Disinfection of Needless Connectors to Reduce Staphylococcus Aureus Bacterial Load

Biazus-Dalcin, Camila; Rocha, Patricia Kuerten; Rickard, Claire M; Gales, Ana Christina; Sincero, Thaís Cristine Marques; Ray-Barruel, Gillian

DOI:
10.2309/JAVA-D-21-00027

Publication date:
2022

DISINFECTION OF NEEDLELESS CONNECTORS TO REDUCE *STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS* BACTERIAL LOAD

Abbreviated title: DISINFECTION OF NEEDLELESS CONNECTORS

1373 words main body

Abstract (50 words)

Disinfection of needleless connectors was undertaken in vitro against *Staphylococcus aureus* comparing 70% isopropyl alcohol (IPA), 70% ethanol, 0.5% and 2% chlorhexidine in 70% IPA applied with gauze, and 70% IPA single-use cap (Site-Scrub®). All disinfectants reduced the bacterial load ($p<0.001$), especially the chlorhexidine solutions. Mechanical friction should follow guidelines.

Keywords: *Staphylococcus aureus*, catheter-related bloodstream infection, needleless connector, vascular access device, disinfection.

Highlights

- Compare effectiveness of chemical disinfectants in reducing *S. aureus*.
- Five disinfectants reduced the bacterial load, especially chlorhexidine solutions.
- Focus on Brazilian clinical practice of needleless connector disinfection.

INTRODUCTION

Needleless connectors (NC) provide entry to vascular access devices for the administration of intravenous fluids, medications, blood products, and other intravenous therapies. However, due to connector design, environmental exposure, and manual manipulation, NCs can increase the risk of catheter-associated bloodstream infection (CABSI) [1,2]. For this reason, clinical practice guidelines such as Infusion Therapy Standards of Practice [3] and Guidelines for the prevention of intravascular catheter-related infections [4] recommend NC external surface disinfection using mechanical friction before each device manipulation. Different chemical disinfectants and NC designs have been introduced to reduce NC bacterial contamination [5]. A recent systematic review concluded that alcohol-impregnated single-use caps and alcoholic chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) wipes were associated with significantly lower CABSI than 70% isopropyl alcohol (IPA) wipes [1]. However, this review included no randomized controlled trials or studies evaluating many of the chemical disinfectants used in lower resource settings (e.g., Brazil). In Brazil, there is a difference in available products for the disinfection of NC in comparison with the USA. In the USA, all disinfectants are available in a single-use option (a wipe or swab), while in Brazil the disinfectants used can be bulk and applied to gauze for use. There is a lack of studies that replicate techniques used for disinfection in countries such as Brazil.

Related to the different methods of disinfection, a pilot randomized controlled study (180 patients) in Australia identified the superiority of 2% CHG in 70% IPA wipes, but this product is not widely available in low-resource settings [5]. Low-resource setting are identified as health care system that do not meet the minimum standards set by organisations such as the World Health Organisation (WHO).

Staphylococcus aureus is the predominant Gram positive bacteria responsible for peripheral intravenous catheter associated bloodstream infection [6]. Thus, this study aimed to gain further knowledge about the comparative effectiveness of chemical disinfectants in reducing the bacterial load of NCs inoculated with *S. aureus*.

METHODS

In this *in vitro* study, we compared the antimicrobial effectiveness of four disinfectants applied with sterile gauze: 70% IPA liquid (Rialcool®, Rioquímica); 70% ethanol liquid (Rialcool®, Rioquímica); 0.5% and 2.0% CHG in 70% IPA liquid (Riohex®, Rioquímica); to that of 70% IPA single-use cap (Site-Scrub®, Becton Dickinson). The choice of disinfectant used was based in the most common disinfection methods used in a pediatric ward from a Hospital in Brazil in which the study was based. It is believed that there is deviation in practice related to the disinfection of NC.

Staphylococcus aureus ATCC 25923 was used as the test organism and applied onto a commonly used NC. The NC used in the study was Safeflow®; B. Braun (Brazil), which is a luer activated valve developed as needleless connector injection port in intravascular applications [Figure 1]. It an easy access for Luer Lock and Slip connections and it provides a fluid flow rate of 360 ml/min according to B. Braun Brazil technical information leaftet. This device is compatible with MRI, lipids and blood and it is latex-free and DEHP free.

Ninety experiments were sequentially performed by a single individual (including biological quintuplicates and three procedural repetitions to ensure validity results). Prior to testing the disinfectants, a negative control ensured absence of pre-existing NC contamination, while a non-treated control certified that the bacterial load was applied.

Pre-study experiments validated the required methods including incubation and sonication times. Neutralizer was not used.

Interventions

Each NCs were placed for 20 minutes in a tube containing 1.2 mL of 10^6 colony forming units (CFU)/mL bacterial suspension of *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 strains. When inoculating the NC, the end was closed with a plastic device that comes with the NC for protection [Figure 1]. Next, NCs were removed from the tubes, shaken three times in a Petri dish to remove the excess, and dried at 35 °C for 2 hours.

For disinfection, 1 mL of each disinfectant solution was applied to sterile gauze, then applied to the external NC surface to simulate clinical practice. The method of disinfection and the amount of disinfectant used aimed to reproduce the practice of disinfection in a specific hospital ward. The NCs were scrubbed with movements of 180º (15 times) for 15 seconds (1 time/second) and left to dry for 15 seconds, as per guideline recommendations [(3)]. This studied was submitted and conducted following the Infusion therapy standards of practice from 2016 [(3)]. The NC with the 70% IPA single-use cap disinfection met the manufacturer's recommendations and are not designed to be left on the NC.

Each connector was then placed inside a tube containing 2 mL of Ringer's Lactate® (BBraun), then immediately vortexed for 5 minutes and sonicated (40 Hz) for 10 minutes. The connectors were removed and 100 µL of the suspension was plated on mannitol salt agar. The plates were incubated for 24 hours at 35 ± 2 ºC, and the CFU were counted for each treated NC and the non-treated control.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out using MedCalc® version 19.1.7 (Belgium). Differences $p \leq 0.001$ were considered statistically significant. Evaluation of effectiveness, using Kruskal Wallis test and Conover as post hoc analysis, was performed by comparing bacterial loads recovered after each NC treatment and with non-disinfected controls.

RESULTS

The final analysis included 83 experiments (outliers were excluded). The median bacterial load of the non-treated control was 223.5 CFU. Following the disinfection procedure as per international guidelines outlined above, all disinfectants were found to be effective in reducing the bacterial load, with rates varying from 93.3% (70% IPA single-use cap) to 100% (0.5% and 2% CHG in 70% IPA) ($p < 0.001$) [Table 1].

No differences in effectiveness were identified between 0.5% and 2% CHG concentrations. No differences in effectiveness were identified between the types of alcohol (IPA or Ethanol). However, CHG solutions were significantly more effective than alcohol-based disinfectants. We found significant but lower reduction in bacterial load with the 70% IPA single-use cap [Figure 2].

DISCUSSION

This study compared the impact of five disinfectants frequently used to reduce bacterial load on NCs. *S. aureus* was selected as the test organism because this pathogen is one of the most common causes of bloodstream infections globally [7]. In fact, *S. aureus* imposes an important

141 healthcare burden, particularly in low-resource countries [6, 7]. Despite the adoption of 70%
142 IPA single-use cap by some Brazilian institutions, liquid disinfectants are still used in most
143 public hospitals to scrub NCs due to their low cost.

144 Four tested disinfectants (70% IPA, 70% Ethanol, and 0.5% and 2% CHG in 70% IPA) were
145 the most effective at removing bacteria from NCs. A recent factorial randomized trial found
146 70% IPA and 2% CHG in 70% IPA to be respectively 97% and 99% effective at NC
147 decontamination in adults [8].

148 Although 70% IPA-based, the single-use cap was not as effective as other disinfectants,
149 likely due to the differences of mechanical friction (possibly higher using gauze) and the cap
150 size (smaller than the NC surface area). This finding is in accordance with previous *in vitro*
151 studies comparing different CHG and alcohol disinfectant solutions with 70% IPA caps [9].
152 Another in vitro study reported a favorable reduction in *S. aureus* bacterial contamination
153 with IPA single-use caps, but in that study the caps remained connected to the NCs for one,
154 three, or 7 days [10]; therefore the passive disinfection time was not comparable to our study.

155 All disinfectants reduced the bacterial load of *S. aureus*, with CHG in IPA formulations being
156 most effective. More studies are necessary to confirm our observation, especially in the
157 clinical setting where compliance to guidelines is often lacking. The implication of clinical
158 use of this study are to test NC disinfection methods used in countries such as Brazil and the
159 possibility of developing a follow up study in a clinical situation based on the findings.

160 Strengths of our study are: (1) the standardization of disinfection technique: the time to scrub
161 and dry the disinfectant on the NC surface was the same (15 seconds) and performed by a
162 single person; (2) the use of non-treated and negative controls; and (3) experiments were
163 performed in triplicate and with biological quintuplicates. Although the use of a single NC
164 type could be considered a limitation of this study, the NC evaluated was the type most

commonly used in Brazilian clinical practice.

References

1. Flynn JM, Larsen EN, Keogh S, Ullman AJ, Rickard CM. Methods for microbial needleless connector decontamination: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Infect Control*. 2019;47(8):956-62. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30824388/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

2. Rosenthal VD. Clinical impact of needle-free connector design: A systematic review of literature. *J Vasc Access*. 2020;21(6):847-53. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32056487/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

3. Gorski L, Hadaway L, Hagle M, McGoldrick M, Orr M, Doellman D. Infusion therapy standards of practice. *J Infus Nurs*. 2016;39(suppl 1):S1-S159. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27922994/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

4. O'Grady N, Alexander M, Burns L, Dellinger E, Garland J, Heard S, et al. Guidelines for the prevention of intravascular catheter-related infections. Centers for Disease Control. 2011:1-83. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21511081/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

5. Rickard CM, Flynn J, Larsen E, Mihala G, Playford EG, Shaw J, et al. Needleless connector decontamination for prevention of central venous access device infection: A pilot randomized controlled trial. *Am J Infect Control*. 2021;49(2):269-73. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32735809/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

6. Rosenthal VD, Bat-Erdene I, Gupta D, Belkebir S, Rajhans P, Zand F, et al. Six-year multicenter study on short-term peripheral venous catheters-related bloodstream infection rates in 727 intensive care units of 268 hospitals in 141 cities of 42 countries of Africa, the Americas, Eastern Mediterranean, Europe, South East Asia, and Western Pacific Regions: International Nosocomial Infection Control Consortium (INICC) findings. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2020;41(5):553-63. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32183925/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

7. Seas C, Garcia C, Salles MJ, Labarca J, Luna C, Alvarez-Moreno C, et al. Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections in Latin America: results of a multinational prospective cohort study. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2018;73(1):212-22. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29045648/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

8. Slater K, Cooke M, Fullerton F, Whitby M, Hay J, Lingard S, et al. Peripheral intravenous catheter needleless connector decontamination study-Randomized controlled trial. *Am J Infect Control*. 2020;48(9):1013-8. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31928890/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

9. Flynn JM, Rickard CM, Keogh S, Zhang L. Alcohol caps or alcohol swabs with and without chlorhexidine: An in vitro study of 648 episodes of intravenous device needleless connector decontamination. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2017;38(5):617-9. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28137322/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

10. Casey AL, Karpanen TJ, Nightingale P, Elliott TSJ. An in vitro comparison of standard cleaning to a continuous passive disinfection cap for the decontamination of needle-free connectors. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2018;7:50. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29632665/ Accessed Nov 2, 2021.

Figure 1. Multiple comparison graph of bacterial load on NCs between control and disinfection treatments

Legend: NTC: Non-treated Control; IPA: Isopropyl Alcohol; CHG: Chlorhexidine. The white circles represent each individual experiment. The central box represents the values from the lower to upper quartile (25 to 75 percentile). The middle line represents the median. A line extends from the minimum to the maximum value.

Table 1. Comparative effectiveness of each disinfectant to reduce the bacterial load on needleless connector surfaces

Treatments	n	CFU median	% reduction in bacterial load	Different (P<0,001) from treatments n°
(1) 0.5% CHG in 70% IPA	15	0	100	(3)(4)(5)(6)
(2) 2% CHG in 70% IPA	15	0	100	(3)(4)(5)(6)
(3) 70% Ethanol	13	4	98.2	(1)(2)(5)(6)
(4) 70% IPA	15	2	99.1	(1)(2)(5)(6)
(5) 70% IPA single-use cap	11	15	93.3	(1)(2)(3)(4)(6)
(6) NTC	14	223.5	-	(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)

Legend: NTC: non-treated control; IPA: isopropyl alcohol; CHG: chlorhexidine; CFU: colony forming units. Differences calculated using Kruskal Wallis test and Conover as post hoc analysis.