TWO-YEAR STUDY TO EVALUATE Daily Endotracheal Tube (ETT) Cleaning Protocol

STUDY TYPE:

Abstract

FIRST AUTHOR:

Brian Wicker, RRT | McLaren Lapeer Region | Lapeer, Michigan CO-AUTHORS:

Gary Salem, DO, FHM | McLaren Lapeer Region | Lapeer, Michigan Linda Schofield, RN, PhD | Northern Michigan Hospital | Petoskey, Michigan Jori Poland, RRT | McLaren Northern Michigan | Petoskey, Michigan Jacqueline Phillips, RRT | McLaren Macomb | Mt. Clemens, Michigan Tracy Williams, RRT | McLaren Flint | Flint, Michigan Chris Babcock, RRT | McLaren Port Huron | Port Huron, Michigan Renee Czerwinski, RRT | McLaren Oakland | Pontiac, Michigan Patty D'Valentine, RRT | McLaren Greater Lansing | Lansing, Michigan



INTRODUCTION/HYPOTHESIS

McLaren Health Care (MHC), Grand Blanc, Michigan, is a fully integrated health network committed to quality evidence-based patient care and cost efficiency. MHC and its 10 hospitals initiated a two year ICU project that included CUSP 4 MVP-VAP (CUSP), a national collaborative quality improvement project funded through the Agency for Healthcare Research

and Quality and a daily endotracheal tube (ETT) cleaning protocol using the endOclear[®] Restore[™] (ECR) device. The purpose of the ICU project was to improve care for mechanically ventilated (MV) patients as measured by objective outcome measurements (OOMs) and evaluate the benefits of daily ETT cleaning.

The purpose of this study was to compare the OOMs with hospitals enrolled in Cohort 2 of the CUSP project. Cohort 2 consisted of 52 hospitals (74 ICUs) in 16 states. As part of CUSP, the project advocated three main interventions to improve care for MV patients: Daily Care Processes (DCPs), Early Mobility and Low Tidal Volume Ventilation. MHC added cleaning the ETT prior to the weaning trials using the ECR as part of the DCPs. The ECR is a sterile, single use, mechanically operated wiper.

METHODS

This study is an IRB exempt, observational, retrospective, multiple centered study to evaluate the outcomes of daily ETT cleaning of patients on MV >24 hours. The primary endpoints are average duration of MV and average hospital length of stay. An independent sample t-test was used to compare the means of the independent variables for both endpoints. Alpha of 0.05 was used and data is mean ±SD.



RESULTS

The 19 month average duration of mechanical ventilation for Cohort 2 (minus MHC) was 4.8 ± 0.4 days (n=57,761/11,915) per subject compared to MHC at 3.7 ± 0.3 days (n=24,320/6,525) per subject resulting in a difference of 1.1 ± 0.3 days (p<0.01). During the same 19 month period, the average hospital length of stay for Cohort 2 (minus MHC) was 10.2 ± 0.7 days (n=122,591/11,915) per subject compared to MHC at 9.4 ± 0.7 day (n=61,047/6,525) per subject resulting in a difference 0.8 ± 0.7 days (p<0.01).

CONCLUSION

All of the hospitals in Cohort 2 implemented evidence-based best practices for the MV patients. MHC added daily cleaning of the ETT as part of their DCPs and was able to demonstrate that the removal of adherent ETT secretions with the use of the ECR device prior to weaning trials improves objective outcome measures and can lead to earlier liberation from MV, reduced hospital length of stays and potential cost savings.





Nine (9) hospitals in the McLaren IDN (part of Cohort 2, comprising 52 hospitals and 18,626 patients) added daily ETT cleaning with the endOclear Restore prior to the SBT as part of the Daily Care Processes.

REFERENCES

- 1. AHRQ Safety Program for Mechanically Ventilated Patients, AHRQ Publication No. 16(17)-0018-1-EF January 2017.
- Carson SS, Cox CE, Homes GM, et al. The changing epidemiology of mechanical ventilation: a population-based study. J Intensive Care Med. 2006;21(3):173-82.
- Klompas M, Khan Y, Kleinman K, et al. Multicenter evaluation of a novel surveillance paradigm for complications of mechanical ventilation. PLoS ONE. 2011 Mar 22;6(3):e18062.
- Klein Klouwenberg PM, van Mourik MS, Ong DS, et al. Electronic implementation of a novel surveillance paradigm for ventilatorassociated events: feasibility and validation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2014 Apr 15;189(8):947-55.
- Safdar N, Dezfullian C, Collard HR, et al. Clinical and economic consequences of ventilator-associated pneumonia: a systematic review. Crit Care Med. 2005; 33(10):2184-93.
- Wunsch H, Linde-Zwirble WT, Angus DC, et al. The epidemiology of mechanical ventilation use in the United States. Crit Care Med. 2010; 38(10):1947-53.
- Berenholtz SM, Pham JC, Thompson DA, et al. Collaborative cohort study of an intervention to reduce ventilator associated pneumonia in the ICU. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2011;32(4):305-14.
- Lipitz-Snyderman A, Steinwachs D, Needham DM, et al. Impact of a statewide intensive care unit quality improvement initiative on hospital mortality and length of stay: retrospective comparative analysis. BMJ. 2011;342:d219.
- Klompas M, Kleinman K, Murphy MV. Descriptive epidemiology and attributable morbidity of ventilator-associated events. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2014;35(5):502-10.
- Sexton JB, Berenholtz SM, Goeschel CA, et al. Assessing and improving safety climate in a large cohort of intensive care units. Crit Care Medicine. 2011;39(5):934-9.
- Waters HR, Korn R Jr, Colantuoni E, et al. The business case for quality: economic analysis of the Michigan Keystone Patient Safety Program in ICUs. Am J Med Qual 2011;26(5):333-9.
- Klompas M, Anderson D, Trick W, et al. The Preventability of Ventilator-Associated Events: The CDC Prevention Epicenters' Wake Up and Breathe Collaborative. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2015 Feb 1;191(3):292-301.
- Lellouche F, Lipes J. Prophylactic protective ventilation: lower tidal volumes for all critically ill patients? Intensive Care Med. 2013;39(1), 6-15.
- Klompas M, Branson R, Eichenwald EC, et al. Strategies to prevent ventilator- associated pneumonia in acute care hospitals: 2014 update. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2014;35(8):915-36.
- 15. Balas MC, Burke WJ, Gannon D, et al. Implementing the awakening and breathing coordination, delirium monitoring/management, and early exercise/mobility bundle into everyday care: opportunities, challenges, and lessons learned for implementing the ICU Pain, Agitation, and Delirium Guidelines. Crit Care Med. 2013;41(9):S116- 27.

