



Brief report

Developing a new national approach to surveillance for ventilator-associated events: Executive summary

Shelley S. Magill MD, PhD^{a,*}, Michael Klompas MD, MPH^{b,c,d}, Robert Balk MD^{e,f}, Suzanne M. Burns RN, ACNP, MSN, RRT^{f,g}, Clifford S. Deutschman MS, MD^{f,h}, Daniel Diekema MD^{i,j}, Scott Fridkin MD^a, Linda Greene RN, MPS^{k,l}, Alice Guh MD, MPH^a, David Gutterman MD^{f,m}, Beth Hammer RN, MSN, ANP-BC^{f,n}, David Henderson MD^o, Dean R. Hess PhD, RRT^{p,q,r}, Nicholas S. Hill MD^{f,s}, Teresa Horan MPH^a, Marin Kollef MD^{f,t}, Mitchell Levy MD^{f,u}, Edward Septimus MD^{v,w}, Carole VanAntwerpen RN, BSN^{x,y}, Don Wright MD, MPH^z, Pamela Lipsett MD, MHPE^{f,aa}

^a Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA

^b Department of Population Medicine, Harvard Medical School and Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute, Boston, MA

^c Infection Control Department, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

^d Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, Arlington, VA

^e Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Rush University School of Medicine, Chicago, IL

^f Critical Care Societies Collaborative-American Association of Critical-Care Nurses, American College of Chest Physicians, American Thoracic Society, Society of Critical Care Medicine

^g School of Nursing, Critical and Acute Care, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA

^h Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

ⁱ Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine, Iowa City, IA

^j Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee Surveillance Working Group, Atlanta, GA

^k Infection Prevention and Control Department, Rochester General Health System, Rochester, NY

^l Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Washington, DC

^m Department of Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI

ⁿ Department of Cardiology, Zablocki VA Medical Center, Milwaukee, WI

^o Hospital Epidemiology and Quality Improvement, The Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD

^p Department of Respiratory Care, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

^q Department of Anesthesia, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

^r American Association for Respiratory Care, Irving, TX

^s Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA

^t Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Washington University, St Louis, MO

* 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 30329.

E-mail addresses: smagill@cdc.gov (S.S. Magill).

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, the American Association for Respiratory Care, the Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, or the Infectious Diseases Society of America.

This article is an executive summary of a report from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia Surveillance Definition Working Group, entitled "Developing a new, national approach to surveillance for ventilator-associated events" and published in *Critical Care Medicine*. The full report provides a comprehensive description of the Working Group process and outcome.

This article is being jointly published by American Journal of Infection Control, Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology, American Journal of Critical Care, The Society of Healthcare Epidemiology of America, Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, American Association for Respiratory Care, American Association of Critical-Care Nurses, American Thoracic Society, American College of Chest Physicians, and the Infectious Diseases Society of America.

Supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Conflicts of interest: Dr Klompas received grant support from the CDC, US Food and Drug Administration, and the Office of the National Co-ordinator for Health IT. Dr Balk received grant support from the CDC and bioMérieux for participation in the EPIC CAP study (CDC) and the Procalcitonin in ICU antibiotic stewardship study

(CDC and bioMérieux). Dr Deutschman received grant support from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. Dr Diekema received grant support from Merck, Cereva, bioMérieux, PurThread Technologies, and Pfizer. Dr Klompas received support for travel from the CDC, Society of Healthcare Epidemiologists of America, Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, and the Duke University Infection Control Outreach Network. Dr Balk received support for travel from the CDC and Critical Care Societies Collaborative. Dr Burns received support for travel from the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses (AACN; meeting unrelated to this study). Drs Deutschman and Lipsett received support for travel from the Society of Critical Care Medicine. Ms Greene received support for travel from the Department of Health and Human Services/CDC. Ms Greene consults for INC. Dr Hess consulted for Philips Respironics, ResMed, Pari, and Breathe and received honorarium from Covidien and Maquet. Ms Greene lectured for Premier, Advanced Sterilization Products, and APIC. Dr Burns lectured for AACN (annual national conference). Ms Greene presented speeches for Covidien and Maquet. Dr Septimus received an honorarium for a lecture. Dr Klompas received support from the Society of Healthcare Epidemiologists of America for the development of educational presentations. Ms Greene is employed by the Rochester General Hospital. Dr Lipsett has board membership with the Society of Critical Care Medicine. Dr Deutschman received a stipend for his Presidency with the Society of Critical Care Medicine. Dr Deutschman received royalties from Elsevier for the textbook, *Evidence-based Practice of Critical Care Medicine*. Dr Burns receives royalties from McGraw-Hill for books endorsed by AACN. Ms Greene receives royalties from Up-To-Date, Jones and Bartlett, and McGraw-Hill. The remaining authors disclose no conflicts.

^u Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep, Warren Alpert Medical School at Brown University, Rhode Island Hospital, Providence, RI

^v Department of Internal Medicine, Texas A&M Health Science Center, College Station, TX

^w Infectious Diseases Society of America, Arlington, VA

^x New York State Department of Health, Bureau of Healthcare-Associated Infections, Albany, NY

^y Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, Atlanta, GA

^z Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, US Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC

^{aa} Department of Surgery, Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

Key Words:

Ventilator-associated pneumonia

Intensive care unit

Epidemiology

Public health

Critical care

Mechanical ventilation

In September 2011, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) convened a Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia (VAP) Surveillance Definition Working Group to organize a formal process for leaders and experts of key stakeholder organizations to discuss the challenges of VAP surveillance definitions and to propose new approaches to VAP surveillance in adult patients (Table 1). The charges to the Working Group were to (1) critically review a draft, streamlined VAP surveillance definition developed for use in adult patients; (2) suggest modifications to enhance the reliability and credibility of the surveillance definition within the critical care and infection prevention communities; and (3) propose a final adult surveillance definition algorithm to be implemented in the CDC's National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN), taking into consideration the potential future use of the definition algorithm in public reporting, interfacility comparisons, and pay-for-reporting and pay-for-performance programs.

Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc.

The Working Group's surveillance definition algorithm, which is referred to as the *ventilator-associated events* or *VAE surveillance definition algorithm*, represents a purposeful departure from VAP toward more general, objective measures of conditions and complications occurring in patients on mechanical ventilation (Fig 1; VAE surveillance protocol available at <http://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/acute-care-hospital/vae/index.html>). The VAE surveillance definition algorithm uses a tiered approach, moving from measures of ventilator-associated conditions (VAC), to infection-related ventilator-associated complications (IVAC), to possible and probable VAP.

The first tier of VAE surveillance, VAC, seeks to identify episodes of sustained respiratory deterioration and will capture both infectious and noninfectious conditions and complications occurring in mechanically ventilated patients. VAC is defined by a sustained period of worsening oxygenation that immediately follows a baseline period of stability or improvement on the ventilator. To meet the VAC definition, a mechanically ventilated patient must have at least 2 calendar days of stable or decreasing daily minimum positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) or fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO_2), followed by at least 2 days of increased daily minimum PEEP or FiO_2 , where the increase in the daily minimum PEEP is ≥ 3 cm H_2O greater than the daily minimum PEEP during the baseline period, or where the increase in the daily minimum FiO_2 is ≥ 0.20 (or 20 percentage points in oxygen concentration) greater than the daily minimum FiO_2 during the baseline period. For example, if a patient's daily minimum FiO_2 requirement on days 4 and 5 of mechanical ventilation is 0.40, then the patient's daily minimum FiO_2 requirement would need to be at least 0.60 on days 6 and 7 of mechanical ventilation for the VAC definition to be met. The Working Group's decisions to set specific thresholds of 3 cm H_2O and 0.20 (20 points) for the increases in PEEP and FiO_2 , respectively, and to define a "sustained" increase as an increase persisting for at least 2 calendar days were based on expert opinion of what criteria would likely identify clinically important events, while minimizing inadvertent inclusion of other types of events resulting in transient changes in oxygenation, such as surgery or performance of other procedures. Thresholds were also selected based on published data indicating that increases of ≥ 2.5 cm H_2O in PEEP or ≥ 0.15 (15 points) in FiO_2 sustained for at least 2 days were associated with longer duration of mechanical ventilation, intensive care unit (ICU)

Table 1

VAP Surveillance Definition Working Group organizations, representatives and federal participants

Organization	Representative(s)
American Association of Critical-Care Nurses	Suzanne Burns and Beth Hammer
American Association for Respiratory Care	Dean Hess
American College of Chest Physicians	Robert Balk and David Gutterman
American Thoracic Society	Nicholas Hill and Mitchell Levy
Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology	Linda Greene
Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists	Carole VanAntwerpen
Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee Surveillance Working Group	Daniel Diekema
Infectious Diseases Society of America	Edward Septimus
Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America	Michael Klompas
Society of Critical Care Medicine	Clifford Deutschman, Marin Kollef, and Pamela Lipsett
US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion	Don Wright
National Institutes of Health	David Henderson
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion	Scott Fridkin, Alice Guh, Shelley Magill, Teresa Horan, others

and hospital stays, and increased mortality.¹ Subsequently, additional data have been published that support the Working Group's approach to VAC.²

The second tier, IVAC, attempts to identify the subset of VACs that are potentially related to infection, as evidenced by an abnormal white blood cell count or temperature and initiation of a new antimicrobial agent. IVAC will likely capture patients with pulmonary infections and extrapulmonary infections of sufficient severity to trigger respiratory deterioration. The Working Group recognized the low predictive value of an abnormal temperature or white blood cell count in ICU patients, and Klompas et al have shown that the addition of fever or abnormal white blood cell count to VAC definition does not substantially enhance the definition's predictive value for death.² Nevertheless, these are objective and readily available signs that are frequently used at the bedside to assess for the presence of infection. The additional required

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2639563>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2639563>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)