

# Assessment of Efficiency of using Clinical Pulmonary Infection Score (CPIS) among Mechanically Ventilated Cases

## Thesis

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Doctorate Degree  
In Public Health*

By

**Sara Ahmed Ayman Mahmoud Heikal**

*M.B.,B.Ch. (Cairo University)  
MS Public Health (Cairo University)*

## Supervisors

**Dr. Salwa Abd ELazeem**

*Professor of Public Health  
Faculty of Medicine  
Cairo University*

**Dr. Sahar Yassin**

*Professor of Public Health  
Faculty of Medicine  
Cairo University*

**Dr. Doa'a Ahmed Essawi Saleh**

*Professor of Public Health  
Faculty of Medicine  
Cairo University*

**Dr. Lamia'a Hamed Mohammed**

*Fellow-Critical Care Department  
Faculty of Medicine  
Cairo University*

**Faculty of Medicine  
Cairo University**

**2016**

# تقييم كفاءة استخدام مقياس الالتهاب الرئوي الكلينيكي لدى حالات التنفس الصناعي

رساله مقدمه من

**الطبيبة / ساره أحمد أيمن محمود هيكل**

(بكالوريوس الطب والجراحة-جامعة القاهرة)  
(ماجستير الصحة العامة- جامعة القاهرة)

توطئة للحصول عل درجة الدكتوراه

فى

الصحة العامة

تحت اشراف

**أ.د./ سلوى عبد العظيم**

أستاذ الصحة العامة وطب المجتمع  
كلية الطب  
جامعة القاهرة

**أ.د./ سحر يس**

أستاذ الصحة العامة وطب المجتمع  
كلية الطب  
جامعة القاهرة

**أ.د./ دعاء أحمد عيسوي صالح**

أستاذ الصحة العامة وطب المجتمع  
كلية الطب  
جامعة القاهرة

**أ.د./ لمياء حامد محمد**

زميل الحالات الحرجه  
كلية الطب  
جامعة القاهرة

كلية الطب

جامعة القاهرة

2016



## Acknowledgement

*First and foremost, thanks to "ALLAH" the most generous, the most merciful.*

*This study would not have been possible without the loving support of so many people. As a person is usually too full of words, I find myself overwhelmed in offering them all my thanks.*

*At first, I would like to express my great love and my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my dear Professor Dr. Safwa Ad Elazeem for her meticulous advice, continuous encouragement and without her enormous help this study would have never come to reality.*

*Many thanks and heartfelt appreciation to my dear Professor Dr. Sahar Yassin whose kindness, knowledge, and wisdom have supported and enlightened me over the whole way of this research. She has generously given her expertise to help me complete this work,*

*Special thanks, grateful and appreciation to my dear Professor Dr. Lamia'a Hamed Mohammed for her kind faithful help, support and encouragement and without her great work in the hospital information system in the critical care department the work in the study would never be completed.*

*Many thanks and appreciation to Professor Dr. Doa'a Ahmed Essawi Saleh for her continuous help, guidance and direct supervision.*

*I want to take this chance to express my thanks, respect and love to all participants in this work, the manager of the department; doctors, nurses and IT team for their warm support, help and their descent attitude.*

*To my ever-supporting mother, to spirit of my father and to my husband and all my family members, who gave me the model of life that I live by; beautiful open and trusting one. I dedicate all of my work to them.*

*Sara Ahmed Ayman Mahmoud Heikal*

# **Abstract**

Ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) is the most frequent nosocomial infection in the intensive care unit. VAP is defined as pneumonia that develops more than 48 hours after tracheal intubation.

VAP prolongs the duration of ventilation, ICU stay and hospital stay, and increases healthcare costs, morbidity, and mortality.

The challenges of managing VAP include the requirement for appropriate antimicrobial therapy, and the need to avoid administering unnecessary antibiotics to prevent emergence of resistant microorganism and to avoid excess hospital cost and prolonged hospital stay.

In our study we use the clinical pulmonary infection score (CPIS) to help clinicians in early diagnosis of VAP, continuous monitoring of the VAP patients and to guide their decision to initiate or withhold antibiotic therapy with de-escalation according to the culture results and associated comorbidity of the patients.

## **Key words:**

- ICU
- VAP
- CPIS
- APACHE II score
- Antibiotic cost.
- Medication cost and total hospital cost.
- Length of stay.
- Duration of Mechanical ventilation.
- Morbidity and mortality.

# Contents

|  | Page       |
|--|------------|
| <b>List of Abbreviation</b>  | <b>I</b>   |
| <b>List of Tables</b>  | <b>II</b>  |
| <b>List of Figures</b>   | <b>V</b>   |
| <b>Introduction &amp; Aim of Work .....</b>                            |            |
| <b>Review of Literature</b>  |            |
| <b>Chapter (1):</b><br>Quality in Health Care .....                    | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Chapter (2):</b><br>Health Care Associated Infections .....         | <b>5</b>   |
| <b>Chapter (3):</b><br>Ventilator Associated Pneumonia (VAP) .....     | <b>17</b>  |
| <b>Chapter (4):</b><br>ICU Scoring System .....                        | <b>26</b>  |
| <b>Chapter (5):</b><br>Clinical Pulmonary Infection Score (CPIS) ..... | <b>39</b>  |
| <b>Materials &amp; Methods .....</b>                                   | <b>43</b>  |
| <b>Results .....</b>   | <b>52</b>  |
| <b>Discussion .....</b>  | <b>61</b>  |
| <b>Conclusion &amp; Recommendations .....</b>                          | <b>96</b>  |
| <b>Summary .....</b>   | <b>114</b> |
| <b>References .....</b>  | <b>119</b> |
| <b>Appendix .....</b>  | <b>122</b> |
| <b>Arabic Summary .....</b>  |            |

## List of Abbreviations

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>APACHE</b>      | Acute physiology and chronic health evaluation |
| <b>BAL</b>         | Broncho-alveolar lavage                        |
| <b>CAP</b>         | Community acquired pneumonia                   |
| <b>CCI</b>         | Charlson's comorbidity index                   |
| <b>CDC</b>         | Center for disease control and prevention      |
| <b>CDC's NHSN</b>  | CDC's National health care safety network      |
| <b>CNS DISEASE</b> | Central nervous system disease                 |
| <b>COPD</b>        | Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease          |
| <b>CPIS</b>        | Clinical pulmonary infection score             |
| <b>CVS disease</b> | Cardiovascular system disease                  |
| <b>DCL</b>         | Disturbed conscious level                      |
| <b>HAI</b>         | Health care associated infection               |
| <b>HIS</b>         | Hospital Information System                    |
| <b>ICU</b>         | Intensive care unite                           |
| <b>JCI</b>         | Joint commission international                 |
| <b>LOS</b>         | Length of stay                                 |
| <b>MDR</b>         | Medical drug resistant                         |
| <b>MRSA</b>        | Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus    |
| <b>MV</b>          | Mechanical ventilation                         |
| <b>RF</b>          | Respiratory failure                            |
| <b>VAP</b>         | Ventilator associated pneumonia                |

## List of Tables

| Tables    |  | Pages     |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b>  | Age, APACHE II score and Charlson's comorbidity score of control group and intervention group  | <b>62</b> |
| <b>2</b>  | Characteristics of control group and intervention group regarding patient admission source, patient type, causes of patient admission and causes of ventilation                            | <b>65</b> |
| <b>3</b>  | Percent change of CPIS in control group and intervention group   | <b>67</b> |
| <b>4</b>  | Culture results of control group and intervention group.   | <b>67</b> |
| <b>5</b>  | Duration of mechanical ventilation (MV) and the ICU length of stay (LOS) in control group and intervention group   | <b>68</b> |
| <b>6</b>  | Comparison between control group and intervention group when CPIS at day 3 $\leq$ 6 regarding duration of mechanical ventilation (MV) and the ICU length of stay (LOS)                     | <b>69</b> |
| <b>7</b>  | Comparison between control group and intervention group when CPIS at day 3 $>$ 6 regarding duration of mechanical ventilation (MV) and the ICU length of stay (LOS)                        | <b>69</b> |
| <b>8</b>  | Comparison between patient's outcome (deaths or recovered/referred) regarding CPIS at day3 and CPIS at day of extubation in control group  | <b>71</b> |
| <b>9</b>  | Comparison between patient's outcome (deaths or recovered/referred) regarding CPIS at day3 and CPIS at day of extubation in intervention group   | <b>71</b> |
| <b>10</b> | Comparison between control group and intervention group regarding total cost, medication cost and cost of antibiotics by Egyptian pounds (LE)  | <b>72</b> |
| <b>11</b> | Comparison between control group and intervention group regarding number and cost of antibiotics per day by Egyptian pounds (LE), percent of antibiotic cost to total and medication cost  | <b>73</b> |
| <b>12</b> | Comparison between patients with CPIS at day 3 (CPIS $\leq$ 6) and patients with (CPIS $>$ 6) in control group regarding the total, medication and antibiotic cost by Egyptian pounds (LE) | <b>74</b> |

|           |  |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>13</b> | Comparison between patients with CPIS at day 3 ( $CPIS \leq 6$ ) and patients with ( $CPIS > 6$ ) in control group regarding the number and cost of antibiotics per day by Egyptian pounds (LE) and percent of antibiotic cost to total and medication cost      | <b>75</b> |
| <b>14</b> | Comparison between patients with CPIS at day 3 ( $CPIS \leq 6$ ) and patients with ( $CPIS > 6$ ) in intervention group regarding the total, medication and antibiotic cost by Egyptian pounds (LE)  | <b>76</b> |
| <b>15</b> | Comparison between patients with CPIS at day 3 ( $CPIS \leq 6$ ) and patients with ( $CPIS > 6$ ) in intervention group regarding the number and cost of antibiotics per day by Egyptian pounds (LE) and percent of antibiotic cost to total and medication cost | <b>77</b> |
| <b>16</b> | Culture results in intervention group who were followed by CPIS and who weren't followed by CPIS   | <b>78</b> |
| <b>17</b> | Comparison between patients in intervention group who were followed by CPIS and who weren't followed by CPIS, regarding mechanical ventilation days (MV) days and ICU length of stay (LOS)   | <b>79</b> |
| <b>18</b> | Comparison between patients in intervention group who were followed by CPIS and who weren't followed by CPIS, regarding total, medication and antibiotics cost by Egyptian pounds (LE)   | <b>80</b> |
| <b>19</b> | Comparison between patients in intervention group who were followed by CPIS and who weren't followed by CPIS, regarding number and cost of antibiotics per day by Egyptian pounds (LE) and percent of antibiotic cost to total and medication cost               | <b>81</b> |
| <b>20</b> | Comparison between control group and intervention group (who were followed by CPIS) regarding mechanical ventilation (MV) days and ICU length of stay (LOS)  | <b>82</b> |
| <b>21</b> | Comparison between patients in control group and intervention group (who were followed by CPIS), regarding total, medication and antibiotic cost by Egyptian pounds (LE)   | <b>83</b> |
| <b>22</b> | Comparison between patients in control group and intervention group (who were followed by CPIS), regarding number and cost of antibiotics per day by Egyptian pound (LE), percent of antibiotic cost to total and medication                                     | <b>84</b> |



|           |  |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>23</b> | Comparison between patients in control group and in intervention group (who were followed by CPIS), regarding patient outcome                              | <b>85</b> |
| <b>24</b> | Comparison between medical and surgical patients in control group regarding the ICU length of stay (LOS) and mechanical ventilation (MV) days              | <b>86</b> |
| <b>25</b> | Comparison between medical and surgical patients in intervention group regarding the ICU length of stay (LOS) and mechanical ventilation (MV) days         | <b>86</b> |
| <b>26</b> | Comparison between medical patient and surgical patients in control group regarding the total, medication and antibiotic cost by Egyptian pounds (LE)      | <b>87</b> |
| <b>27</b> | Comparison between medical patient and surgical patients in intervention group regarding the total, medication and antibiotic cost by Egyptian pounds (LE) | <b>88</b> |
| <b>28</b> | Comparison between medical patients and surgical patients in control group regarding patient outcome   | <b>88</b> |
| <b>29</b> | Comparison between medical patients and surgical patients in intervention group regarding patient outcome  | <b>89</b> |
| <b>30</b> | The table displays logistic regression between patient outcome and factors affecting it in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40                  | <b>93</b> |
| <b>31</b> | The table displays logistic regression between patient outcome and factors affecting it in control group n=40  | <b>94</b> |
| <b>32</b> | The table displays logistic regression between patient outcome and factors affecting it in intervention group n=40   | <b>95</b> |

## List of Figures

| Figures   |  | Pages     |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b>  | Types of HCAI.   | <b>19</b> |
| <b>2</b>  | Age distribution of the control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.  | <b>63</b> |
| <b>3</b>  | Sex pattern of the control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.   | <b>64</b> |
| <b>4</b>  | Line graph of the Median of the CPIS in the day 1 of ventilation, day 3 and day of extubation in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40. | <b>66</b> |
| <b>5</b>  | Payment categories in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.  | <b>70</b> |
| <b>6</b>  | Patient outcome in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.   | <b>70</b> |
| <b>7</b>  | Patient's outcome of <i>intervention group</i> who were followed by CPIS (n=19) and who weren't followed by CPIS (n=21).                         | <b>79</b> |
| <b>8</b>  | Correlation between CPIS at day3 and mechanical ventilation (MV) days in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.                         | <b>90</b> |
| <b>9</b>  | Correlation between CPIS at day 3 and number of antibiotics in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.                                   | <b>90</b> |
| <b>10</b> | Correlation between mechanical ventilation (MV) days and number of antibiotics in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.                | <b>91</b> |
| <b>11</b> | Correlation between mechanical ventilation (MV) days and antibiotics cost in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40                      | <b>91</b> |
| <b>12</b> | Correlation between ICU days and number of antibiotics taken in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.                                  | <b>92</b> |
| <b>13</b> | Correlation between ICU days and numbers of antibiotics taken in control group n=40 and intervention group n=40.                                 | <b>92</b> |



# Introduction

Quality means the degree to which the activities of healthcare services increase the likelihood of desirable health related welfare for individuals and population groups, and the services are performed in accordance with current professional knowledge. It also implies the adequacy of healthcare services to the needs and expectations of clients/patients and the best possible performance (*Rygh-Helgeland, 2010 and Lohr, 1990*).

Patient safety is an integral part of the quality agenda; it is difficult to provide effective care where safety is compromised. Although the patient safety events may not be completely eliminated but the harm to patients can be reduced, and the goal is always zero harm (*Brennan-Sampson et al., 2005*). Reducing the risk of health care associated infection (HAIs) is one of international patient safety goals (*Joint commission international, 2016*).

HAIs represent a major public health problem in many developing countries, particularly in intensive care units (ICU), represent a major threat to patient safety and it's one of the most common sources of preventable harm (*Klebens et al., 2007*).

HAIs from invasive medical devices, particularly central line-associated bloodstream infection (CLABSI), ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP), and catheter-associated urinary tract infection (CAUTI), lead to significant threats to patients in ICUs, associated with prolonged hospital stays, greater health care costs, and increased mortality (*EL-Kholy-Saied et al., 2012*).



Better evaluation of the costs of these infections could help providers and payers to justify investing in prevention of the HAIs. The leadership of patient safety professionals will allow hospitals to realize cost savings and shifting it to prevent HAIs (*Zimlichman-Henderson et al., 2013*).

ICU patients are more vulnerable to medical errors and HAIs due to complexity and number of interventions, the severity of illness, time spent in hospital, and breadth of care being provided. Predictive scoring systems works by taking known clinical variables and deriving a numerical or severity score for the outcome of interest (*Hemmila and Wahl, 2016*).

The four major ICU predictive scoring systems used in the ICU setting are the Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) system, the Simplified Acute Physiologic Score (SAPS), the Mortality Prediction Model (MPM), and the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) (*Hemmila and Wahl, 2016*).

The Clinical Pulmonary Infection Score (CPIS) was proposed in 1991 as a diagnostic method for ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP) and has also been studied as a tool for reducing unnecessary antibiotic use in critically ill patients. The CPIS relies in part on microbiologic data that are usually not immediately available, and a modified CPIS was developed which only includes data immediately available on patient presentation (*Pugin-Auckenthaler et al., 1991; Singh-Rogers et al., 2000 and Fartoukh-Maiˆtre et al., 2003*).

The CPIS score has good correlation with National Health care Safety Network criteria (CDC's NHSN)- is the nation's most widely used healthcare-associated infection tracking system - but does not offer a



major advantage over NHSN criteria for VAP surveillance (*Safdar-O'Horo et al., 2013*).

Ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP) impacts 10%-20% of patients requiring mechanical ventilation and nearly doubles the risk for mortality in critically ill patients (*Safdar et al., 2005*).

VAP is defined as pneumonia that develops more than 48 hours after tracheal intubation or tracheotomy. The challenges of managing VAP include the requirement for appropriate antimicrobial therapy, and the need to avoid administering of unnecessary antibiotics (*Iregui-Ward et al., 2002*).

Inappropriate use of antibiotic is quite common all over the world and the threat of antimicrobial resistant organisms is a growing concern worldwide. Many health care professionals have long warned against the overuse of antibiotics. However, serious outbreaks of resistant bacteria still occur around the world. As a result of frequent and inappropriate antibiotic use in ICUs, the infections with multiple drug resistant microorganisms are developed and difficulties are experienced in treating those (*Salah El-DinHamdy-Shabban et al., 2014*).



## **Aim of the Work**

### **\* Goal:**

The goal of the study is reducing morbidity in mechanically ventilated patients in critical care department of Kasr El-Aini Hospital Cairo University.

### **\* Specific objectives:**

1. Assessment of mortality rate from ventilator associated pneumonia (VAP) in the studied group.
2. Early detection of cases of (VAP) using clinical pulmonary infection score (CPIS).
3. Measurement of cost efficiency of using CPIS for patients with VAP as regards duration and cost of hospital stay and cost of the antimicrobial therapy.

## Quality in Health Care

### Concepts

Thousands of patients die each year because of hospitals' failure to adhere consistently to standard procedures of safe and effective medical care. Accordingly, an effective way to promote quality improvement is to implement standard practices for the safety and care of hospitalized patients (*Michael et al., 2007*).

Quality of care is the level of attainment of health systems' intrinsic goals for health improvement and responsiveness to legitimate expectations of the population. Another issue in regards to quality is that care should be provided in a continuum. That is to say care should be initiated, rendered, evaluated, improved and continuously monitored even after the patient is cured. Care is extended to include wellness, health promotion and disease prevention (*WHO, 2004*).

The institute of medicine (IOM) defines the quality by the degree to which health services for individuals and populations increase the likelihood of desired health outcomes and are consistent with current professional knowledge (*IOM, 2013*).

Quality from the perspective of the administrator is to provide effective care in a cost conscious environment that may include the rationing of health care, especially when resources are limited. From the patient's perspective, on the other hand, quality is getting my care when and where I need it and from whomever I choose to cure my condition in the fastest possible way (*WHO, 2004*).