International Journal of Applied Research 2016; 2(6): 303-306

ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2016; 2(6): 303-306
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 12-04-2016
Accepted: 13-05-2016

Ghanshyam Biswas
Department of Medical oncology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha O Anusandhan University, K 8, Kalinga Nagar, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Soumya Surath Panda
Department of Medical oncology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha O Anusandhan University, K 8, Kalinga Nagar, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Poonamrani Mishra
Directorate of Medical Research, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha O Anusandhan University, K 8, Kalinga Nagar, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Correspondence
Soumya Surath Panda
Department of Medical oncology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha O Anusandhan University, K 8, Kalinga Nagar, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Incidence of MRSA in head and neck cancer patients at a tertiary care teaching hospital

Ghanshyam Biswas, Soumya Surath Panda and Poonamrani Mishra

Abstract
Objective: We aimed to determine any beneficial effect from targeted surveillance, cohort nursing, and restricted health care worker access in controlling MRSA infection in patients undergoing surgery for head and neck cancer.
Subjects and Methods: In phase 1 data were gathered on MRSA-positive cases admitted from February 1, 2015 to February 28, 2016
Results: In the first phase, 24 patients developed MRSA infection out of a total of 84 eligible admissions. There were 31 eligible admissions during phase 2. None of them had known risk factors for MRSA as per Scottish Infection Standards and Strategy Group (SISS) guidelines. All screened patients were noncarriers of MRSA. Three patients out of this group subsequently developed MRSA during their hospital stay. There was a statistically significant drop in MRSA to 9.6 percent (3/31) during this phase compared to 28.5 percent (24/84) in phase 1.
Conclusion: Head and neck cancer patients are at high risk of acquiring MRSA infection. Their targeted surveillance is unlikely to influence their MRSA infection rate. However, cohort nursing with restricted health care worker access may help control MRSA infection in them.

Keywords: MRSA, head and neck cancers, antibiotic treatment, risk factor

Introduction
Staphylococcus aureus is a typical pathogen in the head and neck area, and the predominance of this creature must be considered in the treatment of most diseases in this district. Methicillin resistant S. aureus (MRSA) is a shrewd pathogen that causes visit episodes of diseases in healing facilities. In Japan, MRSA contamination originally pulled in consideration as a postoperative and nosocomial issue in the mid 1980s [1]. Numerous patients in otorhinolaryngology units have perpetual as well as intermittent contaminations, for example, incessant tonsillitis, otitis media, and sinusitis. Such patients might be inclined to an improved probability of MRSA diseases as the aftereffect of rehashed anti-microbial treatment. Besides, patients with head and neck malignancies who have experienced medical procedure, radiotherapy, or chemotherapy may need ordinary host guard systems in the upper respiratory tracts. Along these lines, otolaryngology head and neck medical procedure units are particularly powerless against the spread of MRSA contaminations [2]. Regardless, there are couple of accessible information about MRSA disease or colonization in head and neck malignant growth inpatients [3, 4], and no information about hazard factors for MRSA recognition or for the advancement of MRSA contamination. This examination was attempted to reveal insight into the clinical attributes of MRSA-positive inpatients with head and neck malignant growths. The optional objective was to assess hazard factors for MRSA disease or colonization in examination with MSSA in cancer patients.

Materials and Methods
This examination was performed in a tertiary referral place for all patients with head and neck malignancy in IMS and SUM Hospital, Bhubaneswar, serving an expected populace of 526,000. Approval and support for this investigation was given by the clinical adequacy unit of our inside. Head and neck malignancy cases are overseen by both otolaryngology and maxillofacial authorities. Most patients are alluded from essential consideration focuses and are at first surveyed at devoted head and neck centers and talked about in a multidisciplinary meeting that incorporates radiologists, pathologists, and oncologists.

The underlying departmental review in stage 1 assembled subtleties of all MRSA-positive patients breast fed in our ward from February 1, 2015 to February 28, 2016. Patients were breast fed in blended zones of the ward according to accessibility of beds. On the off chance that clinical societies demonstrated MRSA contamination, they were confined by nearby rules. Information appropriate to these patients were assembled. Stage 2 of the examination (from July 1, 2007 to January 31, 2008) included preoperative head and neck disease patients seen at this middle. All cases with head and neck malignant growth booked for medical procedure were enlisted. Patients with kind head and neck pathology or those planned for analytic endoscopy of this locale were rejected. Inpatients booked for select chemotherapy or radiotherapy were additionally prohibited. Every single qualified case had focused on observation amid their facility participation preceding healing center affirmation. This included taking a swab from both nasal vestibules, which was later refined and tried for affectability and the outcomes surveyed at the season of their confirmation. A standard frame was utilized amid their doctor's facility remain to record data relevant for the investigation including information proposed by SISS to help stratify the danger of MRSA colonization. This included assembling insights regarding their pertinent therapeutic or dermatologic conditions and medicine, any history of MRSA colonization/disease, and their wellspring of affirmation. Notwithstanding reconnaissance swabs, every single qualified patient were breast fed in a different ward zone far from different inpatients. Access to patients was limited to least important HCW. Ordinary healing center strategy relevant to quiet guests was pursued. Rehash swabs were done dependent on clinical grounds, eg, wound contamination or ulcers. As in stage 1, patients testing positive were treated according to nearby doctor's facility approach. Hospitalwide rates of healing facility procured MRSA found in circulation system, respiratory, urinary tract, and careful site diseases were estimated amid each stage. We didn't think about different intercessions, for example, occasional reconnaissance, concentrated great contamination control practice, broad natural cleaning, strict rules for anti-infection remedy, HCW screening, result criticism, or staff instructive projects.

Results

Survey of disease control information uncovered that 29 patients were tainted with MRSA in our ward in stage 1. Three were restorative patients emptied from somewhere else, one had a neck sore, and one patient developed MRSA from a tainted mastoid cavity. The rest of the 24 patients had MRSA contaminating their neck wound after medical procedure for head and neck disease. Amid this period there were 84 affirmations for careful extraction of harmful sore from the head and neck locale. The all out number of MRSA-tainted cases in healing facility amid this period was 785 out of 66,738 clinic affirmations, yielding a MRSA rate of 1.17 percent. In the second stage there were 31 careful affirmations for head and neck malignant growth strategies. None were found to have hazard factors for MRSA colonization dependent on criteria recommended by SISS. Seventeen patients had swabs taken in the facility preceding ward confirmation while the remaining had nasal swabs at the season of affirmation. All screened patients were negative for nasal MRSA. Amid this stage three patients tried positive for MRSA when swabbed along these lines for clinical signs (Table 1). The complete number of MRSA-contaminated cases in clinic amid this year (ie, January 1, 2007 to January 31, 2008) was 752 out of 62,945 healing center affirmations, for a MRSA rate of 1.19 percent. The MRSA disease rate demonstrated a factually huge tumble to 9.6 percent (3/31) amid stage 2 contrasted with 28.5 percent (24/84) in stage 1 (P _ 0.034, 95 percent CI _ 1.4 to 31.1). The all out number of patients determined to have MRSA disease in the healing facility was generally consistent amid both these periods, precluding any real change in network or doctor's facility MRSA contamination rates.

Table 1: Result comparing the two study phases

Parameters	Phase 1	Phase 2	
	(Feb. 1, 2006 – Feb. 28, 2007)	(July 1, 2007	– Jan. 1, 2008)
Number of eligible cases	84	31	
Number of cases developing MRSA infection	24	3	
Statistical result	*P* 0.034, 95% CI 1.4 to 31.1		
MRSA infection rate across the hospital	1.17%	1.19%	

Discussion

The sensational approach of MRSA in European nations and North American doctor's facilities has been one of the greatest difficulties confronting us as of late. MRSA represented under 5 percent of S. aureus blood culture secludes in the mid 1990s and has appeared stunning increment to in excess of 40 percent in the UK among 1990 and the mid 2000s [5]. The general MRSA pervasiveness is as high as 46.3 per 1000 inpatients in US human services focuses; 70 percent of these are probably going to be doctor's facility acquired.2 Various investigations have plainly appeared more terrible patient result and expanded monetary expense from MRSA contrasted with anti-infection delicate strains [6, 7]. MRSA is an autonomous factor affecting mortality. Demise authentications partner MRSA in England and Wales have demonstrated an expansion from 8 percent in 1993 to 44 percent in 1998.6 However, there is extensive variety in the commonness of MRSA, fluctuating from low in the Scandinavian nations to high endemic rates in the UK, Ireland, Spain, and Italy [5, 7]. The essential method of MRSA transmission inside a foundation is from patient to persistent. MRSA can pollute therapeutic gear and has been appeared to endure long haul on lifeless doctor's facility environments [6, 7]. Transient hand or apparel colonization of HCWs with MRSA has been appeared to happen after immediate or backhanded patient contact, from taking care of tainted materials, or from lifeless environments [6, 7]. Studies additionally propose that MRSA could be gained by medicinal staff and patients through airborne transmission.1 Detailed hereditary examination has recommended that for all intents and purposes all patients colonized or contaminated by MRSA secure it from an outside source as opposed to all over again mutation [7]. Molecular composing has affirmed that

transmission of MRSA inside and between social insurance offices is principally in charge of its spread in endemic territories, for example, the United Kingdom and United States.4 With a rising MRSA plague, all inclusive screening for MRSA in all recently conceded clinic patients has been prescribed as the key disease control measure. The low MRSA pervasiveness in some northern European nations that have a thorough national way to deal with disease control arrangements has additionally bolstered this view. In any case, the achievement and cost-viability of this methodology is dubious. The UK Joint MRSA Working Party presumed that reviews assessing screening give inadequate information to survey the individual impact of the screening of patients [8]. Similarly, audit of concentrates that portray the disconnection or accomplice nursing of patients as a mediation to control the transmission of MRSA showed clashing outcomes [8]. without great quality proof, rules, for example, SISS in Scotland and SHEA in North America are the standard on which to base wellbeing practice. The two rules concede to the majority of their perceptions, decisions, and proposals, which gives further solidarity to their selection. Both have featured the job of the doctor's facility condition, HCWs, and overwhelming anti-toxin solution in the spread of MRSA. A key contrast between these rules is the arrangement of hazard stratification by SISS. Perceiving the danger presented by asymptomatic bearers in a populace colonized by MRSA and the job they can play in the spread of MRSA, SISS has upheld chance evaluation of all patients with their order into "conceivable MRSA transporter" and "impossible MRSA bearer" to help focused on reconnaissance and nursing. It likewise comprehensively characterizes wards into intense clinical units (into which our specialty falls) and nonacute clinical units. It assigns patients in intense clinical units in whom MRSA disease can be particularly hazardous as "defenseless patients," while those having prosthetic careful inserts are named "particularly powerless." The nearness of MRSA contamination in 28.5 percent of qualified patients amid stage 1 of our investigation underlines their weakness and the need to intercede effectively and proactively. This is vital as 38 percent of sound subjects having nasal colonization with MRSA create consequent contamination, and in this manner asymptomatic colonization has been recommended to assume a key job in ensuing pathogenesis [9]. However, in view of the criteria proposed by SISS, most head and neck disease patients don't appear to have hazard elements to make them plausible MRSA transporters. It is consequently not astounding that none of the patients screened amid stage 2 of our investigation was observed to be colonized with MRSA. Our examination would propose that nasal colonization is rare in this gathering of patients and along these lines focused on observation swabs are probably not going to be of much clinical incentive in anticipating resulting MRSA disease. This might be especially valid if these patients were breast fed as a partner far from different inpatients. As there were neither extra confinements far beyond the ordinary relevant clinic strategy with respect to guests, nor any exceptional insurance taken amid the patient's interdepartmental visits, the job of brief term introduction to MRSA transporters seems, by all accounts, to be negligible. It is evaluated that 15 percent of clinical Staphylococcus aureus segregates from the network are MRSA in the Grampian region.3 From 2001 to 2002 a national wellbeing and nourishment overview puts the national colonization rate with MRSA at 0.8 percent in the United States [10]. Over 50 percent of Staphylococcus aureus disease happening in American healing facilities is currently impervious to methicillin [11]. Therefore the danger of cross contamination from asymptomatic MRSA bearers is noteworthy. Without foundation allowing hazard stratification and screening of all patients admitted to the healing facility, associate nursing of powerless patients from different patients appears to be consistent. The factually critical drop in MRSA contamination rate toward the finish of stage 2 of our examination focuses towards a positive effect of this training in our area. Limiting the quantity of HCW surveying zones on the ward where these powerless patients are breast fed is a down to earth choice to hand cleaning and can positively affect contamination control. This training has assumed a job in our middle in adding to the fall in MRSA contamination rates amid the second stage. Prior to making any firm inferences from our investigation, we might want to underline its impediments. Stage 2 was done over a generally brief period (seven months) with little patient numbers. The outcome may not be pertinent to an alternate populace because of conceivable effect of an alternate MRSA colonization rate in the all inclusive community. Geographic zones with an a lot higher pervasiveness of MRSA colonization could profit by all inclusive screening while separate companion nursing might be of sketchy use in those populaces that have a much lower rate of asymptomatic bearers. Because of the review idea of stage 1, we can't gauge what extent of patients was colonized with MRSA at the season of confirmation. Rehash swabs in stage 2 were done just on clinical grounds and in this way we don't know whether these patients were asymptomatically colonized with MRSA at the season of their release. As the accentuation of this investigation was to control MRSA disease, our decisions would in any case have all the earmarks of being substantial as none of these patients created clinical contamination with MRSA after release. We don't have the review information on adherence to the arrangement of negligible HCW access to the examination gathering. Because of these issues and the lower furthest reaches of 95 percent CI (ie, 1.4), we feel that the aftereffect of our intercession ought to be seen as fundamental.

Conclusion

The information accessible firmly ensnare MRSA as a huge doctor's facility obtained disease in head and neck malignant growth patients, prompting extra grimness and mortality and adding to medicinal services costs. Regardless of its potential weaknesses, we feel this investigation offers vital understanding into the conceivable weight of MRSA in head and neck disease patients experiencing medical procedure in regions with high endemic MRSA rates. As far as anyone is concerned, this is the principal contemplate taking a gander at MRSA in this subgroup of healing center patients and it raises questions about the benefit of screening before confirmation. This is additionally fortified by our finding that a large portion of these patients don't have chance factors that would put them at higher rates of MRSA colonization. We feel that the primary factor prompting the fall in the rate of MRSA disease amid our examination was the act of partner nursing and limiting the quantity of HCW entering this patient zone. Be that as it may, more

examinations will be required here to affirm our discoveries and reach a firm determination.

References

1. Takeuchi K, Tsuzuki Y, Ando T, Sekihara M, Hara T, Yoshikawa M *et al*. Clinical studies of enteritis caused by methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. Eur J Surg. 2001; 167:293-6.
2. Shiomori T, Miyamoto H, Makishima K. Significance of airborne transmission of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in an otolaryngology-head and neck surgery unit. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2001; 127:644-8.
3. Parton M, Beasley NJ, Harvey G, Houghton D, Jones AS. Four cases of aggressive MRSA wound infection following head and neck surgery. J Laryngol Otol. 1997; 111:874-6.
4. Watters K, O'Dwyer TP, Rowley H. Cost and morbidity of MRSA in head and neck cancer patients: what are the consequences? J Laryngol Otol. 2004; 118:694-9.
5. Scottish Infection Standards and Strategy Group. Good practice guidelines for the management of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, The Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh and The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, 2006. pdf. Accessed February 28, 2007.
6. Muoto CA, Jernigan JA, Ostrowsky BE *et al*. SHEA guideline for preventing Nosocomial transmission of multidrug-resistant strains of *Staphylococcus aureus* and Enterococcus. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2003; 24:362-86.
7. Coia JE, Duckworth GJ, Edwards DI *et al*. Guidelines for the control and prevention of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in healthcare facilities. J Hosp Infect. 2006; 63(1):S1-44.
8. Loveday HP, Pellowe CM, Jones SRLJ *et al*. A systematic review of the evidence for interventions for the prevention and control of methicillin- resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (1996-2004): report to the Joint MRSA Working Party (Subgroup A). J Hosp Infect. 2006; 63(1):S45-70.
9. Suffoletto BP, Cannon EH, Ilkhanipour K *et al*. Prevalence of *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal colonization in emergency department personnel. Ann Emerg Med. 2008; 52(5):529-33.
10. Kuhnert MJ, Kruszon-Moran D, Hill HA *et al*. Prevalence of *Staphylococcus aureus* colonization in the United States, 2001-2002. J Infect Dis. 2006; 193(2):172-9.
11. Iversen NJ, Mellgren JR, Baxter C *et al*. Prevalence of methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) colonization: a patient and employee study in a 270-bed regional referral hospital. Am J Infect Control. 2007; 35(5):E23-4.