ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Prevalence of Healthcare-Associated Infections in Acute Care Hospitals in Jacksonville, Florida

Shelley S. Magill, MD, PhD;[1] Walter Hellinger, MD;[2] Jessica Cohen, MPH;[1,3] Robyn Kay, MPH;[4] Christine Bailey, RN, BSN, MSH, CIC;[5] Bonnie Boland, RN, BSN, CIC;[6] Darlene Carey, RN, BSN, CIC;[7,a] Jessica de Guzman, BSN, RN, MAN;[8] Karen Dominguez, RN, MPH;[9] Jonathan Edwards, MStat;[1] Lori Goraczewski, RN, CIC;[2,a] Teresa Horan, MPH;[1] Melodee Miller, BSN, RN, CIC;[10] Marti Phelps, RN, CIC;[9] Rebecca Saltford, RN, CIC;[11] Jacquelyn Seibert, RN, BS, CIC;[2] Brenda Smith, RN, CNOR;[2] Patricia Starling, BSN, RN, CIC;[8] Bonnie Viergutz, BSN, CIC;[12] Karla Walsh, RN, MSN, CIC;[6] Mobeen Rathore, MD;[5,13] Nilmarie Guzman, MD;[13] Scott Fridkin, MD[1]

OBJECTIVE. To determine healthcare-associated infection (HAI) prevalence in 9 hospitals in Jacksonville, Florida; to evaluate the performance of proxy indicators for HAIs; and to refine methodology in preparation for a multistate survey.

DESIGN. Point prevalence survey.

PATIENTS. Acute care inpatients of any age.

METHODS. HAIs were defined using National Healthcare Safety Network criteria. In each facility a trained primary team (PT) of infection prevention (IP) staff performed the survey on 1 day, reviewing records and collecting data on a random sample of inpatients. PTs assessed patients with one or more proxy indicators (abnormal white blood cell count, abnormal temperature, or antimicrobial therapy) for the presence of HAIs. An external IP expert team collected data from a subset of patient records reviewed by PTs to assess proxy indicator performance and PT data collection.

RESULTS. Of 851 patients surveyed by PTs, 51 had one or more HAIs (6.0%; 95% confidence interval, 4.5%–7.7%). Surgical site infections ($n = 18$), urinary tract infections ($n = 9$), pneumonia ($n = 9$), and bloodstream infections ($n = 8$) accounted for 75.8% of 58 HAIs detected by PTs. *Staphylococcus aureus* was the most common pathogen, causing 9 HAIs (15.5%). Antimicrobial therapy was the most sensitive proxy indicator, identifying 95.5% of patients with HAIs.

CONCLUSIONS. HAI prevalence in this pilot was similar to that reported in the 1970s by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Study on the Efficacy of Nosocomial Infection Control. Antimicrobial therapy was a sensitive screening variable with which to identify those patients at higher risk for infection and reduce data collection burden. Additional work is needed on validation and feasibility to extend this methodology to a national scale.

Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2012;33(3):283-291

Significant progress has been made in recent years to implement effective infection prevention strategies in US healthcare facilities and to reduce the occurrence of some preventable healthcare-associated infections (HAIs). Despite this progress, a recent analysis of HAI burden and cost using data reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) indicates that HAIs remain a serious public health problem in the United States.[1] To develop, target, and implement effective HAI surveillance and prevention strategies in US hospitals, a full understanding of the types of HAIs and the affected patient populations is needed.

Single-center and small multicenter prevalence surveys have been utilized in US hospitals since the 1960s as a simple method by which to describe HAI burden and evaluate the effectiveness of surveillance programs.[2-5] In the earliest of these studies, performed at Boston City Hospital, 13.4% of patients surveyed over a 1-week period had an infection that

Affiliations: 1. Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia; 2. Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida; 3. Atlanta Research and Education Foundation, Decatur, Georgia; 4. Florida Department of Health, Jacksonville, Florida; 5. Wolfson Children's Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida; 6. Baptist Medical Center Downtown, Jacksonville, Florida; 7. University of Florida/Shands Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida; 8. Baptist Medical Center Beaches, Jacksonville, Florida; 9. St. Vincent's Medical Center, Jacksonville, Florida; 10. Orange Park Medical Center, Orange Park, Florida; 11. Baptist Medical Center South, Jacksonville, Florida; 12. St. Luke's Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida; 13. University of Florida, Jacksonville, Florida; a. Present affiliations: Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida (D.C.); Tanner Medical Center, Villa Rica, Georgia (L.G.).

Received August 4, 2011; accepted October 17, 2011; electronically published January 12, 2012.

 0899-823X/2012/3303-0012$15.00. DOI: 10.1086/664048

was not present at admission to the hospital.[2] In a 6-hospital, CDC-run survey conducted during 1965 and 1966, the adjusted nosocomial infection rate was 3.5 cases per 100 hospital discharges.[4] These early efforts informed the development and implementation of the CDC National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) system and the Study on the Efficacy of Nosocomial Infection Control (SENIC) in the 1970s. SENIC was a $27 million, multiphase effort in which teams of trained CDC data abstractors reviewed the medical records of 169,526 patients from a stratified random sample of 338 hospitals over a 1-year period.[6,7] In the SENIC project, 5.23% of hospitalized patients acquired one or more HAIs.[7]

Hospital-wide surveillance in selected hospitals continued in the NNIS system until 1996. At that time, in response to increasing demands on infection control personnel, NNIS hospitals moved from hospital-wide surveillance toward targeted surveillance in high-risk inpatient areas, such as intensive care units (ICUs). In 2002, CDC epidemiologists used NNIS data from 1990–2002 and estimated the total number of HAIs in the United States to be 1.7 million, or 4.5 infections per 100 hospital admissions.[8]

The CDC's current HAI surveillance system, the NHSN, replaced the NNIS in 2005; over 4,500 healthcare facilities across the country report some device- and procedure-associated HAIs in selected hospital locations to the NHSN. However, most facilities do not report data on all HAI types present in all acute care patient populations. Therefore, measurements of the magnitude of all types of HAIs occurring hospital-wide, which are needed to inform decisions by local and national policy makers and by hospital infection control personnel regarding the appropriate targets and strategies for HAI surveillance and prevention, are not currently readily available on a national scale from the NHSN. Such estimates can be obtained in a resource-effective way through point prevalence surveys; these surveys can also be repeated at regular intervals to assess HAI and antimicrobial use trends over time.[9] Multiple countries have used prevalence surveys to estimate the scope of their HAI problems.[10-32] Some investigators have evaluated screening approaches (eg, using proxy indicators to identify those patients most likely to have HAIs) to reduce the number of patients who need to be fully evaluated, therefore providing a more feasible approach to conducting large-scale prevalence surveys.[33,34]

To inform the development of a large, multistate US HAI point prevalence survey, we conducted a pilot survey in collaboration with the Florida Department of Health and 9 acute care hospitals in Jacksonville, Florida. The primary objectives of this pilot survey were to (1) estimate HAI prevalence in a random sample of inpatients, (2) describe the distribution of HAIs by major infection site and causative pathogens, (3) evaluate the performance of proxy indicators in identifying patients with HAIs, and (4) evaluate the accuracy and reliability of prevalence survey data collection.

METHODS

Survey Design, Hospitals, and Patient Selection

Nine acute care hospitals located in the Jacksonville, Florida, metropolitan area volunteered to participate in the survey. After approval by the CDC institutional review board (IRB) and by the IRBs of participating hospitals, each hospital conducted the survey on a single day (Tuesday through Thursday) in August 2009. The Florida Department of Health determined the survey to be a nonresearch surveillance activity.

Patients of any age who were hospitalized in acute care inpatient units were eligible for inclusion. Patients were not eligible if they were in non–acute care or outpatient areas; in psychiatric units, rehabilitation units, or skilled nursing units; in the emergency department; or on observation status in an acute care inpatient unit with a length of stay less than 24 hours at the time of the survey. The hospital census on the morning of the survey was used to generate a random sample of eligible patients to be surveyed.

Training and Data Collection

Data were collected on paper forms by infection preventionists (IPs) and other designated personnel working in their own hospitals; these hospital-based teams were called the primary teams (PTs). Before the survey dates, PTs participated in approximately 6 hours of training in NHSN HAI terms and definitions and survey procedures. PTs completed most of their data collection activities on the survey date but were permitted an additional 14 days after the survey date to complete data collection when necessary, as long as all data collection remained restricted to information present (or cultures collected) on or prior to the survey date. In addition to limited demographic and clinical information, data collection included information on the presence of proxy HAI indicators on the survey date or the calendar day before the survey date (white blood cell count, $<4{,}000$ cells/mm^3 or $\geq 12{,}000$ cells/mm^3 [$\geq 15{,}000$ cells/mm^3 for infants ≤ 1 year of age]; temperature, >38°C for all ages or <36°C for infants ≤ 1 year of age; and whether the patient was receiving antimicrobial agents).

To identify active HAIs, PTs performed comprehensive medical record review for those patients with ≥ 1 proxy indicator. HAIs were defined according to NHSN criteria[35] and were identified as being active if signs and symptoms of the HAI were present on the survey date or if signs and symptoms of the HAI were present before the survey date and the patient was still receiving antimicrobial treatment for that HAI on the survey date. PTs reported only those HAIs that were attributed to their own hospitals; active HAIs detected on the survey date that were attributed to other healthcare facilities were not reported.

Paper forms labeled with hospital and patient identification codes were returned to the CDC for analysis. Identification

codes (called CDC ID codes) were created for the survey and contained no personal identifiers. The links between CDC ID codes and hospital and patient identifiers were known only to each individual hospital.

Evaluation Team (ET) Assessment of Proxy Indicator Performance and PT Surveillance

An ET, composed of 4 experienced IPs who were from outside of Jacksonville, Florida, and were serving as expert reviewers, performed an assessment of proxy indicator performance and an evaluation of the data collected by the PTs. The ET attempted to perform comprehensive medical record review (regardless of the presence of proxy indicators) for every other patient on the PTs' lists of patients randomly selected for inclusion in the survey. Because of time constraints, the ET reviewed records of a 40% subset of the patients reviewed by the PTs. ET members traveled to each of the hospitals on the survey dates and performed assessment activities in parallel with PT members. ET members also completed HAI criteria worksheets for those patients who were determined to have HAIs. PT members provided the ET with brief orientations to the hospitals and medical record systems on the mornings of the survey dates. Other than these orientations, the ET and PTs operated independently and were not permitted to discuss or exchange information regarding surveyed patients.

After the CDC review of the data, PT members again reviewed the medical records of those patients for whom the PT and ET made differing HAI determinations. ET HAI criteria worksheets were used to determine how ET HAI determinations were made for discrepant cases, and for some discrepancies, the ET leader returned to a participating hospital to review medical records once again. After completion of these additional reviews, a resolution team (RT), composed of PT members, the ET leader, and Florida Department of Health and CDC prevalence survey personnel, was convened. The RT held conference calls with a representative of each PT to discuss HAI discrepancies and to make decisions regarding correct HAI determinations. The RT focused on major discrepancies, which were defined as discrepancies in which one team determined that the patient had an HAI and the other team determined that the patient did not have an HAI.

Analysis

To estimate the survey sample size, we used the standard sample size formula for random samples. Using an estimated HAI prevalence of 10% and a desired precision of plus or minus 2%, we estimated the desired survey sample size to be approximately 864 patients. This total estimated sample size was divided between the participating hospitals in a manner proportional to each hospital's average daily census, such that each PT was asked to review approximately 33% of its average daily census.

Data were entered into a Microsoft Access 2007 database and analyzed in SAS, version 9.2 (SAS) and OpenEpi, version 2. Confidence intervals (CIs) around prevalence estimates were generated using the mid-*P* exact method. A descriptive analysis of HAIs and major HAI discrepancies was performed. Sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative predictive values of proxy indicators (as collected by the ET) in detecting HAIs were calculated.

RESULTS

Patients

A total of 857 patients identified by unique CDC ID codes were surveyed by the PTs. Six patients were excluded because of data coding errors or incomplete data collection. Therefore, 851 patients (47–175 patients at each participating hospital) were included in the analysis. The median patient age was 54 years (interquartile range, 33–69 years). More than a quarter of all surveyed patients had a device in place on the survey date, had undergone an operative procedure during the current hospitalization, or had a previous admission to the survey hospital within 3 months before the survey date (Table 1).

Prevalence and Distribution of HAIs and Pathogens Identified by PT Surveillance

A total of 489 patients (57.5%) had one or more proxy HAI indicators and underwent comprehensive medical record review by the PTs. PTs detected 58 HAIs in 51 patients; 7 patients had 2 HAIs each. The prevalence of patients with one or more HAIs was 6.0% (95% CI, 4.5%–7.7%). Surgical site infection (SSI) was the most common HAI type, accounting for 18 (31.0%) of 58 HAIs. Ten SSIs (55.6%) were organ/space infections, 4 (22.2%) were deep incisional infections, and 4 (22.2%) were superficial incisional infections. Pneumonia (PNEU), urinary tract infection (UTI), and bloodstream infection (BSI) were also prevalent, each accounting for more than 10% of HAIs (Table 2). Overall, these 4 HAI types accounted for 75.8% of all HAIs detected by the PTs. Of the 40 non-SSI HAIs, 15 (37.5%) were attributed to non-ICU ward locations, 13 (32.5%) were attributed to critical care units, 4 (10%) were attributed to stepdown units, and 4 (10%) were attributed to specialty care areas. Locations of attribution were missing or unknown for 4 non-SSI HAIs (10%).

Pathogens were reported for 41 HAIs detected by the PTs (70.7%). A single pathogen was reported for 34 (82.9%) of 41 HAIs, and multiple pathogens were reported for 7 HAIs (17.1%). *Staphylococcus aureus* was the most common pathogen (9 HAIs; 15.5% of all HAIs). Other pathogens reported for one or more HAIs included *Candida* species (6 HAIs), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (5), coagulase-negative staphylococci (5), *Enterococcus* species (5), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (4), *Escherichia coli* (4), *Clostridium difficile* (2), and viridans streptococci (2).

TABLE 1. Patient Demographic and Clinical Characteristics

Characteristic	No. (%) of patients (n = 851)
Sex	
Male	362 (42.5)
Female	481 (56.5)
Missing data	13 (1.5)
Age category, years	
<1	98 (11.5)
1–17	27 (3.2)
18–24	35 (4.1)
25–44	145 (17.0)
45–64	271 (31.8)
≥65	274 (32.2)
Missing data	1 (0.1)
Hospital location[a] on the survey date	
Critical care unit	125 (14.7)
Stepdown unit	80 (9.4)
Critical care or stepdown unit[b]	3 (0.4)
Specialty care area	35 (4.1)
Newborn nursery and special care nursery	47 (5.5)
Ward	553 (65.0)
Missing data	8 (0.9)
Device use on survey date	
Central line	237 (27.8)
Peripherally inserted central catheter	140 (16.5)
Femoral line	14 (1.6)
Other central line	85 (10.0)
Unspecified central line type	12 (1.4)
>1 central line type	13 (1.5)
Urinary catheter	231 (27.1)
Ventilator	44 (5.2)
NHSN-defined operative procedure[c] during current hospitalization	252 (29.6)
Previous admission to the survey hospital within 3 months before survey date	218 (25.6)
HAI proxy indicators	
White blood cell count abnormality[d]	213 (25.0)
Temperature abnormality[e]	80 (9.4)
Antimicrobial therapy	389 (45.7)
≥1 indicator	489 (57.5)

NOTE. HAI, healthcare-associated infection; NHSN, National Healthcare Safety Network.

[a] As defined by NHSN. Critical care units include level II/III and level III neonatal intensive care units.

[b] Patients for whom a single location was not assigned.

[c] Includes NHSN-defined "other" (OTH) procedures.

[d] White blood cell count <4,000 cells/mm^3 or ≥12,000 cells/mm^3 (≥15,000 cells/mm^3 for infants ≤1 year) on the survey date or the calendar day prior to the survey date.

[e] Temperature >38°C (all ages) or <36°C (infants ≤1 year of age) on the survey date or the calendar day before the survey date.

ET Assessment of Proxy Indicator Performance and PT Surveillance

The ET reviewed the medical records of 340 (40.0%) of the 851 patients surveyed by the PTs. Among these patients, antimicrobial therapy was the most sensitive proxy indicator, detecting 95.5% of patients determined by the ET to have HAI (Table 3).

The ET detected 24 HAIs overall and one or more HAIs in 22 patients, for a prevalence of 6.5% (95% CI, 4.2%–9.5%). Similar to the PTs, SSI was the most common HAI (9 [37.5%] of 24 HAIs), followed by PNEU (5 [20.8%] of 24), BSI (3 [12.5%] of 24), and UTI (2 [8.3%] of 24). Pathogens were reported for 18 of the HAIs detected by the ET (75.0%); as for the PT, *S. aureus* was identified as the most common pathogen (accounting for 6 [25.0%] of 24 HAIs).

Overall agreement between the PTs and ET on the presence or absence of HAIs was moderate at the HAI level (κ, 0.47; 95% CI, 0.30–0.64) and at the patient level (κ, 0.51; 95% CI,

TABLE 2. National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Healthcare-Associated Infections (HAIs) Detected by the Primary Teams

NHSN HAI type (code)	No. (%) of HAIs (n = 58)
Surgical site (SSI)	18 (31.0)
Pneumonia (PNEU)[a]	9 (15.5)
Urinary tract (UTI)[b]	9 (15.5)
Bloodstream (BSI)[c]	8 (13.8)
Gastrointestinal (GI)	4 (6.9)
Skin and soft tissue (SST)	4 (6.9)
Lower respiratory tract (LRI)	2 (3.4)
Eye, ear, nose, throat, or mouth (EENT)	2 (3.4)
Cardiovascular system (CVS)	1 (1.7)
Central nervous system (CNS)	1 (1.7)

[a] Two (22.2%) of 9 infections were ventilator associated.
[b] Five (55.6%) of 9 infections were catheter associated.
[c] Eight (100%) of 8 were central line associated.

0.33–0.69). HAI discrepancies at the patient level were common. Forty-one HAIs in 35 patients were detected among the 340 patients surveyed by the PTs and the ET. Of these, 17 were detected only by the PTs, 10 were detected only by the ET, and 14 were detected by both teams. Thirty-two discrepancies were detected in these 41 HAIs; 27 (84.4%) of these were major discrepancies, in which teams disagreed as to whether an HAI was present (Table 4). HAI types that were most common among the major discrepant cases were PNEU (9 [33.3%] of 27 cases) and UTI (6 [22.2%] of 27 cases). Although the PTs and the ET detected similar proportions of HAIs that were PNEU and UTI, there was no agreement between the teams on the individual patient level as to which patients had PNEU and which patients had UTI.

The RT determined that most major discrepancies (21 [77.8%] of 27) were attributable to problems understanding and/or interpreting NHSN HAI definition criteria. The RT was able to assign a correct determination to 26 (96.3%) of 27 cases with major discrepancies: 14 (53.8%) were not HAIs, 12 (46.2%) were HAIs, and resolution was not achieved for 1 PNEU case. A modified HAI prevalence was calculated using RT determinations for the discrepant cases. Among the 339 patients for whom there was PT and ET agreement on the presence or absence of HAIs or for whom resolution was achieved, there were 13 patients with HAIs detected by PTs and the ET, plus an additional 9 patients with HAIs confirmed through the RT process, yielding a prevalence of 6.5% (95% CI, 4.2%–9.5%), similar to initial estimates obtained by the PTs and the ET.

DISCUSSION

In this pilot phase of the CDC's HAI prevalence survey development effort, 6.0% of acute care inpatients had one or more HAIs detected by the PTs, which is similar to the prevalence of 5.23% reported in the SENIC,[7] conducted more than 30 years ago, before the widespread appreciation of HAIs as important causes of preventable harm in hospitalized patients. Although implementation of effective HAI prevention measures in recent years[36] might suggest that HAI prevalence should have been lower in 2009, there are a number of potential reasons why HAI prevalence in this single-city pilot survey is similar to that observed in the 1970s. The SENIC included general adult medical and surgical patients and excluded children, obstetrics patients (except those undergoing cesarean delivery), and surgical subspecialty patients. It was also designed to capture only the 4 major types of HAI (UTI, SSI, BSI, and PNEU), because at the time, these were estimated to account for at least 80% of all HAIs.[7] Because not all HAI types were included, it is possible that 5.23% is an underestimate of HAI prevalence in the SENIC. In addition, other factors may explain why the prevalence does not appear to be substantially lower in the current survey, which was conducted in an era of increased HAI prevention success: for example, greater severity of illness in acute care inpatients, differences in comorbidities of the patient populations under surveillance, and improvements in HAI surveillance definitions and detection methods.

Although HAI prevalence in the current survey is similar to that reported in SENIC, the distribution and rank order of HAIs in this survey is different. SSIs in this survey were the most common HAIs detected by the PTs, accounting for almost one-third of all infections. This is similar to the 28% prevalence of surgical wound infections in the SENIC,[7] but is in contrast to the results of an analysis by Klevens et al[8] that used NNIS data from 1990–2002, which showed that just 20% of HAIs were SSIs. In both of these previous efforts, UTIs were the most common HAI type, accounting for 53% and 36% of all HAIs, respectively,[7,8] whereas in the current survey, UTIs accounted for just 15.5% of all HAIs. The exclusion of asymptomatic bacteriuria and funguria from the CDC's healthcare-associated UTI definition in 2009 likely explains, in part, the relatively lower proportion of HAIs that are now found to be UTIs. In addition, an increased focus on the appropriate use of urinary catheters, which is a major risk factor for healthcare-associated UTI, may also have contributed to the lower rank order of UTI in the current survey.

The proportion of HAIs other than the 4 major types in the current survey was approximately 24%, which is similar to that reported in the Klevens analysis.[8] It is perhaps surprising that gastrointestinal tract infections did not account for a larger proportion of HAIs in the current survey, given the increasing incidence of *C. difficile* infection in healthcare settings.[37,38] *C. difficile* was reported as the cause of only 2 gastrointestinal tract infections in this survey (3.4% of all HAIs), raising the possibility that existing NHSN definitions for gastrointestinal tract infection, which have not been updated in several years, are not adequately capturing the majority of healthcare-associated cases of *C. difficile* infection. To address this concern, a specific definition of healthcare-

TABLE 3. Performance of Proxy Indicators in Identifying Patients with Healthcare-Associated Infection (HAI) as Determined by the Evaluation Team (n = 340)

Indicator	HAI present	No HAI	Total	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)
White blood cell count abnormality[a]							
Yes	11	75	86	52.4 (29.8–74.3)	72.8 (67.2–78.0)	12.8 (6.6–21.7)	95.3 (91.5–97.7)
No	10	201	211	...	...	...	...
Missing data	1	42	43	...	...	...	...
Temperature abnormality[b]							
Yes	3	19	23	13.6 (2.9–34.9)	93.7 (90.4–96.1)	13.0 (2.8–33.6)	94.0 (90.7–96.3)
No	19	296	315	...	...	...	...
Missing data	0	2	2	...	...	...	...
Antimicrobial therapy[c]							
Yes	21	118	139	95.5 (77.2–99.9)	62.8 (57.2–68.1)	15.1 (9.6–22.2)	99.5 (97.3–100)
No	1	199	200	...	...	...	...
Missing data	0	1	1	...	...	...	...

NOTE. CI, confidence interval; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value.

[a] White blood cell count <4,000 cells/mm^3 or ≥12,000 cells/mm^3 (≥15,000 cells/mm^3 for infants ≤1 year of age) on the survey date or the calendar day before the survey date.

[b] Temperature >38°C (all ages) or <36°C (infants ≤1 year of age) on the survey date or the calendar day before the survey date.

[c] On the survey date or the calendar day before the survey date.

associated *C. difficile* infection will be used in subsequent phases of the CDC prevalence survey.

Many of the existing NHSN HAI definitions were developed in the 1990s for use in internal quality improvement efforts and reporting to the NNIS system. In some cases, definitions are complex and multifaceted, and many are subjective and open to significant interpretation by the user. It is not entirely surprising, then, that understanding and/or interpretation of the NHSN definitions were the sources of most major discrepancies in HAI determinations. Significant interobserver variability has been reported for some of the NHSN HAI definitions;[39,40] in this survey, the agreement between the PTs and the ET on HAI determinations was moderate, with κ of approximately 0.5. Not surprisingly, PNEU and UTI cases accounted for many of the major HAI discrepancies. These are anecdotally regarded as among the most complex of the HAI surveillance definitions. To address this, more training in NHSN terms and definitions has been incorporated into subsequent phases of the CDC HAI prevalence survey development effort. CDC staff are also reviewing some of the current NHSN HAI definitions, including those for BSI, PNEU, and SSI, as well as aspects of NHSN surveillance methodology, with the goal of making HAI surveillance more objective, streamlined, and in some cases automatable through use of electronic data capture.

We explored the performance of 3 proxy indicators in detecting patients with HAIs and found that 1 indicator in particular, antimicrobial therapy, detected almost all patients who were determined to have HAIs by the ET. The high sensitivity of antimicrobial therapy is likely to be related to the high prevalence of antimicrobial use in this survey population; approximately 46% of patients received antimicrobial therapy on the survey date or on the calendar day before the survey date. We did not have the resources in this pilot study to collect detailed information on antimicrobial use but have incorporated this into the next phases of the survey. On the basis of its high sensitivity in identifying patients with HAI in this pilot, we are using antimicrobial therapy as a proxy indicator to reduce the burden of medical record review in subsequent phases of survey development.

This pilot survey has several limitations, including its small size and restriction to acute care hospitals in a single metropolitan area. The results therefore may not be generalizable to other regions or to the United States overall. Furthermore, training of PT members in NHSN terms and definitions was limited, and training was not provided for ET members. This may have contributed to the interobserver variability that we observed. Because of the single-day nature of the individual hospital surveys, PT and ET members were faced with a considerable amount of data collection to complete in a short amount of time. ET members had limited time to familiarize themselves with each hospital's medical information system and at times encountered challenges in locating the necessary clinical information in patient medical records. We expect these factors also contributed to interobserver variability. We have attempted to address these limitations in subsequent phases of the survey development effort by (1) increasing the sample size of hospitals and patients, (2) increasing the geographic diversity of participating hospitals, (3) changing the data collection procedures so that HAI determinations are made through retrospective medical record review, and (4) providing enhanced training in NHSN terms and definitions and survey procedures to all data collectors involved in the survey.

The experience gained in this pilot survey has contributed to refinements in methodology and training that will improve

TABLE 4. Healthcare-Associated Infection (HAI) Determination Major Discrepancies and Resolution (n = 27)

HAI no.	PT determination	ET determination	Discrepancy source(s)[a]	Final RT determination
1	BSI	No HAI	Data access; data collection error	BSI
2	EENT	No HAI	Data collection error	No HAI
3	GI	No HAI	Data collection error	GI
4	PNEU	No HAI	Data access	No HAI
5	PNEU	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	Unresolved
6	PNEU	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
7	PNEU	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
8	SSI	No HAI	Data collection error	SST
9	SSI	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
10	SSI	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
11	SST	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
12	SST	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
13	SST	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
14	UTI	No HAI	Data access	UTI
15	UTI	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
16	UTI	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
17	UTI	No HAI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	UTI
18	No HAI	CVS	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	CVS
19	No HAI	PNEU	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	PNEU
20	No HAI	PNEU	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	PNEU
21	No HAI	PNEU	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	PNEU
22	No HAI	PNEU	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
23	No HAI	PNEU	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	PNEU
24	No HAI	REPR	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	REPR
25	No HAI	SSI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation; data collection error	No HAI
26	No HAI	UTI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	No HAI
27	No HAI	UTI	HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation	UTI

NOTE. BSI, bloodstream infection; CVS, cardiovascular system infection; EENT, ears/eyes/nose/mouth/throat infection; ET, evaluation team; GI, gastrointestinal infection; PNEU, pneumonia; PT, primary team; REPR, reproductive tract infection; RT, resolution team; SSI, surgical site infection; SST, skin and soft-tissue infection; UTI, urinary tract infection.

[a] Possible sources included the following: (1) data access, in which the ET did not have access to test results available to the PTs (eg, results of cultures collected on the survey date); (2) data collection error, in which information necessary to make an HAI determination was clearly present in the medical record but was not recognized or recorded by the data collector; (3) HAI definition understanding and/or interpretation, in which data collectors lacked awareness or understanding of the criteria necessary to make National Healthcare Safety Network HAI determinations. More than one source could be identified for any given HAI discrepancy.

the quality of the CDC multistate prevalence survey effort. In addition, this pilot survey effort has contributed to a greater understanding of the potential sources of interobserver variability in NHSN surveillance methods. Expansion of prevalence assessments to a larger sample of US hospitals and modification of operations in response to the lessons learned in this pilot should provide policy makers, public health workers, infection preventionists and healthcare providers with HAI and antimicrobial use data to inform the development and implementation of targeted surveillance and high-impact prevention programs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the staff of the following hospitals for their invaluable contributions to this effort: Baptist Medical Center Beaches; Baptist Medical Center Downtown; Baptist Medical Center South; Mayo Clinic Florida; Orange Park Medical Center; St. Luke's Hospital; St. Vincent's Medical Center (including Irene Pappalardo, RN, and Phil Perry, MD, CMO); University of Florida/Shands Jacksonville Hospital (including Marilyn Middlebrooks, BSN, RN, CCRN, CIC, and Murriel Andra Love, BSN); and Wolfson Children's Hospital (including Katherine Suter, RN, BSN). We would also like to thank the Florida Department of Health; Ruth A. Voss, RN, MPH, and Taj H. Azarian, MPH, of the Duval County Health Department; Kathy Allen-Bridson, RN, BSN, CIC, and Gloria Morrell, RN, MS, MSN, CIC, of the NHSN Training and User Support Team at the CDC for their assistance with NHSN HAI definitions training; and Mary L. Andrus, RN, CIC, Rebecca Lynn Sharrer, RN, BSN, CIC, Stanley M. Ostrawski, RN, MS, CIC, and Katherine S. Ward, RN, BSN, MPH, CIC, for their work as the Evaluation Team. Finally, we owe a debt of gratitude to numerous colleagues in the European Union from whom we have learned a great deal about HAI and antimicrobial use prevalence survey methodology and would like to particularly thank Dr. Edward Smyth, Mr. Gerard McIlvenny, and Dr. Carl Suetens for their input and advice.

Financial support. This study was supported by the CDC Foundation through grants from Astellas and Pfizer and by the CDC.

Potential conflicts of interest. M.R. is a consultant for Pfizer. All other authors report no conflicts of interest relevant to this article. All authors submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest,

and the conflicts that the editors consider relevant to this article are disclosed here.

Address correspondence to Shelley S. Magill, MD, PhD, Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, MS A-24, Atlanta, GA 30333 (smagill@cdc.gov).

The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

REFERENCES

1. Wise ME, Scott RD, Ellingson KD, et al. Burden of major hospital-onset device-associated infection types among adults and children in the United States, 2007. In: *Program and Abstracts of the Annual Meeting of the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America.* Dallas: Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, 2011. Abstract 303.
2. Kislak JW, Eickhoff TC, Finland M. Hospital-acquired infections and antibiotic usage in the Boston City Hospital—January, 1964. *New Engl J Med* 1964;271:834–835.
3. Barrett FF, Casey JI, Finland M. Infections and antibiotic use among patients at Boston City Hospital February 1967. *New Engl J Med* 1968;278:5–9.
4. Eickhoff TC, Brachman PS, Bennett JV, et al. Surveillance of nosocomial infections in community hospitals. I. Surveillance methods, effectiveness, and initial results. *J Infect Dis* 1969;120: 305–317.
5. Hughes JM. Nosocomial infection surveillance in the United States: historical perspective. *Infect Control* 1987;8:450–453.
6. Haley RW, Culver DH, White JW, et al. Study on the efficacy of nosocomial infection control (SENIC project): summary of study design. *Am J Epidemiol* 1980;111:472–485.
7. Haley RW, Hooton TM, Culver DH, et al. Nosocomial infections in U.S. hospitals, 1975–1976: estimated frequency by selected characteristics of patients. *Am J Med* 1981;70:947–959.
8. Klevens RM, Edwards JR, Richards CL, et al. Estimating health care-associated infections and deaths in U.S. hospitals, 2002. *Public Health Rep* 2007;122:160–166.
9. Llata E, Gaynes RP, Fridkin S. Measuring the scope and magnitude of hospital-associated infection in the United States: the value of prevalence surveys. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;48:1434–1440.
10. Smyth ET, McIlvenny G, Enstone JE, et al. Four country healthcare-associated prevalence survey 2006: overview of results. *J Hosp Infect* 2008;69:230–248.
11. Lyytikäinen O, Kanerva M, Agthe N, Möttönen T, Ruutu P; Finnish Prevalence Survey Study Group. Healthcare-associated infections in Finnish acute care hospitals: a national prevalence survey, 2005. *J Hosp Infect* 2008;69:288–294.
12. Gastmeier P, Kampf G, Wischnewsky N, et al. Prevalence of nosocomial infections in representative German hospitals. *J Hosp Infect* 1998;38:37–49.
13. Struwe J, Dumpis U, Gulbinovic J, Lagergren A, Bergman U. Healthcare-associated infections in university hospitals in Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden: a simple protocol for quality assessment. *Euro Surveill* 2006;11:167–171.
14. Scheel O, Stormark M. National prevalence survey on hospital infections in Norway. *J Hosp Infect* 1999;41:331–335.
15. Vaque J, Rossello J, Arribas JL, et al. Prevalence of nosocomial infections in Spain. *J Hosp Infect* 1999;43:105–111.
16. French Prevalence Survey Study Group. Prevalence of nosocomial infections in France: results of the nationwide survey in 1996. *J Hosp Infect* 2000;46:186–193.
17. Azzam R, Dramaix M. A one day prevalence survey of hospital-acquired infections in Lebanon. *J Hosp Infect* 2001;49:74–78.
18. Zotti CM, Messori G, Charrier L, et al. Hospital-acquired infections in Italy: a region wide prevalence study. *J Hosp Infect* 2003;56:142–149.
19. Gikas A, Pediaditis J, Papadakis JA, et al. Prevalence study of hospital-acquired infections in 14 Greek hospitals. *J Hosp Infect* 2002;50:269–275.
20. Plowman R, Graves N, Griffin MA, et al. The rate and cost of hospital-acquired infections occurring in patients admitted to selected specialities of a district general hospital in England and the national burden imposed. *J Hosp Infect* 2001;47:198–209.
21. Emmerson AM, Enstone JE, Griffin MA, et al. The Second National Prevalence Survey of infection in hospitals: overview of the results. *J Hosp Infect* 1996;32:175–190.
22. Pittet D, Harbarth S, Ruef C, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for nosocomial infection in four university hospitals in Switzerland. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1997;20:37–42.
23. Faria S, Sodano L, Gjata A, et al. The first prevalence survey of nosocomial infections in the University Hospital Centre Mother Teresa of Tirana, Albania. *J Hosp Infect* 2007;65:244–250.
24. Hajdu A, Samodova OV, Carlsson TR, et al. A point prevalence survey of hospital-acquired infections and antimicrobial use in a pediatric hospital in north-western Russia. *J Hosp Infect* 2007; 66:378–384.
25. Lee MK, Chiu CS, Chow VC, et al. Prevalence of hospital infection and antibiotic use at a university medical Center in Hong Kong. *J Hosp Infect* 2007;65:341–374.
26. Duerink DO, Roeshadi D, Wahjono H, et al. Surveillance of healthcare-associated infections in Indonesian hospitals. *J Hosp Infect* 2006;62:219–229.
27. Klavs I, Luznik TB, Skerl M, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for hospital-acquired infections in Slovenia: results of the first national survey, 2001. *J Hosp Infect* 2003;54:149–157.
28. Kallel H, Bahoul M, Ksibi H, et al. Prevalence of hospital-acquired infection in a Tunisian hospital. *J Hosp Infect* 2005;59: 343–347.
29. Metintas S, Akgun Y, Durmaz G, et al. Prevalence and characteristics of nosocomial infections in a Turkish university hospital. *Am J Infect Control* 2004;32:409–413.
30. Danchaivijitr S, Judaeng T, Sripalakij S, Naksawas K, Plipat T. Prevalence of nosocomial infection in Thailand 2006. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2007;90:1524–1529.
31. Gravel D, Matlow A, Ofner-Agostini M, et al. A point prevalence survey of healthcare-associated infections in pediatric populations in major Canadian acute care hospitals. *Am J Infect Control* 2007;35:157–162.
32. Gravel D, Taylor G, Ofner M, et al. Point prevalence survey for healthcare-associated infections within Canadian adult acute-care hospitals. *J Hosp Infect* 2007;66:243–248.
33. Gastmeier P, Brauer H, Hauer T, et al. How many nosocomial infections are missed if identification is restricted to patients

with either microbiology reports or antibiotic administration? *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1999;20:124–127.
34. Brusaferro S, Regattin L, Faruzzo A, et al. Surveillance of hospital-acquired infections: a model for settings with resource constraints. *Am J Infect Control* 2006;34:362–366.
35. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Healthcare Safety Network patient safety component manual. http://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/TOC_PSCManual.html. Accessed June 7, 2011.
36. Cardo D, Dennehy PH, Halverson P, et al. Moving toward elimination of healthcare-associated infections: a call to action. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;38:671–675.
37. Dubberke ER, Butler AM, Yokoe DS, et al. Multicenter study of *Clostridium difficile* infection rates from 2000 to 2006. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31:1030–1037.
38. Zilberberg MD, Tillotson GS, McDonald LC. *Clostridium difficile* infections among hospitalized children, 1997–2006. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2010;16:604–609.
39. Klompas M. Interobserver variability in ventilator-associated pneumonia surveillance. *Am J Infect Control* 2010;38:237–239.
40. Malpiedi P, Hota B, Magill S, et al. Interobserver variability in bloodstream infection determinations using National Healthcare Safety Network definitions. In: *Program and Abstracts of Annual Meeting of the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America.* Dallas: Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, 2011. Abstract 305.