DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

BACKGROUND

- Hospital-acquired infections (HAIs) are preventable conditions that cause substantial morbidity and mortality in hospitals throughout the United States.¹
- There are approximately 100,000 deaths and \$45 billion in healthcare expenses attributed to hospital-acquired infections in the United States annually.²
- There have been notable differences in the prominent types of HAIs between individual hospitals.³

PURPOSE

To examine the relationship between hospital characteristics (academic status, ownership, urban-rural location, and size) and hospital-acquired infections in the most and least affected states in the United States.

METHODS

- A retrospective cohort study using data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services on HAIs by state.
- Six types of HAIs were assessed by standardized infection ratios (SIRs).
- SIRs were categorized as low (SIR≤1) or high (SIR>1) (adequate or inadequate infection control, respectively) consistent with national guidelines.
- The most and least affected states were determined by the highest and lowest proportion of adequate SIRs.
- The association among hospital-level characteristics and HAIs was evaluated regression through binary logistic adjusting influential potentially for covariates.

Hospital characteristics and hospital-acquired infections in the United States Cassidy Prewitt, MPH (c), MMS (c)

Faculty Advisor: Heather F. de Vries McClintock, PhD, MSPH, MSW **Department of Public Health**

RESULTS

- Arizona had the least burden of SIRs while Rhode Island had the greatest.
- Hospital ownership and size was shown to be associated with the state in which the hospital was located.
- Hospitals in Rhode Island were more likely than Arizona hospitals to report high SIRs for CLABSIs, CAUTIs, and C. *difficile* infections.
- Public and private, non-profit hospitals were more likely than for-profit hospitals to have high SIRs for colectomy surgical site infections.

Hospital Characteristics in the Most and Least Affected States						
		Arizona (n=52)	New Jersey (n=64)	Rhode Island (n=11)	Utah (n=26)	<i>P</i> value
Academic Status – no. (%)						0.143
Teaching		80 (50.7%)	39 (60.9%)	6 (54.5%)	9 (34.6%)	
Non-Teaching	2	22 (42.3%)	25 (39.1%)	5 (45.5%)	17 (65.4%)	
Ownership – no. (%)						**0.007
Public & Private, Non-Pre	ofit 4	10 (76.9%)	56 (87.5%)	9 (81.8%)	14 (53.8%)	
Private, For-Profit	1	L 2 (23 .1%)	8 (12.5%)	2 (18.2%)	12 (46.2%)	
Size – no. (%)						**0.003
Small	(7)	84 (65.4%)	27 (42.2%)	8 (72.7%)	21 (80.8%)	
Large	1	L8 (34.6%)	37 (57.8%)	3 (27.3%)	5 (19.2%)	
Analysis of Hospital Characteristics and SIRs						
	Standardized Infection Ratio (SIR)					

	Standardized Infection Ratio (SIR)					
	CLABSI OR, [95% CI]	CAUTI OR, [95% CI]	SSI Colectomy OR, [95% CI]	SSI Hysterectomy OR, [95% CI]	MRSA OR, [95% CI]	C. <i>difficile</i> OR, [95% C
State					'	'
New Jersey	1.62	**3.21	**0.32	2.14	2.73	2.13
ref: Arizona (least HAIs)	[0.58, 4.48]	[1.19, 8.70]	[0.12, 0.85]	[0.44, 10.32]	[1.01, 7.37]	[0.91, 4.96]
Rhode Island	**4.97	**8.60	1.71	insufficient	0.58	**6.02
ref: Arizona (least HAIs)	[1.04, 23.77]	[1.65 <i>,</i> 44.82]	[0.25 <i>,</i> 11.85]	sample size	[0.06 <i>,</i> 6.06]	[1.48, 24.42
Utah	0.50	**3.88	**5.63	**20.19	0.77	2.73
ref: Arizona (least HAIs)	[0.09, 2.93]	[1.06 <i>,</i> 14.23]	[1.12 <i>,</i> 28.29]	[1.72 <i>,</i> 236.46]	[0.13 <i>,</i> 4.72]	[0.97, 7.66]
Academic Status						
Teaching	1.56	1.12	1.91	1.48	0.61	0.65
ref: Non-Teaching	[0.57, 4.32]	[0.45 <i>,</i> 2.79]	[0.63 <i>,</i> 5.74]	[0.22 <i>,</i> 9.93]	[0.23 <i>,</i> 1.64]	[0.29, 1.46]
Ownership						
Public & Private, Non-Profit	0.34	0.94	**8.02	18.15	0.43	0.97
ref: Private, For-Profit	[0.11, 1.03]	[0.35, 2.56]	[1.84 <i>,</i> 34.88]	[0.78, 423.79]	[0.13, 1.38]	[0.41 <i>,</i> 2.33]
Size						
Small	1.21	1.41	1.94	1.60	1.13	0.72
ref: Large	[0.46, 3.23]	[0.57, 3.49]	[0.69 <i>,</i> 5.47]	[0.20, 12.53]	[0.42, 2.99]	[0.31, 1.70]

**Designates significance

CLABSI: Central-Line Associated Bloodstream Infection; CAUTI: Catheter-Associated Urinary Tract Infection; SSI: Surgical Site Infection; MRSA: Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus; C. difficile: Clostridium difficile; OR: Odds Ratio; CI: Confidence Interval

C
3

1.	Tellez- health <i>Goverr</i>
2	doi:10
Ζ.	(2013) infectio
	Hospit
3.	Schröc
	owner
	Hospit
4.	Salinsk
	and lo
	https:/
	papers

CONCLUSIONS

The state where a hospital is located was shown to be influential with regard to a hospital's SIR.

We found that state was the most significant predictor of a hospital's infection control performance compared to all other characteristics measured.

Because public health policy is often regulated and implemented at the state and local levels, it follows that indicators of health would vary by state of residence.⁴

These findings promote a greater understanding of HAIs as well as introduce new areas that may be critical to target for prevention initiatives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The United States must re-prioritize hospital-acquired infections.

Local and state health departments should develop more thorough methods of evaluating hospital performance in their jurisdictions.

administrators their Hospital and control departments infection must collaborate and coordinate to develop new prevention policies and practices tailored to the needs of their hospital.

REFERENCES

-Marfin, A. (2012). Public health implications of ncare-associated infections: Problems and prospects. Clinical nance: An International Journal, 17(2), 101-108.).1108/14777271211220808 Y. P., Zilberberg, M. D., Johannes, R. S., Sun, X., & McDonald, L. C. . Attributable burden of hospital-onset Clostridium difficile ion: A propensity score matching study. Infection Control and *tal Epidemiology, 34*(6), 588-596. doi:10.1086/670621 der, C., Behnke, M., Geffers, C., & Gastmeier, P. (2018). Hospital

rship: A risk factor for nosocomial infection rates? Journal of *tal Infection, 100*(1), 76-82. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2018.01.019 ky, E. (2010). Governmental public health: An overview of state

ocal public health agencies. Retrieved from //www.nhpf.org/library/background-

s/BP77_GovPublicHealth_08-18-2010.pdf