



Published in final edited form as:

*Clin Infect Dis.* 2024 August 16; 79(2): 576–577. doi:10.1093/cid/ciad777.

## Reply to Diekema et al. “Are contact precautions “essential” for the prevention of healthcare-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*?”

**Kyle J. Popovich, MD, MS,**

Department of Internal Medicine, RUSH Medical College

**Kathy Aureden, MS, MT, CIC,**

Advocate Health Care, Downers Grove, IL

**D. Cal Ham, MD, MPH,**

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA

**Anthony D. Harris, MD, MPH,**

Health Care Outcomes Research, University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

**Amanda J. Hessels, PhD, MPH, RN, CIC, CPHQ,**

Columbia University, School of Nursing, New York, NY. Hackensack Meridian Health, Edison, NJ.

**Susan S. Huang, MD, MPH,**

Division of Infectious Diseases, University of California Irvine School of Medicine, Irvine, CA

**Lisa L. Maragakis, MD, MPH,**

Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, MD

**Aaron M. Milstone, MD, MHS,**

Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

**Julia Moody, MS, CIC,**

Infection Prevention, HCA Hospital Corporation of America, Nashville, TN

**Deborah Yokoe, MD, MPH,**

Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine, San Francisco, CA

**David P. Calfee, MD, MS**

Departments of Medicine and Population Health Sciences, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY

### Dear Editor:

As the authors of the 2022 update of the SHEA/IDSA/APIC practice recommendations for prevention of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infection and

---

**Corresponding author:** David P. Calfee, MD, MS, Professor of Medicine and Population Health Sciences, Weill Cornell Medicine, 525 East 68<sup>th</sup> Street, Box 265, New York, NY 10065, dpc9003@med.cornell.edu. **Alternate corresponding author:** Kyle J. Popovich, MD, MS, RUSH Medical College, Chicago, IL, Kyle\_Popovich@rush.edu.

transmission in acute care hospitals [1], we would like to respond to the recently published Viewpoints article by Diekema and colleagues [2]. The purpose of this Letter is to highlight that there is more agreement than disagreement between the recently published practice recommendations and what Diekema et al. proposed as an alternative. For decades, the infection prevention community has debated the use of contact precautions for MRSA prevention. We agree that studies of contact precautions for MRSA prevention have come to conflicting conclusions and do not provide a definitive answer that applies to all settings. Current data suggest that contact precautions are an important component of an MRSA control program in many but not all hospitals. In some hospitals, a low prevalence of MRSA and/or successful implementation of other control strategies has reduced the incremental benefit of contact precautions to the point that the potential benefits may be outweighed by other considerations and priorities.

In recognition of these data, the updated recommendation for contact precautions differs substantially from the 2014 Compendium update [3] and current recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [4], which both call for the use of contact precautions for all patients colonized or infected with MRSA without consideration of local context and epidemiology. While the 2022 update also recommends contact precautions, it allows for their discontinuation if a thorough risk assessment has determined that this is unlikely to increase the risk of patient harm.

The *2022 Compendium of Strategies to Prevent Healthcare-Associated Infections in Acute Care Hospitals* categorizes preventive practices as either essential practices, those that should be adopted by all acute-care hospitals unless a clear and compelling rationale for an alternative approach is present, or additional approaches, those that can be considered for use in locations or patient populations where infections are not controlled after implementation of essential practices [5]. As noted by Diekema et al., contact precautions were categorized as an essential practice for prevention of MRSA transmission. The recommendation statement, however, also includes guidance for hospitals that have eliminated or that are considering elimination of contact precautions in some or all patient populations. [“A facility that chooses or has already chosen to modify the use of contact precautions for some or all of these patients should conduct a MRSA-specific risk assessment to evaluate the facility for transmission risks and to assess the effectiveness of other MRSA risk mitigation strategies (e.g., hand hygiene, cleaning and disinfection of the environment, single occupancy patient rooms) and establish a process for ongoing monitoring, oversight, and risk assessment [1].” ]

Diekema et al. state that this recommendation “blurs the distinction” between essential practices and additional approaches [2]. We categorized the recommendation as an essential practice intentionally. An additional approach is generally interpreted to be a strategy for which one can “opt-in,” with no real expectation that an individual hospital will systematically consider it for implementation. Thus, categorizing contact precautions as an additional approach could result in mass de-implementation of a practice that is currently used in a majority of US hospitals, without adequate consideration of the benefits and risks within the local context, potentially leading to avoidable patient harm. To avoid this risk, the recommendation presents contact precautions as an essential practice with

an “opt-out” strategy, with discontinuation of their use in some or all patients only after thoughtful consideration of risks and benefits within the context of the individual hospital (e.g., current MRSA epidemiology in the facility and various patient populations, adherence to horizontal infection prevention measures such as hand hygiene and equipment and environment disinfection, proportion of multi-bedded versus single-patient rooms, use of additional approaches (e.g., universal decolonization of adult ICU patients)).

The Compendium’s recommendation for contact precautions is not dissimilar to that of the recently proposed “precision-based approach” to contact precautions for endemic pathogens that accounts for facility, infection prevention, host, and pathogen-related factors [6] and that was supported by Diekema and colleagues. The challenge is to get there as safely as possible. The 2022 Compendium provides recommendations and strategies for the use of contact precautions for MRSA that account for the diversity in epidemiology and risk that exists among and within hospitals.

## References:

1. Popovich KJ, Aureden K, Ham DC, et al. SHEA/IDSA/APIC practice recommendation: strategies to prevent methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* transmission and infection in acute care hospitals: 2022 update. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2023;44:1039–1067. [PubMed: 37381690]
2. Diekema DJ, Nori P, Stevens MP, et al. Are contact precautions “essential” for the prevention of healthcare-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*? *Clin Infect Dis* 2023 Sep 21:ciad571. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciad571. Epub ahead of print.
3. Calfee DP, Salgado CD, Milstone AM, et al. Strategies to prevent methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* transmission and infection in acute care hospitals: 2014 update. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;35:772–796. [PubMed: 24915205]
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA): preventing infections in healthcare. <https://www.cdc.gov/mrsa/healthcare/inpatient.html> Accessed October 21, 2023
5. Yokoe DS, Advani SD, Anderson DJ, et al. Introduction to A Compendium of Strategies to Prevent Healthcare- Associated Infections In Acute-Care Hospitals: 2022 Updates. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2023;44:1533–1539. [PubMed: 37855077]
6. Bearman GM, Harris AD, Tacconelli E. Contact precautions for the control of endemic pathogens: finding the middle path. *Antimicrob Steward Healthc Epidemiol* 2023;3(1):e57 [PubMed: 37008747]