ID: 98

EFFECTIVENESS OF DAILY CHLORHEXIDINE BATHING FOR REDUCING GRAM NEGATIVE INFECTIONS: A META-ANALYSIS

A Patel, ¹ P Parikh, ¹ A Deshpande, ^{1,5} JA Otter, ² P Thota, ³ CJ Donskey, ⁴ TG Fraser⁵. ¹Center for Value Based Care Research, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio, United States; ²Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom; ³Vancive Medical Technologies, an Avery Dennison business, Chicago, Illinois, United States; ⁴Department of Infectious Diseases, Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio, United States; ⁵Department of Infectious Diseases, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio, United States

10.1136/jim-2016-000120.81

Background Multiple studies have demonstrated that daily chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) bathing is associated with a significant reduction in infections caused by Gram positive pathogens. However, there is limited data on the effectiveness of daily CHG bathing on gram negative infections. The aim of this study was to determine if daily CHG bathing is effective in controlling and preventing gram negative infections in adult ICU patients.

Methods We searched MEDLINE and 3 other databases for original studies comparing daily CHG bathing to soap and water bathing. All studies investigating the effectiveness of daily CHG bathing on gram negative infections were eligible. Two investigators extracted data independently on baseline characteristics, study design, form and concentration of CHG, incidence and outcomes related to gram negative infections. Data were combined by means of a random-effects model and pooled relative risk ratios (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were derived for overall gram negative infections and individual gram negative pathogens.

Results Eleven studies (n=27,793 patients) met the inclusion criteria. Of these, 13,852 patients received daily CHG bathing, and 13,941 patients daily bathing with soap and water. Daily CHG bathing was not associated with a lower

	Experimental		Control		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Bloosdala 2007	2	11	1	27	1.3%	4.91 [0.49, 48.76]		
Carnus 2005	44	130	50	126	16.3%	0.85 (0.62, 1.18)		
Cassir 2015	22	150	43	175	12.9%	0.60 [0.37, 0.95]	-	
Clime 2013	23	3842	27	3970	11.1%	0.88 (0.51, 1.53)		
Evens 2010	25	286	26	253	11.7%	0.85 (0.50, 1.43)	-	
Gould 2006	55	1421	30	1232	13.5%	1.59 [1.03, 2.48]	-	
Mertinez-Reséndez 2014	56	327	84	351	16.7%	0.72 (0.53, 0.97)	-	
Montecalvo 2012	6	1832	21	1808	6.2%	0.28 [0.11, 0.70]		
Nato 2015	20	4488	22	4852	10.2%	0.98 [0.54, 1.80]	-	
Total (95% CII)		12487		12794	100.0%	0.84 [0.64, 1.09]	•	
Total events	253		304					
Heterogensity: Tau ² = 0.09	Chi2 = 19	44, df =	8 (P = 0.0	ME F =	59%		9.01 9.1 10 100	
Test for ownrall effect: Z = 1	31 /P = 0	191					0.01 0.1 1 10 100	

Abstract ID: 98 Figure 1

risk of gram negative infections (2.03% vs. 2.38%; RR 0.84; 95%CI: 0.64–1.09, P=.19). Subgroup analysis demonstrated that daily CHG bathing significantly reduced the risk of gram negative infections caused by Acinetobacter (RR, 0.33; 95% CI: 0.17–0.66, P<.00001) but was not effective for E. coli, Klebsiella, Enterobacter and Pseudomonas associated gram negative infections.

Conclusions In a meta-analysis of 11 studies, the use of daily CHG was not associated with a lower risk of gram negative infections. However, daily CHG bathing appears to be effective for Acinetobacter associated gram negative infections. There is a need for larger and better designed trials with adequate power with gram negative infections as the primary endpoint to determine the effectiveness of daily CHG bathing.