CONCISE COMMUNICATION

Infections in Australian Aged-Care Facilities: Evaluating the Impact of Revised McGeer Criteria for Surveillance of Urinary Tract Infections

Noleen J. Bennett, RN, MPH, PhD;¹ Sandra A. Johnson, BSc, MPH;¹ Michael J. Richards, MBBS, FRACP, MD;^{1,2} Mary A. Smith, RN;³ Leon J. Worth, MBBS, FRACP, Grad Dip Epi, PhD^{1,2}

Our survey of 112 Australian aged-care facilities demonstrated the prevalence of healthcare-associated infections to be 2.9%. Urinary tract infections (UTIs) defined by McGeer criteria comprised 35% of all clinically defined UTIs. To estimate the infection burden in these facilities where microbiologic testing is not routine, modified surveillance criteria for UTIs are necessary.

Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2016;37:610-612

Residential aged-care facility (RACF) residents are at risk of developing healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) for many reasons, including advanced age, comorbidities, functional disabilities, immunosuppression, and use of invasive devices.^{1–4} In 1991, to standardize the identification of HAIs within RACFs, McGeer et al⁵ published surveillance definitions specific to these facilities.⁵ These were revised in 2012,⁶ including new requirements for clinical and microbiologic criteria to fulfill the case definition for urinary tract infection (UTI).

To estimate the prevalence of HAIs and antibiotic use within long-term aged-care facilities, the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control conducted the first European point prevalence survey (PPS) in 2010.⁷ In 2011, an equivalent survey was performed in rural Australian RACFs in the state of Victoria. This survey was repeated in 2012 and 2013, and revised McGeer definitions were applied in 2013.

In Australian RACFs, urinary tract, respiratory tract, skin, soft-tissue, and mucosal infections have been shown to comprise the majority of HAIs. Limited use of microbiology testing has also been demonstrated, possibly related to difficulty obtaining clinical specimens from confused or debilitated residents, the clinical significance of culture results being difficult to interpret, insufficient access to diagnostic laboratories, and/or costs.⁸ The impact of using the revised McGeer definition for UTI upon HAI surveillance in Australia has not been evaluated.

The objectives of this 2014 PPS were (1) to estimate the prevalence of HAIs, (2) to review the utility of microbiology testing for HAIs, and (3) to evaluate the impact of a revised casedefinition for UTI upon prevalence estimates in Victorian RACFs.

METHODS

Study Population

The Rural Infection Control Practice Group (RICPRAC) represents Victorian infection control practitioners (ICP) employed in rural public health services, including 146 RACFs operated by state government. All members were invited to participate in the current study. Although not actively recruited, participation by ICPs working in the metropolitan 28 RACFs operated by state government was also permitted. Eligible residents were those who resided full-time in the RACF for \geq 48 hours and were present on the survey day. In Victoria, RACFs provide continuous supported care ranging from assistance with personal care and daily tasks to 24-hour nursing care.

Survey Tool and Data Collection

Using resident medical records, data were collected by ICPs on a single day between July 1 and August 31, 2014. Prior to data collection, ICPs were educated regarding uniform methodology, and a study coordinator was available to assist (via telephone) on the survey day. A facility survey was completed for each participating RACF, including the total number, age, and sex of residents. A resident survey was completed for residents identified by ICPs or RACF clinical staff and confirmed by ICPs as having an HAI on the survey date.

Definitions

Presumed and confirmed UTIs were classified according to 3 case definitions: (1) revised McGeer clinical and microbiologic criteria met, (2) revised McGeer clinical (not microbiologic) criteria met, and (3) revised McGeer microbiologic (not clinical) criteria met.

Bloodstream infections, gastrointestinal tract infections, respiratory tract infections (RTIs), skin, soft-tissue, or mucosal infections, as well as unexplained fever were defined according to the revised McGeer definitions.⁶ HAIs were reported if not already present at the time of admission to the RACF. The prevalence of HAIs was calculated by dividing the number of residents having \geq 1 HAI by the total number of surveyed residents.

RESULTS

Participating Facilities

Overall, 3,741 residents in 112 RACFs (99 rural, 13 metropolitan) participated in the PPS, corresponding to 64.4% of all state-government–operated RACFs in Victoria. The median number of eligible residents at participating RACFs was 28.5 (range, 7–110), the median proportion of residents aged >85 years was 52.3% (range, 0–89.3%), and the median proportion of male residents was 35.1% (range, 3.6–79.3%).

Hospital-Associated Infections

Using the revised McGeer definition, 109 residents had at least 1 HAI, corresponding to a crude prevalence of 2.9% (95% confidence interval [CI] 2.4%–3.5%). In total, 111 HAIs were identified, with 2 residents having 2 infections. The most frequently reported HAIs were skin, soft-tissue, or mucosal infections (44.1%) and RTIs (38.7%) (Table 1). Of the 109 residents with an infection, 32 (29.4%) had a clinical specimen collected for microbiological testing.

Urinary Tract Infections

In total, 14, 26, and 5 residents met case definitions A, B, and C, respectively. The majority of these residents (97.8%) were prescribed antibiotic therapy for a UTI (Table 2). Case definition A accounted for 31.1% of all UTIs. Of those that fulfilled the clinical criteria alone (case definition B), 53.9% (14 of 26) did not undergo microbiological testing, 19.2% (5 of 26) were tested but organism(s) cultured did not meet the microbiologic criteria threshold, 15.4% (4 of 26) were tested and cultured negative, and 11.5% (3 of 26) were tested but results were unavailable. As a composite clinical measure, combining case definitions A and B resulted in an estimated crude prevalence of 3.6% (135 of 3,741; 95% CI, 3.0%–4.3%).

 TABLE 1. Healthcare-Associated Infections in Victorian RACF

 Residents (2014)

Healthcare-Associated Infection ^a	No.	%
Skin, soft tissue or mucosal infections	49	44.1
Cellulitis/soft tissue/wound infection	35	
Scabies	0	
Fungal infections (oral, perioral or skin)	4	
Herpes virus skin infection	0	
Conjunctivitis	7	
Not otherwise specified	3	
Respiratory tract infection	43	38.7
Common cold syndromes/pharyngitis	7	
Influenza-like illness	2	
Pneumonia	10	
Bronchitis/tracheobronchitis	20	
Not otherwise specified	4	
Urinary tract infection	14	12.6
Indwelling catheter	1	
Non-indwelling catheter	13	
Gastrointestinal tract infection	4	3.6
Unexplained fever	1	0.9
Bloodstream infection	0	0
Total	111 ^b	100

^aAll infections were defined according to revised McGeer criteria.⁶ ^bTwo residents had two infections (109 residents with 111 HAIs).

DISCUSSION

Our study is the largest in Australia to apply standardized methodology to estimate HAI prevalence in RACFs. This study supports the national agenda concerning monitoring of antimicrobial use and resistance to improve safety and clinical outcomes in the aged-care setting.⁹ HAI prevalence was 2.9%, which is lower than but still comparable to estimates provided in 2013 by Victorian and international studies: 3.3% (unpublished data) and 3.4%,¹⁰ respectively. Using revised McGeer definitions, skin, soft-tissue, and mucosal infections and RTIs were most frequently identified.

The estimated prevalence of UTIs is influenced significantly by the surveillance case definition employed. In particular, we observed that a large proportion of presumed UTIs (68.9%) did not meet the revised McGeer definition, mostly the microbiologic criteria (57.8%). If the objective of surveillance is to monitor the burden of illness, including impact upon resources and antimicrobial prescribing, a broader case definition would be more appropriate to capture cases of confirmed and presumed UTI.

We have demonstrated the feasibility of an annual PPS tool in Australian RACFs using internationally accepted methodology. Given the need for enhanced monitoring of HAIs in non-acute healthcare settings, we propose that this tool could provide quality indicators for Australian RACFs. Historically, HAIs have been regarded as important performance indicators within acute-care facilities,¹¹ and a similar framework could be adopted within RACFs. Standardized reporting of HAIs allows identification of potential processes for policy development and formulation of targeted clinical guidelines. Furthermore, standardized reporting would facilitate comparison of baseline and post-intervention outcomes for individual RACFs implementing prevention programs.

The strengths of our study include the application of internationally accepted HAI definitions to facilitate international comparisons and longitudinal evaluation by participating RACFs.

Some limitations of our study include the potential seasonality of some HAIs. The PPS was performed during winter months, which may have particularly influenced RTI prevalence. Although a large number of public RACFs participated, this study did not include non–government-operated RACFs and therefore may not be generalizable to other RACF types. Given that not all eligible facilities participated in the study, data may be influenced by selection bias. Data quality was dependent upon documentation in resident records. We acknowledge that incomplete and/or missing clinical details may contribute to the underestimation of HAIs.

Given the low uptake of microbiologic testing in Australian RACFs, it may be beneficial for future PPSs to measure the utility of microbiologic testing and to incorporate the assessment of clinically significant HAIs to ensure that UTI prevalence is not underestimated. Antibiotic prescribing practices for UTIs could also be used to apply a more sensitive case

Category	UTI Case Definition	Cases (No.)	No. (%) Receiving Antibiotics for UTI
A (confirmed)	Revised McGeer clinical and microbiologic criteria	14	14 (100)
B (presumed)	Revised McGeer clinical criteria only	26	25 (96.2)
C (presumed)	Revised McGeer microbiologic criteria only	5	5 (100)
Total		45	44 (97.8)

TABLE 2. Comparison of Urinary Tract Infections (UTI) Identified by 3 Case Definitions

definition, and therefore an estimated prevalence that is more closely aligned with clinical practice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, we wish to thank the Rural Infection Control Practice Group and the Victorian Healthcare Associated Infection Surveillance System Coordinating Center who coordinated the 2014 Point Prevalence Study. Additionally, we wish to thank the infection control practitioners and clinical staff employed at the participating Victorian RACFs who collected and submitted the data.

Financial support: The VICNISS Coordinating Centre is funded by the Victorian Department of Health.

Potential conflicts of interest: All authors report no conflict of interest or financial disclosures.

Affiliations: 1. Victorian Healthcare Associated Infection Surveillance System (VICNISS) Coordinating Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; 2. Department of Medicine, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; 3. Department of Health, Grampians Region, Horsham, Victoria, Australia.

Address correspondence to Dr Noleen Bennett, VICNISS Coordinating Centre, Doherty Institute, 792 Elizabeth St, Melbourne 3000 VIC (Noleen.Bennett@mh.org.au).

Received October 25, 2015; accepted January 4, 2016; electronically published February 4, 2016

© 2016 by The Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. All rights reserved. 0899-823X/2016/3705-0019. DOI: 10.1017/ice.2016.7

REFERENCES

- Kirk MD, Hall GV, Veitch MG, Becker N. Assessing the incidence of gastroenteritis among elderly people living in long term care facilities. J Hosp Infect 2010;76:12–17.
- 2. Kirk MD, Moffatt CR, Hall GV, Becker N, Booy R, Heron L, et al. The burden of infectious gastroenteritis in elderly residents and staff of long-term care facilities, Australia. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31:860–863.
- 3. Smith PW, Bennett G, Bradley S, Drinka P, Lautenbach E, Marx J, et al. SHEA/APIC guideline: infection prevention and control in

the long-term care facility, July 2008. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2008;29:785–814.

- 4. Stevenson KB, Moore J, Colwell H, Sleeper B. Standardized infection surveillance in long-term care: interfacility comparisons from a regional cohort of facilities. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2005;26:231–238.
- McGeer A, Campbell B, Emori TG, Hierholzer WJ, Jackson MM, Nicolle LE, et al. Definitions of infection for surveillance in long-term care facilities. *Am J Infect Control* 1991;19: 1–7.
- 6. Stone ND, Ashraf MS, Calder J, Crnich CJ, Crossley K, Drinka PJ, et al. Surveillance definitions of infections in long-term care facilities: revisiting the McGeer criteria. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33:965–977.
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Point Prevalence Survey of Healthcare-Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Use in European Long-Term Care Facilities (HALT) Protocol. Stockholm: ECDC; May–September 2010.
- Stuart RL, Wilson J, Bellaard-Smith E, Brown R, Wright L, Vandergraaf S, et al. Antibiotic use and misuse in residential aged care facilities. *Intern Med J* 2012;42:1145–1149.
- Antimicrobial Use and Resistance in Australia (AURA) Project. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care website. http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/national-priorities/ amr-and-au-surveillance-project/. Accessed May 7, 2015.
- 10. Point Prevalence Survey of Healthcare-Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Use in European Long-Term Care Facilities Surveillance Report April–May 2013. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control website. http://ecdc.europa.eu/ en/publications/Publications/healthcare-associated-infectionspoint-prevalence-survey-long-term-care-facilities-2013.pdf. Published 2014. Accessed October 1, 2015.
- National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care website. http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/ 09/NSQHS-Standards-Sept-2012.pdf. Published 2012. Accessed October 1, 2015.