



Endoscopy in the 21st century: minimally invasive state of the art medical technology or a future main vector of hospital-acquired infections?

Rodolphe C. Hervé PhD MSc MIDSc

University of Southampton, UK



## Looking inside patients

2016







#### Looking inside patients





Patient Contact	Examples	Device Classification	Minimum Inactivation Level
Intact skin		Non-Critical	Cleaning and/or Low/Intermediate Level Disinfection
Mucous membranes or non-intact skin		Semi-Critical	"High Level Disinfection"
Sterile areas of the body, including blood contact	Je st	Critical	Sterilization



#### UK recommendations after vCJD























### Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangio-Pancreatography







Biofilms are 3D structures







Channels recovered from endoscopes in clinical use







Cleaning limitations: biofilm growth



<sup>D</sup> Instituto Adolfo Lutz, São Paulo, Brazil <sup>c</sup> Federal University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil





How simpler and easier may it become?







Infection control in the SSD/endoscopy unit

Steps in infection control

Locate (and identify) the infectious agent(s)

Eliminate (or neutralize?) the infectious agent(s)

Prevent introducing new infectious agent(s)

Tools available

Eyes, detection kits, bioassays

Equipment (AERs) and chemicals

SOPs (based on RA)





#### How can standard reprocessing fail ?

#### <u>Mechanism</u>

Physical disruption (detergent, sonication, brushing, flushing)

Enzymatic degradation

Chemical modification (pH>12...not 1/1000!) E.g. hypochlorite 10k ppm

#### Potential caveats

Displacement and/or spreading, blockages, damage

Shelf life; control of parameters

Damage to instruments; control of parameters and efficacy





So what can we do?

- Improve (develop!) surveillance of instruments





How clean is clean?

Sensitivity of QC assay



Ideal scenario





#### Episcopic Differencial Interference Contrast with Epifluorescence (EDIC/EF) microscopy.



Limit of detection well beyond necessary and practical values (over 2-log more sensitive than WB).

Total proteins (SYPRO Ruby) MLD<sub>75</sub> = 175 pg/mm<sup>2</sup> (95% CI 104 - 286 pg/mm<sup>2</sup>)  $\sim$  5 femtomoles

Amyloid proteins (Thioflavin T) Prp<sup>Sc</sup> – 1 μm / 1pg aggregates ~ 30 attomoles

ThT (amyloid) and SR (all proteins) non toxic at concentrations bound to contaminated surfaces.

Live/dead or other staining of individual bacteria within biofilms.

Keevil *et al.,* Water Sci Technol 2003 Lipscomb *et al.,* JHI 2006











Cleaning limitations: Protein removal action of various cleaners



Hervé *et al.*, JHI 2010





So what can we do?

- Improve (develop!) surveillance of instruments
- Improve reprocessing efficacy and/or prevent biofilms





Targeting residual contamination in long lumen

1. Water-based treatments:

- Pros: a) Homogeneity of the mixture
  - b) Even distribution throughout whole channel
- Cons: a) High volume of waste
  - b) Inefficient against adsorbed/incrusted microcontamination
  - c) Requires rinse; chemical residues?
  - d) Additional treatments (e.g. ethylene oxide...)





## Standard reprocessing of flexible Gas plasma for endoscope reprocessing





#### Non-equilibrium Chemistry

#### **Benefits**

• Energetic electrons → chemical dissociation @ low gas temperature

 On-site production of reactive, short-living species e.g. O<sub>2</sub><sup>•-</sup>; O; <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>; NO ... OH<sup>•</sup> and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> → known to act on protein, lipid and DNA

• **Oxidants**: OH•, O<sub>2</sub>•-; O; <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>











Targeting residual contamination in long lumen

1. Plasma-based treatment:

- Pros: a) Very efficient against bacteria\* (prions?)
  - b) No extra volume of waste generated
  - c) No potentially harmful residues
- Cons: a) Uneven distribution and short life span, hence possibly reduced effective range (effect of PAG\*)
  - b) Non-homogenous mix



\*: Bhatt et al.. GIE journal 2018



Infection control in the SSD/endoscopy unit

Steps in infection control

Tools available

Locate (and identify) the infectious agent(s) Si

Eliminate (or neutralize?) the infectious agent(s)

Prevent introducing new infectious agent(s)

Simple, cheap and rapid surveillance tools

More effective, yet still affordable decontamination technologies

Increase in AMR, pressures on healthcare





Infection control in the future endoscopy units...







Conclusions

Proteinaceous and microbial contamination are common problems in clinical settings worldwide.

Current standard decontamination procedures suffer from inherent physicochemical limitations.

Current standard surveillance procedures suffer from poor accessibility (particularly for luminal flexible endoscopes) and limited recovery; current tolerance margins only reveal the "tip of the iceberg".

Further development of emerging decontamination and surveillance technologies are required (at a cost) to match the increase in instruments complexity and usage.

**NIHR** National Institute for Health Research





THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH (NCJDRSU)





#### Standard reprocessing of flexible



