



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

American Journal of Infection Control

journal homepage: www.ajicjournal.org

Major Article

Duodenoscope hang time does not correlate with risk of bacterial contamination



Riley Heroux^a, Michelle Sheppard MSN, RN, DNPc^a, Sharon B. Wright MD, MPH^{a,b}, Mandeep Sawhney MBBS, MS^{a,b}, Elizabeth B. Hirsch PharmD^{a,c}, Robin Kalaidjian RN^a, Graham M. Snyder MD, SM^{a,b,*}

^a Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA^b Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA^c Northeastern University, Boston, MA

Key Words:

ERCP
Endoscope
Environmental contamination
Disinfection

Background: Current professional guidelines recommend a maximum hang time for reprocessed duodenoscopes of 5–14 days. We sought to study the association between hang time and risk of duodenoscope contamination.

Methods: We analyzed cultures of the elevator mechanism and working channel collected in a highly standardized fashion just before duodenoscope use. Hang time was calculated as the time from reprocessing to duodenoscope sampling. The relationship between hang time and duodenoscope contamination was estimated using a calculated correlation coefficient between hang time in days and degree of contamination on the elevator mechanism and working channel.

Results: The 18 study duodenoscopes were cultured 531 times, including 465 (87.6%) in the analysis dataset. Hang time ranged from 0.07–39.93 days, including 34 (7.3%) with hang time ≥ 7.00 days. Twelve cultures (2.6%) demonstrated elevator mechanism and/or working channel contamination. The correlation coefficients for hang time and degree of duodenoscope contamination were very small and not statistically significant (-0.0090 [$P = .85$] for elevator mechanism and -0.0002 [$P = 1.00$] for working channel). Odds ratios for hang time (dichotomized at ≥ 7.00 days) and elevator mechanism and/or working channel contamination were not significant.

Conclusions: We did not find a significant association between hang time and risk of duodenoscope contamination. Future guidelines should consider a recommendation of no limit for hang time.

© 2017 Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Recent outbreaks of infections due to multidrug-resistant bacterial pathogens associated with contaminated endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) duodenoscopes have intensified interest in practices that mitigate the risk of duodenoscope contamination. These outbreaks have been described with and without evidence of a lapse in reprocessing techniques, and in some cases have prompted empirical use of ethylene oxide (ETO) gas sterilization.^{1,2} Parts of the duodenoscope are difficult to access for cleaning and disinfection, including removal of biofilm. The inher-

ent design of these devices has been proposed as a possible mechanism for persistent contamination, and thus growth while the duodenoscope is stored following reprocessing.³ Therefore, an important aspect of managing duodenoscope reprocessing that has been subject to debate is the hang time (also known as shelf life), or the duration of time between duodenoscope reprocessing and use.

Current guidelines recommend reprocessing ERCP duodenoscopes if not used (ie, hang time) within 5–14 days.^{4,5} However, uncertainty in this duration has been acknowledged, and the possibility cannot be excluded that there is no additional growth for hang times exceeding this duration.⁶ A recent systematic review identified 10 studies investigating hang time for flexible endoscopes, with no change in the rate of contamination over the hang time duration studied (at least 2–7 days, including up to 56 days).⁷ The 4 studies specifically investigating duodenoscopes included a total of 19 duodenoscopes and 88 samples.^{7–10} However, hang time only exceeded 7 days in a single of these studies.¹⁰ Available data

* Address correspondence to Graham M. Snyder, MD, SM, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, 330 Brookline Ave, Mailstop SL-435, Boston, MA 02215.

E-mail address: gsnyder@bidmc.harvard.edu (G.M. Snyder).

Funded in part by an investigator-initiated grant from the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (MS, EBH, and GMS) and with support from the study institution.

Conflicts of interest: None to report.

investigating markedly longer hang times among duodenoscopes and other endoscopes demonstrate a low to zero rate of culture positivity, although for a limited sample size.^{11,12}

In this study, we sought to characterize the risk of bacterial contamination among ERCP duodenoscopes, particularly with a hang time longer than 5–14 days.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study setting

This study was undertaken as a secondary analysis of data collected during the DISINFECTS study (Duodenoscope Infection Surveillance IN Functioning automated Endoscope reprocessors in Conjunction with ethylene oxide Sterilization; NCT02611648), which was reviewed and approved by the institutional review board of the study institution. The study was conducted at a tertiary care center performing approximately 1,500 ERCP procedures annually. Briefly, the DISINFECTS study was a prospective, randomized trial investigating 3 methods of reprocessing ERCP duodenoscopes: standard high-level disinfection (sHLD), sHLD with a repeated (double) cycle of disinfectant exposure (dHLD), and sHLD followed by ETO gas sterilization (sHLD/ETO).¹³ During the study, the 18 ERCP duodenoscopes were assigned to a reprocessing arm for the duration of the study (sHLD, dHLD, or HLD/ETO in a 5:5:8 ratio) and were selected using a block randomization scheme for clinical use in a procedure when the need for an ERCP duodenoscope was anticipated. All 18 ERCP duodenoscopes were the same model and manufacturer (model TJF-Q180V; Olympus, Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan), of which 7 (38.9%) were purchased shortly before study initiation (ie, 2015; new duodenoscopes) and 11 (61.1%) were previously acquired during 2012 (in-service duodenoscopes).

ERCP duodenoscopes were cultured in a highly standardized fashion after reprocessing and before anticipated use, including a swab sample of the elevator mechanism and a flush-brush-flush sampling of the working channel. ERCP duodenoscopes not used within 1 calendar day subsequent to culture or not used during the procedure were sent for reprocessing. During the study investigators selected, when feasible, a duodenoscope for culturing and use that was least recently reprocessed, resulting in an asymmetric distribution of hang time ≥ 7 days and < 7 days. Otherwise, the hang time of a duodenoscope was not influenced by observable factors and occurred in an as-practiced or stochastic fashion.

ERCP duodenoscope reprocessing and microbiologic methods

Immediately following the completion of each procedure, ERCP duodenoscopes received a manual wipe of the exterior and a flush of the working channel with enzymatic solution (EmPower; Metrex, Orange, CA). Manual reprocessing then took place within 1 hour of procedure completion consistent with the manufacturer's guidelines for use, and included the use of a brush specific to the elevator mechanism as well as manual wire brush cleaning of the working channel.¹⁴ Reprocessing was completed using automated endoscope reprocessors (System 83 Plus 9; Custom Ultrasonics, Ivyland, PA) with orthophthalaldehyde (MetriCide OPA Plus; Metrex) disinfectant followed by flushing with alcohol and then compressed air. ERCP duodenoscopes are hung vertically for drying in a cabinet without circulated or ventilated air. ETO gas sterilization was performed with a Steri-Vac Sterilizer/Aerator (3M, Maplewood, MN). Dedicated cleaning technicians and specialty nurses are trained in the process according to the manufacturer's instructions for use, with periodic competency re-evaluations.

The culturing process was adapted from the procedure recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and included the sampling of the working channel and elevator

mechanism.¹⁵ Sampling was performed with the researcher wearing bouffant cap, face mask with shield, sterile gown, and sterile gloves over a field prepped with a sterile surgical drape. A dry flocced swab (ESwab with liquid Amies media; Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA) was used to sample under the elevator, the top and the bottom of the elevator, and over the face of the duodenoscope tip, using a swirling motion. The working channel was sampled using sterile water and a sterile wire brush in a flush-brush-flush method: the channel was flushed with a standardized volume of sterile water; a sterile channel brush was inserted the entire length of the duodenoscope, removed, and the brush tip was agitated in the collected sterile water for 10 seconds; and finally a second standardized volume of sterile water was flushed through the duodenoscope and collected with the first flush and brush-agitated specimen. After sampling, air was forced through the scope to promote drying.

Elevator mechanism and working channel specimens were processed in the study laboratory directly after collection or after refrigeration (at temperatures 2°C–8°C) in transport media or phosphate-buffered solution for no more than 72 hours.¹⁶ Elevator mechanism swabs were vortexed in transport media and the subsequent virtual pellet was plated and incubated aerobically on Mueller-Hinton agar plates. Working channel samples were vortexed and a pellet was withdrawn twice in sequence and then plated to Mueller-Hinton agar. Bacterial growth (in colony forming units) was quantified after overnight incubation.

Statistical analysis

The exposure of interest in this analysis was hang time, defined as the duration of time in days between ERCP duodenoscope reprocessing and sampling of elevator mechanism and working channel for culture. Observations with incomplete data or observations following procedures in which the duodenoscope did not have patient contact (eg, would not be at risk for contamination from the gastrointestinal tract) were excluded. Hang time was dichotomized at the commonly used and guideline-commensurate cutoff of < 7.00 days and ≥ 7.00 days. Exact reprocessing times were not available at our institution; therefore, we estimated the start of hang time using the preceding procedure end date and time, because the time elapsed between procedure end and reprocessing (within 1 hour) and time to complete reprocessing was short and relatively fixed.

The primary outcome was the relationship between hang time and risk of bacterial contamination, calculated as a correlation coefficient between hang time and colony forming units, for each elevator mechanism and working channel in serial. Additionally, we characterized the relationship between a dichotomized exposure (hang time ≥ 7.00 days) and outcome (significant contamination, defined as the presence of ≥ 10 CFU aerobic bacterial growth on either the elevator mechanism or working channel¹⁷) by calculating an odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence intervals and *P* values using logistic regression. Because the probability of persistent contamination may differ based on the sampled location on the duodenoscope, an OR was also calculated for the relationship between hang time ≥ 7 days and elevator mechanism and working channel contamination, respectively. Additionally, we hypothesized that duodenoscope age (new vs in-service duodenoscopes) may serve as an effect modifier of the relationship between hang time and duodenoscope contamination. Therefore, we calculated stratified OR among cultures performed on previously owned versus newly purchased duodenoscopes. We also hypothesized that study arm (dHLD and HLD/ETO, compared with sHLD) may confound the relationship between hang time and duodenoscope contamination, and we therefore calculated an adjusted OR for hang time in a multivariable logistic regression that included study arm. *P* values $< .05$ were considered significant. Analyses were performed using STATA version 12.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

Among 541 opportunities for ERCP duodenoscope use during the study, 531 (98.2%) were cultured before the procedure. For 66 of these 531 events (12.4%), hang time could not be analyzed for various reasons, including that the duodenoscope was reprocessed without having patient contact ($n = 41$; 7.7%), the culture was the first culture during the study period for a given duodenoscope and therefore without available preceding hang time information ($n = 18$; 3.4%), culture time data were incomplete ($n = 4$; 0.8%), and procedure time data were incomplete ($n = 3$; 0.6%). Therefore, the analysis set comprised 465 observations.

The hang time ranged from 0.07-39.93 days, with a median hang time of 1.96 days (interquartile range [IQR], 0.89-3.98 days). Forty-five (9.7%) observations demonstrated any growth (>0 CFU) on the elevator mechanism and 54 (11.6%) had any growth on the working channel. Among observations with any growth, the median (IQR) colony forming units on the elevator mechanism was 2 CFU (IQR, 1-20 CFU) (maximum, 7,352 CFU) and for the working channel was 1 CFU (IQR, 1-3 CFU) (maximum, 4,512 CFU).

Figures 1 and 2 demonstrate the distribution of colony forming units on the elevator mechanism and working channel in relationship to the hang time. The correlation coefficients for hang time and elevator mechanism (-0.0090) and hang time and working channel (-0.0002) were not statistically significant ($P = .85$ and $P = 1.00$, respectively).

Table 1 demonstrates the frequency of significant contamination of the elevator mechanism, working channel, or either the elevator mechanism or working channel for individual ERCP duodenoscopes. Among all culture events, 19 (4.1%) met the secondary outcome of significant contamination (≥ 10 CFU) on either the elevator mechanism or working channel, including 2 (0.4%) demonstrating significant contamination on both the elevator mechanism and working channel. Twelve (2.6%) cultures identified an elevator mechanism that was significantly contaminated and 9 (1.9%) cultures identified a working channel that was significantly contaminated.

A total of 34 (7.3%) observations had a hang time ≥ 7.00 days, of which 2 (5.9%) demonstrated significant contamination (≥ 10 CFU) of either the elevator mechanism or working channel. Among the 431 duodenoscope samples with a hang time < 7.00 days, 17 (3.9%) demonstrated significant contamination. A hang time of ≥ 7.00 days was associated with a nonsignificant 1.52 times higher odds (95% confidence interval, 0.34-6.88) of duodenoscope contamination (≥ 10 CFU) of either the elevator mechanism or working channel among duodenoscopes than those with a hang time < 7.00 days ($P = .59$).

The findings of additional analyses are presented in Table 2. There was a nonsignificant relationship between hang time and significant contamination of the elevator mechanism, and between hang time and significant contamination of the working channel. Among new duodenoscopes, there were no outcome events among the 12 observations with a hang time ≥ 7.00 days; therefore, an OR could not be calculated for this stratum. Among in-service duodenoscopes, there was a nonsignificant relationship between hang time and significant contamination of either the elevator mechanism or working channel (Table 2). When adjusted for study arm, the relationship between hang time and significant duodenoscope contamination remained nonsignificant; compared with sHLD, the intervention arms (dHLD and HLD/ETO) demonstrated a nonsignificant association with significant contamination.

DISCUSSION

In this analysis of ERCP duodenoscope contamination of the elevator mechanism and/or working channel following a wide range of hang times following reprocessing, we did not identify a significant relationship between hang time and the probability of contamination with aerobic bacteria. A significant relationship between hang time and probability of contamination could not be demonstrated with various analytic strategies, including when considering whether the duodenoscope had been used for several years or was newly acquired, and when considering 3 different strategies for automated reprocessing.




Fig 1. The distribution of elevator mechanism contamination (colony forming units, log-transformed) as a function of hang time (days) for duodenoscope sampling events. The vertical dashed line represents a hang time of 7 days and the horizontal dotted line represents an elevator mechanism contamination of 10 CFU.




Fig 2. The distribution of working channel contamination (colony forming units, log-transformed) as a function of hang time (days) for duodenoscope sampling events. The vertical dashed line represents a hang time of 7 days and the horizontal dotted line represents an elevator mechanism contamination of 10 CFU.

Table 1

Frequency of significant contamination of the elevator mechanism, working channel, or either the elevator mechanism or working channel for individual duodenoscopes

Duodenoscope	Number of observations	In-service (vs newly purchased)	Study arm	Number (%) of observations with significant contamination		
				Elevator mechanism	Working channel	Elevator mechanism or working channel
A	36	No	dHLD	1 (2.8)	1 (2.8)	2 (5.6)
B	17	No	HLD/ETO	1 (5.9)	0	1 (5.9)
C	19	No	HLD/ETO	1 (5.3)	1 (5.3)	2 (10.5)
D	41	No	sHLD	0	0	0
E	31	No	sHLD	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)
F	24	No	HLD/ETO	2 (8.3)	0	2 (8.3)
G	17	Yes	HLD/ETO	0	2 (11.8)	2 (11.8)
H	36	Yes	sHLD	1 (2.8)	0	1 (2.8)
I	14	Yes	sHLD	1 (7.1)	0	1 (7.1)
J	22	Yes	HLD/ETO	1 (4.6)	0	1 (4.6)
K	38	Yes	sHLD	1 (2.6)	0	1 (2.6)
L	18	Yes	HLD/ETO	0	0	0
M	27	Yes	dHLD	0	1 (3.7)	1 (3.7)
N	13	Yes	HLD/ETO	0	1 (7.7)	1 (7.7)
O	26	Yes	dHLD	0	0	0
P	18	Yes	HLD/ETO	0	0	0
Q	31	Yes	dHLD	2 (6.5)	1 (3.2)	2 (6.5)
R	37	No	dHLD	0	1 (2.7)	1 (2.7)
Total	465	—	—	12 (2.6)	9 (1.9)	19 (4.1)

NOTE. Significant contamination was considered growth of aerobic bacteria on overnight incubation of ≥ 10 CFU. Duodenoscopes considered in-service were purchased in 2012; newly purchases duodenoscopes first entered use shortly before study initiation.

dHLD, double high-level disinfection; HLD/ETO, standard high-level disinfection followed by ethylene oxide gas sterilization; sHLD, standard high-level disinfection.

These findings help to fill an important information gap in recommendations regarding duodenoscope reprocessing, and suggest that maximum hang time recommendations (within the studied durations [approximately 1-2 months]) are unnecessary. The focus on mitigating the risk of contamination, therefore, may turn to other aspects of duodenoscope reprocessing. In particular, the reasons for contamination are important to elucidate. Although emphasis has been placed on the consistent and thorough performance of the manual steps of reprocessing, biofilm in protected areas of the duodenoscope that is refractory to manual cleaning and automated reprocessing may be an important factor in the risk of contamination.¹⁸⁻²⁰ Although nonsignificant, the trend observed on stratified analysis of in-service duodenoscopes (3 years of contin-

uous use) might support the hypothesis that over time duodenoscopes become susceptible to contamination by way of biofilm formation. We hypothesize that if hang time does not relate to the probability of contamination in a nonventilated cabinet (as was the case in our study), the addition of a ventilated drying storage cabinet to appropriately store dried reprocessed duodenoscopes will not afford additional benefit.²¹ However, the potential benefit of ventilated or circulated air storage conditions merits further study. Additionally, health care worker handling of duodenoscopes post-processing is an understudied aspect of duodenoscope contamination warranting further investigation.

There are several possible limitations to this study. The sampling method for aerobic bacteria may be insensitive to detect

Table 2

The relationship between hang time ≥ 7 days and significant duodenoscope contamination of either the elevator mechanism or working channel, including stratified and adjusted logistic regression analyses

Model	Odds ratio (95% confidence interval), hang time ≥ 7 d	P value
Unadjusted model: Elevator mechanism or working channel contamination outcome	1.54 (0.34-6.98)	.57
Secondary analysis: Elevator mechanism contamination outcome	1.16 (0.14-9.24)	.89
Secondary analysis: Working channel contamination outcome	1.60 (0.19-13.20)	.66
Stratified analysis: In-service duodenoscopes	2.88 (0.57-14.46)	.20
Adjusted model: Elevator mechanism or working channel contamination outcome*	1.29 (0.28-5.95)	.74

NOTE. Significant contamination was considered growth of aerobic bacteria on overnight incubation of ≥ 10 CFU. Duodenoscopes considered in-service were purchased in 2012.

*Multivariable model included hang time and study arm. Odds ratio (OR) (95% confidence interval [CI]) and P values for study arms, with standard high-level disinfection arm as reference: double high-level disinfection, OR, 1.54; 95% CI, 0.43-5.58; $P = .51$, and standard high-level disinfection followed by ethylene oxide gas sterilization: OR, 2.47; 95% CI, 0.74-8.27; $P = .14$.

contamination, and would not necessarily detect contamination with anaerobic bacteria, mycobacteria, and fungi. However, our approach was pragmatic and comparable to the surveillance strategy recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.¹⁵ Our duration of hang time likely overestimated the true hang time by approximately 1-2 hours (0.04-0.08 days) because we estimated reprocessing time based on the end of the procedure time. Although imprecision regarding this estimate may have been variable due to the delay postprocedure in starting reprocessing and the time it took to reprocess duodenoscopes, at our institution variability in these durations are relatively fixed and the contribution to misestimation (a fraction of a day) was likely too small to affect the overall findings. Because duodenoscopes were only cultured shortly before use, we cannot exclude the possibility that contamination occurred at any time point from the time reprocessing was complete to the time of culture. However, this would require serial cultures over time of the same duodenoscope postreprocessing, an intensive effort that would have made our large sample size difficult to achieve. Lastly, for the dichotomized exposure/outcome analyses the effect estimates suggested a positive although non-significant correlation between hang time and duodenoscope contamination. With no prior estimates of this correlation, we are unable to calculate a sample size for the study. However, assuming a 2-sided type 1 error rate of 5%, power of 90%, and contamination rates of 6% versus 4% in the long and short hang time arms, respectively, a study of $>2,500$ culture events in each arm would be required to demonstrate a statistically significant difference in the contamination rates.

CONCLUSIONS

In a large dataset of rigorously collected elevator mechanism and working channel cultures, hang time for ERCP duodenoscopes did not significantly correlate with the probability of duodenoscope contamination with aerobic bacteria. Hang times for duodenoscopes exceeding 7 days may present a negligible additional risk of duodenoscope contamination.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the entire DISINFECTS study team and the staff of the Stoneman 4 Advanced Endoscopy Unit for their work on and support of the project.

References

- Epstein L, Hunter JC, Arwady MA, Tsai V, Stein L, Gribogiannis M, et al. New Delhi metallo-beta-lactamase-producing carbapenem-resistant *Escherichia coli* associated with exposure to duodenoscopes. *JAMA* 2014;312:1447-55.
- Smith ZL, Oh YS, Saeian K, Edmiston CE Jr, Khan AH, Massey BT, et al. Transmission of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae during ERCP: time to revisit the current reprocessing guidelines. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;81:1041-5.
- Verfaillie CJ, Bruno MJ, Voor in 't Holt AF, Buijs JG, Poley JW, Loeve AJ. Withdrawal of a novel-design duodenoscope ends outbreak of a VIM-2-producing *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Endoscopy* 2015;47:502. Epub ahead of print.
- ASGE Quality Assurance In Endoscopy Committee, Petersen BT, Chennat J, Cohen J, Cotton PB, Greenwald DA, et al. Multisociety guideline on reprocessing flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes: 2011. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2011;73:1075-84.
- Society of Gastroenterology Nurses and Associates. Standards of Infection Prevention in Reprocessing of Flexible Gastrointestinal Endoscopes. 2016. Available from: <https://www.sgna.org/Education/Standards-Practice-Guidelines>. Accessed March 16, 2016.
- Burlingame B, Denholm B, Link T, Ogg MJ, Spruce L, Spry C, et al. Guideline for processing flexible endoscopes. Available from: <http://www.aornstandards.org/content/1/SEC33.body?sid=db0fbf23-247b-4292-8bb1-45f2c2d5d44f>. Accessed November 30, 2016.
- Schmelzer M, Daniels G, Hough H. Safe storage time for reprocessed flexible endoscopes: a systematic review. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep* 2015;13:187-243.
- Alfa MJ, Sepehri S, Olson N, Wald A. Establishing a clinically relevant bioburden benchmark: a quality indicator for adequate reprocessing and storage of flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes. *Am J Infect Control* 2012;40:233-6.
- Grandval P, Hautefeuille G, Marchetti B, Pineau L, Laugier R. Evaluation of a storage cabinet for heat-sensitive endoscopes in a clinical setting. *J Hosp Infect* 2013;84:71-6.
- Brock AS, Steed LL, Freeman J, Garry B, Malpas P, Cotton P. Endoscope storage time: assessment of microbial colonization up to 21 days after reprocessing. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;81:1150-4.
- Scanlon P, Flaherty K, Reilly E, Barth EG, Potter-Bynoe G, Cardini J, et al. Association between storage interval and contamination of reprocessed flexible endoscopes in pediatric gastrointestinal procedural unit. Paper presented at: IDWeek 2014; 10/11/2014; Philadelphia, PA, U.S.A., 2014.
- Ingram J, Gaines P, Kite R, Morgan M, Spurling S, Winsett RP. Evaluation of medically significant bacteria in colonoscopes after 8 weeks of shelf life in open air storage. *Gastroenterol Nurs* 2013;36:106-11.
- Snyder GMWS, Smithey A, Mizrahi M, Sheppard M, Hirsch EB, Sawhney M. Prospective randomized trial comparing three duodenoscope high-level disinfection and sterilization procedures. Paper presented at: Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America Spring 2016 Conference; May 18, 2016; Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A., 2016.
- Olympus. TJF-Q180V Reprocessing Manual. 2015. Available from: https://medical.olympusamerica.com/sites/default/files/pdf/TJF-Q180V_Reprocessing_Manual.pdf. Accessed November 11, 2016.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim Duodenoscope Culture Method. 2015. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/hai/settings/lab/lab-duodenoscope-culture-method.html>. Accessed March 31, 2015.
- Chen ALB, Wright SB, Yassa DS, Snyder GM, Hirsch EB. Delayed processing of simulated duodenoscope and patient cultures yields viable bacteria. In: Society for healthcare epidemiology of America Spring 2016 conference; May 18, 2016. Atlanta (GA): 2016.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim Duodenoscope Surveillance Protocol. 2015. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/hai/organisms/cre/cre-duodenoscope-surveillance-protocol.html>. Accessed March 31, 2015.
- Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Gastrointestinal endoscopes: a need to shift from disinfection to sterilization? *JAMA* 2014;312:1405-6.
- Ren-Pei W, Hui-Jun X, Ke Q, Dong W, Xing N, Zhao-Shen L. Correlation between the growth of bacterial biofilm in flexible endoscopes and endoscope reprocessing methods. *Am J Infect Control* 2014;42:1203-6.
- Neves MS, da Silva MG, Ventura GM, Cortes PB, Duarte RS, de Souza HS. Effectiveness of current disinfection procedures against biofilm on contaminated GI endoscopes. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;83:944-53.
- Pineau L, Villard E, Duc DL, Marchetti B. Endoscope drying/storage cabinet: interest and efficacy. *J Hosp Infect* 2008;68:59-65.