American Journal of Infection Control ■■ (2017) ■■-■■

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

American Journal of Infection Control

journal homepage: www.ajicjournal.org

Major Article

Assessment of test methods for evaluating effectiveness of cleaning flexible endoscopes

Rebecca E. Washburn RN, BSN, MHA *, Jennifer J. Pietsch RN, MSN

Henry Ford Health System, Detroit, MI

Key Words:
Cleaning verification
endoscope
manual cleaning verification
ATP
culture
protein

Background: Strict adherence to each step of reprocessing is imperative to removing potentially infectious agents. Multiple methods for verifying proper reprocessing exist; however, each presents challenges and limitations, and best practice within the industry has not been established. Our goal was to evaluate endoscope cleaning verification tests with particular interest in the evaluation of the manual cleaning step. The results of the cleaning verification tests were compared with microbial culturing to see if a positive cleaning verification test would be predictive of microbial growth.

Methods: This study was conducted at 2 high-volume endoscopy units within a multisite health care system. Each of the 90 endoscopes were tested for adenosine triphosphate, protein, microbial growth via agar plate, and rapid gram-negative culture via assay. The endoscopes were tested in 3 locations: the instrument channel, control knob, and elevator mechanism.

Results: This analysis showed substantial level of agreement between protein detection postmanual cleaning and protein detection post–high-level disinfection at the control head for scopes sampled sequentially.

Conclusions: This study suggests that if protein is detected postmanual cleaning, there is a significant likelihood that protein will also be detected post–high-level disinfection. It also infers that a cleaning verification test is not predictive of microbial growth.

BACKGROUND

Recent outbreaks related to contaminated endoscopes have pressed health care organizations, endoscope manufacturers, and professional organizations to reevaluate guidelines and recommendations related to the cleaning and disinfection of endoscopes and verification of those functions.[1-7] In 2015, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration issued several notifications to health care facilities regarding reprocessing of duodenoscopes.[8] The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also issued several statements, including a proposed protocol for culturing these devices for microbial contamination.[9] During this time frame the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation,[10] Society of Gastroenterology Nurses and Associates,[11] American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy,[2] and other industry standards groups also released new and revised standards for reprocessing. Finally, the manufacturers of these endoscopes (Olympus, Center Valley, PA, Pentax, Montvale, NJ, and Fujifilm, Stamford, CT) issued new and revised instructions for reprocessing, including new tools for more effective cleaning.[3] Although there is a clear need for evaluation of the effectiveness of endoscope reprocessing, health care organizations struggle with an undefined standard method of verification of readiness for use.

Strict adherence to each of the multiple steps of reprocessing is imperative to removing potentially infectious agents from the endoscope. Precleaning at the point of use, leak testing, manual cleaning, and finally high-level disinfection or liquid chemical sterilization are 4 distinct steps that can be evaluated using various methods. Steps prior to high-level disinfection must be taken to ensure soil and proteinaceous material is removed from the endoscope. Failure to do so can interfere with the disinfection and sterilization process' ability to kill or inactivate organisms and may lead to the development of biofilm. Several studies have been performed to evaluate the effectiveness of endoscope reprocessing that led to the development of cleaning verification tests for frontline clinician use.[4-6] Such methods included tests that detected organic soils in the form of adenosine triphosphate (ATP),[7] blood, protein, and carbohydrates.[12] Microbiologic culturing has also been used, but long incubation periods, the labor intensive process, and meticulous protocols have made this practice prohibitive as a method for use en masse by frontline staff reprocessing the endoscopes.

* Address correspondence to Rebecca E. Washburn, RN, BSN, MHA, Henry Ford Health System, One Ford Place, Detroit, MI 48202.
E-mail address: rwashbu1@hfhs.org (R.E. Washburn).
Conflicts of interest: None to report.

0196-6553/
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2017.11.014

The purpose of the study was to evaluate multiple point-of-use reprocessing verification tests with particular interest in the evaluation of the manual cleaning step. In addition to evaluating point-of-use tests, microbiologic culturing was also performed. The team compared results of the various verification methods at the manual cleaning and high-level disinfection steps. Furthermore, we assessed if the use of the cleaning verification tests could be incorporated into a quality assurance process in the future.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Setting

This study was conducted at 2 high-volume endoscopy units within a large, multisite health care system located in the Midwestern United States. Prior to this study, the locations were evaluated for endoscope reprocessing practices and both were found to be compliant with each manufacturers' most recent instructions for reprocessing.

Olympus flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes and duodenoscopes were tested. At each facility, 45 endoscopes were sampled (15 in storage, 15 postmanual cleaning, and 15 post–high-level disinfection using an automated endoscope reprocessor), for a total of 90 scopes. A total of 8 unique, individual duodenoscopes and a total of 25 unique, individual flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes were tested. The in-storage samples were collected at the beginning of day, before the clinic opened. The in-process samples were randomly collected as the endoscopes progressed through the reprocessing room. The endoscopes to be sampled were chosen based on availability of the staff that were collecting and samples and in a manner that did not impede patient flow. In some instances, an endoscope was sampled more than once in the event it reappeared in the course of clinic use and reprocessing. Each of the 90 endoscopes were tested for ATP, protein, microbial growth via agar plate (traditional culturing), and rapid gram-negative culture via assay. The rapid gram-negative test was only performed on the instrument channel because the test is designed only for testing via flushing. The endoscopes were tested in 3 specific locations on the endoscope itself: the instrument channel (via flushing), control knob (via swab), and elevator mechanism (for duodenoscopes only). A total of 666 samples were taken.

Sample collection

Instrument channel samples were collected via flushing with sterile water and recapturing at the distal tip. Samples of the recaptured liquid were then drawn off and tested separately for protein, ATP, gram-negative rapid culture, and microbial culture via plating. Samples were collected using aseptic technique, and steps were taken to prevent contamination.

Control knob samples were collected via swabbing around the control knob of the endoscope and testing for protein, ATP, and microbial culture via plating. The cotton swab was moistened with sterile water prior to sampling. Swabbing was performed behind the up and down angulation control knob. Three samples needed to be taken from this physical location (ATP, protein, and microbial culturing). Once a surface is swabbed, repeated swabbing in the exact location is likely to result in an inaccurate representation because the previous swab could potentially remove or wipe away any bioburden. For this reason, a different place on each endoscope's control head was sampled using a method that viewed the control knob as the face of a clock. For example, the 12 o'clock position might be used for the ATP sample, the 3 o'clock position for the protein sample, and the 6 o'clock position for the microbial culture sample.

Elevator mechanisms on duodenoscopes were swabbed and tested for protein, ATP, and microbial culture via plating. The cotton swab was moistened with sterile water prior to sampling. A single swab was used to sample this area. The area was swabbed around the elevator mechanism and while it was raised and lowered, swabbing in all 3 positions.

Assays for ATP, protein, rapid gram-negative culture, and microbiologic culturing

A total of 4 test methods were selected: ATP detection, protein detection, rapid (overnight) gram-negative bacteria test, and microbiologic culturing.

ATP

ATP testing had originally been designed for the food production industry and has been used for environmental cleaning assessment; however, researchers have determined that ATP could be detected in manually cleaned endoscopes. The ATP system from Charm Sciences (Lawrence, MA) was chosen because of its high degree of sensitivity. Its relative light unit scale is orders of magnitude higher than most other systems on the market. ATP levels of >200,000 relative light units were considered positive or inadequate for patient use per Charm Scientific's instructions for use. This brand allowed for greater granularity to the results, but it can cause confusion because the values that would trigger alerts or action levels on competing systems are well below the threshold for concern with the Charm Scientific system.

Protein

Although residual contamination can be detected by the very sensitive protein detection system (EndoCheck; Healthmark Industries, Fraser, MI) used (down to 1 μg of protein), the more likely trigger for a positive result is bodily fluids and other organic soils from the patient. Two methods were used for capturing samples for protein. For flushing the biopsy channel, 1 mL of the collected sample was drawn off and mixed with the reagent. This was then placed in a spectrophotometer (DR 1900; Hach, Loveland, CO) and read for telltale protein (340-800 nM). The second method was to swab (control head and elevator mechanism). Once a sample was collected, the swab was added to the liquid assay and a wait time of 5 minutes for protein detection elapsed. Color change of the liquid or the swab to blue-green indicated a positive result. No color change after 5 minutes was recorded as negative.

Rapid gram-negative test

The rapid gram-negative test (NOW! Test; Healthmark Industries) used has a sensitivity of <10 colony forming units of gram-negative bacteria. It uses a reagent that reacts with the enzymes produced by gram-negative bacteria. In this way, it is able to provide a rapid result. Once the fluid is recaptured from the endoscope, a growth medium is added, and the sample is incubated overnight (≥12 hours). Once the incubation period is complete, the reagent is added, and the sample is placed in a fluorometer that reflects and detects light at a set frequency indicating the presence of the enzyme produced by viable gram-negative bacteria. The reading takes 10 minutes after adding the reagent; therefore, the minimum time to a result is 12 hours. The test was used only for channel flush samples in this study.

Microbial culturing

In the case of microbial culturing (culturing services provided by Nelson Laboratories, Salt Lake City, UT), blood agar culture plates were selected. Once collected, samples were incubated for 48 hours prior to counting colonies. In the instance of 60 endoscopes that

Table 1
Comparing positive responses over stages of reprocessing

Test location	Test method	Postmanual cleaning (n = 30)	Postdisinfection (n = 30)	In storage (n = 30)	*P* value
Control head	ATP	0 (0)	1 (3)	0 (0)	>.99
	Protein	17 (57)	17 (57)	19 (63)	.893
	Microbial culture	19 (63)	1 (3)	19 (63)	<.001
Channel flush	ATP	21 (70)	12 (40)	10 (33)	.01
	Protein	11 (37)	3 (10)	10 (33)	.033
	Microbial culture	30 (100)	1 (3)*	2 (7)†	<.001

NOTE. Values are n (%) or as otherwise indicated.
ATP, adenosine triphosphate.
*n = 29.
†n = 28.

had gone completely through the cleaning and disinfection process, any growth found on plates was further analyzed to determine the species. For the 30 endoscopes that had only been cleaned, the test ended at this point and speciation was not conducted. Speciation of colonies found after cleaning was deemed as being not necessary because this is not the terminal step. In the case of culturing for microbial contamination, testing was performed for total bacteria. For positive results after storage and after disinfection, viable colonies were further analyzed to determine the species.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the κ level of agreement and Fisher exact test. Fisher exact tests were performed to assess differences in the positive rates among the 3 stages of reprocessing (postmanual cleaning, postdisinfection, and storage) for the full cohort. *P* values <.05 were considered statistically significant. Endoscopes sampled sequentially were analyzed using the κ level of agreement.

RESULTS

All methods (ATP, protein, and microbial culture) were compared with each other at each of the 3 stages of reprocessing (postmanual clean, post–high-level disinfection, and in storage). As would be expected, higher rates of ATP, protein, and microbial contamination were found postmanual cleaning compared with post–high-level disinfection. The postdisinfection stage had a significantly lower rate of microbial growth on culture than the other 2 stages (Table 1).

Twenty-three individual endoscopes were tested sequentially at the postmanual cleaning stage and then retested postdisinfection. The κ statistics were computed to assess the degree of agreement for those results. A substantial level of agreement was found in the control head location samples for protein detection postcleaning and post–high-level disinfection (Table 2). When protein was identified after manual cleaning, there was a high likelihood that it would be identified after high-level disinfection. Although this is not an unexpected finding for researchers, validation of this finding is useful as a means to remind frontline staff that an automated endoscope reprocessor does not remove soil that is left behind from the manual cleaning process.

For the total cohort of scopes included in the study, the incidence of soiling (microbial contamination) was much lower at the channel and elevator mechanism compared with the control head location. This low incidence resulted in difficulty obtaining meaningful statistics for those locations.

In the case of ATP testing around the control handle, results were often negative, even when there was observable contamination on the sample swab. Results from the recaptured water flushed through the instrument channel seemed to provide somewhat better correlation, but still did not correlate with the results of the other tests.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to identify a test method that best validated cleaning practices allowing for immediate intervention when an endoscope tests positive for a chosen marker. More broadly, the goal is to improve overall performance by reprocessing staff through gap analysis of current practice and improved training.

Each of the chosen cleaning verification methods tests for different markers of residue. Therefore, some degree of divergence in results is to be expected. Indeed, this was found to be the case.

Overall, there was very little correlation noted between any of the different validation tests. In this study, a high level of

Table 2
Assessing agreement among stages of reprocessing for scopes sampled more than once

	Cleaning to disinfection			Cleaning to storage			Disinfection	
Disinfection	Positive	Negative	Storage	Positive	Negative	Storage	Positive	Negative
Protein control head								
Positive	11	2	Positive	3	0	Positive	3	1
Negative	1	9	Negative	2	3	Negative	2	2
κ statistic	0.74			0.53			0.25	
Level of agreement	Substantial			Moderate			Fair	
Protein flush channel								
Positive	1	8	Positive	2	2	Positive	1	0
Negative	2	12	Negative	2	2	Negative	3	4
κ statistic	–0.03			0			0.25	
Level of agreement	Poor to none			Slight			Fair	
ATP flush channel								
Positive	8	8	Positive	3	1	Positive	1	1
Negative	1	6	Negative	1	3	Negative	2	4
κ statistic	0.28			0.50			0.14	
Level of agreement	Fair			Moderate			Slight	
Culture control head								
Positive	0	16	Positive	2	2	Positive	0	0
Negative	1	6	Negative	3	1	Negative	6	2
κ statistic	–0.09			–0.25			NA	
Level of agreement	Poor to none			Poor to none				

ATP, adenosine triphosphate; *NA*, not applicable.

contamination was noted after manual cleaning. Gastrointestinal endoscopes have a high level of bioburden-microbial contamination compared with other instruments because of the nature of their use. Items with higher bioburden after the cleaning step are at higher risk of sustained contamination even after high-level disinfection. Rutala and Weber,[13] Alfa et al,[14] Ofstead et al,[15] and others[16] have demonstrated similar findings of high levels of contamination after manual cleaning of endoscopes in their research. Their previous findings of significant contamination levels after cleaning were confirmed in this study.

At 1 of the 2 testing facilities, nearly 100% of the scopes were positive for both protein and microbial contamination after manual cleaning. At this facility, soil could be visually observed on the swab after sample collection. At the second facility, the incidence of contamination was approximately 50%. It was not determined why the contamination rate was different between the 2 facilities; however, the population of endoscopes and the equipment used to reprocess were considerably older at the facility experiencing the greater frequency of positive results. The age difference of the endoscopes is anecdotal information based on conversation with the managers and was included to provoke thought and future studies. This may be related to biofilm development which is beyond the scope of this study.

The rapid gram-negative test had similar results to the microbial culturing. Further studies using this technology could determine the value of this test in an enhanced reprocessing verification program.

Scopes in storage had significantly higher microbial culture rates than post–high-level disinfection. Given volume and turnover at these locations, scopes were likely not in storage >24 hours prior to the testing period. However, 24 hours is enough time to allow for growth and suggests that evaluation of reprocessing practices is a valuable addition to the process. Most of the organisms identified from the scopes in storage were associated with skin; therefore, handling the scopes without gloves was the suspected culprit.

Several study limitations existed. Testing occurred at 1 point in time during 1 day at each of the 2 locations, which resulted in a small sample size, particularly as related to the number of duodenoscopes sampled. Because testing was done at 2 large, high-volume centers, the results may not be representative of the smaller, lower-volume locations. Not all scopes were sampled sequentially. The scopes were randomly sampled as they became available in an attempt to minimize the disruption to the clinic flow. Because those endoscopes that were sampled sequentially had different results, some of them significant, future studies could benefit from performing sequential sampling of the scopes across the points of time in the reprocessing steps.

CONCLUSIONS

This study supports the concept that there is value in verification testing of the endoscope cleaning steps and that of the tests included in this study, protein is a useful marker of soil postmanual cleaning. The disinfection stage has many quality assurance checks that are used to verify the process. Currently, there are no mandated quality assurance checks within the manual cleaning process. The study showed that if a scope tested positive for protein after manual cleaning, it is very likely that it will test positive for protein after high-level disinfection. The results of this study highlighted areas where we could better examine our practice in an objective way and provide more detailed training to the staff that reprocess endoscopes. Further studies are recommended to evaluate incorporating cleaning verification into the endoscope reprocessing workflow.

Acknowledgments

We thank Healthmark Industries, Fraser, Michigan, for their contribution to this study in the form of supplies, assistance with sample collection, and interpretation of individual test results. We also thank Nelson Laboratories, Salt Lake City, Utah, for the processing and interpretation of microbial results. Neither Healthmark Industries nor Nelson Laboratories assisted with the analysis of the results. We also thank Sheri King and Christine Nagy, the managers of the units where this study was conducted, for providing work space and access to their reprocessing room, scopes, and staff to conduct this study. We also thank Stephanie Stebens for assistance with manuscript preparation.

References

1. University of Pittsburg Medical Center. UPMC investigation into GI scope-related infections changes national guidelines. Available from: http://www.upmc.com/media/NewsReleases/2014/Pages/upmc-investigation-into-gi-scope-related-Infections-changes-national-guidelines.aspx. Accessed May 31, 2017.
2. ASGE Technology Committee, Komanduri S, Abu Dayyeh BK, Bhat YM, Chauhan SS, Gottlieb KT, et al. Technologies for monitoring the quality of endoscope reprocessing. Gastrointest Endosc 2014;80:369-73.
3. US Food and Drug Administration. Duodenoscope model TJF-Q180V by Olympus: FDA safety communication—new reprocessing instructions validated. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/Safety/MedWatch/SafetyInformation/SafetyAlertsforHumanMedicalProducts/ucm440098.htm. Accessed May 31, 2017.
4. Alfa MJ, Degagne P, Olson N. Worst-case soiling levels for patient-used flexible endoscopes before and after cleaning. Am J Infect Control 1999;27:392-401.
5. Humphreys T, Kovach SM. Improving the cleaning process for flexible endoscopes. Available from: http://www.infectioncontroltoday.com/articles/2006/11/improving-the-cleaning-process-for-flexible-endos.aspx. Accessed May 31, 2017.
6. Catalone B. Microbiological surveillance of flexible endoscopes: a method for verifying reprocessing efficacy in clinical practice. Manag Infect Control 2006;6:56-60.
7. Hansen D, Benner D, Hilgenhoner M, Leisebein T, Brauksiepe A, Popp W. ATP measurement as method to monitor the quality of reprocessing flexible endoscopes. Ger Med Sci 2004;2:Doc04.
8. US Food and Drug Administration. Infections associated with reprocessed duodenoscopes. Available from: http://www.fda.gov/medicaldevices/productsandmedicalprocedures/reprocessingofreusablemedicaldevices/ucm454630.htm. Accessed May 31, 2017.
9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim duodenoscope surveillance protocol: interim protocol for healthcare facilities regarding surveillance for bacterial contamination of duodenoscopes after reprocessing. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/hai/organisms/cre/cre-duodenoscope-surveillance-protocol.html. Accessed May 31, 2017.
10. Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation, American National Standards Institute. ANSI/AAMI ST91:2015 flexible and semi-rigid endoscope processing in health care facilities. Arlington (VA): Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation; 2015.
11. Society of Gastroenterology Nurses and Associates. Standard of infection prevention in the gastroenterology setting. Chicago (IL): Society of Gastroenterology Nurses and Associates, Inc.; 2015.
12. Alfa MJ, Olson N, Degagne P, Simner PJ. Development and validation of rapid use scope test strips to determine the efficacy of manual cleaning for flexible endoscope channels. Am J Infect Control 2012;40:860-5.
13. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Gastrointestinal endoscopes: a need to shift from disinfection to sterilization? JAMA 2014;312:1405-6.
14. Alfa MJ, Olson N, DeGagne P, Jackson M. A survey of reprocessing methods, residual viable bioburden, and soil levels in patient-ready endoscopic retrograde choliangiopancreatography duodenoscopes used in Canadian centers. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2002;23:198-206.
15. Ofstead CL, Wetzler HP, Heymann OL, Johnson EA, Eiland JE, Shaw MJ. Longitudinal assessment of reprocessing effectiveness for colonoscopes and gastroscopes: results of visual inspections, biochemical markers, and microbial cultures. Am J Infect Control 2017;45:e26-33.
16. Hamed MMA, Shamseya MM, Alah IDAND, El Deen El Sawaf G. Estimation of average bioburden values on flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes after clinical use and cleaning: assessment of the efficiency of cleaning processes. Alexandria J Med 2015;51:95-103.