



## Aerosol-Generating Procedures and Risk of Transmission of Acute Respiratory Infections: A Systematic Review

Adapted from Tran K, Cimon K, Severn M, Pessoa-Silva CL, Conly J. [Aerosol-Generating Procedures and Risk of Transmission of Acute Respiratory Infections: A Systematic Review](#) (Rapid Response Report: Systematic Review). Ottawa: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2011.

### Introduction

It has been hypothesized that aerosol-generating procedures expose health care workers to respiratory pathogens, thereby increasing the risk of contracting the associated infectious diseases. However, the risk of transmission of acute respiratory infections from each aerosol-generating procedure has not been fully determined. World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines<sup>1</sup> have listed procedures that may be associated with an increased risk of respiratory pathogen transmission.

### Objective

The objective of the report was to answer the following research question:

What is the clinical evidence for the risk of transmission of acute respiratory infections to health care workers caring for patients undergoing aerosol-generating clinical procedures, compared with the risk of transmission to health care workers caring for patients not undergoing aerosol-generating procedures?

### Methods

An information specialist performed a literature search on key health technology assessment (HTA) resources. The search included all languages and was limited to articles published between January 1, 1990 and October 22, 2010. Regular alerts were current to January 15, 2011. Filters were applied to limit the retrieval to HTAs, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled studies, and guidelines. The studies selected were HTAs, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, and non-randomized controlled trials that evaluated the risk of disease transmission to health care workers exposed to aerosol-generating procedures. The outcome of interest was risk of disease transmission. The quality of evidence was rated using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system.

### Results

Ten relevant non-randomized studies were identified: five case-control and five retrospective cohort studies. All studies evaluated the transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) to health care workers while caring for ill patients in hospital or intensive care unit settings during the 2002-2003 SARS outbreaks. Procedures that showed a statistically significant increased risk of SARS transmission to health care workers, or were a statistically significant risk factor for SARS infection in health care workers, included tracheal intubation, non-invasive tracheotomy, and manual ventilation before intubation. The risk of transmission associated with suction before intubation, suction after intubation, manual ventilation after intubation, bronchoscopy, nebulizer treatment, oxygen mask manipulation, BiPAP (bi-level positive airway pressure) mask manipulation, defibrillation, chest compressions, insertion of nasogastric tube, and collection of a sputum

sample was not statistically significant. As well, high-frequency oscillatory ventilation, high-flow oxygen, endotracheal aspiration, suction of body fluid, administration of oxygen, chest physiotherapy, and mechanical ventilation showed either no statistically significant difference in the risk of transmission or were a statistically significant risk factor for transmission. All studies were rated very low quality according to GRADE assessment of the evidence.

## Limitations

The included studies in this report have a number of limitations. The evidence (all 10 included studies) was of very low quality, according to assessments made using a GRADE approach. Details of limitations of individual studies are presented in the summary table of GRADE evidence profiles. In general, limitations in design and imprecision are main issues in all studies that lead to the very low rating according to GRADE. Further, all of the included studies evaluated the risk of transmission of SARS and may not be generalizable to other acute respiratory pathogens, specifically the influenza virus. The extent of multivariate adjustments varied across studies, and thus the effects of residual confounding may vary from study to study. Also, with the exception of tracheal intubation, a limited number of studies was identified (one to three) for each procedure.

Seven out of ten studies conducted the investigation at only one hospital, which could limit the generalizability of the results. Four studies included fewer than 100 patients. The number of health care workers included in the studies who were exposed to the aerosol-generating procedures was small, ranging from two to 120. The sample size of the studies could limit statistical power, and results from analyses based on studies of small sample size may be less reliable than those based on a larger sample size. Related to this, the number of events was small in a number of studies. As

noted in the results, for a number of potentially aerosol-generating procedures (bronchoscopy,<sup>2</sup> non-invasive positive pressure ventilation,<sup>3</sup> manipulation of BiPAP mask,<sup>2</sup> and insertion of nasogastric tube<sup>2</sup>), point estimates suggested an increased risk, but confidence intervals were wide and were not statistically significant. Not all health care workers caring for SARS patients were included in the studies, as there were some health care workers who refused to participate in the interview. The recollections of health care workers might be imperfect, thus generating recall bias if some were more complete or more accurate than others. As the source of transmission (i.e., primary, secondary, or tertiary cases) was sometimes unclear, it is difficult to accurately determine whether health care workers were infected directly or indirectly from the index patients.

The estimated risk of transmission of infection through aerosol-generating procedures or of a certain procedure being a risk factor for infection transmission in the included studies could have been confounded by the medical characteristics of the patients, the level of infection control training, and compliance with the use of effective personal protection methods among health care workers. Among the included studies, five<sup>4-8</sup> showed that infection control training and personal protective measures were effective against the nosocomial spread of SARS. These factors might also influence the spread of the diseases, in addition to the aerosol-generating procedures themselves.

## Conclusions

Our findings suggest that some procedures potentially capable of generating aerosols have been associated with increased risk of SARS transmission to health care workers or were a risk factor for transmission, with the most consistent association across multiple studies identified with tracheal intubation. Other associations included non-invasive ventilation from two studies, and manual ventilation

before intubation and tracheotomy each from single studies. These findings must be interpreted in the context of the very low quality of the studies, which was assessed using well-established GRADE methods. A significant research gap exists in this area. Studies of higher methodological quality are required to provide more precise information about the risk of aerosol generation and the risk of transmission of microbes causing specific acute respiratory infections, including influenza, to health care workers from patients undergoing aerosol-generating procedures.

## References

1. World Health Organization (WHO). Epidemic- and pandemic-prone acute respiratory diseases. Infection prevention and control in health care: aide memoire [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2008. [cited 2010 Nov 18]. Available from: [http://www.who.int/csr/resources/publications/EPR\\_AM3\\_E3.pdf](http://www.who.int/csr/resources/publications/EPR_AM3_E3.pdf)
2. Loeb M, McGeer A, Henry B, Ofner M, Rose D, Hlywka T, et al. SARS among critical care nurses, Toronto. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004 Feb;10(2):251-5.
3. Fowler RA, Guest CB, Lapinsky SE, Sibbald WJ, Louie M, Tang P, et al. Transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome during intubation and mechanical ventilation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2010 Oct 29];169(11):1198-202. Available from: <http://ajrccm.atsjournals.org/cgi/reprint/169/1/1198>
4. Liu W, Tang F, Fang LQ, De Vlas SJ, Ma HJ, Zhou JP, et al. Risk factors for SARS infection among hospital healthcare workers in Beijing: a case control study. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2009;14(Suppl 1):52-9.
5. Raboud J, Shigayeva A, McGeer A, Bontovics E, Chapman M, Gravel D, et al. Risk factors for SARS transmission from patients requiring intubation: a multicentre investigation in Toronto, Canada. *PLoS ONE* [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2010 Nov 26];5(5):e10717. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2873403/pdf/pone.0010717.pdf>
6. Chen WQ, Ling WH, Lu CY, Hao YT, Lin ZN, Ling L, et al. Which preventive measures might protect health care workers from SARS? *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2010 Nov 1];9:81. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2666722/pdf/1471-2458-9-81.pdf>
7. Pei LY, Gao ZC, Yang Z, Wei DG, Wang SX, Ji JM, et al. Investigation of the influencing factors on severe acute respiratory syndrome among health care workers. *Beijing da xue xue bao J Peking Univ (Health Sci)*. 2006;38(3):271-5.
8. Ma HJ, Wang HW, Fang LQ, Jiang JF, Wei MT, Liu W, et al. A case-control study on the risk factors of severe acute respiratory syndromes among health care workers. *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi*. 2004 Sep;25(9):741-4. Chinese.

## Production Notes

*CADTH Technology Overviews* is produced by:  
Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH)  
600-865 Carling Ave.  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5S8  
Tel.: 613-226-2553  
Fax: 613-226-5392  
Website: [www.cadth.ca](http://www.cadth.ca)

*CADTH Technology Overviews* contains articles that are based on CADTH Technology Reports and other CADTH reports on health technologies. The information presented in these publications is intended to help Canadian health care decision-makers, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. The information in this publication should not be used as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect to the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process, nor is it intended to replace professional medical advice.

While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of this publication to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete, and up to date as of the date of publication, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not responsible for any errors or omissions or injury, loss or damage arising from or relating to the use (or misuse) of any information, statements, or conclusions contained in or implied by the information in this publication or in any of the source documentation.

*CADTH Technology Overviews* and the information it provides is prepared and intended for use in the context of the Canadian health care system. Other health care systems are different; the issues and information related to the subject matter presented in this publication may be different in other jurisdictions and, if used outside of Canada, it is at the user's risk. This disclaimer and any questions or matters of any nature arising from or relating to the content or use (or misuse) of this publication will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein, and all proceedings shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Province of Ontario, Canada.

CADTH takes sole responsibility for the final form and content of this publication, subject to the limitations noted above. The statements and conclusions in this publication are those of CADTH and not of its advisory committees and reviewers. The statements, conclusions, and views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Health Canada or any Canadian provincial or territorial government.

Production of *CADTH Technology Overviews* is made possible by financial contributions from Health Canada and the governments of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, and Yukon.

Copyright © CADTH 2013. You are permitted to reproduce this document for non-commercial purposes, provided it is not modified when reproduced and appropriate credit is given to CADTH. You may not otherwise copy, modify, translate, post on a website, store electronically, republish, or redistribute any content from this document in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of CADTH.

Please contact CADTH's Vice-President of Corporate Services at [corporateservices@cadth.ca](mailto:corporateservices@cadth.ca) with any inquiries about this notice or other legal matters relating to CADTH's services.

**Cite as:** Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health. *CADTH Technology Overviews*, 2013; 3(1).

ISSN: 1481-4501 (online)