

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

3 Zaw Myo Tun^{1*}, Dale A. Fisher^{2, 3}, Sharon Salmon⁴, Clarence C. Tam^{1, 5}

4

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

6 ²Division of Infectious Diseases, National University Hospital, Singapore

7 ³Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore

8 ⁴UNSW Medicine, University of New South Wales, Australia

9 ⁵London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom

10

11 * Corresponding author

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

13

14 Short title:

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

1 **Abstract:**

2 **Background**

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

7 **Methods**

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

12 **Results**

13 Most patient transfers concentrated in a stable core network of wards. Factors associated with
14 increased rate of MRSA acquisition were ward MRSA admission prevalence (rate ratio (RR):
15 1.50, 95% CI: 1.28, 1.71, per one percentage point increase), admission to a critical care ward
16 (RR: 1.86, 95% CI: 1.14, 3.06) and average number of patients in the ward on a typical day (RR:
17 1.31, 95% CI: 1.02, 1.68, for every 10 patients quarterly). Admission to an oncology ward (RR:
18 0.61, 95% CI: 0.40, 0.93) (compared to medical ward), and median length of stay (RR: 0.71, 95%
19 CI: 0.54, 0.93) were associated with lower acquisition rates. We did not find evidence that
20 network measures of ward connectivity, including in-degree, weighted in-degree, influenced
21 MRSA acquisition rate after adjusting for other ward characteristics.

22 **Conclusion**

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

26

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

1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

10 **Methods**

11 **Data sources**

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

17 **Patient Affordability Simulation System (PASS)**

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

21 **MRSA Active Surveillance Cultures**

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

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

7 **Hand-hygiene compliance**

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

13 **Data linkage**

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

16 **Network analysis**

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

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

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

4 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

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

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

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

19 **Statistical analysis**

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

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

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

16 **Sensitivity Analyses**

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

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

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

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

14 **Ethics review**


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

17 **Results**

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

21

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



1 **Characteristics of in-patient wards**

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

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

12 **Table 1. Characteristics of wards with MRSA active screening at the National University**
13 **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

15 MRSA, Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*

16 * Median of quarterly measurements was quantified for each ward. Median and range of these
17 values from 36 in-patient wards with active MRSA screening were presented.

1 **MRSA acquisition rates**

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

10 **Factors associated with ward-level MRSA acquisition rates**

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

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


24

1 **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)

2 CI, Confidence Interval; RR, Rate Ratio

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



3

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

7 AP, Admission prevalence; LOS, Length of stay

8

1 Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 **Acknowledgements**

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

7

1 **References**

- 2 1. Pada SK, Ding Y, Ling ML, Hsu LY, Earnest A, Lee TE, et al. Economic and clinical impact
3 of nosocomial methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in Singapore: a matched
4 case-control study. *J Hosp Infect.* 2011;78(1):36-40.
- 5 2. Nathwani D. Impact of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections on key
6 health economic outcomes: does reducing the length of hospital stay matter? *The Journal of*
7 *antimicrobial chemotherapy.* 2003;51 Suppl 2:ii37-44.
- 8 3. World Health Organization. *Antimicrobial Resistance: Global Report on Surveillance.*
9 Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014.
- 10 4. Kourtis AP, Hatfield K, Baggs J, Mu Y, See I, Epton E, et al. Vital Signs: Epidemiology and
11 Recent Trends in Methicillin-Resistant and in Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus*
12 Bloodstream Infections - United States. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report.*
13 2019;68(9):214-9.
- 14 5. Laupland KB, Lyytikainen O, Sogaard M, Kennedy KJ, Knudsen JD, Ostergaard C, et al. The
15 changing epidemiology of *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream infection: a multinational
16 population-based surveillance study. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2013;19(5):465-71.
- 17 6. European Center for Disease Prevention and Control. *Surveillance Atlas of Infectious*
18 *Diseases Solna Municipality, Sweden 2019* [Available from:
19 <http://atlas.ecdc.europa.eu/public/index.aspx>.
- 20 7. Fisher D, Tambyah PA, Lin RT, Jureen R, Cook AR, Lim A, et al. Sustained methicillin-
21 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* control in a hyper-endemic tertiary acute care hospital with
22 infrastructure challenges in Singapore. *J Hosp Infect.* 2013;85(2):141-8.
- 23 8. MOH Singapore. *The national infection prevention and control guidelines for acute*
24 *healthcare facilities.* In: Ministry of Health Singapore, editor. Singapore 2017.
- 25 9. Win MK, Soliman TA, Lee LK, Wong CS, Chow A, Ang B, et al. Review of a two-year
26 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* screening program and cost-effectiveness analysis
27 in Singapore. *BMC infectious diseases.* 2015;15:391.

- 1 10. Chow A, Lim VW, Khan A, Pettigrew K, Lye DCB, Kanagasabai K, et al. MRSA
2 Transmission Dynamics Among Interconnected Acute, Intermediate-Term, and Long-Term
3 Healthcare Facilities in Singapore. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;64(suppl_2):S76-s81.
- 4 11. Santos HB, Machado DP, Camey SA, Kuchenbecker RS, Barth AL, Wagner MB. Prevalence
5 and acquisition of MRSA amongst patients admitted to a tertiary-care hospital in Brazil. *BMC*
6 *infectious diseases*. 2010;10:328.
- 7 12. Graffunder EM, Venezia RA. Risk factors associated with nosocomial methicillin-
8 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infection including previous use of antimicrobials. *The*
9 *Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*. 2002;49(6):999-1005.
- 10 13. Grundmann H, Barwolff S, Tami A, Behnke M, Schwab F, Geffers C, et al. How many
11 infections are caused by patient-to-patient transmission in intensive care units? *Crit Care Med*.
12 2005;33(5):946-51.
- 13 14. von Baum H, Schmidt C, Svoboda D, Bock-Hensley O, Wendt C. Risk factors for
14 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* carriage in residents of German nursing homes.
15 *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2002;23(9):511-5.
- 16 15. Moore C, Dhaliwal J, Tong A, Eden S, Wigston C, Willey B, et al. Risk factors for
17 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition in roommate contacts of
18 patients colonized or infected with MRSA in an acute-care hospital. *Infect Control Hosp*
19 *Epidemiol*. 2008;29(7):600-6.
- 20 16. Giuffre M, Amodio E, Bonura C, Geraci DM, Saporito L, Ortolano R, et al. Methicillin-
21 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal colonization in a level III neonatal intensive care unit:
22 Incidence and risk factors. *Am J Infect Control*. 2015;43(5):476-81.
- 23 17. Merrer J, Santoli F, Appere de Vecchi C, Tran B, De Jonghe B, Outin H. "Colonization
24 pressure" and risk of acquisition of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a medical
25 intensive care unit. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2000;21(11):718-23.
- 26 18. Loke HY, Kyaw WM, Chen MIC, Lim JW, Ang B, Chow A. Length of stay and odds of MRSA
27 acquisition: a dose-response relationship? *Epidemiology and infection*. 2019;147:e223.

- 1 19. Marshall C, Harrington G, Wolfe R, Fairley CK, Wesselingh S, Spelman D. Acquisition of
2 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a large intensive care unit. *Infect Control Hosp*
3 *Epidemiol.* 2003;24(5):322-6.
- 4 20. Kluytmans J, van Leeuwen W, Goessens W, Hollis R, Messer S, Herwaldt L, et al. Food-
5 initiated outbreak of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* analyzed by pheno- and
6 genotyping. *J Clin Microbiol.* 1995;33(5):1121-8.
- 7 21. Haill C, Fletcher S, Archer R, Jones G, Jayarajah M, Frame J, et al. Prolonged outbreak of
8 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a cardiac surgery unit linked to a single colonized
9 healthcare worker. *J Hosp Infect.* 2013;83(3):219-25.
- 10 22. Hugonnet S, Harbarth S, Sax H, Duncan RA, Pittet D. Nursing resources: a major
11 determinant of nosocomial infection? *Current opinion in infectious diseases.* 2004;17(4):329-
12 33.
- 13 23. Kaier K, Mutters NT, Frank U. Bed occupancy rates and hospital-acquired infections—
14 should beds be kept empty? *Clinical Microbiology and Infection.* 2012;18(10):941-5.
- 15 24. Kibbler CC, Quick A, O'Neill AM. The effect of increased bed numbers on MRSA
16 transmission in acute medical wards. *Journal of Hospital Infection.* 1998;39(3):213-9.
- 17 25. Dziekan G, Hahn A, Thune K, Schwarzer G, Schafer K, Daschner FD, et al. Methicillin-
18 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a teaching hospital: investigation of nosocomial transmission
19 using a matched case-control study. *J Hosp Infect.* 2000;46(4):263-70.
- 20 26. Gunapal PPG, Kannapiran P, Teow KL, Zhu Z, Xiaobin You A, Saxena N, et al. Setting up a
21 regional health system database for seamless population health management in Singapore.
22 *Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare.* 2015;25(1):27-34.
- 23 27. National University Hospital. Hospital Wide Indicators 2019 [Available from:
24 [https://www.nuh.com.sg/About-NUH/Clinical-Outcomes/Pages/Hospital-Wide-](https://www.nuh.com.sg/About-NUH/Clinical-Outcomes/Pages/Hospital-Wide-Indicators.aspx)
25 [Indicators.aspx](https://www.nuh.com.sg/About-NUH/Clinical-Outcomes/Pages/Hospital-Wide-Indicators.aspx).

- 1 28. World Health Organization, WHO Patient Safety. Hand hygiene technical reference
2 manual: to be used by health-care workers, trainers and observers of hand hygiene practices.
3 Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009.
- 4 29. DalBen MF, Basso M, Garcia CP, Costa SF, Toscano CM, Jarvis WR, et al. Colonization
5 pressure as a risk factor for colonization by multiresistant *Acinetobacter* spp and carbapenem-
6 resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in an intensive care unit. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*.
7 2013;68(8):1128-33.
- 8 30. Thompson DS. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a general intensive care
9 unit. *J R Soc Med*. 2004;97(11):521-6.
- 10 31. Marshall C, Spelman D, Harrington G, McBryde E. Daily hazard of acquisition of
11 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infection in the intensive care unit. *Infect Control*
12 *Hosp Epidemiol*. 2009;30(2):125-9.
- 13 32. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria:
14 R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019.
- 15 33. Csardi G, Nepusz T. The igraph software package for complex network research.
16 *InterJournal*. 2006;Complex Systems:1695.
- 17 34. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4.
18 *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2015;67(1):1-48.
- 19 35. Meers PD, Leong KY. The impact of methicillin- and aminoglycoside-resistant
20 *Staphylococcus aureus* on the pattern of hospital-acquired infection in an acute hospital. *J Hosp*
21 *Infect*. 1990;16(3):231-9.
- 22 36. Sadsad R, Sintchenko V, McDonnell GD, Gilbert GL. Effectiveness of hospital-wide
23 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infection control policies differs by ward
24 specialty. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(12):e83099.
- 25 37. Chau JP, Thompson DR, Twinn S, Lee DT, Pang SW. An evaluation of hospital hand
26 hygiene practice and glove use in Hong Kong. *Journal of clinical nursing*. 2011;20(9-10):1319-
27 28.

- 1 38. Pan SC, Tien KL, Hung IC, Lin YJ, Sheng WH, Wang MJ, et al. Compliance of health care
2 workers with hand hygiene practices: independent advantages of overt and covert observers.
3 PLoS One. 2013;8(1):e53746.
- 4 39. Oztoprak N, Cevik MA, Akinci E, Korkmaz M, Erbay A, Eren SS, et al. Risk factors for ICU-
5 acquired methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections. Am J Infect Control.
6 2006;34(1):1-5.
- 7 40. Tambyah PA, Kumarasinghe G. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus control at
8 the National University Hospital, Singapore: a historical perspective. Ann Acad Med Singap.
9 2008;37(10):855-60.
- 10 41. Mitchell BG, Gardner A, Stone PW, Hall L, Pogorzelska-Maziarz M. Hospital Staffing and
11 Health Care-Associated Infections: A Systematic Review of the Literature. Joint Commission
12 journal on quality and patient safety. 2018;44(10):613-22.
- 13 42. Price JR, Cole K, Bexley A, Kostiou V, Eyre DW, Golubchik T, et al. Transmission of
14 Staphylococcus aureus between health-care workers, the environment, and patients in an
15 intensive care unit: a longitudinal cohort study based on whole-genome sequencing. The Lancet
16 Infectious diseases. 2017;17(2):207-14.


17

18

1 **Supporting Information**

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

4



5

6

1 **S2 Table. MRSA acquisition rate in MRSA active screening**
2 **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

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

4 * Number of MRSA acquisitions per 100 person-weeks

5 ^ The ward numbers are masked

1 # Median value from 10,000 iterations in the main analysis

2

1 **S3 Table. Multivariable analysis with and without hand**
 2 **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)	

3 CI, Confidence Interval; RR, Rate Ratio

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

No.	Ward	Active screening ^a	Ward speciality	Swabbing rate at admission	Cohorting beds	Critical care ward	Ward size ^b				Hand hygiene compliance ^c (%)				In-degree ^d				Weighted in-degree ^d				Median length of stay ^e (days)				Admission MRSA prevalence ^e (%)									
							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	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	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	Medical, GRM	Yes	Medical	86	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	8.6
4	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	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	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	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	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	Oncology	Yes	Oncology	88	No	No	0	24	27	27	28	46	63	72	80	90	0	0	22	24	26	0	78	80	83	92	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.6	5.1	0	0	1.5	3.4	5.1
10	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	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	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	Oncology, Medical	Yes	Oncology	75	No	No	0	0	11	20	23	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	15	22	30	0	73	137	160	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.4	3.7	0	0	1.2	2.3	4.4	
14	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	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	Orthopaedics	Yes	Orthopaedics	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	Orthopaedics	Yes	Orthopaedics	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	Orthopaedics	Yes	Orthopaedics	80	No	No	0	0	19	20	20	52	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	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	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	1.4	3	7.1
21	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	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	Cardiac	Yes	Other	91	No	No	40	50	53	54	56	39	56	64	73	100	18	22	22	28	31	312	377	410	425	485	2.7	2.8	2.9	3	3	0.4	1.6	1.9	2.5	3.9
24	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	Other ward	Yes	Other	98	No	No	0	0	0	0	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	16	27	3	3.2	3.5	3.7	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	7
27	Surgery, ICU	Yes	Surgery	86	No	Yes	9	9.8	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	Neurosurgery, HDU	Yes	Surgery	92	No	Yes	5.7	11	11	12	13	59	64	71	80	88	13	17	18	20	23	72	94	100	104	113	6.6	7.2	7.7	8.1	8.7	0	0	1.6	3.6	5.7
29	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	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	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	Surgery, HDU	Yes	Surgery	93	No	Yes	0	0	0	0	3	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	27	2	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.7	0	1.8	3.6	4	4	3
33	Surgery	Yes	Surgery	88	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	0	1.5	1.8	2.9	4.6
34	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	1.9	3.3	3.9	3.9
35	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	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	Obs and Gynae	No	Obstetrics and Gynaecology	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	0	0	0	0	1.9
38	Obs and Gynae	No	Obstetrics and Gynaecology	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	0	0	0	0	2.6
39	Obs and Gynae	No	Obstetrics and Gynaecology	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	0	0	0	0	2.6
40	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	0	0	0	0	12
41	Other ward	No	Other	1	No	No	0	0	0	0	20	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	659	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.5	
42	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	0	0	0	0	4
43	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	0	1.8	3.6	4	4
44	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	0	1.5	1.8	2.9	4.6
45	Medical	No	Other	0	No	No	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6	0	0	0	0	0
46	Surgery	No	Other	0	No	No	0	0	0	0	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0	0	0	0	0</	