li> </ul>
Secondary	Prevalence of patients	Total number of patients cared for under

objectives	managed under transmission based precautions isolation in a single room	transmission-based precautions divided by the total number of patients surveyed, overall (weighted by the probability of sampling), by hospital, by ward specialty
	Prevalence of patients with an indwelling urinary catheter device	Total number of patients with a urinary catheter divided by the total number of patients surveyed, overall, by hospital, by ward specialty
	Prevalence of patients with vascular access device(s)	Total number of patients with a vascular access device divided by the total number of patients surveyed  Of those with a vascular device, the proportion by type of device, overall, by hospital, by ward specialty
	Prevalence of patients with a multi drug resistance organism (infection or colonisation)	Total number of patients infected or colonised with a multi drug resistance organism divided by the total number of patients surveyed  Of those with a multi drug resistance organism, the proportion by organism, overall, by hospital, by ward specialty

### Ethical Considerations

This study has been approved by the Alfred Health Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) (HREC/17/Alfred/203) through the National Mutual Assessment (NMA) process. The

1  
2  
3 NMA is a system of single scientific and ethical review of multicentre human research  
4 projects in public health organisations in, Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales,  
5 Queensland, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia. A separate approval was  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 obtained from the Tasmanian Health and Medical Human Research Committee (H0016978)  
11  
12 for participating Tasmanian hospitals.  
13

14  
15  
16 Any risks or harms identified and associated with the study will be reported to the HRECs.  
17  
18 Reporting of the study and progress, including audits, will be conducted consistent with the  
19 requests of the HRECs. Any modification to the study that have ethical implications will be  
20  
21 forwarded to the HRECs for approval. In the main results paper for the study, we will also  
22  
23 aim to estimate the resources required to obtain ethics approval and site specific  
24  
25  
26 authorisations.  
27  
28  
29

### 30 31 32 *Informed consent*

33  
34 A waiver of individual patient consent has been obtained for this study from the HRECs  
35  
36 based on a number of considerations. These considerations are: there are no interventions  
37  
38 and no harm or discomfort to the patient as a result of the project; the benefits of the  
39  
40 research justify any risk of harm associated with not obtaining consent; results of the  
41  
42 research are not individualised or indeed patient identifiable; the study requires no direct  
43  
44 involvement of patients, rather it collates existing information obtained during their  
45  
46 hospitalisation; and no new information will be obtained about individual patients,  
47  
48  
49 therefore results will have no significance for the individual welfare of patients.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Dissemination

Dissemination of knowledge gained from this study will be facilitated using a variety of modes. Each participating hospital will be provided with an individualised report highlighting their outcomes in comparison to other hospitals (deidentified) and aggregated data. Overall study findings will be presented through peer reviewed publications, presentations to jurisdictional policy representatives and relevant conferences.

## Discussion

There is a dearth of national HAI data in Australia. Data from a multicentre PPS on urinary tract infections in Australia estimated the HAI rate of UTI was 1.4%, and the catheter associated UTI prevalence to be 0.9%.<sup>16</sup> Recently an estimate of the burden of HAI in Australia was generated from a systematic review of studies published between 2010 and 2016 and suggested the incidence of HAIs in Australia may be up to 165,000 per year.<sup>17</sup>

Although the Australian Commission for Safety and Quality in Health Care has a number of national initiatives to prevent HAI, it can be argued that these initiatives may be misdirected given the lack of national HAI data to inform and evaluate interventions. While administrative data will soon be used to measure HAIs in Australia<sup>18</sup>, we contend that HAI surveillance cannot be adequately performed with this approach.<sup>19 20</sup>

The importance of reliable national HAI data in Australia cannot be underestimated. The CHAINS study is a small first step towards an improved understanding of the prevalence of HAIs in Australia. To identify, develop, implement and evaluate national HAI initiatives, reliable data based on validated methods must be used.

### *Strengths*

This study has a number of strengths. First, it is based on established and validated methodology from the ECDC. Second, rather than rely on each hospital to collect and submit data, which is the common process in large PPS studies, this study will use the same trained and competent data collectors at each hospital. This greatly increases the likelihood of consistency in data collection and application of HAI definitions and prevents any subjective influences that may occur at a hospital level. Third, the two stage cluster design, randomised sampling of patients at each facility, and the inclusion of facilities in six of the seven Australian jurisdictions will provide confident estimates of the prevalence of HAI. Fourth, data on the prevalence of device use, single room placement and transmission based precautions has never before been estimated in Australia and will generate new knowledge.

### *Limitations*

Data collecting is limited to adult acute inpatients, no data is being collected from hospitals within the private sector, and to ensure timely collection of data at each site, patient level risk factor data (i.e. McCabe index data) is not being collected. Some HAIs may be missed due to randomisation and the use of fever or current antimicrobial therapy as a screen to explore the presence of HAI.

### **Study status**

Data collection is due to commence in August 2018.

## Footnotes

### *Author contributions*

Five authors (PLR, AS, AC, TB, BGM) are chief investigators and are involved in the design and implementation of the study. KM has provided expert advice on national point prevalence surveys and provided access to data collection tools and educational materials. PLR prepared the manuscript, all other authors contributed sections, critiqued and revised and approved the manuscript

### *Competing interests*

None declared

### *Funding*

This project is wholly funded by the Rosemary Norman Foundation, a philanthropic nursing charity that has funded in excess of one million dollars into nursing and midwifery research over the last decade. None of the researchers receive any income from the funding or have any role with the charity. The Foundation was not involved in the design nor the conduct of the study, and will not benefit in any form, from the results of the study.

### *Patient and Public Involvement statement*

There was no patient or public involvement in the development of this study however the study was reviewed by patient and consumer representatives on the Human Research Ethics Committee. Whilst results will not be provided directly to the

1  
2  
3 patients surveyed in the study, data will be provided back to each participating  
4 facility, policy representatives and disseminated through peer review publications  
5 and conferences.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 *Data sharing statement*

12  
13 Any available unpublished data can be requested on contacting the authors.  
14  
15

### 16 17 *Acknowledgements*

18  
19 The authors acknowledge the work of the CHAINS Project Manager, Bridey Saultry, and the  
20 key stakeholders at potential sites. The Centre for Quality and Patient Safety, Deakin  
21 University for supporting and administering the project. We also acknowledge Professor  
22 Jacqui Reilly and Professor Jennie Wilson for expert advice and guidance in the planning  
23 stages of this project.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

1. Perl TM, Chaiwarth R. Surveillance: An Overview. In: Lautenbach E, Woeltje KF, Malani PN, eds. *Practical Healthcare Epidemiology*. 3rd ed. London: The University of Chicago Press 2010:111-42.
2. Cairns S, Gibbons C, Milne A, et al. Results from the third Scottish National Prevalence Survey: Is a population health approach now needed to prevent HAI? *J Hosp Infect* 2018 doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2018.03.038
3. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Point prevalence survey of healthcare-associated infections and antimicrobial use in European acute care hospitals – protocol version 5.3. Stockholm: ECDC, 2016.
4. Russo PL, Cheng AC, Richards M, et al. Healthcare-associated infections in Australia: time for national surveillance. *Aust Health Rev* 2015;39(1):37-43. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/AH14037>
5. McLaws M, Gold J, King K, et al. The prevalence of nosocomial and community-acquired infections in Australian hospitals. *Med J Aust* 1988;149(11-12):582-90.
6. Russo PL, Barnett AG, Cheng AC, et al. Differences in identifying healthcare associated infections using clinical vignettes and the influence of respondent characteristics: a cross-sectional survey of Australian infection prevention staff. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2015;4(29):1-7. doi: 10.1186/s13756-015-0070-7
7. Russo PL, Cheng AC, Richards M, et al. Healthcare-associated infections in Australia: time for national surveillance. *Aust Health Rev* 2014;39:37-43. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/AH14037>
8. Russo PL, Cheng AC, Richards M, et al. Variation in health care-associated infection surveillance practices in Australia. *Am J Infect Control* 2015;43(7):773-75. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2015.02.029
9. Russo PL, Chen G, Cheng AC, et al. Novel application of a discrete choice experiment to identify preferences for a national healthcare-associated infection surveillance programme: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(5):e011397. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011397 [published Online First: 2016/05/06]
10. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Point prevalence survey of healthcare associated infections and antimicrobial use in European acute care hospitals. Stockholm: ECDC, 2013.
11. Phu VD, Wertheim HFL, Larsson M, et al. Burden of Hospital Acquired Infections and Antimicrobial Use in Vietnamese Adult Intensive Care Units. *PLoS One* 2016;11(1):e0147544. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0147544
12. Morioka H, Hirabayashi A, Iguchi M, et al. The first point prevalence survey of health care-associated infection and antimicrobial use in a Japanese university hospital: A pilot study. *Am J Infect Control* 2016;44(7):e119-e23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2016.03.045>
13. Cai Y, Venkatachalam I, Tee NW, et al. Prevalence of Healthcare-Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Use Among Adult Inpatients in Singapore Acute-Care Hospitals: Results From the First National Point Prevalence Survey. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017;64(suppl\_2):S61-s67. doi: 10.1093/cid/cix103 [published Online First: 2017/05/06]
14. Australian Institute for Health and Welfare. Australian hospital peer groups. Health services series no. 66. Cat. no. HSE 170. Canberra: AIHW, 2015.



15. National Centre for Antimicrobial Stewardship and Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. Antimicrobial prescribing practice in Australian hospitals: Results of the 2015 National Antimicrobial Prescribing Survey. Sydney: ACSQHC, 2016.
16. Gardner A, Mitchell B, Beckingham W, et al. A point prevalence cross-sectional study of healthcare-associated urinary tract infections in six Australian hospitals. *BMJ Open* 2014;4
17. Mitchell BG, Shaban RZ, MacBeth D, et al. The burden of healthcare-associated infection in Australian hospitals: A systematic review of the literature. *Infection, Disease & Health* 2017;22(3):117-28. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.idh.2017.07.001>
18. Australian Commission for Safety and Quality in Health Care. Hospital-acquired complications 2018 [Available from: <https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/indicators/hospital-acquired-complications/> accessed 20 April 2018.
19. Mitchell BG, Ferguson JK. The use of clinical coding data for the surveillance of healthcare-associated urinary tract infections in Australia. *Infection, Disease & Health* 2016;21(1):32-35. doi: 10.1016/j.idh.2016.03.002
20. van Mourik MSM, van Duijn PJ, Moons KGM, et al. Accuracy of administrative data for surveillance of healthcare-associated infections: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(8) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008424

# BMJ Open

## Establishing the prevalence of healthcare associated infections in Australian hospitals: Protocol for the Comprehensive Healthcare Associated Infection National Surveillance (CHAINS) study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024924.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Sep-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Russo, Philip; Deakin University, School of Nursing and Midwifery Stewardson, Andrew; Alfred Health, Infectious Diseases; Monash University, Medicine Cheng, Allen; Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine; Alfred Hospital, Infectious Diseases Unit Bucknall, Tracey; Deakin University, School of Nursing & Midwifery; Deakin University & Alfred Health, Nursing Services Marimuthu, Kalisvar; Ten Tock Hospital; National University Singapore Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine Mitchell, Brett; Avondale College for Higher Education, Faculty of Nursing and Health; Australian Catholic University, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Paramedicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases
Keywords:	Healthcare associated infection, point prevalence surveillance, infection prevention, Infection control < INFECTIOUS DISEASES

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **ESTABLISHING THE PREVALENCE OF HEALTHCARE ASSOCIATED**  
5  
6 **INFECTIONS IN AUSTRALIAN HOSPITALS: PROTOCOL FOR THE**  
7  
8 **COMPREHENSIVE HEALTHCARE ASSOCIATED INFECTION NATIONAL**  
9  
10 **SURVEILLANCE (CHAINS) STUDY**

11  
12  
13  
14 *Russo PL<sup>1\*</sup>, Stewardson A<sup>2</sup>, Cheng A<sup>3</sup>, Bucknall T<sup>1</sup>, Marimuthu K<sup>4,5,6</sup>, Mitchell BG<sup>7</sup>*

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 <sup>1</sup> School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Health, Centre for Quality and Patient Safety  
20  
21 Research - Alfred Health Partnership, Deakin University, Victoria Australia

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>2</sup> Department of Infectious Diseases, Alfred Health and Monash University, Victoria Australia

27  
28  
29  
30  
31 <sup>3</sup> Infection Prevention and Healthcare Epidemiology Unit, Alfred Health; School of Public  
32  
33 Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Victoria Australia

34  
35  
36  
37  
38 <sup>4</sup> Department of Infectious Diseases, Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore

39  
40  
41 <sup>5</sup> National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore

42  
43  
44 <sup>6</sup> Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

45  
46  
47  
48  
49 <sup>7</sup> Faculty of Arts, Nursing and Theology, Avondale College of Higher Education, Wahroonga,  
50  
51 New South Wales, Australia

52  
53  
54 **\*Corresponding author**

55  
56 School of Nursing and Midwifery, Deakin University

1  
2  
3 221 Burwood Hwy  
4

5 Burwood 3125, Victoria Australia  
6

7 Email: [p.russo@deakin.edu.au](mailto:p.russo@deakin.edu.au)  
8

9  
10 PH: +61 411 659 486  
11

12  
13  
14 Word count: 2644  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

### Introduction

A healthcare associated infection data (HAI) point prevalence study (PPS) conducted in 1984 in Australian hospitals estimated the prevalence of HAI to be 6.3%. Since this time, there have been no further national estimates undertaken. In the absence of a coordinated national surveillance program or regular PPS, there is a dearth of national HAI data to inform policy and practice priorities.

### Methods and Analysis

A national HAI PPS study will be undertaken based on the European Centres for Disease Control method. Nineteen public acute hospitals will participate. A standardised algorithm will be used to detect HAIs in a two stage cluster design, random sample of adult inpatients in acute wards and all ICU patients. Data from each hospital will be collected by two trained members of the research team. We will estimate the prevalence of HAIs, invasive device use, single room placement and deployment of transmission based precautions.

### Ethics and Dissemination

Ethics approval was obtained from the Alfred Health Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC/17/Alfred/203) via the National Mutual Assessment and the Tasmanian Health and Medical Human Research Committee (H0016978). Findings will be disseminated in individualised participating hospital reports, peer review publications and conference presentations.

## Keywords

Healthcare associated infection, point prevalence surveillance, infection prevention, infection control.

## Article Summary: Strengths and limitations of this study

- The study is based on validated methods within the European Centres for Disease Control (ECDC) PPS surveillance protocol, with the addition of device use prevalence estimates
- Data from all sites will be collected by two trained data collectors minimising variation between sites
- Restriction to adult acute inpatients in public facilities limits representativeness
- Some infections may be missed due to sampling process

## INTRODUCTION

Surveillance of healthcare associated infections (HAI) is a fundamental component of any infection prevention program.<sup>1</sup> National HAI point prevalence studies (PPS) provide a ‘snapshot’ of all HAI types and are used to identify priority areas for action and inform infection prevention recommendations and policy direction.<sup>2</sup> Many European countries regularly contribute HAI data to the European Centres for Disease Control (ECDC) PPS surveillance, and this is often in addition to existing, well established national HAI surveillance programs.<sup>3,4</sup>

Australia’s first and only HAI PPS was conducted in 1984 and estimated the prevalence of “nosocomial” infections to be 6.5%.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, many local HAI surveillance programs have evolved separately, resulting in broad variation in activity and methodology to the extent that data cannot be reliably collated to generate national Australian HAI data, with the exception of *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia.<sup>6-8</sup>

Despite strong support for a national surveillance program,<sup>9</sup> there has been no funding identified to achieve this goal. This means that Australian national infection prevention policy is not informed by sound national data, nor can national interventions be effectively evaluated. Further, where existence of HAI surveillance occurs at local hospital or State level, variations in methodologies means that it is not possible to meaningfully aggregate data.

We will undertake the first Australian HAI PPS in over 30 years, the Comprehensive Healthcare Associated Infection National Surveillance (CHAINS) study. The European

1  
2  
3 protocol provides a standardised methodology to European Member States and hospitals.  
4  
5 The current version 5.3 provides a framework to develop a PPS in Australia.<sup>3</sup> Whilst based  
6  
7 on the protocol developed by the ECDC, the CHAINS protocol differs in a number of areas  
8  
9 including participation and recruitment criteria, and does not include patient level risk  
10  
11 factors or antimicrobial prescribing data.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 The purpose of this study is to update our knowledge on the prevalence of HAIs and multi-  
17  
18 drug resistant organisms in Australia and provide stakeholders with national benchmarks  
19  
20 that can be used to identify areas for improvement, measure effectiveness of interventions,  
21  
22 and importantly use as a model for future national surveillance activities. We will also  
23  
24 determine the prevalence of device use, informing future research projects and providing  
25  
26 useful data for industry.  
27  
28

29  
30  
31 Whilst guidelines for describing point prevalence study protocols have not been published,  
32  
33 this paper describes the study protocol, and focuses on areas that vary from the ECDC  
34  
35 protocol.  
36  
37

## 38 39 40 41 **Study Objectives**

42  
43  
44 The primary objectives of the CHAINS study are:

- 45  
46 1. To estimate the total prevalence of HAIs among inpatients aged  $\geq 18$  in public acute  
47  
48 care hospitals in Australia
- 49  
50 2. To describe the HAIs by site, type of patient, specialty, type of facility and  
51  
52 geographical location  
53  
54

55  
56 The secondary objectives are:  
57  
58  
59  
60



1. To determine the prevalence of patients:
  - a. managed under transmission based precautions isolation in a single room
  - b. with an indwelling urinary catheter device
  - c. with vascular access device(s)
  - d. with a multidrug resistant organism (infection or colonisation)

## METHODS AND ANALYSIS

### Study Design

A rolling PPS across a sample of Australian public hospitals will be undertaken over a three month period. The PPS protocol is based on the ECDC standardised methodology for PPSs on HAIs,<sup>10</sup> with some modifications to the Standard Protocol option (see below and Table 1). The ECDC protocol was developed and tested extensively with reliable outcomes. It has been utilised across 29 European countries for national PPS, and has also been applied in several non-European countries<sup>11-13</sup>

**Table 1** – Summary of major differences in protocol

ECDC protocol	Deviations	Rationale
<b>Patient Inclusion and Exclusion</b>		
– All patients admitted to the ward before or at 8 a.m. and not discharged from the ward at the time	– 50% patients in acute wards and all ICU patients – Only adults ≥18-year-olds admitted to the ward	– Insufficient resources to sample every patient

of survey, including neonates on maternity and paediatric wards, will be included	before or at 8 a.m. and not discharged from the ward at the time of survey will be included	
<b>Data Collection Processes</b>		
– Composition of the team responsible for data collection varied from one hospital to another	– The same data collectors will be collecting data for all hospitals in the PPS	– To minimise variation and maximise consistency in classifying infections – Minimise the burden of data collection on participating hospitals
– Total time frame for data collection for all wards of a single hospital did not exceed two to three weeks	– Data to be collected during a one off hospital visit (1-3 days)	– Same data collectors used across all facilities – Smaller sample size
<b>Patient Data Fields</b>		
– McCabe score was employed to classify the severity of underlying medical conditions	– No risk factor data will be collected	– Insufficient resources to collect risk factor data
– Antimicrobial use	– No antimicrobial use data will be collected	– Antimicrobial data already collected in

		annual point prevalence survey
<b>Data Validation</b>		
– Recommended sample size at the national level was 750 patients in 25 hospitals	– Records of 100% of patients identified as having an infection at the first hospital (up to a maximum of 40), and a random sample of 5% of those identified as not having an infection will be reviewed	– Same data collectors used across all facilities – Pragmatic validation within existing resources
– Validation team consisted was separate from the original data collection team	– Validation team members will consist of the chief investigators who cross-check the data	– Same data collectors used across all facilities
– Blinded data validation recommended	– Validation team will not be blinded	– Not practical for this study

### Hospital Selection

Public acute care hospitals categorised as a Principal Referral hospital or a Group A hospital as per the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare peer groupings will be eligible to participate.<sup>14</sup> These two peer groups are characterised by providing a broad range of services, include emergency and intensive care units, and have larger patient volumes than

1  
2  
3 other peer groups.<sup>14</sup> Because of anticipated heterogeneity and to maximise representation  
4  
5 of large acute care public facilities, specialist hospitals (e.g. maternity, cancer and paediatric  
6  
7 hospitals) and private hospitals will be excluded.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Limited resources for this PPS restricts the number of participating hospitals to a sample of  
13  
14 public acute care facilities. We will launch a call for expressions of interest for hospitals to  
15  
16 participate in the study to measure the appetite for participation. To best meet the  
17  
18 objectives of the study, 19 hospitals will be purposively selected to participate from those  
19  
20 who meet the selection criteria. Hospital selection numbers will be approximately  
21  
22 proportional to the size of the six States and one of Territories in Australia (the other  
23  
24 Territory will not be included due to logistical reasons)  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Ward Selection**

31  
32 In each participating hospital, all acute care inpatient wards will be included with the  
33  
34 exception of:

- 35  
36 • paediatric wards
- 37  
38 • psychiatric wards (acute and non-acute)
- 39  
40 • neonatal ICUs
- 41  
42 • rehabilitation, palliative, sub-acute and long-term care wards in acute care facilities  
43  
44 (e.g. nursing homes, spinal rehabilitation wards);
- 45  
46 • accident and emergency (A&E) departments (except for wards attached to A&E  
47  
48 departments where patients are monitored for more than 24 hours).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Patient sampling

Patients will be sampled in a two-stage cluster design, with a sample of patients in a sample of Principal Referral and Group A Hospitals. Patients will be systematically sampled on each eligible ward at participating hospitals by randomly selecting either odd or even numbered beds (50% sample). Randomisation will be achieved by the toss of a coin by the Lead Investigator (PLR) prior to the RAs visiting each site. If the bed is empty due to it not being used, then this is not counted in the denominator, and the next bed occupied within the random sample will be surveyed. As a high-risk group of interest, all patients in adult intensive care units (ICUs) will be surveyed.

We estimate that we will survey 50% of patients at 19 hospitals (estimated up to 5000 patients total). Assuming an intracluster correlation coefficient of 3% and a prevalence of hospital acquired infection of 7.5-10%, we will be able to estimate prevalence with a precision of +/- 2.2-2.5% (based on the 95% CI). Estimates of prevalence will account for the clustered design and oversampling in ICU (using inverse probability weighting).

## Patient Selection

Consistent with the ECDC protocol, in each ward meeting the above inclusion criteria, all patients admitted to the ward before or at 0800 on the first survey day, and not discharged from the ward at the time of the survey will be eligible. In practice, this means that patients transferred in or out after 0800 of the first survey day from or to another ward, or location outside the hospital, will not be included.

Patients who meet the following criteria on the eligible wards will be excluded:

- patients under 18 years of age (in any hospital ward or unit)
- patients undergoing same day treatment or surgery
- patients seen at outpatient department
- patients in the emergency room;
- dialysis patients (outpatients)

### Data collection and management

Data collection from 19 sites across Australia will occur over a 3-month period from August to October 2018. A specific date for each hospital visit will be coordinated with the hospital. The location and size of the facility will be considered when planning visits to maximise efficiency of data collection.

All data will be collected by two trained Research Assistants (RAs). As a condition of enrolment in the study, hospitals will be required to provide a hospital-based clinician, preferably a member of the infection prevention team, on the survey days. The role of the hospital clinician will be to accompany the RAs and to facilitate access to all wards and data.

The two RA's will be trained by the research team in data collection methodology, and use of data collection tools. The RA's will also undergo competency based assessment prior to data collection. A secure online web-based survey tool will be accessed for data entry.

We will collect four levels of data; hospital, ward, patient and HAI.

### *Hospital data*

General hospital demographic data will be collected based on the ECDC protocol. However the only indicator data similar to ECDC protocol is data on hand hygiene compliance, and the number of infection control FTE nurses. Further indicator data to be included are *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia rates (routinely reported to the Australian Health and Institute of Welfare) and intensive care unit central line-associated bloodstream infection rates if available. This data will be collected prior to the visit.

### *Ward Data*

Ward demographic data will be collected on the day of the survey. Data on the ward specialty, total number of beds and number of single rooms is the same as for ECDC. Different to ECDC protocol will be data collected on the number of patients placed in single room isolation and the type of isolation. No other ward level data will be collected.

### *Patient data*

Patient-level data is a modified version of the ECDC Standard Protocol. Two main differences are the omission of both risk factor data (McCabe) score and antimicrobial use data. The omission of risk factor data is to ensure patient data can be collected in a timely manner. Detailed antimicrobial data was omitted given that Australia has an annual national antimicrobial prescribing PPS which allows more thorough analysis of antimicrobial use in Australia than what was possible in this PPS.<sup>15</sup> As a screen to determine the presence of a HAI, data on the presence of fever and current antimicrobial therapy will be collected. Data on the presence of a multidrug resistant organism will also be collected. These will include:

- MRSA: Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*,
- VRE: Vancomycin Resistant Enterococci
- ESBL: Extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamase
- CPE: carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*
- *Clostridium difficile*
- Other drug resistant Gram negative organisms
- Other organisms that have been identified by the hospital as an MRO

Screening for colonisation will occur according to local protocols by participating hospitals.

The prevalence of colonisation will therefore represent colonisation as detected according to current Australian infection prevention practices. We will report on the local screening practices to assist with interpretation of the prevalence of colonisation.

#### *HAI data*

For each patient with a fever or currently receiving antimicrobial therapy, the RA's will work through an algorithm applying the HAI definitions in the ECDC protocol. Data on each HAI identified will be consistent with the ECDC protocol.

#### *Data validation*

Data will be assessed for completeness and accuracy at the first hospital to undergo the survey. Records of 100% of patients identified as having an infection (up to a maximum of 40), and a random sample of 5% of those identified as not having an infection will be reviewed by two chief investigators. Findings will be discussed with the research team prior to the survey proceeding.



### *Data Analysis*

The prevalence of HAI will be estimated from the proportion with infection in the sample (correcting for oversampling of ICU patients) with confidence intervals corrected for the clustered design. This will be performed using the svy module in Stata 14.2 (College Station, Texas 2017). The analysis will consider each hospital as a cluster, and adjust for oversampling in ICU using inverse probability weights. Logistic regression will be used to examine factors associated with infection. These factors will include:

- Location of hospital: metro, remote etc.
- Age
- Gender
- Ward type
- Intubation
- Presence of peripheral vascular access device
- Presence of central vascular access device
- Indwelling urinary catheter

### **Outcome measures**

The outcomes for each objective of the study are outlined in Table 2.

**Table 2** Key outcome measures

	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Outcome measure</b>
Primary	To estimate the total	Total number of patients classified as having a

objectives	prevalence of HAIs among inpatients aged $\geq 18$ in public acute care hospitals in Australia	HAI divided by the total number of patients surveyed, weighted by the probability of sampling
	To describe the HAIs by site, type of patient, specialty, type of facility and geographical location	Of the patients with a HAI, the proportion by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• infection site</li> <li>• elective or emergency</li> <li>• gender</li> <li>• age</li> <li>• ward specialty</li> <li>• facility type</li> </ul>
Secondary objectives	Prevalence of patients managed under transmission based precautions isolation in a single room	Total number of patients cared for under transmission-based precautions divided by the total number of patients surveyed, overall (weighted by the probability of sampling), by hospital, by ward specialty
	Prevalence of patients with an indwelling urinary catheter device	Total number of patients with a urinary catheter divided by the total number of patients surveyed, overall, by hospital, by ward specialty
	Prevalence of patients with vascular access device(s)	Total number of patients with a vascular access device divided by the total number of patients surveyed  Of those with a vascular device, the proportion by type of device, overall, by hospital, by ward

		specialty
	Prevalence of patients with a multi drug resistance organism (infection or colonisation)	Total number of patients infected or colonised with a multi drug resistance organism divided by the total number of patients surveyed  Of those with a multi drug resistance organism, the proportion by organism, overall, by hospital, by ward specialty

### Ethical Considerations

This study has been approved by the Alfred Health Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) (HREC/17/Alfred/203) through the National Mutual Assessment (NMA) process. The NMA is a system of single scientific and ethical review of multicentre human research projects in public health organisations in, Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia. A separate approval was obtained from the Tasmanian Health and Medical Human Research Committee (H0016978) for participating Tasmanian hospitals.

Any risks or harms identified and associated with the study will be reported to the HRECs. Reporting of the study and progress, including audits, will be conducted consistent with the requests of the HRECs. Any modification to the study that have ethical implications will be forwarded to the HRECs for approval. In the main results paper for the study, we will also aim to estimate the resources required to obtain ethics approval and site specific authorisations.

### *Informed consent*

A waiver of individual patient consent has been obtained for this study from the HRECs based on a number of considerations. These considerations are: there are no interventions and no harm or discomfort to the patient as a result of the project; the benefits of the research justify any risk of harm associated with not obtaining consent; results of the research are not individualised or indeed patient identifiable; the study requires no direct involvement of patients, rather it collates existing information obtained during their hospitalisation; and no new information will be obtained about individual patients, therefore results will have no significance for the individual welfare of patients.

### *Patient and Public Involvement statement*

There was no patient or public involvement in the development of this study however the study was reviewed by patient and consumer representatives on the Human Research Ethics Committee. Whilst results will not be provided directly to the patients surveyed in the study, data will be provided back to each participating facility, policy representatives and disseminated through peer review publications and conferences.

### **Dissemination**

Dissemination of knowledge gained from this study will be facilitated using a variety of modes. Each participating hospital will be provided with an individualised report highlighting their outcomes in comparison to other hospitals (deidentified) and aggregated data. Overall study findings will be presented through peer reviewed publications, presentations to jurisdictional policy representatives and relevant conferences.

## Discussion

There is a dearth of national HAI data in Australia. Data from a multicentre PPS on urinary tract infections in Australia estimated the HAI rate of UTI was 1.4%, and the catheter associated UTI prevalence to be 0.9%.<sup>16</sup> Recently an estimate of the burden of HAI in Australia was generated from a systematic review of studies published between 2010 and 2016 and suggested the incidence of HAIs in Australia may be up to 165,000 per year.<sup>17</sup>

Although the Australian Commission for Safety and Quality in Health Care has a number of national initiatives to prevent HAI, it can be argued that these initiatives may be misdirected given the lack of national HAI data to inform and evaluate interventions. While administrative data will soon be used to measure HAIs in Australia<sup>18</sup>, we contend that HAI surveillance cannot be adequately performed with this approach.<sup>19,20</sup>

The importance of reliable national HAI data in Australia cannot be underestimated. The CHAINS study is a small first step towards an improved understanding of the prevalence of HAIs in Australia. To identify, develop, implement and evaluate national HAI initiatives, reliable data based on validated methods must be used.

## Strengths

This study has a number of strengths. First, it is based on established and validated methodology from the ECDC. Second, rather than rely on each hospital to collect and submit data, which is the common process in large PPS studies, this study will use the same trained and competent data collectors at each hospital. This greatly increases the likelihood of

1  
2  
3 consistency in data collection and application of HAI definitions and prevents any subjective  
4  
5 influences that may occur at a hospital level. Third, the two stage cluster design,  
6  
7 randomised sampling of patients at each facility, and the inclusion of facilities in six of the  
8  
9 seven Australian jurisdictions will provide confident estimates of the prevalence of HAI.  
10  
11 Fourth, data on the prevalence of device use, single room placement and transmission  
12  
13 based precautions has never before been estimated in Australia and will generate new  
14  
15 knowledge.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 *Limitations*

22 Data collecting is limited to adult acute inpatients, no data is being collected from hospitals  
23  
24 within the private sector, and to ensure timely collection of data at each site, patient level  
25  
26 risk factor data (i.e. McCabe index data) is not being collected. Some active HAIs may be  
27  
28 missed due to the random sampling of patients and the use of fever or current antimicrobial  
29  
30 therapy as a screen to explore the presence of HAI.  
31  
32

33 As hospitals were purposively selected rather than a random sample, we cannot exclude  
34  
35 selection bias. To examine this, we will compare administrative and infection prevention  
36  
37 metrics of participating hospitals with those of non-participating hospitals in the same peer  
38  
39 categories. Such metrics will include state/territory location, remoteness area, bed  
40  
41 numbers, presence of high-risk units for HAIs (e.g. oncology, bone marrow transplantation  
42  
43 and solid organ transplantation), healthcare-associated *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream  
44  
45 infection rate (cases per 10,000 bed days), and hand hygiene compliance  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Study status

Data collection is due to commence in August 2018.

## Footnotes

### *Author contributions*

Five authors (PLR, AS, AC, TB, BGM) are chief investigators and are involved in the design and implementation of the study. KM has provided expert advice on national point prevalence surveys and provided access to data collection tools and educational materials.

PLR prepared the manuscript, all other authors contributed sections, critiqued and revised and approved the manuscript

### *Competing interests*

None declared

### *Funding*

This project is wholly funded by the Rosemary Norman Foundation, a philanthropic nursing charity that has funded in excess of one million dollars into nursing and midwifery research over the last decade. None of the researchers receive any income from the funding or have any role with the charity. The Foundation was not involved in the design nor the conduct of the study, and will not benefit in any form, from the results of the study.

### *Data sharing statement*

Any available unpublished data can be requested on contacting the authors.

### *Acknowledgements*

The authors acknowledge the work of the CHAINS Project Manager, Bridey Saultry, and the key stakeholders at potential sites. The Centre for Quality and Patient Safety, Deakin University for supporting and administering the project. We also acknowledge Professor Jacqui Reilly and Professor Jennie Wilson for expert advice and guidance in the planning stages of this project.



## References

1. Perl TM, Chaiwarth R. Surveillance: An Overview. In: Lautenbach E, Woeltje KF, Malani PN, eds. *Practical Healthcare Epidemiology*. 3rd ed. London: The University of Chicago Press 2010:111-42.
2. Cairns S, Gibbons C, Milne A, et al. Results from the third Scottish National Prevalence Survey: Is a population health approach now needed to prevent HAI? *J Hosp Infect* 2018 doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2018.03.038
3. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Point prevalence survey of healthcare-associated infections and antimicrobial use in European acute care hospitals – protocol version 5.3. Stockholm: ECDC, 2016.
4. Russo PL, Cheng AC, Richards M, et al. Healthcare-associated infections in Australia: time for national surveillance. *Aust Health Rev* 2015;39(1):37-43. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/AH14037>
5. McLaws M, Gold J, King K, et al. The prevalence of nosocomial and community-acquired infections in Australian hospitals. *Med J Aust* 1988;149(11-12):582-90.
6. Russo PL, Barnett AG, Cheng AC, et al. Differences in identifying healthcare associated infections using clinical vignettes and the influence of respondent characteristics: a cross-sectional survey of Australian infection prevention staff. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2015;4(29):1-7. doi: 10.1186/s13756-015-0070-7
7. Russo PL, Cheng AC, Richards M, et al. Healthcare-associated infections in Australia: time for national surveillance. *Aust Health Rev* 2014;39:37-43. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/AH14037>
8. Russo PL, Cheng AC, Richards M, et al. Variation in health care-associated infection surveillance practices in Australia. *Am J Infect Control* 2015;43(7):773-75. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2015.02.029
9. Russo PL, Chen G, Cheng AC, et al. Novel application of a discrete choice experiment to identify preferences for a national healthcare-associated infection surveillance programme: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(5):e011397. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011397 [published Online First: 2016/05/06]
10. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Point prevalence survey of healthcare associated infections and antimicrobial use in European acute care hospitals. Stockholm: ECDC, 2013.
11. Phu VD, Wertheim HFL, Larsson M, et al. Burden of Hospital Acquired Infections and Antimicrobial Use in Vietnamese Adult Intensive Care Units. *PLoS One* 2016;11(1):e0147544. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0147544
12. Morioka H, Hirabayashi A, Iguchi M, et al. The first point prevalence survey of health care-associated infection and antimicrobial use in a Japanese university hospital: A pilot study. *Am J Infect Control* 2016;44(7):e119-e23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2016.03.045>
13. Cai Y, Venkatachalam I, Tee NW, et al. Prevalence of Healthcare-Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Use Among Adult Inpatients in Singapore Acute-Care Hospitals: Results From the First National Point Prevalence Survey. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017;64(suppl\_2):S61-s67. doi: 10.1093/cid/cix103 [published Online First: 2017/05/06]
14. Australian Institute for Health and Welfare. Australian hospital peer groups. Health services series no. 66. Cat. no. HSE 170. Canberra: AIHW, 2015.

15. National Centre for Antimicrobial Stewardship and Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. Antimicrobial prescribing practice in Australian hospitals: Results of the 2015 National Antimicrobial Prescribing Survey. Sydney: ACSQHC, 2016.
16. Gardner A, Mitchell B, Beckingham W, et al. A point prevalence cross-sectional study of healthcare-associated urinary tract infections in six Australian hospitals. *BMJ Open* 2014;4
17. Mitchell BG, Shaban RZ, MacBeth D, et al. The burden of healthcare-associated infection in Australian hospitals: A systematic review of the literature. *Infection, Disease & Health* 2017;22(3):117-28. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.idh.2017.07.001>
18. Australian Commission for Safety and Quality in Health Care. Hospital-acquired complications 2018 [Available from: <https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/indicators/hospital-acquired-complications/> accessed 20 April 2018.
19. Mitchell BG, Ferguson JK. The use of clinical coding data for the surveillance of healthcare-associated urinary tract infections in Australia. *Infection, Disease & Health* 2016;21(1):32-35. doi: 10.1016/j.idh.2016.03.002
20. van Mourik MSM, van Duijn PJ, Moons KGM, et al. Accuracy of administrative data for surveillance of healthcare-associated infections: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(8) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008424