medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Ward-Level Factors Associated with Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Acquisition – an Electronic Medical Records study in Singapore

Zaw Myo Tun[1*], Dale A. Fisher[2, 3], Sharon Salmon[4], Clarence C. Tam[1, 5]

[1] Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore, Singapore

[2] Division of Infectious Diseases, National University Hospital, Singapore

[3] Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore

[4] UNSW Medicine, University of New South Wales, Australia

[5] London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom

* Corresponding author

Email: zawmyotun@nus.edu.sg (ZMT)

Short title:

Ward characteristics associated with Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* acquisition

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract:

Background

Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) is endemic in hospitals worldwide. When patients are transferred between wards within a hospital, their risk of acquiring MRSA may change. In this study, we investigated how ward characteristics and connectivity are associated with MRSA acquisition.

Methods

We analysed electronic medical records on patient transfers and MRSA screening of in-patients at an acute-care tertiary hospital in Singapore to investigate whether ward characteristics and connectivity within the hospital network were associated with MRSA acquisition rates over a period of four years.

Results

Most patient transfers concentrated in a stable core network of wards. Factors associated with increased rate of MRSA acquisition were ward MRSA admission prevalence (rate ratio (RR): 1.50, 95% CI: 1.28, 1.71, per one percentage point increase), admission to a critical care ward (RR: 1.86, 95% CI: 1.14, 3.06) and average number of patients in the ward on a typical day (RR: 1.31, 95% CI: 1.02, 1.68, for every 10 patients quarterly). Admission to an oncology ward (RR: 0.61, 95% CI: 0.40, 0.93) (compared to medical ward), and median length of stay (RR: 0.71, 95% CI: 0.54, 0.93) were associated with lower acquisition rates. We did not find evidence that network measures of ward connectivity, including in-degree, weighted in-degree, influenced MRSA acquisition rate after adjusting for other ward characteristics.

Conclusion

Ward MRSA admission prevalence, critical care ward, ward patient capacity, ward specialty, and median length of stay, rather than relative connectivity of the ward in the hospital network were associated with MRSA acquisition.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Keywords: infection control, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, Singapore, electronic medical records analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Since its emergence in the 1960s, Meticillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) has become endemic in hospitals worldwide, causing significant health and financial burden (1, 2), accounting for >20% of *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream infections globally (3). In high-income settings, the incidence of hospital-onset MRSA infection has declined over time, although progress in controlling MRSA has plateaued in recent years (4-6).

In Singapore, a high-income city state in Asia, acute care public hospitals initiated a multi-pronged MRSA control strategy from 2006 (7-9). This strategy, comprising active surveillance screening for MRSA, hand hygiene promotion and compliance auditing, cohorting of colonized patients with contact precaution, and other measures, led to a substantial reduction in hospital-acquired MRSA bacteremias (7). Despite this, MRSA remains endemic in healthcare settings. A point prevalence survey in 2014 indicated that 11.8% of patients in a large tertiary public hospital were colonized by MRSA. The prevalence was higher in intermediate (29.9%) and long-term (20.4%) care facilities (10).

Colonization with MRSA is a major risk factor for invasive disease. Numerous factors are known to be associated with MRSA colonization, including patient characteristics such as older age (11), previous hospitalization (11, 12), intensive care unit (ICU) admission (13), chronic illness (14), exposure to other patients known to be colonized with MRSA (15-17), antibiotic use (12, 15), prolonged hospital stay (16, 18), and receiving medical procedures during hospitalization (12). Other factors include colonization pressure (13, 16, 19), infection control practices (such as hand hygiene compliance (7), cohorting (7), environmental decontamination (20), MRSA colonization status of healthcare staff (21)), and organizational factors (such as staff to patient ratio (22), bed occupancy rate (23), patient capacity of a ward (24)).

Variation in infection control practices and organizational factors between hospital functional units means that MRSA acquisition risk experienced by a patient is likely to change if they are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

transferred between wards within a hospital. Studies investigating MRSA acquisition risks associated with intra-hospital patient transfer are rare, because of the need for longitudinal data on patient transfers and MRSA colonization status with high temporal resolution. A case-control study by Dziekan and colleagues found a linear relationship: the greater the number of between-ward transfers, the higher the risk of MRSA acquisition (25). This led us to assess whether greater ward connectivity in terms of patient transfer influences MRSA acquisition risk. In this study, we used high-resolution electronic medical records of in-patient ward transfers from a large public acute care hospital in Singapore, together with active MRSA admission screening data, to identify ward characteristics associated with MRSA acquisition.

Methods

Data sources

We used a dataset of in-patient electronic medical records from the National University Hospital (NUH), Singapore spanning January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2013 (the Patient Affordability Simulation System (PASS)). In addition, we obtained data on in-hospital MRSA acquisitions over the same period from the hospital's MRSA active surveillance culture data set, as well as ward-level hand hygiene compliance from audit data.

Patient Affordability Simulation System (PASS)

PASS records hospital service use and cost information (26). The following variables were available in the dataset: ward number, ward specialty, patients' age, and timestamps for patients' admission, transfers between wards and discharge.

MRSA Active Surveillance Cultures

Active MRSA screening is implemented in 36 out of 64 in-patient wards. Other low-risk wards do not routinely perform active screening and include obstetric, pediatric, psychiatric and acute

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

stay wards. The screening process involves obtaining nasal, axillary, and groin (NAG) swabs at admission, transfer, and discharge. These samples are cultured on selective chromogenic agar. Swabs are obtained on the day of or one day before/after the admission or transfer, and on the day of or one day before discharge. The exceptions are patients hospitalized for <48 hours, those with a MRSA positive result in a previous hospitalization, and deceased patients. MRSA results from clinical isolates are not captured in the active screening database.

Hand-hygiene compliance

Infection control liaison nurses perform random audits in 40 in-patient wards once a month. Twenty observations of healthcare staff hand hygiene activities are recorded clandestinely at any time of the day (27). Hand hygiene compliance is defined as per WHO guidance: the number of hand hygiene activities performed as a percentage of the total number of hand hygiene opportunities (28). The data were available quarterly.

Data linkage

A third-party analyst who was not a study team member linked these data sets using unique patient identifiers and anonymized them before providing access to the study team.

Network analysis

We constructed a weighted directed network using patient transfer data to understand how hospital wards are connected. The network comprised all 64 in-patient wards represented as nodes. Ward connectivity through patient transfers was represented as directed edges linking the origin and destination wards. Edges were weighted based on the number of patients transferred over a specific period.

To investigate the association of ward connectivity and MRSA acquisition rates, we used in-degree and weighted in-degree as network centrality measures. The former represents the number of other wards from which a focal ward receives at least one patient, while the latter

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

reflects the number of patients a focal ward receives from other wards. We constructed 16 quarterly networks from patient transfer data and computed quarterly network measures for consistency with the temporal resolution of hand hygiene compliance data.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included in the analysis in-patient admissions to one of the 36 active screening wards lasting >48 hours. We defined a hospitalization episode as the period between admission to and discharge from the hospital. One hospitalization episode could contain one or more spells, defined as the period from entry into to exit from a hospital ward.

We excluded from analysis episodes with a positive or no screening result at admission; episodes of patients younger than 15 (pediatric patients are not routinely screened for MRSA); and episodes with a negative MRSA result at admission but no subsequent MRSA screening results.

A MRSA acquisition event was defined as an initially MRSA-negative patient who was found positive during a hospitalization episode. For each ward, we estimated MRSA acquisition rate, defined as the number of MRSA acquisitions per 100 patient-weeks. We computed patient-weeks at risk for each ward by summing the total time spent by patients in that ward. For patients who acquired MRSA, their contribution to patient-weeks at risk was censored at the time of collecting a sample positive for MRSA.

Statistical analysis

We used mixed-effects Poisson regression to identify ward-level factors associated with MRSA acquisition. The outcome was the total number of MRSA acquisitions in a specific ward in each quarter. The natural logarithm of the total patient-weeks at risk was used as an offset. We modelled wards as a random intercept and time (in quarters) as a random slope to account for ward-level variability in MRSA acquisition rates and their trends, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

We extracted nine explanatory variables from the available data sources. Time-varying variables included quarterly ward in-degree and weighted in-degree, number of patients in a ward on a typical day, ward MRSA admission prevalence, length of stay, and hand hygiene compliance. Time-invariant variables were critical care ward (i.e., ICU and high dependency unit (HDU)), ward specialty (medical, surgical, orthopedics, oncology, and other), and presence of cohorting beds for MRSA-positive patients. The number of patients in a ward on a typical day was the quarterly average number of patients registered on the 15th of each month. This was considered a proxy for a ward's patient capacity.

We considered ward MRSA admission prevalence as a proxy for colonization pressure. In a hospital ward, the colonization pressure of a pathogen is mainly influenced by admission of patients who are already colonized (29). Admission prevalence was measured using only the first hospitalization of all patients between 2010 and 2013. This is because, as per the screening protocol, no screening is performed in subsequent hospitalizations if a patient has been previously identified as MRSA positive; including all hospitalization episodes would underestimate the admission prevalence.

Sensitivity Analyses

Hand hygiene compliance audit was not implemented in some of the active MRSA screening wards and thus data were unavailable. Consequently, we could not include these wards in modelling hand hygiene compliance data. We therefore compared the results of the multivariable models with and without this variable.

In 299 out of 2,370 (12.8%) MRSA-positive hospitalization episodes, information on MRSA screening was missing in at least one ward spell prior to that in which the positive result was obtained. For these episodes, we could not determine the exact ward in which patients acquired MRSA. To assess the impact of missing MRSA screening information on the results, we conducted sensitivity analyses using five scenarios: (1) complete case analysis – we only included episodes with complete screening results for all spells; (2) mid-point analysis – we

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

assumed that MRSA acquisition occurred in the ward the patient was in at the mid-point between the last known negative result and the positive result; in the next three scenarios, we probabilistically attributed MRSA acquisition to spells with missing MRSA results by random selection (3) using equal probabilities; (4) using a probability weighted by the patient's length of stay in each spell (16, 18, 19, 30, 31); and (5) using a probability weighted by both length of stay and MRSA admission prevalence in each spell (16, 19, 30, 31). For scenarios 1 and 2, we obtained point estimates and confidence intervals from the multivariable model. For scenarios 3 to 5, we iterated the imputation and model fitting 10,000 times to obtain an empirical distribution of estimates for each parameter. We took the median, 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles of these distributions as the point estimate, and lower and upper confidence bounds, respectively.

We considered scenario five as the main analysis as we deemed its assumptions to be more realistically capture the uncertainty associated with missing screening data. Analyses were carried out using R (version 3.5.2) (32), `igraph` package (33), and `lme4` package (34).

Ethics review

Ethical exemption for this secondary data analysis was obtained from the National Healthcare Group Domain Specific Review Board (reference number: 2018/00890).

Results

We successfully linked 92% of MRSA screening results in the MRSA Active Surveillance Cultures dataset to PASS. A total of 64,362 hospitalization episodes were eligible to investigate factors associated with MRSA acquisition (Fig 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Fig 1. Hospitalization episodes from 2010 to 2013 in National University Hospital, Singapore included in the analysis



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Characteristics of in-patient wards

In quarterly networks of 64 in-patient wards, in-degree was highest in Ward 1 Surgery (HDU), Ward 1 Medical (ICU/HDU), and Ward 1 Isolation in most quarters over four years. Weighted in-degree was highest in Ward 1 Surgery (HDU), Ward 3 Cardiac, and Ward 4 Surgery. On the other hand, we observed lowest values in both in-degree and weighted in-degree in Ward 2 Psychiatry, Ward 2 Other, and Ward 5 Coronary care/Cardiac medical. Characteristics of all 64 in-patient wards are further enumerated in (S4 Table).

Of 36 active screening wards, 8 (22%) were critical care wards; 8 (22%) contained MRSA-cohorting beds. Median MRSA admission prevalence was 1.8% (range: 0, 4.7); median hand hygiene compliance was 70.4% (range: 61.8, 83.7). Median in-degree and weighted in-degree were 21.5 (range: 6, 30) and 137 (range: 16, 410.5), respectively (Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of wards with MRSA active screening at the National University Hospital, Singapore in 2010-2013

Time invariant variable	No. wards	%
Critical care wards	8	22
Presence of MRSA cohorting beds	8	22
Ward specialty		
Medical	7	19
Surgical	10	28
Oncology	8	22
Orthopedics	3	8
Other	8	22
Time varying variable*	**Median**	**Range**
Number of patients in a ward on a typical day	21.8	2.7, 54.2
Length of stay (days)	3.3	2.6, 7.7
Admission prevalence of MRSA	1.8	0, 4.7
Hand hygiene compliance (%)	70.4	61.8, 83.7
Measures of ward connectivity		
In-degree	21.5	6, 30
Weighted in-degree	137	16, 410.5

MRSA, Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
* Median of quarterly measurements was quantified for each ward. Median and range of these values from 36 in-patient wards with active MRSA screening were presented.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

MRSA acquisition rates

MRSA acquisitions were identified in 2,370 of 64,362 (3.7%) hospitalization episodes over four years. In the main analysis, the median overall acquisition rate was 3.3 acquisitions per 100 patient-weeks (95% confidence interval (CI): 3.2, 3.5). The impact of missing MRSA results in spells prior to that in which the positive result was obtained was small: the maximum range of variability in 16 quarters over 10,000 iterations was only 0.2 acquisitions per 100 patient-weeks (S1 Fig). The acquisition rates were higher in the hospital wards of the following specialties: surgery, geriatric medicine, orthopedics, and cardiac. Overall MRSA acquisition rates by ward are shown in S2 Table.

Factors associated with ward-level MRSA acquisition rates

In our main analysis, factors associated with a higher MRSA acquisition rate were: ward admission prevalence (rate ratio (RR): 1.50, 95% CI: 1.31, 1.72, per one percentage point increase), critical care ward (RR: 1.86, 95% CI: 1.14, 3.06) and average number of patients on a typical day (RR: 1.31, 95% CI: 1.02, 1.68, for every 10 additional patients). On the other hand, oncology ward (RR: 0.61, 95% CI: 0.40, 0.93) (compared to medical ward), and median length of stay (RR: 0.71, 95% CI: 0.54, 0.93) were associated with a lower acquisition rate (Table 2). Sensitivity analyses showed that the direction of association was largely consistent across all scenarios (Fig 2).

We compared the above model with one including hand hygiene compliance. The results of the latter showed that hand hygiene compliance itself was not associated with MRSA acquisition rate in the subset of wards for which this information was available, after controlling for other factors. However, compared to the main analysis, the estimates were substantially different for ward specialty, presence of MRSA cohorting beds, and median length of stay (S3 Table).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Ward characteristics associated with MRSA acquisition

Ward characteristics	Unadjusted RR (95% CI)	Adjusted RR (95% CI)
Critical care wards		
No	1	1
Yes	1.09 (0.68, 1.76)	1.86 (1.14, 3.06)
Presence of MRSA cohorting beds		
No	1	1
Yes	1.41 (0.94, 2.11)	1.38 (0.95, 2.01)
Ward specialty		
Medical	1	1
Surgical	1.08 (0.70, 1.65)	0.90 (0.62, 1.30)
Oncology	0.43 (0.27, 0.70)	0.61 (0.40, 0.93)
Orthopedics	1.24 (0.66, 2.31)	0.93 (0.56, 1.54)
Other	1.10 (0.73, 1.66)	1.20 (0.78, 1.84)
Number of patients in a ward on a typical day* (for each 10 additional patients)	1.37 (1.09, 1.73)	1.31 (1.02, 1.68)
Median length of stay (for each day increase)	0.75 (0.59, 0.95)	0.71 (0.54, 0.93)
Admission prevalence of MRSA (per one percentage point increase)	1.50 (1.30, 1.72)	1.50 (1.31, 1.72)
In-degree (for each additional ward)	1.40 (0.76, 2.58)	0.96 (0.51, 1.79)
Weighted in-degree (for each 10 additional patients)	4.51 (1.21, 16.81)	1.25 (0.32, 4.88)

CI, Confidence Interval; RR, Rate Ratio

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Fig 2. Sensitivity analyses accounting for the impact of spells without screening prior to a positive spell.



In our main analysis, these spells were assigned MRSA acquisition with a probability weighted by LOS and AP of these spells. Each panel describes rate ratio with corresponding 95% confidence interval of each term in the multivariable models.
AP, Admission prevalence; LOS, Length of stay

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Discussion

We used electronic medical records with high temporal resolution to understand in-patient ward connectivity in a large acute care hospital and ward characteristics associated with MRSA acquisition. We found that ward specialty, median length of stay, MRSA admission prevalence, critical care ward, average number of patients on a typical day were associated with MRSA acquisition rates. However, network measures of ward connectivity, such as the number of wards from which patients were received, or the number of patients received from other wards, were not associated with MRSA acquisition rates in wards.

MRSA acquisition rate was generally lower in oncology wards compared to other wards, after adjusting for potential confounders. The acquisition rate of a ward reflects a balance between the ward's case mix (35) and how stringently infection control measures are implemented (36). Oncology wards, which tend to have patients at higher risk of infections, are likely to have stricter adherence to infection control measures, and our findings also suggest that improvements in infection control should be possible for other ward types.

We did not find evidence that ward connectivity measures (in-degree and weighted in-degree) influenced ward-level MRSA acquisition after adjusting for other ward characteristics. It should be noted that in our ward-level analysis, the connectivity measures used can only account for the total number of transfers between a ward pair, rather than the number of transfers for individual patients (25). For instance, a highly connected ward may have lower acquisition rate, perhaps because of better infection control measures, but it is possible that individual patients from this ward who undergo more transfers still experience higher MRSA acquisition risk.

The median hand hygiene compliance in NUH was 70.4%, comparable to large tertiary hospitals in Hong Kong (37) and Taiwan (38) using similar monitoring protocols. Differences in the results of multivariable models with and without hand hygiene compliance suggest that wards

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

with and without the hand hygiene compliance data available differed with respect to the other characteristics investigated.

Although length of hospital stay is an important patient-level risk factor (16, 18, 19, 30, 31), our ward-level analysis showed the opposite: median length of stay was associated with a lower MRSA acquisition rate. This may reflect stricter infection control measures in the in-patient wards in which patient length of stay is longer.

In line with previous studies (13, 35, 39), we found that critical care ward status was associated with higher rate of MRSA acquisition. Critical care patients are known to be at particularly high risk for nosocomial infections, pointing to a need for more stringent infection control measures in these wards.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting our findings. Firstly, the unavailability of MRSA results from clinical isolates means that we could not include a subset of MRSA acquisitions that are not identified through routine screening. However, the incidence of MRSA infections in NUH is <1 per 100 patient-weeks (40), so the impact of this is likely small. Secondly, we could not adjust for ward staffing level (22, 41), or MRSA colonization status and compliance with contact precaution measures of healthcare staff as this information is not routinely available (21, 42). Lastly, this ward-level analysis cannot account for individual-level differences in MRSA acquisition risk, including age, gender, comorbidities, and use of out-patient services. More detailed individual-level analyses could investigate the interaction between individual and ward-level risk factors. Nonetheless, electronic medical records provided objective measures of patients' transfers through hospital that do not rely on recall and self-report, a major strength of this analysis.

Our analysis demonstrates an efficient use of linked electronic medical records and infection control data to comprehensively study the complexity of intra-hospital patient transfer patterns. Although we did not find evidence of the association of ward connectivity and MRSA acquisition, our findings highlighted other ward characteristics associated with MRSA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

acquisition rate, pointing to a need for further investigation and strengthening MRSA control efforts. Similar methods could be used to understand the transmission dynamics of other nosocomial organisms.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Mark Salloway and Joanne Chee on their assistance in data retrieval and linkage.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

References

1. Pada SK, Ding Y, Ling ML, Hsu LY, Earnest A, Lee TE, et al. Economic and clinical impact of nosocomial meticillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections in Singapore: a matched case-control study. J Hosp Infect. 2011;78(1):36-40.

2. Nathwani D. Impact of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections on key health economic outcomes: does reducing the length of hospital stay matter? The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy. 2003;51 Suppl 2:ii37-44.

3. World Health Organization. Antimicrobial Resistance: Global Report on Surveillance. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014.

4. Kourtis AP, Hatfield K, Baggs J, Mu Y, See I, Epson E, et al. Vital Signs: Epidemiology and Recent Trends in Methicillin-Resistant and in Methicillin-Susceptible Staphylococcus aureus Bloodstream Infections - United States. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2019;68(9):214-9.

5. Laupland KB, Lyytikainen O, Sogaard M, Kennedy KJ, Knudsen JD, Ostergaard C, et al. The changing epidemiology of Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infection: a multinational population-based surveillance study. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2013;19(5):465-71.

6. European Center for Disease Prevention and Control. Surveillance Atlas of Infectious Diseases Solna Municipality, Sweden2019 [Available from: http://atlas.ecdc.europa.eu/public/index.aspx.

7. Fisher D, Tambyah PA, Lin RT, Jureen R, Cook AR, Lim A, et al. Sustained meticillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus control in a hyper-endemic tertiary acute care hospital with infrastructure challenges in Singapore. J Hosp Infect. 2013;85(2):141-8.

8. MOH Singapore. The national infection prevention and control guidelines for acute healthcare facilities. In: Ministry of Health Singapore, editor. Singapore2017.

9. Win MK, Soliman TA, Lee LK, Wong CS, Chow A, Ang B, et al. Review of a two-year methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus screening program and cost-effectiveness analysis in Singapore. BMC infectious diseases. 2015;15:391.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

10. Chow A, Lim VW, Khan A, Pettigrew K, Lye DCB, Kanagasabai K, et al. MRSA Transmission Dynamics Among Interconnected Acute, Intermediate-Term, and Long-Term Healthcare Facilities in Singapore. Clin Infect Dis. 2017;64(suppl_2):S76-s81.

11. Santos HB, Machado DP, Camey SA, Kuchenbecker RS, Barth AL, Wagner MB. Prevalence and acquisition of MRSA amongst patients admitted to a tertiary-care hospital in Brazil. BMC infectious diseases. 2010;10:328.

12. Graffunder EM, Venezia RA. Risk factors associated with nosocomial methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) infection including previous use of antimicrobials. The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy. 2002;49(6):999-1005.

13. Grundmann H, Barwolff S, Tami A, Behnke M, Schwab F, Geffers C, et al. How many infections are caused by patient-to-patient transmission in intensive care units? Crit Care Med. 2005;33(5):946-51.

14. von Baum H, Schmidt C, Svoboda D, Bock-Hensley O, Wendt C. Risk factors for methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus carriage in residents of German nursing homes. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2002;23(9):511-5.

15. Moore C, Dhaliwal J, Tong A, Eden S, Wigston C, Willey B, et al. Risk factors for methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) acquisition in roommate contacts of patients colonized or infected with MRSA in an acute-care hospital. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2008;29(7):600-6.

16. Giuffre M, Amodio E, Bonura C, Geraci DM, Saporito L, Ortolano R, et al. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus nasal colonization in a level III neonatal intensive care unit: Incidence and risk factors. Am J Infect Control. 2015;43(5):476-81.

17. Merrer J, Santoli F, Appere de Vecchi C, Tran B, De Jonghe B, Outin H. "Colonization pressure" and risk of acquisition of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in a medical intensive care unit. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2000;21(11):718-23.

18. Loke HY, Kyaw WM, Chen MIC, Lim JW, Ang B, Chow A. Length of stay and odds of MRSA acquisition: a dose-response relationship? Epidemiology and infection. 2019;147:e223.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

19. Marshall C, Harrington G, Wolfe R, Fairley CK, Wesselingh S, Spelman D. Acquisition of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in a large intensive care unit. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2003;24(5):322-6.

20. Kluytmans J, van Leeuwen W, Goessens W, Hollis R, Messer S, Herwaldt L, et al. Food-initiated outbreak of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus analyzed by pheno- and genotyping. J Clin Microbiol. 1995;33(5):1121-8.

21. Haill C, Fletcher S, Archer R, Jones G, Jayarajah M, Frame J, et al. Prolonged outbreak of meticillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in a cardiac surgery unit linked to a single colonized healthcare worker. J Hosp Infect. 2013;83(3):219-25.

22. Hugonnet S, Harbarth S, Sax H, Duncan RA, Pittet D. Nursing resources: a major determinant of nosocomial infection? Current opinion in infectious diseases. 2004;17(4):329-33.

23. Kaier K, Mutters NT, Frank U. Bed occupancy rates and hospital-acquired infections—should beds be kept empty? Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2012;18(10):941-5.

24. Kibbler CC, Quick A, O'Neill AM. The effect of increased bed numbers on MRSA transmission in acute medical wards. Journal of Hospital Infection. 1998;39(3):213-9.

25. Dziekan G, Hahn A, Thune K, Schwarzer G, Schafer K, Daschner FD, et al. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in a teaching hospital: investigation of nosocomial transmission using a matched case-control study. J Hosp Infect. 2000;46(4):263-70.

26. Gunapal PPG, Kannapiran P, Teow KL, Zhu Z, Xiaobin You A, Saxena N, et al. Setting up a regional health system database for seamless population health management in Singapore. Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare. 2015;25(1):27-34.

27. National University Hospital. Hospital Wide Indicators 2019 [Available from: https://www.nuh.com.sg/About-NUH/Clinical-Outcomes/Pages/Hospital-Wide-Indicators.aspx.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

28. World Health Organization, WHO Patient Safety. Hand hygiene technical reference manual: to be used by health-care workers, trainers and observers of hand hygiene practices. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009.

29. DalBen MF, Basso M, Garcia CP, Costa SF, Toscano CM, Jarvis WR, et al. Colonization pressure as a risk factor for colonization by multiresistant Acinetobacter spp and carbapenem-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa in an intensive care unit. Clinics (Sao Paulo). 2013;68(8):1128-33.

30. Thompson DS. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in a general intensive care unit. J R Soc Med. 2004;97(11):521-6.

31. Marshall C, Spelman D, Harrington G, McBryde E. Daily hazard of acquisition of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infection in the intensive care unit. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2009;30(2):125-9.

32. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019.

33. Csardi G, Nepusz T. The igraph software package for complex network research. InterJournal. 2006;Complex Systems:1695.

34. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software. 2015;67(1):1-48.

35. Meers PD, Leong KY. The impact of methicillin- and aminoglycoside-resistant Staphylococcus aureus on the pattern of hospital-acquired infection in an acute hospital. J Hosp Infect. 1990;16(3):231-9.

36. Sadsad R, Sintchenko V, McDonnell GD, Gilbert GL. Effectiveness of hospital-wide methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) infection control policies differs by ward specialty. PLoS One. 2013;8(12):e83099.

37. Chau JP, Thompson DR, Twinn S, Lee DT, Pang SW. An evaluation of hospital hand hygiene practice and glove use in Hong Kong. Journal of clinical nursing. 2011;20(9-10):1319-28.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

38. Pan SC, Tien KL, Hung IC, Lin YJ, Sheng WH, Wang MJ, et al. Compliance of health care workers with hand hygiene practices: independent advantages of overt and covert observers. PLoS One. 2013;8(1):e53746.

39. Oztoprak N, Cevik MA, Akinci E, Korkmaz M, Erbay A, Eren SS, et al. Risk factors for ICU-acquired methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections. Am J Infect Control. 2006;34(1):1-5.

40. Tambyah PA, Kumarasinghe G. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus control at the National University Hospital, Singapore: a historical perspective. Ann Acad Med Singap. 2008;37(10):855-60.

41. Mitchell BG, Gardner A, Stone PW, Hall L, Pogorzelska-Maziarz M. Hospital Staffing and Health Care-Associated Infections: A Systematic Review of the Literature. Joint Commission journal on quality and patient safety. 2018;44(10):613-22.

42. Price JR, Cole K, Bexley A, Kostiou V, Eyre DW, Golubchik T, et al. Transmission of Staphylococcus aureus between health-care workers, the environment, and patients in an intensive care unit: a longitudinal cohort study based on whole-genome sequencing. The Lancet Infectious diseases. 2017;17(2):207-14.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Supporting Information

S1 Fig. Quarterly MRSA acquisition rate among MRSA active screening wards at National University Hospital, 2010-2013



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

S2 Table. MRSA acquisition rate in MRSA active screening wards of National University Hospital, 2010-2013

Ward^	Acquisition rate*	95% CI	Median MRSA acquisitions#	Median person-week at risk#
11 Surgery, HDU	12.9	4.2, 30.0	5	38.9
6 Medical, Geriatric Medicine	5.8	5.0, 6.6	205	3539.0
2 Orthopaedics	5.1	4.4, 6.0	163	3169.8
3 Cardiac	4.8	4.2, 5.4	249	5194.4
4 Cardiac	4.5	3.8, 5.2	173	3882.2
4 Surgery	4.3	3.6, 5.0	161	3770.6
2 Cardio-Thoracic ICU	4.2	3.1, 5.5	52	1241.6
2 Medical	4.2	3.6, 4.8	173	4157.3
8 Medical, Neuro	4.2	3.3, 5.2	72	1730.7
5 Medical, Renal	3.9	3.3, 4.5	156	4038.0
5 Surgery	3.8	3.2, 4.4	162	4311.7
1 Surgery, HDU	3.5	2.7, 4.5	63	1804.1
2 Neurosurgery, HDU	3.3	2.3, 4.7	31	931.2
1 Medical, ICU, HDU	3.3	2.5, 4.4	54	1614.6
1 Cardiac	3.2	2.2, 4.5	33	1037.9
3 Other ward	3.0	2.1, 4.0	2	67.4
3 Surgery, ICU	3.0	0.4, 10.7	25	864.3
1 Oncology, Medical	2.9	1.9, 4.3	43	1456.9
6 Surgery	2.9	2.2, 3.6	71	2571.1
2 Oncology	2.8	2.2, 3.5	70	2454.7
4 Oncology	2.5	1.9, 3.2	61	2465.4
2 Isolation	2.5	1.9, 3.4	48	1890.3
5 Coronary Care, Cardiac Medical	2.4	1.2, 4.1	12	509.1
9 Surgery	2.2	1.4, 3.3	24	1084.1
Medical, Surgery mixed	2.1	1.5, 2.9	38	1796.4
3 Oncology	1.8	1.3, 2.4	51	2849.0
1 Orthopaedics	1.7	1.3, 2.2	59	3520.5
4 Medical, HDU	1.7	0.6, 3.6	6	361.9
9 Medical	1.4	0.8, 2.3	14	1011.8
8 Surgery	1.0	0.5, 1.9	10	955.1
3 Orthopaedics	0.8	0.3, 1.9	5	614.3
6 Oncology, Medical	0.8	0.3, 1.7	7	862.7
10 Surgery	0.6	0.1, 1.6	3	541.9
8 Oncology	0.5	0.2, 1.2	5	949.8
7 Oncology	0.5	0.2, 1.1	5	1023.5
5 Oncology, HDU	0.2	0, 0.7	2	1068.2

CI, Confidence interval; HDU, High dependency unit; ICU, Intensive care unit

* Number of MRSA acquisitions per 100 person-weeks

^ The ward numbers are masked

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Median value from 10,000 iterations in the main analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

S3 Table. Multivariable analysis with and without hand hygiene compliance

Ward characteristics	Model including hand hygiene compliance Adjusted RR (95% CI)	Final model Adjusted RR (95% CI)
Critical care wards		
No	1	1
Yes	1.83 (1.20, 2.79)	1.86 (1.14, 3.06)
Presence of MRSA cohorting beds		
No	1	1
Yes	1.78 (1.42, 2.22)	1.38 (0.95, 2.01)
Ward specialty		
Medical	1	1
Surgical	1.02 (0.80, 1.28)	0.90 (0.62, 1.30)
Oncology	1.09 (0.81, 1.48)	0.61 (0.40, 0.93)
Orthopedics	1.16 (0.83, 1.61)	0.93 (0.56, 1.54)
Other	1.67 (1.26, 2.20)	1.20 (0.78, 1.84)
Number of patients in a ward on a typical day* (for each 10 additional patients)	1.57 (1.22, 2.00)	1.31 (1.02, 1.68)
Median length of stay (for each day increase)	1.02 (0.77, 1.36)	0.71 (0.54, 0.93)
Admission prevalence of MRSA (per one percentage point increase)	1.48 (1.28, 1.70)	1.50 (1.31, 1.72)
In-degree (for each additional ward)	1.12 (0.61, 2.04)	0.96 (0.51, 1.79)
Weighted in-degree (for each 10 additional patients)	1.50 (0.57, 3.97)	1.25 (0.32, 4.88)
Hand hygiene compliance (for each percentage point increase)	0.96 (0.90, 1.02)	

CI, Confidence Interval; RR, Rate Ratio

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.07.20148155; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

S4 Table. Characteristics of 64 in-patient wards of National University Hospital

No.	Ward	Active screening^	Ward specialty	Swabbing rate at admission	Cohorting beds	Critical care ward	Ward size$#					Hand hygiene compliance# (%)					Indegree#					Weighted in-degree#					Median length of stay# (days)					Admission MRSA prevalence# (%)				
							Min	P25	P50	P75	Max	Min	P25	P50	P75	Max	Min	P25	P50	P75	Max	Min	P25	P50	P75	Max	Min	P25	P50	P75	Max	Min	P25	P50	P75	Max
1	1 Medical, ICU, HDU	Yes	Medical	90	No	Yes	11	17	18	20	22	55	66	75	80	93	23	26	27	29	31	121	130	136	144	162	4.9	5.7	6	6.7	7	1.3	3.2	4.7	6.3	11
2	2 Medical	Yes	Medical	88	Yes	No	24	47	50	51	53	55	59	66	72	82	18	22	24	27	31	179	188	226	238	298	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.9	1.4	1.8	2.1	3	5.5
3	6 Medical, GRM	Yes	Medical	66	Yes	No	45	50	51	52	56	58	66	71	76	83	19	22	24	24	31	100	136	156	183	244	3.3	4	4.1	4.7	4.9	0	2.9	3.2	5	6.6
4	5 Medical, Renal	Yes	Medical	87	Yes	No	36	47	48	51	52	47	59	63	68	77	20	22	26	27	33	104	123	147	164	192	3	3.1	3.5	3.7	3.8	1.4	3.2	4.5	5.5	15
5	8 Medical, Neuro	Yes	Medical	90	No	No	10	15	16	16	41	-	-	-	-	-	10	14	14	17	22	63	78	85	99	163	2	2.3	2.7	2.8	3.9	0	0	1.1	2.1	7.5
6	4 Medical, HDU	Yes	Medical	87	No	Yes	1.7	3.2	4	4.7	6	-	-	-	-	-	11	15	16	18	19	29	35	41	46	51	4.2	5.6	5.8	6.2	8.7	0	0	0	3.6	8.7
7	9 Medical	Yes	Medical	84	No	No	0	0	9.2	21	25	44	54	64	77	85	0	0	12	26	30	0	0	34	85	108	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8	3	0.6	0.8	1.4	2.1	4.1
8	2 Oncology	Yes	Oncology	92	Yes	No	15	19	20	21	47	54	69	75	78	88	11	15	17	22	24	69	91	106	114	129	2.6	2.9	3	3	3.9	0	1.1	1.7	2.8	7.2
9	4 Oncology	Yes	Oncology	88	No	No	0	24	27	27	28	46	63	72	80	90	0	20	22	24	26	0	76	80	83	92	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.6	5.1	0	0	1.8	3.4	5.1
10	3 Oncology	Yes	Oncology	88	No	No	21	25	26	27	29	50	71	76	82	89	17	20	22	23	28	68	75	93	100	124	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.6	5.4	0	2.1	3.4	4.7	9.8
11	5 Oncology, HDU	Yes	Oncology	92	No	Yes	6	7.2	7.8	8.3	9	-	-	-	-	-	5	7.8	9	10	12	21	27	32	37	47	5.2	6.3	7.2	8.4	13	0	0	0	0	13
12	1 Oncology, Medical	Yes	Oncology	87	No	No	0	0	23	36	41	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	18	27	30	0	0	116	219	248	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.9	3	1	1.3	1.8	2.7	5.1
13	6 Oncology, Medical	Yes	Oncology	75	No	No	0	0	11	20	23	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	15	22	30	0	0	73	137	160	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.4	3.7	0	0	1.2	2.3	4.4
14	8 Oncology	Yes	Oncology	94	No	No	0	0	6.2	15	19	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	4.5	10	15	0	0	9.5	24	47	3.1	4	4.1	4.7	4.8	0	0	0	4.3	6.7
15	7 Oncology	Yes	Oncology	88	No	No	0	0	6	16	19	55	74	81	85	95	0	0	4.5	11	13	0	0	12	27	37	3.7	3.7	3.8	4.1	4.9	0	0	2	2.7	3.9
16	1 Orthopaedics	Yes	Orthopedics	87	No	No	28	35	40	43	45	50	69	72	78	83	7	10	12	13	16	133	153	174	188	210	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	0.5	0.7	1	1.1	2
17	2 Orthopaedics	Yes	Orthopedics	80	Yes	No	37	42	48	51	54	48	59	62	66	79	19	20	22	24	24	74	93	100	110	153	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.8	0.5	2	3	3.8	6.7
18	3 Orthopaedics	Yes	Orthopedics	80	No	No	0	0	0	19	20	62	72	75	79	84	0	0	0	15	19	0	0	0	97	116	3.8	3.8	3.9	4	4.8	0	0	1	1	4.3
19	2 Cardio-Thoracic ICU	Yes	Other	89	No	Yes	10	12	14	15	18	40	62	70	76	81	20	22	25	26	30	204	211	216	227	249	4	4.8	5	5.2	5.9	0	0	3.4	7.6	19
20	1 Cardiac	Yes	Other	90	No	No	0	4.8	16	19	20	60	75	83	87	88	0	21	24	25	32	0	93	242	274	332	3.2	3.7	3.9	4	5.9	0	0.7	1.4	3	7.1
21	5 Coronary Care, Cardiac Medical	Yes	Other	84	No	No	0	0	0	18	25	46	69	75	78	90	0	0	0	25	28	0	0	0	264	313	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.6	1.1	1.7	2.5	2.9
22	2 Isolation	Yes	Other	72	No	No	18	21	22	23	26	63	70	73	77	83	10	12	18	21	23	26	41	48	53	64	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.7	4	0	1.7	3.5	6.1	8.9
23	3 Cardiac	Yes	Other	91	No	No	40	50	53	54	56	39	56	64	73	100	18	22	23	28	31	312	377	410	425	485	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.9	3	0.4	1.6	1.9	2.5	3.9
24	4 Cardiac	Yes	Other	66	No	No	47	52	54	56	57	43	59	64	70	83	20	23	27	28	33	124	138	172	196	254	2.7	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.7	0	1.9	2.6	3.5	6
25	Medical, Surgery mixed	Yes	Other	84	No	No	0	0	14	39	45	40	59	65	70	80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.1	0.7	1.2	1.3	1.5	4.1
26	3 Other ward	Yes	Other	98	No	No	0	0	0	0	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	16	2.7	3	3.2	3.5	3.7	0	0.5	1	1.5	2
27	3 Surgery, ICU	Yes	Surgery	86	No	Yes	9	9.9	11	12	13	59	66	71	80	88	20	24	25	28	31	126	136	157	164	171	3.2	3.7	4	4.2	5	0	0	0	4.6	8.7
28	2 Neurosurgery, HDU	Yes	Surgery	92	No	Yes	5.7	11	11	12	13	59	64	71	80	88	13	17	18	20	22	72	94	100	104	113	6.6	7.2	7.7	8.1	9.7	0	0	1.6	3.6	5.7
29	1 Surgery, HDU	Yes	Surgery	90	No	Yes	19	21	22	25	29	46	60	66	70	75	27	29	30	32	35	380	393	408	430	450	4.7	4.9	4.9	5	5.9	0	1.6	3.2	4.6	7
30	5 Surgery	Yes	Surgery	87	Yes	No	31	47	48	49	52	54	65	70	75	90	14	16	19	24	29	168	224	240	251	291	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.9	3	0	1.2	2.1	2.9	3.9
31	4 Surgery	Yes	Surgery	89	Yes	No	0	45	50	52	54	52	58	65	72	82	20	23	24	28	30	237	283	295	316	333	2.4	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9	1	1.5	2.2	2.7	3.8
32	11 Surgery, HDU	Yes	Surgery	93	No	Yes	0	0	0	0	3	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	27	2	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.7	0	1.8	3.6	4	4.3
33	6 Surgery	Yes	Surgery	88	Yes	No	20	25	27	30	42	58	64	66	73	83	14	18	19	22	29	110	124	137	156	171	2.8	2.9	3	3	3.8	0	1.3	1.8	2.9	4.6
34	9 Surgery	Yes	Surgery	91	No	No	0	0	14	28	30	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	16	21	27	0	0	87	165	191	2.8	2.9	2.9	3	3.1	0.7	1.7	1.9	3.3	3.9
35	10 Surgery	Yes	Surgery	78	No	No	0	0	0	13	20	37	63	70	70	73	0	0	6	17	22	0	0	41	112	125	2.2	2.6	2.8	2.9	3	0	0.8	1.8	3.3	4.2
36	8 Surgery	Yes	Surgery	79	No	No	0	0	9.2	25	28	40	55	62	72	83	0	0	14	28	32	0	0	48	136	160	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	3	0	0.6	0.7	0.9	2.9
37	1 Obs and Gynae	No	Obstetrics and Gynecology	0	No	No	26	31	33	35	43	-	-	-	-	-	9	13	15	16	18	142	182	192	220	236	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9					
38	2 Obs and Gynae	No	Obstetrics and Gynecology	0	No	No	0	0	7.8	16	19	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	4	8	10	0	0	48	119	160	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.7					
39	3 Obs and Gynae	No	Obstetrics and Gynecology	0	No	No	0	0	6.2	18	20	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	2	5.2	9	0	0	68	167	222	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6					
40	4 Orthopaedics, Medical	No	Other	0	No	No	12	20	21	22	25	-	-	-	-	-	12	14	16	17	17	129	142	160	170	197	3.8	5.7	6.4	8.9	12					
41	2 Other ward	No	Other	1	No	No	0	0	0	0	20	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	659	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5					
42	3 Medical, AAW	No	Other	4	No	No	43	51	51	52	53	79	79	79	79	79	1	4	5	8.2	11	1	6.8	11	16	191	2.9	3.6	3.7	3.8	4					
43	1 Isolation	No	Other	48	No	No	20	21	22	22	23	48	66	74	80	91	21	24	26	27	31	61	74	78	89	115	2.6	2.8	3.2	3.7	4.1					
44	1 Other ward	No	Other	4	No	No	0	0	9.2	15	18	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	2.5	5.2	7	0	0	15	30	42	2.9	2.9	3	3.1	3.1					
45	7 Medical	No	Other	0	No	No	0	0	0	0	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6					
46	7 Surgery	No	Other	0	No	No	0	0	0	0	14	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3					
47	Day Surgery Ward	No	Other	0	No	No	0	31	35	37	48	-	-	-	-	-	0	1.8	2	3	4	0	79	110	118	132	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3					
48	Emergency Day Surgery	No	Other	0	No	No	0	0	0	3.1	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	3	0.3	0.6	0.7	1.1	1.6					
49	6 Invasive Cardiac Lab Recovery	No	Other	0	No	No	0	0	1.5	3.3	7	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.9	1.1					
50	Same Day Admission Ward	No	Other	0	No	No	3.7	7.3	9	10	14	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.3					
51	Sleep Lab	No	Other	0	No	No	5.3	15	20	27	39	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	7.3					
52	Short Stay DS Ward	No	Other	1	No	No	0	7.7	14	17	31	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	2	3	4	0	115	144	171	206	0.9	1	1	1	1					
53	4 Neonatal Unit	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	12	14	16	17	20	71	77	83	89	93	2	3	3	3	4	18	22	27	33	42	4	5	5.8	6.7	17					
54	5 Paediatrics	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	6.3	7.2	8.2	9.3	10	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	4	4.2	6	12	15	21	26	32	1.9	2.2	2.7	2.9	3.8					
55	7 Paediatrics	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	6.7	6.9	7.5	8	8.7	-	-	-	-	-	5	6	7	8	10	55	65	74	79	95	0.7	0.9	1	1.5	3.3					
56	2 Paediatrics, ICU	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	7.7	8.6	9	9.8	12	56	61	70	81	89	7	8	9	10	12	75	93	104	114	129	3.9	4	4.2	4.8	5.1					
57	1 Paediatrics	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	38	43	46	48	55	-	-	-	-	-	8	10	11	12	13	134	160	174	202	215	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9					
58	Acute Paediatric Unit	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	0	0	1	2.1	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	9	11	15	0	0	22	39	50	2	2.9	3	3.6	5.2					
59	8 Paediatrics	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	0	0	0	0	14	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	1.5	5	7	0	0	7	24	55	2.3	2.9	3	3	3.1					
60	9 Paediatric sleep lab	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	0	0	0	0.1	2	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5					
61	6 Nursery	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	8	9.9	13	16	18	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2	3	24	50	88	98	163	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.7					
62	3 Nursery	No	Pediatrics	0	No	No	10	12	13	15	20	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	2	3	19	35	39	43	47	1.8	2	2	2	2.1					
63	2 Psychiatry	No	Psychiatrics	0	No	No	0	0	0	3.3	24	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	1.8	11	0	0	0	6.5	30	6	6.5	7.8	9.2	9.6					
64	1 Psychiatry	No	Psychiatrics	0	No	No	0	12	21	22	23	-	-	-	-	-	0	9	14	16	23	0	24	35	43	61	5.5	8.3	10	11	11					

^ Wards in which active MRSA screening were included in the analysis

$ Ward size represented by the average number of patients in a ward on a typical day. This was estimated by taking the mean value of patient number in a ward on the 15th of every month during the study period.

These characteristics varied quarterly over four years. The quartiles of the distribution is presented.

<This table is included separately in a excel workbook (sheet name: ward characteristics) in the submission.>