

of ICU infection prevention programmes, the lack of an easily applicable definition, providing accurate and clinically meaningful data limits implementation. We aimed to conduct a pilot study of ventilator associated event (VAE) surveillance, per Centre for Disease Control National Healthcare Safety Network (CDC NHSN) criteria, to describe the incidence, and outcomes for patients with VAE in our setting.

Methods. We conducted a prospective cohort study in our 24-bed mixed tertiary ICU in Melbourne, Australia. Adult patients requiring mechanical ventilation for ≥ 2 days between March and October, 2015, were included. We collected detailed clinical and laboratory data, including antibiotic duration and indication, and ICU and hospital length of stay. We applied the CDC NHSN criteria.

Results. We included 202 patients (median age 58.1 ± 17.8 years, 32.7% female, 73% medical), over 1,390 ventilator days. Ventilator associated condition (VAC) occurred in 33 (16.3%) patients (23.7 per 1,000 ventilator days), Infection-related VAC (IVAC) in 15 (7.4%) patients (10.7 per 1,000 ventilator days), and possible VAP (PVAP) in 8 (3.9%) patients (5.75 per 1,000 ventilator days). In contrast, clinician-diagnosed VAP (CD-VAP) occurred in 37 (18.3%) patients (26.6 per 1,000 ventilator days). Patients with VAC had a greater median number of ventilator days (12 vs. 4, $P < 0.001$), ICU length of stay (LOS) (17 vs. 6 days, $P < 0.005$), hospital LOS (30 vs. 19 days, $P = 0.005$), and antibiotic days (12 vs. 5, $P < 0.001$), than those without VAC. CD-VAP was associated with VAC (OR 4.7, 95% CI 2.1–10.6, $P < 0.001$), but agreement was poor (κ 0.29). The overall sensitivity of VAC for CD-VAP was 38%, specificity was 89%, PPV 48%, NPV 85%, while for PVAP these were 17, 99, 88 and 82%, respectively.

Conclusion. VAC is associated with important, measurable surveillance outcomes, but the agreement, sensitivity and predictive value of these criteria for CD-VAP are poor. Hence the CDC criteria may miss clinically important healthcare-associated infections and may not capture the most appropriate target group for VAP prevention.

Disclosures. All authors: No reported disclosures.

2181. Efficacy of UV-C Disinfection with or Without Sodium Hypochlorite Compared with Usual Disinfection of Hospital Environmental Surfaces: Pilot Study

Daniela De La Rosa, MSc¹; Eric Ochoa Hein, MD²; Roxana Trejo González, MD, MPH³; Diana Vilar-Compte, MD, MSc⁴; Almudena Laris González, MD¹; Arturo Galindo-Fraga, MD, MS⁵ and Luisa Mariana Guerrero Escudero, MD⁶; ¹Department of Hospital Epidemiology, Hospital Infantil de México Federico Gómez, Mexico City, Mexico, ²Department of Hospital Epidemiology Healthcare-Associated Infection Research, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico, ³Epidemiology, The American British Cowdry Medical Center, I.A.P., Mexico, Mexico, ⁴Infectious Diseases, Instituto Nacional de Cancerología, Mexico City, Mexico, ⁵Hospital Epidemiology and Medical Care Quality Control, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico, ⁶Pediatrics, Hospital Infantil de México Federico Gómez, Mexico City, Mexico

Session: 237. Healthcare Epidemiology: HAI Surveillance
Saturday, October 6, 2018: 12:30 PM

Background. The hospital environment is known to harbor pathogens that cause healthcare-associated infections. Sodium hypochlorite (NaClO) has been a common method for disinfection due to its low cost and wide availability. Nevertheless, UV-C is less time-consuming and less prone to human errors. We are aware of only one study that has directly compared UV-C against NaClO in a high-income country.¹

Methods. A pilot study was designed to test three different methods for terminal room disinfection: (1) NaClO (1,000 ppm); (2) UV-C (two 5-minute cycles at a maximum radius of 2.4 m with the UVDI UV360™ device); and (3) NaClO followed by UV-C. After patient discharge, housekeeping staff cleaned every room with detergent. Next, the rooms were subjected to one of the three disinfection procedures in a nonrandomized way. Environmental cultures were taken before and after cleaning and after every disinfection procedure, from three high touch areas: bedrails, patient tables and mattresses. Bedrails were sampled with swabs and the rest of the surfaces with RODAC™ plates. Cultures were processed by the same external accredited laboratory. Our main objective was to calculate reductions in total bacterial counts (measured in CFUs) to estimate the sample size for a larger multicenter study. We hypothesized that similar bacterial count reductions would be observed for the three methods.

Results. Eight rooms were tested in 4 hospitals in Mexico City (total of 85 cultures). Median bacterial count reductions with their respective IQRs, adjusted to CFUs after cleaning, were: 1 (0–10) after NaClO only; 5 (0–30) after UV-C only; and 1 (0–10) after NaClO + UV-C (Kruskal–Wallis test, $P = 0.419$); the respective median proportion reductions were 95.8% (0–100%), 90.1% (75–100%) and 100% (10–100%).

Conclusion. All three disinfection methods seem to be equally effective for the reduction of total bacterial counts on hospital surfaces, regardless the type of hospital or ward. With a sufficiently powered study, we will attempt to demonstrate that UV-C alone could be used instead of NaClO (reference disinfectant in Mexico), possibly with time and economic savings.

Disclosures. All authors: No reported disclosures.

2182. Perceived Impact of Mandatory Reporting of Healthcare-Associated Infections on Infection Prevention and Control Departments in Acute Care Hospitals

Monika Pogorzelska-Maziarz, PhD, MPH¹, and Pamela De Cordova, PhD, RN-BC²; ¹Thomas Jefferson University, College of Nursing, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, ²Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey School of Nursing, Newark, New Jersey

Session: 237. Healthcare Epidemiology: HAI Surveillance
Saturday, October 6, 2018: 12:30 PM

Background. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) requires hospitals to report healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) through the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program. Facilitated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN), mandatory reporting aims to improve quality by benchmarking and improving transparency. In addition, the majority of U.S. states have policies in place for mandatory reporting of HAIs in acute care hospitals. The aim of this study was to examine Infection Preventionists' perceptions of the impact of mandatory reporting on infection prevention and control (IPC) departments.

Methods. In Winter of 2018, we electronically surveyed IPs working in acute care hospitals. The survey was distributed by the Association of Professionals in Infection Prevention and Epidemiology (APIC) to its members via an initial email and weekly e-blasts over a 6-week period. Descriptive statistics were conducted and themes from open-ended questions were analyzed to describe IP perceptions of mandatory reporting.

Results. There were 255 IPs who completed the survey; 187 IPs provided responses in the mandatory reporting section. Half (53%) reported that mandatory reporting resulted in more influence of the IPC department on hospital decision making and 38% reported increased visibility. The most important benefit of mandatory reporting was increased awareness of IPC for hospital administrators (42%), followed by transparency of outcomes for patients and providers (28%). However, a third of IPs reported less time for staff education and routine IPC activities. IPs also reported an increased workload and lack of action based on the results of the reports as drawbacks of reporting mandates.

Conclusion. According to IPs, mandatory reporting has resulted in increased visibility and awareness of IPC in acute care hospitals, however, some drawbacks were also identified. Given CMS and state mandates for HAI reporting, policy makers need to be attuned to additional demands placed on hospitals to comply with mandatory reporting processes. Future research should aim to examine whether IPC departments have sufficient resources to comply with these regulatory policies and ways in which to improve the reporting process.

Disclosures. All authors: No reported disclosures.

2183. Financial Cost, Length of Stay, and Patient Experience Associated with Healthcare-Associated Infections Across a 43 Hospital Network

Rachel Kast, PhD¹; Cole Grabow, MPH¹; Michelle Fitch, BA¹; Sandra Tobar, MSBA BSN²; Anurag Malani, MD, FIDSA³ and Russell Olmsted, MPH, CIC⁴; ¹Integrated Clinical Services Team, Trinity Health, Livonia, Michigan, ²St. Joseph Mercy Health System, Ypsilanti, Michigan

Session: 237. Healthcare Epidemiology: HAI Surveillance
Saturday, October 6, 2018: 12:30 PM

Background. Reduction of healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) is critical to improve patient safety and hospital quality. However, not all HAI-associated outcomes are well studied. We examined several of these—the financial and length of stay (LOS) burden of HAIs and patient experience of care.

Methods. National Healthcare Safety Network-reported catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTI), *C. difficile* infections (CDI), central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSI), MRSA bacteremia, and colon surgery surgical site infections (SSI-COLO) were queried for the first 9 months of 2016 from 43 hospitals. Patients with an HAI were matched to controls on hospital and primary diagnosis to create a retrospective case-control study. CAUTI and CLABSI patients were matched to controls with associated device codes. LOS and total direct variable cost (TDVC) were collected for all HAI and control patients. If patients returned a Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) survey, their likelihood to recommend (LTR) response was additionally analyzed.

Results. Data were analyzed for 123 CAUTI, 1,116 CDI, 166 CLABSI, 58 MRSA, and 127 SSI-COLO case-control pairs across 43 hospitals. TDVC per case was significantly higher among HAI cases than controls for CDI (\$6,484), CLABSI (\$14,646), and SSI-COLO (\$9,770; figure 1). LOS was significantly higher for cases across all HAI groups, with attributable differences of 7.6 days for CAUTI, 6.4 for CDI, 9.7 for CLABSI, 7.4 for MRSA, and 4.5 for SSI-COLO (Figure 2). Of 3,180 subjects, 198 returned HCAHPS surveys. Response rate of “Yes, definitely” to LTR for 85 HAI patients was 63.5% compared with 72.6% for 113 control patients (Figure 3).

Figure 1: Mean hospital cost attributable to cases of HAI and controls

