

CORRESPONDENCE



# Decontamination regimens: do not forget half of the protocol. Author's reply

Josef Briegel<sup>1\*</sup> , Wolfgang A. Krueger<sup>2</sup>, Baocheng Wang<sup>1</sup>, Ludwig Christian Hinske<sup>1</sup> and Beatrice Grabein<sup>3</sup>

© 2022 The Author(s)

We thank our colleagues for their critical comments, which give us the opportunity to point out the study methods in some more details [1, 2]. First, it is correct that the resistance rates of some multi-drug resistant bacteria (MDRB) differed between groups with and without selective oral decontamination (SOD) already at admission (first 48 h). Importantly, these findings were excluded from the analysis. The objective of the study was to specifically investigate the emergence of MDRB due to selection pressure of SOD in the intensive care unit (ICU). Second, the incidence densities in MDRB are reported as we found them. Clinically important differences in patient characteristics (medical or surgical admission, transplantation, Table 1 in [1]) are not taken into account since the effectiveness of SOD is not modified by the type of ICU admission [3]. Third, the outcome analysis on health care infections and in-hospital death, however, was done after propensity score analysis which was based on seven clinically important variables (Table 2 in [1]). This gave us the opportunity to compare two well balanced groups, especially with respect to type of admission, severity of illness, duration of ventilation and length of stay in the ICU. The effect of propensity score matching on hospital death rate is illustrated in Table 7 of our publication [1]. Of note, the death rates found in the groups after propensity score matching were very similar to those in recent clinical trials [1, 4, 5]. Fourth, we believe that the inclusion of length of stay in

the propensity score analysis is a strength of our study, as it generates two homogeneous groups with respect to length of exposure at risk between these groups. From this point of view, it is also justified to compare incidence rates of these two groups. Fifth, as detailed in the methods the protocols for infection control were investigated in all participating ICUs according to guidelines given by a national group of experts of the Robert-Koch-Institut in Berlin, Germany. Quality assurance measures showed strict adherence to recommendations in all ICUs included in our analysis.

The strength of our observational study is the analysis of real-world data over a long period of time without changing the SOD intervention. This differs from recent clinical trials that used cross-over designs [4, 5]. In particular, the 143.842 microbiological tests we evaluated represent a large dataset. We acknowledge that meta-analyses suggest that the full selective digestive decontamination (SDD) regimen including a 4-days course of prophylactic systemic antibiotics may be slightly more effective than SOD alone [3, 6]. In our original controlled trial, we also administered prophylactic intravenous antibiotics [7]. However, in terms of antibiotic stewardship, we find it problematic to argue against overuse of antibiotics as prolonged prophylaxis after complex surgical procedures, and then to implement routine 4-days antibiotic prophylaxis for ventilated patients. So we have not forgotten half of the protocol. Rather, we try to find an appropriate balance between the benefits and risks of antibiotic prophylaxis and feel reassured by the data we have presented in our publication [1].

\*Correspondence: josef.briegel@med.lmu.de

<sup>1</sup> Department of Anesthesiology, Klinik für Anaesthesiologie, Klinikum der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU), University Hospital, LMU Munich, Marchioninistrasse 15, 81377 Munich, Germany

Full author information is available at the end of the article

### Author details

<sup>1</sup> Department of Anesthesiology, Klinik für Anaesthesiologie, Klinikum der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU), University Hospital, LMU Munich, Marchioninistrasse 15, 81377 Munich, Germany. <sup>2</sup> Department of Anesthesiology, Klinikum Konstanz, Constance, Germany. <sup>3</sup> Clinical Microbiology and Hospital Hygiene, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany.

### Funding

Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

### Availability of data

Data may be made available in coordination with the authors and LMU University Hospital Munich, Germany.

### Declarations

#### Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### Open Access

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

### Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Received: 3 November 2022 Accepted: 6 November 2022

Published: 28 November 2022

### References

1. Wang B, Briegel J, Krueger WA, Draenert R, Jung J, Weber A, Bogner J, Schubert S, Liebchen U, Frank S et al (2022) Ecological effects of selective oral decontamination on multidrug-resistance bacteria acquired in the intensive care unit: a case-control study over 5 years. *Intensive Care Med* 48(9):1165–1175
2. Massart ND, Clarisse A, Gabriel M, Eric F, Pierre (2022) Decontamination regimens: do not forget half of the protocol. *Intensive Care Med*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-022-06915-7>
3. Plantinga NL, de Smet A, Oostdijk EAN, de Jonge E, Camus C, Krueger WA, Bergmans D, Reitsma JB, Bonten MJM (2018) Selective digestive and oropharyngeal decontamination in medical and surgical ICU patients: individual patient data meta-analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 24(5):505–513
4. Oostdijk EAN, Kesecioglu J, Schultz MJ, Visser CE, de Jonge E, van Essen EHR, Bernardis AT, Purmer I, Brimicombe R, Bergmans D et al (2014) Effects of decontamination of the oropharynx and intestinal tract on antibiotic resistance in ICUs: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 312(14):1429–1437
5. SuDDICU Investigators for the Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society Clinical Trials Group; Myburgh JA, Seppelt IM, Goodman F, Billot L, Correa M, Davis JS, Gordon AC, Hammond NE et al (2022) Effect of selective decontamination of the digestive tract on hospital mortality in critically ill patients receiving mechanical ventilation: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.17927>
6. Hammond NE, Myburgh J, Seppelt I, Garside T, Vlok R, Mahendran S, Adigbli D, Finfer S, Gao Y, Goodman F et al (2022) Association between selective decontamination of the digestive tract and in-hospital mortality in intensive care unit patients receiving mechanical ventilation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.19709>
7. Krueger WA, Lenhart FP, Neeser G, Ruckdeschel G, Schreckhase H, Eissner HJ, Forst H, Eckart J, Peter K, Unertl KE (2002) Influence of combined intravenous and topical antibiotic prophylaxis on the incidence of infections, organ dysfunctions, and mortality in critically ill surgical patients: a prospective, stratified, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 166(8):1029–1037