



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Monitoring Quality of Care Through Linkage of Administrative Data: National Trends in Bloodstream Infection in UK PICUs 2003-2012*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/87523/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Harron, K, Parslow, R, Mok, Q et al. (4 more authors) (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

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

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 including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

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

Katie Harron¹, PhD, Roger Parslow², PhD, Quen Mok³, FRCP, Shane M Tibby⁴, MRCP, Angie Wade¹, PhD, Berit Muller-Pebody⁵, PhD, Harvey Goldstein^{1,6}, Ruth Gilbert¹, MD

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

1
2
3
4 Although infection control strategies focussed on CVC-related BSI, we estimated rates of BSI
5
6 from any source. This is justified by the importance of monitoring BSI whether a child has a
7
8 CVC or not, and the hypothesis that infection control strategies may have broader
9
10 implications (e.g. for hand hygiene or skin preparation).
11
12

13
14
15 To distinguish PICU from high dependency care, we restricted analyses to PICUs with more
16
17 than 200 admissions per year on average (22/25 PICUs in England and Wales). We further
18
19 excluded two PICUs due to a lack of reporting to LabBase2. The remaining 20 PICUs
20
21 comprised 102,999/141,164=73% of total admissions to PICUs between 2003 and 2012.
22
23
24
25

Survey data

26
27
28 We surveyed all 22 PICUs by post or email between April and Sept 2012. A designated nurse
29
30 and consultant were asked to complete a questionnaire relating to infection control
31
32 practices designed to reduce CVC-related BSI in PICU and to give approximate dates for
33
34 implementation of these strategies, which were based mainly on *Saving Lives* or *Matching*
35
36 *Michigan* initiatives.(5, 7) Strategies relating to *Saving Lives* focussed on CVC insertion
37
38 (guidelines for catheter type, insertion site, skin preparation, hand hygiene, aseptic
39
40 technique, dressings etc.) or maintenance (guidelines for catheter site inspection, injection
41
42 ports, catheter access, replacement of CVCs and administrative sets etc.).(7) Strategies
43
44 relating to *Matching Michigan* (a two-year quality improvement project funded by the
45
46 Department of Health; including 21 PICUs 2009-2010) aimed to improve guidance and
47
48 training in insertion and maintenance of CVCs and to monitor BSI rates through a staff-
49
50 reported daily census for each unit.(5)
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

PICU data

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

Microbiology data

All positive isolates from blood culture captured by the national laboratory surveillance system for children aged <16 years between 2003 and 2012 were extracted from LabBase2. (11, 15, 16) We have previously validated LabBase2 against reference data obtained directly from laboratories, and taking into account reporting gaps (e.g. through failure to upload), we estimated that LabBase2 ascertains 80-95% of clinically significant BSI in children.(17) Reporting gaps were due to system or staffing issues at the laboratory level and ascertainment was unrelated to individual patient or PICU-level factors such as the type of organism, time period or the number of reports. This means that valid comparison of trends between PICUs was still possible.(14)

Data linkage

A detailed description of the linkage between PICANet and LabBase2 has been published elsewhere.(14) Briefly, a combination of linkage methods was used to identify PICANet admission records that had a corresponding record of BSI in LabBase2, based on agreement between NHS number, Hospital number, first name, surname, date of birth, postcode, sex and location (laboratory and hospital). We evaluated the linkage against reference data and

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

36 Analysis

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 | % |
| Sex | Male | 57,205 | 56.7 | 1,186 | 58.0 |
| | Female | 43,686 | 43.3 | 859 | 42.0 |
| | Unknown | 63 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Age | <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 |
| Length of stay in hours | 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 |
| Vasoactive agent | Yes | 29,254 | 29.0 | 1,192 | 58.3 |
| Renal support | Yes | 3,184 | 3.2 | 336 | 16.4 |
| Retrieval | Yes | 34,525 | 34.2 | 868 | 42.4 |
| Retrieval team | 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 |
| Care area of admission | 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 | |
| Ventilation status | 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 |
| Admission type | Planned | 39,216 | 38.8 | 683 | 33.4 |
| | Unplanned | 61,511 | 60.9 | 1,357 | 66.4 |
| | Unknown | 227 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 |
| Admission source | 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 |
| PIM2 | <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 |
| Primary diagnosis group on admission | 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 |
| Unit type | 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 |
| Unit size | 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

| | | Incidence-rate ratio | 95% confidence interval |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Age (in months) | | 0.996** | 0.996-0.997 |
| Vasoactive agent | | 1.61** | 1.45-1.79 |
| Renal support | | 1.46** | 1.31-1.63 |
| Quarter-year of admission | | 0.97** | 0.96-0.97 |
| Ventilation status | 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 |
| Primary diagnosis group on admission | 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 | |