



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/87523/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Harron, K, Parslow, R, Mok, Q et al. (2015) Monitoring Quality of Care Through Linkage of Administrative Data: National Trends in Bloodstream Infection in UK PICUs 2003-2012. *Critical Care Medicine*, 43 (5). 1070 - 1078. ISSN: 0090-3493

<https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000000941>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**Title: Monitoring quality of care through linkage of administrative data: national trends in bloodstream infection in UK paediatric intensive care units 2003-2012**

Katie Harron<sup>1</sup>, PhD, Roger Parslow<sup>2</sup>, PhD, Quen Mok<sup>3</sup>, FRCP, Shane M Tibby<sup>4</sup>, MRCP, Angie Wade<sup>1</sup>, PhD, Berit Muller-Pebody<sup>5</sup>, PhD, Harvey Goldstein<sup>1,6</sup>, Ruth Gilbert<sup>1</sup>, MD

**Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Institute of Child Health, University College London, London; <sup>2</sup>University of Leeds, Leeds; <sup>3</sup>Great Ormond Street Hospital, London; <sup>4</sup> Evelina London Children's Hospital, London; <sup>5</sup>Public Health England, London; <sup>6</sup>University of Bristol, Bristol

**Address correspondence to:** Katie Harron, Institute of Child Health, University College London, 30 Guilford Street, London, WC1 N 1EH; [k.harron@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:k.harron@ucl.ac.uk); +44207 905 2764

**Work was performed at:** Institute of Child Health, University College London

**Key Words:** central venous catheters; child; infection control; intensive care; patient care bundles, data linkage; bloodstream infection; quality improvement; bacterial infections; laboratories, hospital; questionnaires; incidence

**Funding Source:** This work was supported by funding for the CATCH trial from the National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment (NIHR HTA) programme (project number 08/13/47). The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the HTA programme, NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health. Ruth Gilbert is supported by awards establishing the Farr Institute of Health Informatics Research London from the MRC, in partnership with nine other. PICANet is funded by the National Clinical Audit & Patient Outcomes Programme, administered by the Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership (HQIP); Welsh Health Specialised Services Committee; NHS Lothian/National Service Division NHS Scotland; the Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children; National Office of Clinical Audit Ireland (NOCA) and HCA International.

**Copyright form disclosures:** Dr. Harron is employed by UCL and received grant support and support for travel from the NIHR NIHR (This work was supported by funding for the CATCH trial from the National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment [NIHR HTA] programme [project number 08/13/47]). Dr. Parslow is employed as a senior lecturer in epidemiology at the University of Leeds (HEFCE funded). Dr. Mok received support for article research from National Institute for Health Research, UK and received support for travel (Employed as Intensivist at Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children and Reimbursement by the hospital of expenses incurred for attendance at conferences). Her institution received grant support from the NIHR Health Technology Assessment grant for Catheter infections in Children (CATCH) trial (Co-Applicant and Principal Investigator). Dr. Tibby's institution received grant support from CSL Behring Ltd, UK (Grant for Investigator-Led phase 1b/2A Clinical Trial of fibrinogen concentrate supplementation in the management of bleeding during pediatric cardiopulmonary bypass [ISRCTN50553029, EudraCT 2013-003532-68]) and from the National Institute of Health Research (UK) HTA programme themed call (Healthcare Associated Infection) (CATHeter Infections in Children -

1 the CATCH trial [HAI 08/13/47]). Dr. Muller-Pebody's institution received support from the  
2 Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, UK (Department received  
3 payment from UCL for linkage and use of PHE datasets). Dr. Gilbert received grant support  
4 from the NIHR Health Technology Assessment grant for Catheter infections in Children  
5 (CATCH) trial (Chief Investigator), is employed by UCL, and received support for article  
6 research from the NIHR. Her institution received grant support from MRC (MRC. CHAPTER -  
7 Centre for Health service and Academic Partnership in Translational eHealth Research [PI:  
8 Harry Hemingway; RG member of large team of Co-Is], Policy Research Unit on Child Health  
9 [PI: Terence Stephenson; Co-applicants: Law, Gilbert, Wolpert, et al], and eHealth Research  
10 [PI: Harry Hemingway; RG member of large team of Co-Is]). Dr. Wade disclosed that she  
11 does not have any potential conflicts of interest.  
12  
13  
14  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** Interventions to reduce hospital-acquired bloodstream infection (BSI) have succeeded in reducing rates in US paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) but there is a lack of evidence for the impact of similar interventions in the UK. We assessed variation in BSI rates within and between PICUs over a 10-year period, during which time infection control strategies (care bundles) were implemented.

**Design:** Observational study linking laboratory data to national audit data of paediatric intensive care admissions (PICANet).

**Setting:** 20 PICUs in England and Wales, 2003-2012.

**Patients:** 102,999 children <16 years.

**Interventions:** Implementation of infection control strategies in PICU captured through a survey of clinicians.

**Measurements and main results:** Rates of BSI per 1000 bed-days were estimated from samples taken between 2 days after admission and up to 2 days following discharge from PICU. 2.0% of children experienced at least one BSI, corresponding to 5.11 (95% CI 4.90-5.31) per 1000 bed-days. There was a significant difference in trends pre-implementation of infection control strategies (annual decrease of 8.0%; 95% CI 6.3%-9.7%) versus post-implementation (annual decrease of 13.4%; 95% CI 10.3%-16.4%). By 24 months post-implementation, the rate of BSI fell 25.5% since the reported implementation date and was 15.1% lower than would have been expected if pre-implementation trends had continued.

**Conclusions:** Our population-based study of PICUs in England and Wales demonstrates a steady decline in BSI rates over time. In addition, there was a significant and incremental further decrease in rates associated with timing of implementation of infection control strategies. Assessment of BSI trends before as well as after implementation of infection control strategies can be facilitated using data linkage and is important to avoid over-estimating the impact of unit level interventions to improve infection control. Advances in collection and linkage of real-time data could further support quality improvement efforts.

## Introduction

1  
2  
3  
4 Bloodstream infection (BSI) is an important cause of adverse clinical outcome and cost to  
5  
6 the UK National Health Service (NHS). Paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) have one of the  
7  
8 highest reported rates of hospital-acquired BSI of any clinical specialty.(1-4) An estimated  
9  
10 70% of BSI in PICU is caused by central venous catheters (CVCs), an important focus for a  
11  
12 number of quality improvement initiatives.(5-7) Interventions have succeeded in  
13  
14 dramatically decreasing BSI rates in the US, with reported reductions of up to 66% in rates  
15  
16 of catheter-related BSI 18 months post-implementation.(8, 9) Following a Comprehensive  
17  
18 Spending Review in 2007 in the UK, the Department of Health invested £270 million a year  
19  
20 to support infection prevention and control, including the updated *Saving Lives* CVC care  
21  
22 bundle.(7, 10) However, there is a lack of evidence on the impact of these strategies, with  
23  
24 monitoring mostly limited to process measures that were collated only locally.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 The use of administrative healthcare data is being increasingly recognised as an efficient  
34  
35 approach for monitoring quality of care.(11) In the UK, no single dataset captures both the  
36  
37 clinical data on length of stay and microbiological BSI data required to derive risk-adjusted  
38  
39 BSI rates.(12) However, linkage of data between the national laboratory surveillance  
40  
41 database (LabBase2; coordinated by Public Health England) and clinical information from  
42  
43 the Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network (PICANet) provides the opportunity to estimate  
44  
45 risk-adjusted BSI trends and efficiently monitor quality of care in PICUs in England and  
46  
47 Wales.(13-15) We used these data to derive national trends in BSI in PICU over a ten-year  
48  
49 period and to compare trends before and after the reported implementation of infection  
50  
51 control strategies. Our study is the first to combine national data on BSI trends with  
52  
53 reported changes in PICU practice.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Materials and methods

Although infection control strategies focussed on CVC-related BSI, we estimated rates of BSI from any source. This is justified by the importance of monitoring BSI whether a child has a CVC or not, and the hypothesis that infection control strategies may have broader implications (e.g. for hand hygiene or skin preparation).

To distinguish PICU from high dependency care, we restricted analyses to PICUs with more than 200 admissions per year on average (22/25 PICUs in England and Wales). We further excluded two PICUs due to a lack of reporting to LabBase2. The remaining 20 PICUs comprised 102,999/141,164=73% of total admissions to PICUs between 2003 and 2012.

### Survey data

We surveyed all 22 PICUs by post or email between April and Sept 2012. A designated nurse and consultant were asked to complete a questionnaire relating to infection control practices designed to reduce CVC-related BSI in PICU and to give approximate dates for implementation of these strategies, which were based mainly on *Saving Lives* or *Matching Michigan* initiatives.(5, 7) Strategies relating to *Saving Lives* focussed on CVC insertion (guidelines for catheter type, insertion site, skin preparation, hand hygiene, aseptic technique, dressings etc.) or maintenance (guidelines for catheter site inspection, injection ports, catheter access, replacement of CVCs and administrative sets etc.).(7) Strategies relating to *Matching Michigan* (a two-year quality improvement project funded by the Department of Health; including 21 PICUs 2009-2010) aimed to improve guidance and training in insertion and maintenance of CVCs and to monitor BSI rates through a staff-reported daily census for each unit.(5)

## PICU data

1  
2  
3  
4 Data on all clinically relevant PICU admission characteristics for children aged <16 years  
5  
6 from March 2003 to December 2012 were extracted from the PICANet database (t, Table  
7  
8  
9 1).(13)

## Microbiology data

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 All positive isolates from blood culture captured by the national laboratory surveillance  
17  
18 system for children aged <16 years between 2003 and 2012 were extracted from LabBase2.  
19  
20 (11, 15, 16) We have previously validated LabBase2 against reference data obtained directly  
21  
22 from laboratories, and taking into account reporting gaps (e.g. through failure to upload),  
23  
24 we estimated that LabBase2 ascertains 80-95% of clinically significant BSI in children.(17)  
25  
26  
27 Reporting gaps were due to system or staffing issues at the laboratory level and  
28  
29  
30 ascertainment was unrelated to individual patient or PICU-level factors such as the type of  
31  
32  
33 organism, time period or the number of reports. This means that valid comparison of trends  
34  
35  
36 between PICUs was still possible.(14)  
37  
38  
39  
40

## Data linkage

41  
42  
43  
44 A detailed description of the linkage between PICANet and LabBase2 has been published  
45  
46 elsewhere.(14) Briefly, a combination of linkage methods was used to identify PICANet  
47  
48 admission records that had a corresponding record of BSI in LabBase2, based on agreement  
49  
50  
51 between NHS number, Hospital number, first name, surname, date of birth, postcode, sex  
52  
53  
54 and location (laboratory and hospital). We evaluated the linkage against reference data and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 demonstrated that linkage errors resulted in a small amount of bias (rates were  
2 underestimated by 0.5%).(14)  
3  
4  
5

### 6 Case definition

7  
8  
9

10 We defined an episode of BSI as any positive blood culture with one or more organisms  
11 isolated from any blood sample taken on the same day. Repeated samples of the same  
12 organism within 14 days were treated as the same episode; two or more different  
13 organisms isolated on different days were treated as separate episodes. For children who  
14 already had BSI on admission, we excluded samples that were the same organism as that  
15 isolated before admission.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 For this study, we were interested in BSI occurring during a PICU admission (PICU-acquired  
27 BSI). We therefore excluded samples taken on the day of admission to PICU or the day after  
28 admission. We included samples taken up to two days following discharge from PICU.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 Analysis

36  
37  
38  
39

40 The rate of BSI was defined as the number of BSI per 1000 bed-days. Multi-level Poisson  
41 regression was used to model the rate of BSI over time, allowing for clustering of admissions  
42 within PICUs (see supplementary Appendix 1). Backwards stepwise regression ( $p < 0.05$ ) was  
43 used to identify significant risk-factors based on admission characteristics in Table 1 (age in  
44 months and quarter-year of admission were treated as continuous variables within the  
45 model, all other variables were categorical). Model fit and non-linear relationships for age  
46 and time at risk were assessed using likelihood ratio tests, Akaike's Information Criterion,  
47 Bayesian Information Criterion, and diagnostic plots of residuals. Appropriateness of the  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Poisson model was verified using a goodness-of-fit test based on the deviance statistic.

Smoothed rates were plotted on the log-scale (with 0.5 added to observations where observed rate=0). Incidence-rate ratios were used to compare rates according to different risk-factors. Analysis was performed using Stata 12.(18)

To examine differences in trends in periods before and after implementation of infection control strategies, a variable representing time was created, centred on implementation according to the survey responses. Where dates were different for insertion and maintenance bundles, the earliest date was used. For units where a year but no month was provided, mid-year was used in analysis. Analysis was restricted to PICUs where at least one implementation date had been provided. An interaction term between time and use of strategy was fitted in the model to test for differences in trends pre- and post-implementation. The expected trend, had there been no implementation of infection control strategies, was produced from model predictions. This trend was extrapolated for 24 months post-implementation, to derive the expected rate had there been no intervention. The expected trend was then compared with the observed trend 24-months post-implementation.

For the most recent period (2011-2012), by which time infection control strategies had been implemented, a funnel plot was used to examine the variation among PICUs in risk-adjusted rates.(19) To account for different patient populations at different PICUs, risk-adjusted rates for each PICU were produced by dividing the PICU's unadjusted rate by its predicted rate, and multiplying this ratio by the average rate across all PICUs.(19) This plot indicated whether the rate in an individual PICU differed significantly from the national rate.

## Results

### Rates of BSI

Between March 2003 and December 2012, there were 102,999 admissions to the 20 study PICUs, corresponding to a total of 479,641 bed-days. For these admissions, there were 2452 episodes of BSI, and 2045 admissions (2.0%) experienced at least one BSI (Table 1). The overall rate of BSI was 5.11 (95% CI 4.90-5.31) per 1000 bed-days. Quarter-year of admission, age, vasoactive agent, renal support, primary diagnosis group on admission and ventilation status (invasive only, non-invasive only, both or neither) were independently significantly associated with BSI (Table 2).

### Trends in BSI

Risk-adjusted rates of BSI (controlling for independent risk-factors for BSI in Table 2) decreased across all 20 PICUs by an annual average of 13.2% (95% CI 11.8-14.6%). Risk-adjusted rates fell from 8.96 (95% CI 7.72-10.20) per 1000 bed-days in 2003 to 2.87 (95% CI 2.40-3.35) in 2012. This corresponded to an absolute rate reduction of 68% over the ten year period. Rates were falling at a faster rate in admissions diagnosed with infection compared with other diagnoses and by the end of the study period, rates in children admitted with a primary diagnosis of infection were similar to those for children admitted for cardiovascular problems (Figure 1). Adjusted trends in BSI differed between PICUs (Figure 2).

## Survey data

1  
2  
3  
4 Fourteen PICUs provided survey responses on the implementation of infection control  
5  
6 strategies (Table 3). For these PICUs, there was a significant difference in trends pre- and  
7  
8 post-implementation for all admissions: adjusted rates were decreasing by 8.0% (95% CI 6.3-  
9  
10 9.7%) per year pre-implementation and decreasing by 13.4% (95% CI 10.3-16.4) per year  
11  
12 post-implementation. The observed rate of BSI fell 25.5% from 4.47 (95% CI 2.52-6.42) per  
13  
14 1000 bed-days at the time of implementation to 3.33 (95% CI 1.34-5.32) 24 months post-  
15  
16 implementation (based on 12/14 PICUs with data at 24 months post-implementation, see  
17  
18 Figure 3). Assuming pre-implementation trends had continued at the same rate, the  
19  
20 expected rate for 24 months post-implementation was 3.92 (95% CI 1.76-6.08),  
21  
22 corresponding to an absolute rate reduction of 15.1%.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## Variation between PICUs

30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Data for the most recent years (2011-2012) was available for 18 PICUs. Figure 4 shows  
35  
36 significant variation in the risk-adjusted rate of BSI between PICUs in this period (confidence  
37  
38 intervals for PICUs with highest and lowest rates do not overlap). However, variation was  
39  
40 not attributed to one particular outlying PICU. The funnel plot shows that the majority of  
41  
42 PICUs fell within the expected range of the national rate (Figure 4).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Discussion

1  
2  
3  
4 Our population-based study of PICUs in England and Wales quantifies a steady decline in BSI  
5  
6 rates over time. Use of longitudinal administrative data allowed us to identify that rates  
7  
8 were decreasing in all main clinical groups long before implementation of specific infection  
9  
10 control strategies. However, we demonstrate that there was a significant and incremental  
11  
12 further decrease in rates associated with the timing of implementation of infection control  
13  
14 strategies, over and above background trends. We estimated that 24 months after  
15  
16 implementation, BSI rates for all children in PICU had fallen by 26% and were 15% lower  
17  
18 than they would have been had pre-implementation trends continued. Decreases in rates  
19  
20 were not restricted to children with CVCs, and this may have been achieved through  
21  
22 improvements in infection control more generally (such as hand hygiene).(7) Our study  
23  
24 demonstrates that linkage of administrative data can be used for long-term continuous  
25  
26 monitoring of a broad range of outcomes and is important for capturing trends before as  
27  
28 well as after infection control initiatives to avoid wrongly attributed interventional  
29  
30 effects.(5)  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Like previous studies evaluating implementation of infection control strategies or care  
42  
43 bundles, our study was an observational analysis with trends potentially affected by factors  
44  
45 other than reported practice.(5) This is demonstrated by the 8% annual decline in BSI rates  
46  
47 pre-implementation of infection control strategies in our study. The decrease in rates of BSI  
48  
49 (26%) in 24 months following the introduction of infection control strategies was a smaller  
50  
51 reduction than seen in other studies reporting the impact of interventions in US adult ICUs  
52  
53 (reduction of up to 66%) and in two UK studies (reported reductions of 50-75%).(11, 20, 21)

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59 The small effect in our study may have been due in part to uncertainty around  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 implementation dates as recorded in clinician survey responses, which may have resulted in  
2 an underestimated impact due to recall bias. Strategies in place prior to the implementation  
3 dates used in our analysis may have contributed to the observed effect.(22) Alternatively,  
4 other studies may not have fully taken into account declining background trends for all  
5 patients. We were unable to directly compare results with other studies as we could not  
6 derive rates per CVC-days.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 This study was only possible through the linkage of national data on PICU admissions and  
17 infection surveillance, which offered an efficient and cost-effective method for exploiting  
18 existing data with comprehensive coverage over an extended study period. Linkage  
19 between PICANet and LabBase2 provides a rich but imperfect dataset allowing enhanced  
20 monitoring of BSI in PICU. Our study was limited in that the surveillance data did not provide  
21 a validated diagnosis of BSI in PICU and may have included BSI that should be considered as  
22 contaminants. We were also unable to investigate changes in sampling frequency over time,  
23 or to directly identify children who required a CVC. Data quality in administrative data can  
24 be an issue but, as in this case, may not necessarily be conditioned on the exposure or  
25 outcomes of interest. While monitoring schemes for specific implementation studies can  
26 pre-specify the data to be collected, they are costly, do not capture data pre-intervention,  
27 and can be dependent on clinician judgement of outcomes.(23) In contrast, administrative  
28 data provides the opportunity to analyse routinely-recorded data for entire units and to  
29 take into account background trends before and during implementation of interventions.  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Conclusion

1  
2  
3  
4 Linkage of national administrative data sources provides an opportunity to monitor quality  
5  
6 of care through enhanced surveillance of BSI trends in PICU. In the UK PICUs, rates of BSI  
7  
8 were already falling before the implementation of infection control strategies, but these  
9  
10 interventions were associated with a significant additional reduction in BSI. Standardised  
11  
12 recording of unit-level interventions could help to increase understanding of variations in  
13  
14 practice, and to identify interventions that lead to improvements in outcomes. The  
15  
16 combination of improved characterisation of unit practices and monitoring of BSI using  
17  
18 linked administrative data would allow PICUs most likely to benefit from improved practices  
19  
20 to learn from others. Monitoring quality of care by measuring variation in BSI outcomes in  
21  
22 PICU could then help to sustain improvements in practice.(24, 25)  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Tom Fleming, Phil McShane and Lee Norman (PICANet) for facilitation of data retrieval for this paper. We are grateful to the UK Paediatric Intensive Care Society for continued support and to the members of the PICANet Steering Group and Clinical Advisory Group who are listed on the PICANet website <http://www.picanet.org.uk/About/>. We would like to thank all the staff in participating hospitals who have collected data for PICANet or responded to survey questionnaires ([Barts and the London NHS Trust](#), [The Royal London Hospital](#); [Birmingham Children's Hospital NHS Trust](#), [Birmingham Children's Hospital](#); [Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust](#), [The Royal Alexandra Children's Hospital](#); [Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Addenbrooke's Hospital](#); [Cardiff & Vale NHS Trust](#), [University Hospital of Wales](#); [Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Royal Manchester Children's Hospital](#); [Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust](#), [Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children](#); [Guy's & St. Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Evelina London Children's Hospital](#); [Hull & East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust](#), [Hull Royal Infirmary](#); [Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust](#), [St. Mary's Hospital](#); [King's College Hospital NHS Trust](#), [King's College Hospital](#); [Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust](#), [Leeds General Infirmary](#); [Liverpool Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Liverpool Alder Hey Children's Hospital](#); [Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Great North Children's Hospital](#) & [Newcastle Freeman Hospital](#); [Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust](#), [Nottingham Childrens Hospital](#), [Queen's Medical Centre](#); [Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust](#), [The John Radcliffe Hospital](#); [Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Royal Brompton Hospital](#); [Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Sheffield Children's Hospital](#); [South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust](#); [St. George's Healthcare NHS Trust](#), [St. George's Hospital](#); [The James Cook University Hospital](#); [University Hospital of North Staffordshire NHS Trust](#), [University Hospital of North Staffordshire](#); [University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Southampton Children's Hospital](#); [University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust](#), [Bristol Royal Hospital for Children](#); [University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust](#), [Leicester Royal Infirmary](#) & [Leicester Glenfield Hospital](#).

## ETHICS

For PICANet, collection of personally identifiable data has been approved by the National Information Governance Board (Formerly the Patient Information Advisory Group) <http://www.nigb.nhs.uk/s251/registerapp> and ethical approval granted by the Trent Medical Research Ethics Committee, ref. 05/MRE04/17. PICANet also has specific permission from the National Research Ethics Service for linkage with the PHE laboratory data on bloodstream infections using personal identifiers and to share PICANet data with PHE. An exemption under Section 251 of the NHS Act 2006 (previously Section 60 of the

Health and Social Care Act 2001) allows PHE to receive patient-identifiable data from other organisations without patient consent in order to monitor infectious disease. Specific permission for the PICANet-PHE linkage has been granted by National Information Governance Board for Health and Social Care.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## REFERENCES

1. Lakshmi KS, Jayashree M, Singhi S, et al. Study of nosocomial primary bloodstream infections in a Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. *J Trop Pediatr* 2007;53(2):87-92.
2. Abou Elella R, Najm H, Balkhy H, et al. Impact of bloodstream infection on the outcome of children undergoing cardiac surgery. *Pediatr Cardiol* 2010;31(4):483-9.
3. Elward AM, Hollenbeak CS, Warren DK, et al. Attributable cost of nosocomial primary bloodstream infection in pediatric intensive care unit patients. *Pediatrics* 2005;115(4):868-72.
4. Yogaraj JS, Elward AM, Fraser VJ. Rate, risk factors, and outcomes of nosocomial primary bloodstream infection in pediatric intensive care unit patients. *Pediatrics* 2002;110(3):481-5.
5. Bion J, Richardson A, Hibbert P, et al. 'Matching Michigan': a 2-year stepped interventional programme to minimise central venous catheter-blood stream infections in intensive care units in England. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2012;22(2):110-23.
6. Nosocomial Infection National Surveillance Service. Surveillance of hospital-acquired bacteraemia in English hospitals, 1997-2002 Public Health Laboratory Service 2003. <http://www.hpa.org.uk/Publications/InfectiousDiseases/AntimicrobialAndHealthcareAssociatedInfections/0301NINSSSurvofHospacquiredbacteraemia9702/> (Accessed 29/08/14)
7. Department of Health. Saving Lives: reducing infection, delivering clean and safe care: Department of Health, London 2007. [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH\\_078134](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_078134) (Accessed 29/08/14)
8. Pronovost P, Goeschel C, Colantuoni E, et al. Sustaining reductions in catheter related bloodstream infections in Michigan intensive care units: observational study. *BMJ* 2010;340(feb04 1):c309.
9. Miller MR, Griswold M, Harris JM, II, et al. Decreasing PICU catheter-associated bloodstream infections: NACHRI's quality transformation efforts. *Pediatrics* 2010;125(2):206-13.
10. HM Treasury. Pre-budget report and comprehensive spending review. London: The Stationary Office 2007. [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100407010852/http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/pbr\\_csr07\\_completereport\\_1546.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100407010852/http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/pbr_csr07_completereport_1546.pdf) (Accessed 20/10/14)
11. Harron K, Wade A, Muller-Pebody B, et al. Risk-adjusted monitoring of blood-stream infection in paediatric intensive care: a data linkage study. *Intens Care Med* 2013;39(6):1080-7.
12. García Álvarez L, Aylin P, Tian J, et al. Data linkage between existing healthcare databases to support hospital epidemiology. *J Hosp Infect* 2011;79(3):231-5.
13. Universities of Leeds and Leicester. Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network National Report 2011 - 2013 2013. [www.picanet.org.uk/Audit/Annual-Reporting](http://www.picanet.org.uk/Audit/Annual-Reporting) (Accessed 29/08/14)
14. Harron K, Goldstein H, Wade A, et al. Linkage, evaluation and analysis of national electronic healthcare data: application to providing enhanced blood-stream infection surveillance in paediatric intensive care. *PLoS One* 2013;8(12):e85278.
15. Wilson J, Elgohari S, Livermore DM, et al. Trends among pathogens reported as causing bacteraemia in England, 2004-2008. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2011;17(3):451-8.
16. Health Protection Agency. Reporting to the HPA: a guide for diagnostic laboratories 2010. Report No.: 3.1. [http://www.hpa.org.uk/webc/hpawebfile/hpaweb\\_c/1194947381307](http://www.hpa.org.uk/webc/hpawebfile/hpaweb_c/1194947381307) (Accessed 29/08/14)
17. Harron K. Evaluating data linkage techniques for the analysis of bloodstream infection in paediatric intensive care: University College London; 2014.
18. Stata. Stata Statistical Software: Release 12. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP 2011.
19. Spiegelhalter DJ. Funnel plots for comparing institutional performance. *Stat Med* 2005;24(8):1185-202.

20. Bhutta A, Gilliam C, Honeycutt M, et al. Reduction of bloodstream infections associated with catheters in paediatric intensive care unit: stepwise approach. *BMJ* 2007;334(7589):362-5.
21. Melville S, Paulus S. Impact of a central venous line care bundle on rates of central line associated blood stream infection (CLABSI) in hospitalised children. *J Infect Prev* 2014;15(4):139-41.
22. Harron K, Ramachandra G, Mok Q, et al. Consistency between guidelines and reported practice for reducing the risk of catheter-related infection in British paediatric intensive care units. *Intens Care Med* 2011;37(10):1641-7.
23. Dixon-Woods M, Leslie M, Bion J, et al. What counts? An ethnographic study of infection data reported to a patient safety program. *Milbank Q* 2012;90(3):548-91.
24. Pronovost PJ, Berenholtz SM, Needham DM. Translating evidence into practice: a model for large scale knowledge translation. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1714.
25. Lilford R, Mohammed MA, Spiegelhalter D, et al. Use and misuse of process and outcome data in managing performance of acute medical care: avoiding institutional stigma. *Lancet* 2004;363(9415):1147-54.

## FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Trends in rates of bloodstream infection (BSI) per 1000 bed-days by primary diagnosis group at admission. Averaging across all admission groups, rates decreased by 13% per year. Symbols=observed rates for each diagnosis group; lines=smoothed adjusted rates.

Figure 2: Varying trends in rates of bloodstream infection (BSI) per 1000 bed-days by PICU of admission. Vertical lines show implementation dates of infection control strategies for CVC insertion and maintenance according to survey responses. Symbols=model rates; lines=smoothed model rates.

Figure 3: Trends in rates of bloodstream infection (BSI) per 1000 bed-days for pre- and post-implementation of infection control strategies in 12 PICUs. Data are centred at date of implementation (0 months since bundle implementation). By 24-months post-implementation, rates were 15% lower than would have been expected if pre-implementation rates had continued with the same trend. Symbols = observed rates by 30-days; solid lines = smoothed adjusted rates; dashed line = predicted rate if trend in pre-implementation period had continued.

Figure 4: Caterpillar and funnel plot showing risk-adjusted rates of BSI in 18 PICUs in England and Wales 2011-2012. PICUs 10 and 20 were excluded due to a lack of data in these years. Confidence intervals for PICUs with highest and lowest rates in the caterpillar plot do not overlap, showing significant variation in risk-adjusted rates of BSI between PICUs. The majority of PICUs fall within the 95% funnel plot limits, showing that most PICUs were had rates within an expected distance from the national average.

Figure  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 4  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



**Table 1: Characteristics of admissions to paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) in England and Wales 2003-2012. BSI = bloodstream infection; HDU = high dependency unit; A&E = accident and emergency; NICU = neonatal intensive care unit; PIM2 = paediatric index of mortality score (version 2).**

		Admissions with no BSI (n=100,954)		Admissions with BSI (n=2,045)	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Sex</b>	Male	57,205	56.7	1,186	58.0
	Female	43,686	43.3	859	42.0
	Unknown	63	0.1	0	0.0
<b>Age</b>	<1 month	15,395	15.2	443	21.7
	1 - <12 months	31,075	30.8	828	40.5
	1 – 4 years	26,745	26.5	455	22.3
	5 – 10 years	14,135	14.0	183	9.0
	11 – 15 years	13,604	13.5	136	6.7
	Unknown	1	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Length of stay in hours</b>	1-<4	3,336	3.3	5	0.2
	4-<12	7,307	7.2	15	0.7
	12-<24	19,751	19.6	52	2.6
	24-<48	21,722	21.5	80	3.9
	48+	48,838	48.4	1,893	92.6
<b>Vasoactive agent</b>	Yes	29,254	29.0	1,192	58.3
<b>Renal support</b>	Yes	3,184	3.2	336	16.4
<b>Retrieval</b>	Yes	34,525	34.2	868	42.4
<b>Retrieval team</b>	Non-specialist team	1,889	5.5	29	3.3
	Other specialist team	12,126	35.1	309	35.6
	Own team	20,061	58.1	515	59.3
	Unknown	449	1.3	15	1.7
<b>Care area of admission</b>	A&E	17,326	17.2	238	11.6
	HDU (step-up/step-down unit)	4,082	4.0	104	5.1
	ICU / PICU / NICU	10,983	10.9	389	19.0
	Other intermediate care area	1,748	1.7	52	2.5
	Recovery only	629	0.6	12	0.6
	Theatre and recovery	38,353	38.0	603	29.5
	X-ray / endoscopy / CT scanner	746	0.7	10	0.5
	Ward	23,135	22.9	571	27.9
Unknown	3,952	3.9	66	3.2	
<b>Ventilation status</b>	Neither	31,497	31.2	253	12.4
	Non-invasive only	4,902	4.9	32	1.6
	Invasive only	52,162	51.7	1,118	54.7
	Both	11,022	10.9	597	29.2
	Unknown	1,371	1.4	45	2.2
<b>Admission type</b>	Planned	39,216	38.8	683	33.4
	Unplanned	61,511	60.9	1,357	66.4
	Unknown	227	0.2	5	0.2
<b>Admission source</b>	Same hospital	62,252	61.7	1,104	54.0
	Other hospital	37,515	37.2	936	45.8
	Unknown	1,187	1.2	5	0.2
<b>PIM2</b>	<1%	29,518	29.2	237	11.6
	1-5%	44,432	44.0	810	39.6
	5-15%	19,663	19.5	626	30.6
	15-30%	4,250	4.2	229	11.2
	30%+	3,091	3.1	143	7.0
<b>Primary diagnosis group on admission</b>	Cardiology	28,313	28.0	733	35.8
	Respiratory	27,569	27.3	451	22.0
	Infection	5,482	5.4	265	12.9

	Other	39,590	39.2	596	29.1
<b>Unit type</b>	General	38,727	38.4	607	29.7
	Mixed	58,729	58.2	1,330	65.0
	Cardiac	3,498	3.5	108	5.3
	0-650	32,564	32.3	463	22.6
<b>Unit size</b>	650-1000	46,291	45.9	1,017	49.7
	>1000	22,099	21.9	565	27.6

**Table 2: Independent risk-factors for bloodstream infection based on multi-level Poisson model. Quarter-year of admission is a continuous variable for 3-monthly periods from January-March 2003 to October-December 2012. \*p-value<0.05; \*\* p-value<0.001**

		<b>Incidence-rate ratio</b>	<b>95% confidence interval</b>
<b>Age (in months)</b>		0.996**	0.996-0.997
<b>Vasoactive agent</b>		1.61**	1.45-1.79
<b>Renal support</b>		1.46**	1.31-1.63
<b>Quarter-year of admission</b>		0.97**	0.96-0.97
<b>Ventilation status</b>	Neither	1.00	
	Non-invasive only	0.67*	0.46-0.96
	Invasive only	1.03	0.88-1.21
	Both	1.13	0.96-1.34
<b>Primary diagnosis group on admission</b>	Other	1.00	
	Cardiology	0.90	0.80-1.01
	Respiratory	0.58**	0.52-0.66
	Infection	1.72**	1.49-1.98

**Table 3: Survey responses to questions relating to infection control strategies for central venous catheter (CVC) care, from the 20 paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) analysed.**

PICU	Insertion		Maintenance	
	Do you use a care bundle for Insertion of CVCs?	If yes, please give an approximate month and year for when the care bundle was first implemented	Do you use a care bundle for the Ongoing Care of CVCs?	If yes, please give an approximate month and year for when the care bundle was first implemented
1	Yes	2011	Don't know	
2	Yes	January 2008	Yes	January 2008
3	Yes	August 2007	Yes	August 2004
4	Yes	2010	Yes	2007
5	Yes	Currently being revised	Yes	
6	Yes	January 2009	No	
7	Yes	November 2009	Yes	
8	No		Yes	June 2007
9	Yes	March 2011	Yes	March 2011
10	Yes	May 2010	Yes	May 2010
11	Did not return survey			
12	Did not return survey			
13	Yes	2010	Yes	2010
14	Yes	September 2009	Yes	September 2009
15	Yes	January 2010	Yes	July 2010
16	Yes	January 2010	Yes	January 2010
17	No		Yes	
18	Did not return survey			
19	Yes	May 2009	No	
20	No		No	