



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

American Journal of Infection Control

journal homepage: www.ajicjournal.org

Major article

Correlation between the growth of bacterial biofilm in flexible endoscopes and endoscope reprocessing methods



Wu Ren-Pei MD^{a,1}, Xi Hui-Jun MD^{a,1}, Qi Ke MD^a, Wang Dong MD^a, Nie Xing PhD^b, Li Zhao-Shen PhD, MD^{a,*}

^a Department of Gastroenterology, Changhai Hospital of Second Military Medical University, Shanghai, China

^b National Center for Nanoscience and Technology of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

Key Words:

Flexible endoscope
Biofilm
Endoscope reprocessing

Background: The purpose of this article was to investigate bacterial biofilm formed on endoscopes and to explore the possible correlation between endoscope reprocessing procedures and bacterial biofilm growth on endoscope channels.

Methods: Sixty-six endoscope suction and biopsy channels and 13 water and air channels were collected from 66 hospitals throughout China. Scanning electron microscopy was used to observe biofilm growth on the internal surface of these channels. Questionnaires were mailed to 66 endoscopy centers to investigate reprocessing procedures for endoscopes.

Results: Obvious biofilm growth was detected on 36 suction and biopsy channels (36/66, 54.6%) and 10 water and air channels (10/13, 76.9%). The percentage of manual cleaning in group B (n = 36, without detection of biofilms) was 92.3% (33/36), whereas it was 50.0% (15/30) in group A (n = 30, with detection of biofilms). Follow-up of group A (n = 30) showed that no biofilm was detected, whereas biofilm was detected in group B. The difference was statistically significant (P = .001). The proportion of detergent reuse in group B was 92.3% (33/36), and it was 61.5% in group A (18/30) (P = .005). The proportion of alcohol-air drying in group B was 38.9% (14/36), and it was 76.7% (23/30) in group A (P = .002).

Conclusion: The formation of endoscopic biofilm during clinical practice may be related to reuse of detergent, manual cleaning, and incomplete drying.

Copyright © 2014 by the Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc.

Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Endoscopic procedures are commonly indicated for the diagnosis and treatment of digestive diseases. In the United States, 20 million endoscopic procedures are performed annually.¹ Considering the huge population base in China, the estimated number of digestive endoscopy procedures performed per year may be much larger than that. Endoscopic procedure-related infections have been reported in China²; and the endoscopic procedure-related infection rate has been estimated at 1 in every 1.8 million procedures.¹ Endoscope reprocessing procedures in China have not received attention until recently. Because of the large population base and economic constraints in China, endoscope reprocessing is currently facing serious problems. To prevent endoscopic procedure-related infections, endoscope cleaning and disinfection is of particular importance.

* Address correspondence to Li Zhao-Shen, PhD, MD, Department of Gastroenterology, Changhai Hospital of Second Military Medical University, Shanghai 200433, China.

E-mail address: dr_lizhaoshen@126.com (L. Zhao-Shen).

Conflict of interest: None to report.

¹ These authors contributed equally to this work.

The formation of bacterial biofilms is an important source of infection because of inadequate endoscope cleaning and disinfection. Biofilms are bacterial surface-associated communities attached to solid substrata, growing into a nutrient-containing water phase and embedded in a polymer matrix produced by the bacteria.³ Biofilms are widespread and can be found on moist surfaces, including water pipes, ventilation pipes, and medical devices (eg, catheters, artificial heart valves, pacemakers, endoscope channels).⁴ Pajkos et al³ reported that biofilms were found on suction and biopsy channels and water and air channels of used endoscopes. They noted that there was still bacterial biofilms on endoscope channels even after thorough cleaning and decontamination as part of endoscope reprocessing. Endoscope channels with residual biofilms could lead to bacteria multiplying and regrowing and biofilms reforming. Contaminated endoscopes were found to cause infections in patients after endoscopic procedures.³⁻⁵ Microorganisms might be protected from disinfectants by the output of thick masses of cells and extracellular materials in biofilms. When these masses form, microbes within them will be resistant to disinfectants through various mechanisms, which may include, but

are not limited to, physical characteristics of older biofilms, genotypic variety of bacteria, microbial production of neutralizing enzymes, and physiologic gradients within the biofilms (hydrogen ion concentration). Bacteria within the biofilms are much more difficult to treat than the same bacteria in suspension,⁶ which can result in failure of the decontamination process. For these reasons, research of biofilms is of particular importance to control postendoscopic infections. In a recent study, Vickery et al⁷ found that biofilm removal detergent can effectively eliminate biofilms on endoscope channels. Ren et al also indicated that there was no significant difference in biofilm removal with different contact time of detergents, but nonenzymatic detergent could significantly reduce biofilms.⁸

To our knowledge, there is no study investigating the status of endoscope contamination of bacterial biofilms and its relationship with endoscope reprocessing procedures. Therefore, in this study, endoscope channel tubing samples collected from 66 hospitals were observed by scanning electron microscopy (SEM), and the corresponding endoscope reprocessing procedures from the 66 hospitals were surveyed to identify the correlation between bacterial biofilms and reprocessing procedures.

METHODS

Materials

Endoscopic suction and biopsy channels and water and air channels were provided by the endoscope repair centers of Olympus, Pentax, and Fujifilm in China. There were 66 suction and biopsy channels and 13 water and air channels, which were disassembled as part of the major repair of endoscopes in 66 endoscopic centers throughout China.

Collection and processing of endoscope channels

After collection, endoscope channels were immediately placed in sterile, sealed bags and then sent to the National Center for Nanoscience and Technology for SEM. All scans were finished within 12 hours of collection. One centimeter segments of endoscope channels were taken from suction and biopsy channels and water and air channels at a distance of 10 cm from the apex (portion 1), from the intermediate portion (portion 2), and at 10 cm from the push button portion at the bottom (portion 3). The sizes were 1 × 1 cm, and they were placed in sterile bags for SEM testing.

SEM

First, sample segments were fixed in sterile phosphate-buffered saline (10 mM potassium phosphate, 0.15 M sodium chloride, hydrogen ion concentration 7.0) containing 3% glutaraldehyde for 1.5 hours at room temperature and were washed with phosphate-buffered saline 3 times. Then, graded alcohol (30%, 50%, 70%, 90%, 100%) was used to dehydrate sample segments step by step; the samples were allowed to dry overnight. SEM (S-4800, HITACHI, Tokyo, Japan) was used to examine the interior surface of the sample fragments with a voltage of 10 kV. Representative images were collected for subsequent analysis.

Design of follow-up questionnaire and statistical analysis

A questionnaire with 13 questions was designed according to guidelines in China and abroad.⁹ Then, the questionnaire was sent to 66 hospitals. EpiData version 3.0 software (EpiData, Odense, Denmark) was used for data entry and management. SPSS version 10.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL) software was used for statistical analysis.

All results were categorized according to whether biofilms were detected in the individual hospitals. Fisher exact and χ^2 tests were applied. Statistical significance was set at 2-tailed $P < .05$.

RESULTS

Analysis of detection of biofilms on endoscopic suction and biopsy channels and water and air channels

SEM results from suction and biopsy channels

SEM was used to observe biofilm growth on the inner surface of suction and biopsy channels of endoscopes used in the endoscopic centers. The results are shown in Figure 1. Figure 1A (200 μm) shows that the endoscope suction and biopsy channels were completely clean without biofilm growth; Figure 1B (10.00 μm) shows that biofilm formed on the inner surface of suction and biopsy channels with a single bacteria moving freely; Figure 1C (50.0 μm) shows sheet-like biofilms covering the inner surface of endoscope suction and biopsy channels; and Figure 1D (100 μm) shows a sheet of biofilms growing on the inner surface of an endoscope suction and biopsy channel.

A total of 66 suction and biopsy channels were scanned, and 36 (54.6%) were found to have obvious biofilm growth. In some channels, biofilm grew in all 3 sites. In other channels, a large sheet of biofilms was found to grow only in the middle portion (portion 2), whereas there were little or no biofilms in portions 1 and 3.

SEM results from water and air channels

Thirteen water and air channels were observed with SEM, of which there were 10 (76.9%) with obvious biofilm structure. Other unidentified impurities on the water and air channels were also relatively common.

Results of the survey of the hospitals

The responses of the questionnaires of the 66 hospitals were collected (Table 1). The 66 hospitals were divided into 2 groups based on whether biofilms were detected on endoscopes used. Group A ($n = 30$) included hospitals without detection of biofilms on endoscopes; group B ($n = 36$) consisted of hospitals with detection of biofilms. There was no significant difference between groups A and B in endoscopic procedures performed per day ($P = .239$). The percentage of manual cleaning in group B was 92.3% (33/36) and 50.0% (15/30) in group A ($P = .001$). Eight hospitals in group A used a biofilm removal detergent, and this indicated a significant difference between the 2 groups ($P = .003$). Enzymatic detergents were used exclusively in group B. The proportion of detergent reuse in group B was 92.3% (33/36), whereas it was 61.5% (18/30) in group A ($P = .005$). The proportion of hospitals using alcohol and air drying after reprocessing in group B was 38.9% (14/36), whereas it was 76.7% (23/30) in group A ($P = .002$). The proportions of complete suctioning of all endoscope channels in groups A and B were 90.0% (27/30) and 83.3% (30/36), respectively. The proportion of hospitals using sterile water for rinsing in groups A and B was 60.0% (18/30) and 61.1% (22/36), respectively. There was no statistical difference between the 2 groups for these 2 operations ($P = .670$ and $.927$, respectively).

DISCUSSION

In this study we investigated the formation of biofilms on the channels of gastrointestinal endoscopes used in 66 gastrointestinal departments in China. For suction and biopsy channels and water and air channels scanned, the detection rates of biofilm formation were 54.6% (36/66) and 76.9% (10/13), respectively. The incidence of




Fig 1. Biofilm growth on the inner surface of suction and biopsy channels of endoscopes used clinically.

Table 1

Summary of answers to the follow-up questionnaire for endoscope reprocessing procedures in 66 hospitals

Characteristic and Recommendation	Group A (n = 30)	Group B (n = 36)	Total (N = 66)	P value
Daily surgical volume				.239
<5	70.0 (21/30)	83.3 (30/36)	78.8 (51/66)	
50-100	16.7 (5/30)	13.9 (5/36)	15.2 (10/66)	
>100	13.3 (4/30)	2.7 (1/36)	7.6 (5/66)	
Proportion of manual cleaning	50.0 (15/30)	91.7 (33/36)	72.7 (48/66)	.001
Suctioning all channel	90.0 (27/30)	83.3 (30/36)	86.4 (57/66)	.670
Use of biofilm removal detergent	26.7 (8/30)	0 (0/36)	12.1 (8/66)	.003
Repeated use of detergent	63.3 (19/30)	91.7 (33/36)	78.8 (52/66)	.005
Sterile water used to rinse	60.0 (18/30)	61.1 (22/36)	60.6 (40/66)	.927
Alcohol dry	76.7 (23/30)	38.9 (14/36)	56.0 (37/66)	.002

NOTE. Values are percentages (compliance with recommendations for reprocessing or characteristic).

biofilm formation was higher in water and air channels because these channels were very difficult to scrub with external tools (eg, endoscopic brush). In the study of Ribeiro et al, it was also mentioned that microbial contamination in water and air channels may cause endoscopic procedure-related infections.¹⁰ According to our SEM results, biofilms existed on a high proportion of water and air channels; therefore, the cleaning of water and air channels should be performed rigorously and thoroughly.

The scans of suction and biopsy channels found minimal biofilms covering the 2 apices, whereas there was obvious biofilm growth on the middle of the channels. In the subsequent survey, it was found that the endoscopic cleaning staff only scrubbed both ends of the channels without complete washing the whole channel, which may have resulted in more biofilm growth on the middle part of the channels.

Results of our questionnaire showed that the proportion of manual cleaning in hospitals with biofilm detection was as high as 92.3%, whereas it was 50% in hospitals without biofilm detection,

implying that a high rate of manual cleaning is associated with biofilm growth on endoscopes. Ofstead et al compared the decontamination steps in manual cleaning and automatic machine cleaning and found that reprocessing staff failed to complete 44.9% of the cleaning and disinfection procedure steps, whereas automatic machine cleaning could perform the operations completely.¹¹ In our study, the proportion of manual cleaning in hospitals with biofilm detection was very high, which suggested that manual cleaning operators may not follow standardized decontamination protocols strictly, resulting in biofilm formation on endoscope channels.

In endoscopes with detection of biofilm, enzymatic detergent was commonly used. A large number of studies had shown that enzymatic detergents were unable to clear the biofilms on the endoscope channels,^{7,12,13} which was consistent with our study. The proportion of reuse of detergent in hospitals with detection of biofilms was as high as 92.3%. The detergent was even repeatedly used >4 times in some hospitals. Repeated use of detergent would decrease the components of active ingredients (eg, surfactant) in the detergent; therefore, the cleaning efficiency could not be guaranteed.¹⁴ Moreover, there were serious contaminants and bacteria residual in the reused cleaning agents, and this may result in endoscope cross-contamination. The detection rate of biofilms in hospitals with completed alcohol drying was only 38.9%. Because a moist environment is favorable for multiplication of microorganisms and bacteria in biofilms, incomplete drying would provide a suitable environment for biofilm formation on the endoscope channel.¹⁵ There was no significant difference between the 2 groups in suctioning of all channels or selection of rinsing water, but these could not be excluded as potential contributors to contamination.

Limitations of the study

In this study, the questionnaire suggested a correlation between a high rate of biofilm formation on endoscopes and certain endoscope decontamination methods. Nonetheless, because this is not a randomized study, we cannot establish that these decontamination

methods are the causes for endoscopic biofilm growth. Other factors (eg, age of endoscopes, level and extents of damage in endoscopes, adequacy of reprocessing procedures), which may also contribute to biofilm growth, were not included in the questionnaire.

In conclusion, biofilm contamination of endoscopes has been found in many hospitals. Some decontamination methods cannot effectively remove biofilms inside endoscopes or on endoscope channels. Endoscope biofilm growth might be related to decontamination methods, selection and use of cleaning agents, and inadequate drying procedures. Automatic endoscope reprocessing methods can be used to avoid incomplete cleaning caused by manual cleaning procedures. Choosing biofilm removal detergents, rather than enzymatic ones, and avoiding the reuse of detergents, can lead to a more effective removal of biofilms on endoscope channels.

Acknowledgments

We thank the endoscope repair centers of Olympus, Pentax, and Fujifilm in China for providing samples of endoscope channels. We also thank Nie Xin, PhD, National Center for Nanoscience and Technology of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, for his technical support for all the SEM detection reported. We also thank all participants in the endoscopy centers of the 66 hospitals for their support.

References

- Petersen BT, Chennat J, Cohen J, Cotton PB, Greenwald DA, Kowalski TE, et al. Multisociety guideline on reprocessing flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes: 2011. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2011;73:1075-84.
- Liu-yi L. Nosocomial infection by endoscope: current situation issues and countermeasures. *Chin J Nosocomiol* 2005;15:423-5.
- Pajkos A, Vickery K, Cossart Y. Is biofilm accumulation on endoscope tubing a contributor to the failure of cleaning and decontamination? *J Hosp Infect* 2004; 58:224-9.
- Vickery K, Jacombs A, Valente P, Allan J, Deva AK. Multidrug resistant organism (MRO) biofilm infection of equipment and surfaces in an intensive care unit - implications for infection transmission. *Am J Infect Control* 2011;39:E192-3.
- Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Greenberg EP. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of persistent infections. *Science* 1999;284:1318-22.
- Mah TF, O'Toole GA. Mechanisms of biofilm resistance to antimicrobial agents. *Trends Microbiol* 2001;9:34-9.
- Vickery K, Ngo QD, Zou J, Cossart YE. The effect of multiple cycles of contamination, detergent washing, and disinfection on the development of biofilm in endoscope tubing. *Am J Infect Control* 2009;37:470-5.
- Ren W, Sheng X, Huang X, Zhi F, Cai W. Evaluation of detergents and contact time on biofilm removal from flexible endoscopes. *Am J Infect Control* 2013;41: e89-92.
- The operating technique standard of cleaning and disinfection for endoscope. 2004 ed. Chinese Ministry of Health;2004.
- Ribeiro MM, de Oliveira AC. Analysis of the air/water channels of gastrointestinal endoscopies as a risk factor for the transmission of microorganisms among patients. *Am J Infect Control* 2012;40:913-6.
- Ofstead CL, Wetzler HP, Snyder AK, Horton RA. Endoscope reprocessing methods: a prospective study on the impact of human factors and automation. *Gastroenterol Nurs* 2010;33:304-11.
- Fang Y, Shen Z, Li L, Cao Y, Gu LY, Gu Q, et al. A study of the efficacy of bacterial biofilm cleanout for gastrointestinal endoscopes. *World J Gastroenterol* 2010; 16:1019-24.
- Hadi R, Vickery K, Deva A, Charlton T. Biofilm removal by medical device cleaners: comparison of two bioreactor detection assays. *J Hosp Infect* 2010;74: 160-7.
- Society of Gastroenterology Nurses and Associates. Standards of infection control in reprocessing of flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes. *Gastroenterol Nurs* 2013;36:293-303.
- Pineau L, Villard E, Duc DL, Marchetti B. Endoscope drying/storage cabinet: interest and efficacy. *J Hosp Infect* 2008;68:59-65.