

Interventions to reduce peripheral blood culture contamination in acute care settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis

James A. Hughes RN PhD^{1,2}

C.J. Cabilan RN MAppSci(Res)³

Julian Williams MBBS, PhD, FACEM^{3,4}

Mercedes Ray RN³

Fiona Coyer RN, PhD^{1,5,6}

¹School of Nursing, Queensland University of Technology, Kelvin Grove, Australia

²Emergency and Trauma Centre, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Herston, Australia

³Emergency Department, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Woolloongabba, Australia

⁴Faculty of Medicine, University of Queensland, Herston, Australia

⁵Intensive Care Services, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Herston, Australia

⁶Institute for Skin Integrity and Infection Prevention, University of Huddersfield, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author: Dr James Hughes, Emergency and Trauma Centre, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Herston Road, Herston, Queensland, 4006. +61 409356098, james.hughes@health.qld.gov.au

Running Head: Interventions to reduce blood culture contamination.

Word Count:

Acknowledgements: JAH was supported by a capacity-building grant from the Emergency Medicine Foundation (EMCB-402R23-2015) during part of this work.

Following guidelines outlined in the PRISMA-P methodology, this protocol was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) on 8th December 2017, and last updated on 29th January 2020 (registration number [CRD42017081650](#)).

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: Blood culture contamination is a significant problem in acute care settings. Contamination of a blood sample with pathogens not present in the patient's blood leads to increases in length of stay, overuse of antimicrobials, and increases in healthcare cost. Several interventions have been reported in different settings within the literature to decrease the contamination. However, their overall effectiveness is currently unknown.

Objective: This systematic review aimed to identify interventions to reduce contamination from peripherally collected blood cultures and to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions.

Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Methods: In March 2019 we performed a systematic search of English language literature from academic databases, registers of clinical trials and grey literature for interventions aimed at reducing blood culture contamination in adult acute care settings. Studies meeting inclusion criteria were reviewed and data were extracted by two independent reviewers.

Results: A total of 6,302 articles were retrieved from searches. After removal of duplicates and screening against inclusion criteria 57 studies were included. The majority of the 57 studies had a medium to high risk of bias. These studies identified eight specific interventions (collection packs, dedicated collection teams, education, staff feedback, intervention bundle, sterile procedure, Initial Specimen Diversion Devices, or change of asepsis solution) used in acute care. Thirty-four studies were included in the meta-analysis. There was a wide variation in the definition of contamination which precluded many studies from being included in the meta-analysis. Dedicated collection teams (RR 0.40, 95%CI 0.21 – 0.76, I^2 87%, $p < 0.001$) and initial specimen diversion devices (RR 0.43, 95%CI 0.31 – 0.58, I^2 84%, $p < 0.001$) were the most successful at reducing blood culture contamination. Heterogeneity was high across all studies and interventions.

Conclusions: The use of dedicated collection teams or initial specimen diversion devices showed the most significant reduction in blood culture contamination; however, other interventions such as intervention bundles, education or feedback, may have benefits in terms of ease of implementation, and have still been shown to lower blood culture contamination.

Introduction / Background

The contamination of blood culture samples with organisms not present in the blood of patients is a significant clinical issue in acute care settings (1). Blood culture contamination is defined by the American Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute as "*microorganism isolated from a blood culture during specimen collection or processing [and was] not pathogenic for the patient from whom the blood was collected*" ((2)p5). Blood culture contamination leads to unnecessary treatment, extends hospital length of stay and contributes to antimicrobial resistance. Current recommendations support an upper limit of 3% for potential contamination of all blood cultures collected in acute care settings (1-4). However, in practice, figures below 3% are rarely reported, and contamination rates up to 12% are prevalent (1, 5-10).

In North American studies, blood culture contamination has been identified as contributing up to an additional 4.5 days to the average patient length of hospital stay (9, 11). In the United Kingdom, this length of stay is even further extended to 5.4 days (7). Blood culture contamination has been associated with increased use of antimicrobials, particularly vancomycin, which in turn is associated with increased costs of pharmacokinetic monitoring (12). Blood culture contamination also creates a financial burden on health care systems contributing up to \$7,500 per patient compared to patients with true negative cultures (1, 7, 9-11).

Blood cultures can be collected through either peripheral venepuncture or central venous access device. Most commonly, blood cultures are collected through peripheral venipuncture or a newly established peripheral intravenous catheter (PIVC). Blood cultures can also be collected through venous access devices such as a Port-a-cath® (Smith's Medical), Peripherally Inserted Central Catheter (PICC), and Hickmann® (Bard Access Systems) lines.

Several interventions have been reported targeting reductions in blood culture contamination; these have included educational interventions (6, 13), feedback (9), bundled interventions (13), changes to skin asepsis, and specimen diversion devices (5). However, it is not currently known what the grouped effectiveness of these interventions or their effectiveness in different acute care settings such as the emergency department or ward environment. This systematic review aimed to identify interventions to reduce contamination from peripherally collected blood cultures and to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions.

Methods

A detailed description of the methods used in this systematic review and meta-analysis have been reported in a previously published protocol (14). The results of the systematic review are reported here according to the PRISMA guidelines (15).

Data Sources and Search Strategy

A comprehensive search was conducted from inception to March 2019 in: Cumulative Index Of Nursing And Allied Health Literature (CINAHL via Ebsco), Pubmed, Excerpta Medica database (EMBASE), and Proquest Dissertation and Thesis. Controlled trials were searched

for via the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) from 1996 to March 2019. Search strategy and results for each database are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Search strategies for each database searched. CINAHL = Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature, EMBASE = Excerpta Medica database, CENTRAL = Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials.

Search Terms	Date	Database	Number of publications retrieved
(((((contamination[Title/Abstract]) OR false-positive[Title/Abstract])) AND (((Blood culture[MeSH Major Topic]) OR Hematologic tests[MeSH Major Topic]) OR blood culture*[Title/Abstract]))	March 2019	Pubmed	1577
(Blood Culture OR Culture) AND (Contamination OR False Positive OR Microbial Contamination OR Bacterial Contamination OR False Negative).	March 2019	CINAHL via Ebsco	2359
((((Blood Culture[Title/Abstract/Keyword]) OR (Bacterial Culture[Title/Abstract/Keyword]) AND ((Contamination[Title/Abstract/Keyword]) OR (Microbial Contamination[Title/Abstract/Keyword]) OR (Bacterial Contamination[Title/Abstract/Keyword]) OR (False Positive Result[Title/Abstract/Keyword])))	March 2019	EMBASE	1237
(("Blood Culture"[All]) AND (Contamination[All]) OR ("False Positive"[All]))	March 2019	Proquest Dissertations and Thesis	1022
"Blood Culture" and Contamination	March 2019	CENTRAL	107
"Blood Culture" and "False Positive"			

Inclusion Criteria

Experimental studies (randomised control trials or quasi-experimental studies) that assessed the effectiveness of an intervention or interventions aimed at reduction of blood culture contamination were included. Interventions targeted at adult patients (greater than 16 years old) and cultures collected in acute healthcare (hospital) settings were eligible for inclusion. Secondary outcomes such as multiple sets, volume, the proportion of positive samples and costs were summarised in the results. Due to the lack of funding for translation services, only studies reported in English or with a previous translation available were included in this review.

Study selection and data extraction

Selection of studies was conducted independently by two reviewers (JAH and CJC). Discordant assessments were discussed between the two reviewers without the need for review by a third reviewer (FC). All citations from initial searches were imported to a reference library and screened for relevance using titles and abstracts. Full texts of all relevant citations were accessed and subsequently screened against the inclusion criteria. The methodological quality of each selected study was appraised using the Effective Practice and Organisation of Care group risk of bias criteria (16).

Meta-analysis

Data extraction from selected studies was conducted and cross-checked independently by two reviewers (JAH and CJC) for accuracy. Data were entered into Review Manager (RevMan, version 5.4) software for meta-analysis (17). The primary outcome (blood culture contamination rate) was analysed using the Mantel-Haenszel method within a random-effects model. Risk ratios (presented with 95% confidence intervals) of less than one represented a reduced contamination rate for the intervention. Heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 statistic and considered significant at the $p=0.1$ level (18).

Consensus was reached to group interventions as: dedicated blood culture collection teams, intervention bundle including collection kits, education, initial specimen diversion device, staff feedback, sterile procedure. Studies were only included in the meta-analysis if they had a clear definition of contamination that included at least three of the seven most commonly reported contaminants (19):

- *Coagulase-negative staphylococci*
- *Viridans streptococci*
- *Propionibacterium spp.*
- *Micrococcus spp.*
- *Corynebacterium spp.*
- *Diphtheroids*
- *Bacillus spp.*

Results

A total of 6302 articles were identified from the searches. After removal of duplicates, 5065 articles were screened for relevance, which subsequently reduced the number of articles to 175 for screening against the inclusion criteria (Figure 1), of these 57 were included in the systematic review. Characteristics of included studies can be found in Table 2. The majority of studies ($n=37$, 65%) were quasi-experimental, either pre and post-test design or a time series (6, 8, 9, 13, 20-52). Sixteen studies (28%) used an experimental design (5, 53-67), and four (7%) used other studies designs (1, 68-70). Thirty-four studies included sufficient data for quantitative synthesis in the meta-analysis (5, 6, 9, 20, 22-25, 28-30, 33, 34, 36-38, 44, 45, 47-50, 52, 55-59, 61, 62, 65-67, 70).




Figure 1: Systematic review study (PRISMA) flow diagram (15)

Settings

From the studies included, 18 (31.6%) were conducted in the emergency department (1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 21, 25, 32, 37, 41, 44, 46, 47, 50, 51, 70-72), 13 (22.8%) were conducted in ward environments (22-24, 28, 35, 36, 38, 43, 57, 64, 65, 67, 73) and four (7.0%) were conducted in the intensive care unit setting (27, 30, 33, 66). Combinations of these areas accounted for 13 (22.8%) of studies (20, 29, 39, 40, 45, 48, 53, 58, 59, 61, 68, 74, 75), and nine (15.8%) studies were described as hospital-wide (6, 26, 31, 34, 42, 55, 56, 60, 63).

Quality and Bias

The risk of bias was overall was assessed as high in 13 (22.8%), and medium in 32 (56.1%) of the studies included in this review. The high level of bias is reflective of the quasi-experimental methodology of the majority of the studies with a lack of randomisation procedures, or poorly reported randomisation. Differences in baseline characteristics were either not reported or not taken into consideration in a number of the included studies. A total of 12 studies (21.1%) were assessed as low risk of bias. The risk of bias for each included study is summarised in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2.

Interventions

Interventions to decrease the rate of blood culture contamination varied widely throughout the included studies. Most studies used a combination of initiatives aimed at intervening at different points in the collection process where contamination can occur. Eight distinct types of interventions were identified: education delivered to clinicians who collect blood cultures (6, 13, 20-27, 29-33, 68, 76), staff feedback (20, 21, 24, 25, 27-29, 32, 34, 68, 69, 76), dedicated phlebotomy team to collect blood cultures (36-38, 77); blood culture collection packs containing all necessary equipment (21, 32, 38-42, 47, 53, 60, 76), intervention bundles with standardised blood culture collection processes (13, 20-25, 28, 30, 40, 43, 48, 57, 68, 69, 76), a change to the devices used such as a needle switch or initial specimen diversion devices (44-46, 55, 56, 78) or the introduction of sterile procedures (26, 47, 57, 79). Many of the studies used a combination of these interventions in an attempt to decrease contamination rates. Full details of each study can be seen in Table 2.

The most common intervention to decrease contamination in blood cultures was skin antisepsis before venepuncture (8, 48, 50, 51, 53, 58-61, 63-67, 70, 73-75). A wide variety of antiseptic solutions were used as either "usual care" or as an intervention. For example, chlorhexidine, iodine and alcohol preparations were used as either "usual care" or as an intervention. Table 3 shows the skin asepsis solutions used as intervention or usual care and the contamination rates found in each study.

Table 2: Summary of included studies

Author / Year / Country	Clinical Setting	Intervention	Comparator	Study Design	Definition of Contamination	Other Outcome Measures	Contamination Outcome	Risk of Bias
Intervention Bundle								
Al-Hamad A et al., 2016. Saudi Arabia	Ward, Intensive care and Emergency department setting	Interventional bundle, Educational intervention, Standardised blood culture collection, One-on-one feedback of contamination rates	Historical - usual practice	Quasi-experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Presence of <i>Corynebacterium</i> spp., <i>Bacillus</i> spp., <i>Propionibacterium</i> spp., viridians <i>Streptococci</i> , <i>Micrococcus</i> spp., and coagulase-negative <i>Staphylococcus</i> spp. in at least one culture.	Nil	Pre: 8.2% Post: 5.2%	Medium
Bentley et al., 2016. United Kingdom	Emergency Department	Intervention bundle: blood culture collection kit, visual instructions of standard blood culture collection, drop-in education sessions, regular staff feedback	Historical – usual practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	When certain bacteria which are known to cause frequent contaminations are isolated in a blood culture and do not correlate with clinical history as pathogenic.	Nil	Pre: 4.6% Post: 2.0%	Medium
Bowen et al., (2016). United States of America	Emergency Department	Intervention bundle: blood culture collection kit, standardised blood culture collection process, education sessions, regular staff feedback	Historical – usual practice	Quality improvement	Organisms considered to be contaminants were coagulase negative <i>Staphylococcus</i> , <i>Micrococcus</i> , <i>Diphtheroids</i> , anaerobic <i>Diphtheroids</i> , <i>Bacillus</i> species other than <i>B. anthracis</i> , and viridans <i>Streptococcus</i> isolated from a single set of blood cultures.	Nil	Target contamination rate of <2% was maintained monthly for 12 months.	High

Eskira et al., (2006). Israel	Ward Setting	Intervention bundle: one on one staff education, standardised blood culture collection process	Usual practice	Quasi experimental	Growth of typical contaminants (i.e. coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Micrococcus spp., Propionibacterium acnes, viridans Streptococci, Bacillus spp. and non-JK Corynebacteria.) from one or two bottles during an insignificant febrile episode, with no growth from other cultures or sites, and in the absence of vascular devices.	Nil	Pre: Intervention Ward: 5.7% Control Ward: 7.1% Post: Intervention Ward: 2.0% Control Ward: 6.7%	Medium
Ge et al., (2011) China	Ward Setting	Intervention bundle: one on one staff education, standardised blood culture collection process	Usual Practice	Quasi experimental	At least one of the following criteria: a) patient with incompatible clinical features or no attributable risks; b) with risk factors but the positive result was related to an infection at another site; c) common skin contaminant including coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Propionibacterium acnes, Corynebacterium species or Bacillus species was isolated from one or more blood samples; d) without improvement with specific treatment for that organism; e) fever that can be attributed to other condition; f) culture time ≥ 48 h; g) more than one common skin contaminant from one blood sample.	Nil	Pre: 1.3% Post 0.2%	Medium
Harding et al., (2013) United States of America	Emergency Department and Ward Setting	Intervention bundle: individual staff feedback of contamination rates, education sessions, standardised blood culture collection process	Usual Practice	Quality improvement	Not specifically defined but cited, 'defined in accordance with 2008 Centres for Disease Control and Prevention/National Healthcare Safety Network guidelines'.	Total Cost	Pre: 1.8% Post: 1.0%	Low
Hopkins et al., (2013). United States of America	Ward Setting	Intervention bundle: Standardised blood culture collection process, education sessions, regular feedback of contamination rates	Historical – Usual Practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	"Presence of coagulase negative Staphylococcus spp, Propionibacterium spp, Micrococcus spp, Coryneform-type bacilli, Lactobacillus spp, Bacillus spp, and viridans type Streptococci in a single blood culture.	Nil	Pre: 3.1% Post 1: 2.0% Post 2: 1.6%	Low

Lin et al., (2012) Taiwan	Emergency Department	Intervention bundle: Educational intervention, standard blood culture collection process, and one- on-one feedback of contamination rates	Historical – usual practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Presence of coagulase-negative Staphylococcus; Micrococcus spp.; Staphylococcus epidermidis; Gram- positive bacilli from a patient who clinically had no fever or systemic inflammatory response syndrome.	Nil	Pre: 3.4% Post Phase 1: 2.7% Post Phase 2: 2.0%	Medium
Moeller et al., (2017) United States of America	Emergency Department	Intervention bundle: Standardised blood culture collection process, root cause analysis of contamination followed by peer- to-peer feedback	Historical - usual practice	Quality Improvement	Not specifically defined	Nil	Pre: 5.4% Post 1: 2.9% Post 2: 2.5% Post 3: 1.7% Post 4: 2.0% Post 5: 1.8%	High
Suzuki et al., (2018) United States of America	Hospital Wide	Longitudinal changes made, intro of Chlorhexidine, sterile gloves, education material	Usual Care	Time Series	Not Provided	Multiple Sets	Pre: 3.6% Post: 0.3%	High
Education and Feedback								
Alahmadi et al., 2015. Ireland	Intensive care unit	Educational intervention and staff feedback	Historical - usual practice	Interrupted time series	Common contaminants (unspecified) present in only one of the two collected blood cultures	Estimated cost savings	Pre: 9.0% Post: 4.0%	Low
Chriseleit et al., (2011). United States of America	Emergency Department	Educational intervention: simulation, standardised blood culture collection process	Historical – usual practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Presence of coagulase-negative Staphylococci or Staphylococcus epidermidis.	Nil	Pre: 3.3% Post: 3.7%	High

Gibb et al., (1997) Canada	Ward Setting	Regular (group and individual) staff feedback of contamination rates with reinforcement of standard blood collection process	Usual Practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Presence of coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Micrococcus species, Propionibacterium species in a blood culture.	Nil	Pre: 2.7% Post: 1.4%	Medium
Park et al., (2015) South Korea	Ward and Emergency Department Settings	Educational intervention: self-learning the blood drawing using video clips and guidelines, simulation practice using a manikin on a one-to-one basis, tutor's evaluation, and giving feedback for the procedure.	Without educational intervention	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Presence of one or more of the following organisms grew in only one culture in a series of blood cultures collected from the same patient in sets of blood requested during a single event: common skin flora, including Bacillus spp., coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Corynebacterium spp., Enterococcus spp., Micrococcus spp., Propionibacterium spp., or viridans Streptococcus, without isolation of the identical organism from another potentially infected site in a patient with incompatible clinical features.	Nil	Pre: 1.4% Post: 1.0%	Low
Ramirez et al., (2015) Spain	Intensive Care Unit	Educational intervention, standardised blood culture collection	Historical – usual practice	Quasi experimental	"Presence of one or more of the following organisms in one of a series of blood culture specimens: Corynebacterium spp, Bacillus spp [not B anthracis] spp, Propionibacterium spp, CNS [including S epidermidis], viridans group Streptococci, Aerococcus spp, and Micrococcus spp, without fever (>38 C), chills, or hypotension."	Nil	Pre: 23% Post: 13%	High
Robert et al., (2011) United States of America	Hospital Wide	Education in two separate stages. Collection and pathology staff	Historical – Usual Care	Time Series	Nil Provided	Nil	Pre: 4.8% Post 1: 2.5% Post 2: 3% post	High
Robertson et al., (2015) United Kingdom	Emergency Department	Education, feedback and a blood culture sampling pack.	Historical – Usual Care	Time Series	Contamination was defined pragmatically as the presence in blood culture of low pathogenicity skin commensals in patients without central venous access or indwelling prothesis.	True Positive Rate	Pre: 11.8% Post 7.4%	Medium

Roth et al., (2010) Sweden	Whole of Hospital	Informational intervention to phlebotomists	Historical – usual practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	A blood culture set was defined as the bottles obtained from one blood sample (1 or 2 bottles) and was considered contaminated if one of the following organisms was present in 50% of all blood culture sets obtained from one patient on the same day: coagulase-negative Staphylococci, alpha-hemolytic Streptococci, Micrococcus species, Propionibacterium species, Corynebacterium species, and Bacillus species.	Positive Cultures	Pre: 2.6% Post: 2.2%	Medium
Sanchez-Sanchez et al., (2018) Spain	Intensive Care Setting	Educational Intervention	Usual Care	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Contaminated blood culture: when in a single set coagulase-negative Staphylococcus, Bacillus spp. (except Bacillus anthracis), Propionibacterium spp., Streptococcus from the viridians group, Aerococcus spp., Micrococcus spp. or Corynebacterium spp. were isolated.	Nil	Pre: 14% Post: 5.6%	Medium
Zimmerman et al., (2018) Israel	Hospital Wide	Blood Culture Contamination Scoreboard	Historical Control	Quasi experimental pre and post-test design	Contamination was defined by microbiological criteria: coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Corynebacteria, Micrococci and alpha-haemolytic Streptococci were deemed as contaminants unless isolated from multiple cultures.	True Positive Rate	Pre: 5.6% Post: 5.2	High
Dedicated Phlebotomy Team								
Bae et al., (2018) South Korea	Ward setting	Dedicated phlebotomy team	Interns Collecting Samples (Usual Care)	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	2007 Clinical laboratory standards institute guidelines.	True Positive Rate: Blood Volume:	Pre: 0.5% Post 0.3 %	Medium
Foggiato et al., (2017). Brazil	Ward Setting	Trained phlebotomists collecting blood cultures	Nurses collecting blood samples (usual practice)	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Growth of contaminants (i.e. coagulase-negative Staphylococcus, Propionibacterium spp, Micrococcus spp, Corynebacterium spp, and Bacillus spp.) from one or two bottles.	Nil	Pre: 12.4% Post: 7.9%	Medium
Gander et al., (2009) United States of America	Emergency Department	Trained phlebotomy team collecting blood cultures	Other clinical staff collecting (usual practice)	Quasi experimental	If one or more of the following organisms were identified in only one of a series of blood cultures: coagulase-negative Staphylococcus species, Corynebacterium species, alpha- or gamma-haemolytic Streptococci, Micrococcus species, Bacillus species, and Propionibacterium species	Nil	Pre: 5.6% Post: 3.1%	Medium

Weinbaum et al., (1997)	Ward Setting	Dedicated phlebotomy team and a blood culture collection kit	Usual Care and Kit without team	Quasi experimental pre and post-test design	Blood cultures were considered contaminated if microorganisms derived from common skin flora were cultured: <i>Corynebacterium</i> spp., <i>Bacillus</i> spp., <i>Propionibacterium</i> spp. (e.g., <i>Propionibacterium acnes</i>), and coagulase-negative <i>Staphylococci</i> .	Nil	House Staff without Prep Kits: 8.4%	Medium
United States of America							House Staff with Prep Kits: 4.8%	
							Blood Culture team with Prep Kits: 1.2%	
Blood Culture Collection Pack								
Bamber et al., (2009).	Emergency department; Intensive care unit; Medical and Surgical wards	Blood culture collection packs (aerobic and anaerobic bottles, Leur locked blood collection set, blood collection adapter caps, 2% chlorhexidine wipes, and an information leaflet)	Historical - usual practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Possible contaminant was defined as, the organism that may be responsible for bacteraemia in the appropriate clinical setting but where the significance of the isolate was deemed uncertain. Probable contaminant was defined as, the organism determined to be a contaminant at the time of review by laboratory medical staff.	Nil	Possible contaminants: Pre: 11% Post 5%	High
United Kingdom							Probable contaminants: Pre: 32% Post: 19%	
Dhillon et al., (2009).	Emergency Department and Ward settings	Blood culture collection packs (aerobic and anaerobic bottles, 2% chlorhexidine wipes, sterile drape, disposable tourniquet, information leaflet, request form).	Historical – usual practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Unclear	Nil	Pre: 8.7% Post: 3%	Medium
United Kingdom								
Madeo et al., (2003).	Emergency Department	Blood culture collection kit	No blood culture kit	Quasi experimental	Presence of usual skin organism that was isolated from only one set of blood cultures of a patient without evidence of an infection with that organism.	Nil	Pre: 24% Post: 8%	Medium
United States of America								

Thomas et al., (2011) United Kingdom	Hospital Wide	Introduction of a blood culture collection kit	Historical – Usual Care	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Blood culture contamination, defined as the growth of bacteria in the blood culture bottle that were not present in the patient's blood during the process of collecting the culture.	Gram Negative Bacteraemia	Pre: 9.2% Post: 3.9%	Medium
Trautner et al. (2002) United States of America	Ward and Intensive Care Setting	Collection kit containing 2% alcoholic chlorhexidine	Collection kit containing tincture of iodine	Prospective, blinded clinical trial	A contaminant was defined as a usual skin organism that was isolated from only one set of blood cultures of a patient without clinical or microbiological evidence of infection with that organism	Nil	Iodine: 1.4% Chlorhexidine: 0.5%	Low
Yan et al., (2019) China	Ward Setting	Introduction of standardised procedure for blood culture collection, sterile procedure.	Historical - Usual Care	Quasi experimental pre and post-test design	Nil Provided	True Positive Rate	Pre: 7% Post: 2.3%	High
Initial Specimen Diversion Device or Needle Switch								
Bell et al., (2018) United States of America	Emergency Department	Initial Specimen Diversion Device	Usual Care	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	"Common blood culture contaminants include coagulase-negative Staphylococci, viridans group Streptococci, Propionibacterium acnes, Micrococci, and Corynebacterium species (excluding jeikeium), all of which colonise the skin surface.	Nil	Pre: 3.5% Post: 1.6%	High
Patton et al., (2010) United States of America	Hospitalised, Emergency Department and Outpatient Settings	Initial specimen diversion technique	Historical – usual practice	Quasi experimental	Presence of one or more of the following organisms in one of a series of blood culture specimens: coagulase-negative Staphylococcus spp., Propionibacterium acnes, Micrococcus spp., "viridans" group Streptococci, Corynebacterium spp., or Bacillus spp	Nil	Pre: 3.9% Post: 2.0%	Medium
Rupp et al., (2017) United States of America	Emergency Department	Initial Specimen Diversion Device	Usual Care	Prospective open-label controlled trial, participants served as their own control	A culture was defined as contaminated if one or more of the following skin-residing organisms was recovered from only one of the paired cultures: coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Propionibacterium spp., Micrococcus spp., viridians group Streptococci, Corynebacterium spp., or Bacillus spp.	True Positive Rate; Time to Positive	Usual Care: 1.8% Intervention: 0.2%	Medium

Smart et al., (1993) Australia	Emergency Department	Needle change post venepuncture	Usual care (no needle switch)	Randomised Control Trial	The clinical significance of isolates was determined by experienced physicians from the department of microbiology and infectious diseases.	True Positive Rate; Gram Negative Sepsis	Venepuncture + No Needle Change: 6.4% Venepuncture + Needle Change: 4.2% Freshly Inserted Cannula: 4.3%	Medium
Sutton et al., (2018) United States of America	Emergency Department	Initial Specimen Diversion Device	Usual Care	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Nil Provided	Nil	Pre: 2.5% Post: 1.2%	High
Thamlikitkul et al., (1992) Thailand	Hospital Wide	No Needle Switching	Needle Switching	Interventional cross over trial	Blood culture was contaminated if either bottle grew microorganisms uncommonly pathogenic (such as Bacillus species, diphtheroids, Micrococcus species, Corynebacterium species, coagulase negative Staphylococci, or fungi) in the absence of clinical features suggesting infection, the clinician did not treat the patient for infections, or the clinician caring for these patients did not consider the culture results to represent infection.	Nil	Switch Needle: 7.6% No Switch Needle: 8.3%	Low
Zimmerman et al., (2019) Israel	Hospital Wide	Initial Specimen Diversion Device	Usual Care	Prospective Controlled Pragmatic Study	"Culture contamination was defined a priori as follows: classification of positive blood culture as contaminated was initially defined by microbiological criteria—growth of coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Corynebacteria, Micrococci, or alpha-hemolytic Streptococci. Cultures could be reclassified as true infections if such an organism was isolated from multiple blood cultures obtained by different venepuncture.	True Positive Rate	Usual Care: 4.7% Intervention: 1.0%	Medium
Sterile Procedure								
Kim et al., (2011). Korea	Ward Setting	Sterile gloving before venepuncture with standard blood culture collection process	Optional use of sterile gloves with standard blood culture collection process	Cluster randomised controlled trial	"Presence of Bacillus species, coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Corynebacterium species, Enterococcus species, Micrococcus species, Propionibacterium species, or viridans Streptococcus in a single blood culture."	Nil	Possible contaminants: Pre: 1.0% Post: 0.8% Likely contaminants: Pre: 0.8% Post: 0.6%	Low

Self et al., (2013) United States of America	Emergency Department	Sterile Procedure, Sterile Gloves, Kit	Historical – Usual Care	Interrupted Time Series	"A blood culture was classified as contaminated if one or more of the following organisms grew in only one culture of a series of blood cultures collected within 24 hours: Aerococcus species, a-hemolytic Streptococcus, Bacillus species except anthracis, coagulase negative Staphylococcus species except lugdunensis, Corynebacterium species, Micrococcus species, and Propionibacterium species. (Q-Tracks Definition)	Nil	Pre: 4.6% Post: 1.7%	Low
Self et al., (2014) United States of America	Emergency Department	Sterile blood culture collection process	Historical – Usual Care	Interrupted Time Series	A blood culture was classified as contaminated if one or more of the following organisms grew in only one culture in a series of blood cultures collected from the same patient during a single ED visit: Aerococcus species, a-hemolytic Streptococcus, Bacillus species except anthracis, coagulase-negative Staphylococcus species except lugdunensis, Corynebacterium species, Micrococcus species, and Propionibacterium species. (Taken from the Q Tracks definition)	Nil	Hospital A: Pre: 4.8% Post: 2.7% Hospital B: Pre: 2.5% Post 1: 2.7% Post 2: 0.9%	Low
Skin Asepsis								
Calfee et al., (2002). United States of America	Emergency Department and Ward settings	Skin preparation: 70% isopropyl alcohol, tincture of iodine, or povidone-iodine with 70% ethyl alcohol	10% povidone-iodine	Randomised control trial	One blood culture sample is positive for common skin organism (i.e., coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Micrococcus species, Propionibacterium acnes, viridans Streptococci, Corynebacterium species other than group JK, or Bacillus.	Nil	Povidone Iodine: 2.9% Tincture of Iodine: 2.6% Isopropyl Alcohol: 2.5% Povidone Iodine with Alcohol: 2.5%.	Medium
Kiyoyama et al., (2009) Japan	Ward and Emergency Department Settings	Skin antiseptics with 70% isopropyl alcohol with standard blood culture collection process	Skin antiseptics with 70% isopropyl alcohol + povidone iodine with standard blood culture collection process	Quasi experimental	Presence of coagulase-negative Staphylococci, Bacillus species, Propionibacterium species, Micrococcus species, Clostridium species, and Streptococci in a single blood culture.	Nil	Pre: 0.4% Post: 0.5%	Medium

Madeo et al., (2008). United States of America	Ward and Emergency Department Settings	Skin antisepsis with 2% chlorhexidine gluconate in 70% isopropyl alcohol applicator	Historical – Usual Practice	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Presence of coagulase-negative Staphylococci, diphtheroids, Propionibacteria or Micrococci.	Nil	Pre: 7.5% Post: 8.7%	Medium
Martinez et al., (2017). Spain	Ward, Intensive Care and Emergency Department Settings	Skin antisepsis with 2% chlorhexidine gluconate in 70% isopropyl alcohol	Skin antisepsis with 70% isopropyl alcohol	Randomised Controlled Trial	Presence of coagulase-negative Staphylococcus, Corynebacterium spp, Bacillus spp, Propionibacterium spp, Micrococcus, or α -hemolytic viridans group Streptococci, was recovered in one blood culture from the set of blood cultures, or when the same organism was not isolated from another potentially infected site.	Nil	Control: 0.9% Intervention: 1.9%	Medium
Schifman et al., (1993) United States of America	Hospital Wide	70% isopropyl alcohol / 10% acetone and povidone iodine dispenser in blood culture kits	Conventional care (isopropyl alcohol swabs and povidone iodine)	Prospective controlled study	Contaminants were characterised by the presence of a single positive culture from multiple specimens (if more than one was collected) that contained skin flora in which clinical findings were incompatible with primary or secondary bacteraemia.	True Positive Rate	Conventional Care: 4.6% Intervention: 2.2%	High
Story-Roller et al., (2016) United States of America	Ward and Intensive Care Settings	Chlorhexidine Skin Cleanser	Iodine tincture skin cleanser	Randomised Control Crossover trial	"Positive cultures were considered contaminated if only one culture set grew common skin organisms, including coagulase negative Staphylococci, viridans group Streptococci, Bacillus species, Neisseria species (other than Neisseria meningitidis or Neisseria gonorrhoeae), Micrococcus species, or aerobic Gram-positive rods. If two culture sets were positive with the same skin microorganism, they were considered true positives. A chart review of all contaminants was performed by one of the investigators to confirm that they were, in fact, true contaminants in the context of the patient's clinical picture. This was accomplished by review of progress notes within the electronic medical record to determine whether or not the patient was treated for the potential contaminant. If the clinical care team or infectious disease consultant determined treatment was necessary, the culture was considered a true positive.	True Positive Rate	Iodine: 3.9% Chlorhexidine: 3.9%	Medium

Suwanpimolkul et al., (2008) Thailand	Ward, Emergency and Intensive Care settings	2% Chlorhexidine in Alcohol	10% aq. Povidone Iodine	Prospectively randomised investigator blinded trial	Coagulase negative Staphylococcus, aerobic and anaerobic diphtheroids, Micrococcus spp., Bacillus spp., and viridans Streptococcus are considered contaminants, if two or more blood cultures are obtained and only one is positive.	Nil	Chlorhexidine: 3.2% Iodine: 6.9% Emergency Department: Iodine: 12.5% Chlorhexidine: 4.3% Wards and ICU Iodine 3.9% Chlorhexidine 2.6%	Medium
Wilson et al., (2000) United States of America	Hospital Wide	Iodine Tincture and Isopropyl Alcohol	Povidone Iodine and Alcohol	Crossover clinical trial	Nil provided	Nil	Povidone Iodine 5.5% Iodine Tincture 5.5%	High
Barenfanger et al., 2004 United States of America	Emergency Department	Skin preparation: 2% chlorhexidine	Iodine tincture	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	At least one culture was positive for coagulase negative Staphylococci, viridans group Streptococci, nutritionally deficient Streptococci, Peptostreptococcus spp., diphtheroids, or Propionibacterium, Bacillus, or Micrococcus spp.	Cost; Time required for skin asepsis; Staff preference	Chlorhexidine group: 3.1% Iodine group: 2.7%	Medium
Ryan et al., (2017) United States of America	Emergency Department	Replaced all alcohol pads with Chlorhexidine	Usual care	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	No definition	Nil	Pre: 4.5% Post: 1.5%	High
Strand et al., (1993) United States of America	Emergency Department	Iodine tincture	Povidone iodine	Pairwise comparison across multiple phases	Contaminant isolates were defined as the isolation of coagulase-negative Staphylococci, P acnes, viridians Streptococci, Corynebacterium species (excluding group JK), or Bacillus species from one sample of blood obtained from a single venepuncture.	Nil	Povidone iodine: 6.3% Iodine Tincture 3.7%	Medium
Tepus et al., (2008) United States of America	Emergency Department	2% Chlorhexidine in Alcohol	Tincture of Iodine	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	No definition	Nil	Iodine 3.5% Chlorhexidine: 2.2%	Medium

Little et al., (1999). United States of America	Ward Setting	Skin antiseptics with 2% iodine tincture in 47% alcohol	Skin antiseptics with 10% povidone-iodine	Randomised Controlled Trial	Presence of <i>Corynebacterium</i> , <i>Propionibacterium</i> , <i>Clostridium</i> , <i>Micrococcus</i> or <i>Bacillus</i> spp., coagulase-negative <i>Staphylococci</i> , or <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> in one or both bottles without isolation of the same organism from another blood culture or another site culture.	Cost Savings	Control: 3.8% Intervention: 2.4%	Low
McLellan et al., (2008) United Kingdom	Ward Settings	Skin antiseptics with 2% chlorhexidine gluconate in 70% isopropyl alcohol	Skin antiseptics with 70% isopropyl alcohol	Quasi experimental (pre-test / post-test design)	Blood culture isolates were classified as contaminants or true pathogens following assessment by a medical microbiologist. The decision was based on the identity of the organism, the frequency of its isolation from blood and the clinical scenario. Methicillin-resistant <i>S. aureus</i> (MRSA), methicillin-sensitive <i>S. aureus</i> (MSSA) and all Gram-negative organisms were assumed to be significant for the purposes of this study.	Nil	Pre: 8.9% Post 1: 7.4% Post 2: 7.5%	Medium
Sharar et al., (1990) Israel	Ward Setting	Alcohol + Iodine skin asepsis	Alcohol cleansing alone	Case Control Study	The definition of False Positive was based on clinical judgement following previously described guidelines.	Nil	Alcohol only: 4.4% Alcohol / Iodine: 3.3%	Medium
Washer et al., (2013) United States of America	Ward Setting	Chlorhexidine Skin Cleanser	Povidone Iodine and Iodine tincture	Randomised Crossover Trial	A positive culture set was considered contaminated if it grew typical skin organisms, including aerobic gram-positive rods, <i>Lactobacillus</i> species, <i>Propionibacterium acnes</i> , <i>Micrococcus</i> species, <i>Bacillus</i> species (not <i>B. anthracis</i> or <i>B. cereus</i>), coagulase-negative <i>Staphylococcus</i> , <i>Neisseria</i> species (not <i>N. meningitidis</i> or <i>N. gonorrhoeae</i>), or alpha-haemolytic <i>Streptococci</i> (not <i>Enterococcus</i> species), from only 1 blood culture Set.	Nil	Povidone Iodine: 0.6% Iodine Tincture: 0.8% Chlorhexidine: 0.9%	Low
Mimoz et al., (1999) France	Intensive Care Unit	Skin antiseptics with 0.5% chlorhexidine gluconate	Skin antiseptics with 10% povidone iodine	Randomised Controlled Trial	Presence of coagulase-negative <i>Staphylococci</i> , <i>Propionibacterium acnes</i> , <i>Streptococcus viridans</i> , <i>Corynebacterium</i> species (excluding group JK), <i>Micrococcus</i> species, or <i>Bacillus</i> species—that were obtained from one set of blood cultures and an identical organism that was not obtained from another potentially infected site (for example, blood culture, catheter tip, or urine) 5 days before or 5 days after blood culture collection.	Nil	Control: 3.3% Intervention: 1.4%	Low

Table 3: Studies investigating the change of skin asepsis solutions on contamination rates. ED = Emergency Department; W = Ward; ICU = Intensive Care Unit; H = Whole of Hospital; MO = Medical Officer; RN = Registered Nurse; P = Phlebotomist; T = Health Care Technician.

Author / Year	Sample Size	Setting	Clinician	Skin Asepsis (Intervention)	Contamination	Skin Asepsis (Usual Care)	Contamination
Barenfanger et al., (2004)	11738	ED	MO & RN & P	2% chlorhexidine	5%	Iodine tincture	11%
Calfee et al., (2002)	12692	ED & W	Not Specified	70% isopropyl alcohol	2.50%	10% povidone-iodine	2.93%
				Tincture of iodine	2.58%		
				Povidone-iodine with 70% ethyl alcohol	2.46%		
Kiyoyama et al., (2009)	5653	ED & W	MO	70% isopropyl alcohol	0.42%	70% isopropyl alcohol + povidone iodine	0.46%
Little et al., (1999)	3851	W	P	2% iodine tincture in 47% alcohol	2.42%	10% povidone-iodine	3.8%
Madeo et al., (2008)	100	ED & W	MO	2% chlorhexidine	2.1%	Not defined	7.5%
Martinez et al., (2017)	1102	ED & ICU & W	RN	2% chlorhexidine	1.86%	70% isopropyl alcohol	0.89%
McLellan et al., (2008)	1725	W	MO & T	2% chlorhexidine	7.43% and 7.54%	70% isopropyl alcohol	8.88%
Mimoz et al., (1999)	2041	ICU	RN	0.5% chlorhexidine	1.37%	10% povidone iodine	3.33%
Ryan et al., (2017)	378	ED	MO & RN	3.15% chlorhexidine	1.5%	70% isopropyl alcohol	4.5%
Schifman et al., (1993)	1546	H	MO & RN	70% isopropyl alcohol / 10% acetone / povidone iodine (PREP method)	2.2%	Isopropyl alcohol and povidone-iodine	4.6%
Shahar et al., (1990)	362	W	MO	70% isopropyl alcohol and providone iodine solution applicator	3.3%	70% isopropyl alcohol	4.4%
Story-roller et al., (2016)	6095	ICU & W	RN & T	2% chlorhexidine	3.88%	70% isopropyl alcohol and iodine tincture	3.93%
Strand et al., (1993)	12795	ED	MO & RN	Iodine tincture	3.74%	Povidone-iodine	3.74%
Suwanpimolkul et al., (2008)	2142	ED & ICU & W	MO & RN	2% chlorhexidine	3.2%	Povidone-iodine	6.25%
Tepus et al., (2008)	14764	ED	RN & T	2% chlorhexidine	2.2%	Iodine tincture	3.5%
Trautner et al., (2002)	430	ICU & W	MO & T	2% chlorhexidine	0.5%	Iodine tincture	1.4%
Washer et al., (2013)	8674	W	P	2% chlorhexidine	0.93%	Povidone iodine	0.58%
Wilson et al., (2000)	12367	H	MO	Iodine tincture	5.5%	Povidone iodine	5.5%

Primary outcome

Definition of contamination

The definition of contamination varied widely amongst the studies included in this review. Nine (15.8%) (26, 31, 40, 43, 46, 51, 63, 69, 80) studies did not define contamination at all. The majority (34, 59.6%) of studies used species-based criteria for the definition of contamination with provisions that a contaminant could be considered a true pathogen if it was found in multiple cultures (6, 13, 20, 22, 24, 25, 28-30, 33, 34, 36-38, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 55-59, 61, 65-67, 70, 74-76, 78, 79). The remaining 14 (24.6%) studies defined a contaminant without stating a specific species, but used expert opinion or referred to previously published definitions of contamination (21, 23, 27, 32, 35, 39, 41, 42, 53, 54, 60, 64, 68, 73).


Meta-analysis

Thirty-four studies were included in the meta-analysis. The remaining 23 studies did not satisfy the review's definition of contamination, or included insufficient detail in the reporting of their results. Figure 2 displays the results of the meta-analysis by intervention type.

In the 34 studies (N=556,007) included in the meta-analysis, there were eight distinct interventions reported (dedicated collection team; intervention bundle including collection kit, education, initial specimen diversion device, skin asepsis; feedback, sterile gloving, or needle change). Overall, interventions to reduce blood culture contamination significantly decrease the risk of blood culture contamination by 34% (RR 0.66, 95% CI 0.59-0.75; I^2 87%) (Figure 2). Heterogeneity was significantly high for all interventions, which could be attributed to the differences in interventions and variation in settings and patient acuity.

Skin antisepsis was the most commonly investigated intervention, but its impact on blood culture contamination is inconclusive. The most impactful intervention appeared to be having a dedicated phlebotomy team for blood culture collection, which resulted to a reduction of blood culture contamination by 60% (RR 0.40, 95% CI 0.21-0.76; I^2 87%). This was followed by diversion devices that led to a 57% reduction of contamination (RR 0.43, 95% CI 0.31-0.58; I^2 38%). Intervention bundles, usually a combination of education, feedback, collection packs and change of cleaning solution, were associated with a 51% reduction of contamination (RR 0.49, 95% CI 0.38-0.64; I^2 84%). Staff education and training led to a 36% reduction of contamination (RR 0.64, 95% CI 0.53-0.81; I^2 84%) (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Forest plot of the studies included in the meta-analysis based on intervention. M-H = Mantel-Haenszel, CI = Confidence Interval.



Other outcomes

There were eight other outcome measures reported in 57 studies: true positive rate (n=10, 17.5%) (6, 32, 34, 35, 43, 54, 56, 60, 61, 78); cost savings (n=4, 7%) (27, 50, 67, 68), gram-negative isolates (n=2, 3.5%) (42, 54), blood volume (35), staff preference (50), time required for skin asepsis (50), time to positive (78) and multiple sets (26).

Seven of the studies that reported on true positive rates did not detect a change between control groups and the intervention group (6, 32, 43, 56, 60, 61, 78), however these interventions were varied. There were three studies that showed improvements in true positive rates. Bae et al. (2018) showed that the introduction of a dedicated phlebotomy team increased the true positive rate (5.87% vs 5.01%) (77). Smart et al. (1993) showed that the true positive rate increased when cultures were collected from a pre-existing IVC (54). Zimmerman et al. (2018) showed a decrease in the true positive rate of blood cultures during their information/feedback intervention from 5.6% to 5.2% (34). Due to the large sample size of this study, this decrease was significant. However, the clinical significance of a 0.4% decrease in true positive rates is unknown (34). Gram negative isolates fell by 36% post the introduction of a blood culture collection kit, however this did not change the probability of a gram-negative isolate (42). In earlier work Gram negative isolates were higher when blood taken through an existing intravenous access device however did not change through the needle switch intervention (54).

Blood volume cultured was measured by Bae et al., (2019). During their intervention, where the collectors were changed from intern medical officers to a dedicated phlebotomy team, the volume of blood cultured increased from 2.1mls to 5.6mls (35). This increase in volume was associated with a significant decrease in contamination rates from (0.45% to 0.27%, $p < 0.001$) (35). The number of sets of blood cultures collected were measured by Suzuki et al., (2018) as part of this educational intervention. An increase from multiple sets from 51% to 95% was associated with a reduction of the contamination rate from 3.6% to 0.3% ($p = 0.012$) (26).

In the studies that reported cost savings the results varied widely. Alshmedi et al. (2015) and Harding et al. (2013) reported annualised savings credited to blood culture contamination reduction of £250 000 and \$614 000 respectively (27, 68). Other cost saving have been attributed to a per patient saving of \$4100 (67) and a saving in asepsis solution of 16c per applicator (50).

Discussion

This systematic review identified 57 studies that aimed to decrease peripheral blood culture contamination in acute care settings. These 57 studies utilised eight specific interventions in four distinct acute care settings. In general, the interventions reported were found to reduce the risk of blood culture contamination. However, dedicated collection teams, initial specimen diversion devices, intervention bundles or staff education and training were the most successful at reducing contamination. The majority of studies included in this review were quasi-experimental, and without randomisation, therefore their risk of bias was medium to high, with only 12 (21.1%) having a low risk of bias.

Dedicated collection teams have demonstrated the most significant success in reducing blood culture contamination. The introduction of a dedicated team to collect blood cultures has a high cost to the organisation, which limits the ability of organisations to implement this intervention. The introduction of an initial specimen diversion device was also very successful at reducing blood culture contamination. This intervention first appeared in the literature in 2010 and consisted of a diversion of a quantity of blood into a collection tube before collecting the culture samples (45). Since then, authors have described a specifically designed collection device that automatically diverts 1.5 – 2 mLs of blood before collection of the culture sample (5, 44, 56). While this intervention was successful, it also requires specific equipment (at a cost) and training for staff which may not be practical in all settings. Other successful interventions such as, intervention bundles, staff education and staff feedback are also successful methods for blood culture contamination reduction and may have a lower cost to the organisation.

The reduction in blood culture contamination seen by Self et al. (47) when introducing a sterile procedure was not seen in the study by Kim et al. (57) however the difference in approach to the sterile procedure may account for the differences seen. Multiple different skin asepsis solutions have been tried in an attempt to reduce contamination (Table 3). The comparators for the introduction of Chlorhexidine were varied in type (iodine based preparations, alcohols, acetone or combination of these substances) and also varied in terms of the application method. All of these solutions can provide skin asepsis; however, their use and effectiveness vary depending on their application. Differences in the outcomes of these studies may be due to the nature of the application of the substance rather than the substance itself. For these reasons, these results must be interpreted with caution.

Clear trends are present in successful interventions. Education and feedback to staff that collect blood culture, whether this is dedicated staff or general clinical staff have a dramatic impact on the contamination rate. A bundled approach that contains correct equipment, accompanying education and feedback are likely to be deliverable in most settings without the need for dedicated teams or the introduction of new equipment such as initial specimen diversion devices. However, there are benefits in the reduction of blood culture contamination that may

necessitate the use of dedicated collection teams and initial specimen diversion devices in settings where reduction can not be achieved by education, feedback and bundled interventions alone. There was no support in the studies included in this review for needle swapping or a sterile procedure.

Limitations

Systematic reviews and their associated meta-analyses are reliant on the quality of the original studies they incorporate. Overall in this review, many of the studies had a high risk of bias. Therefore there is an increased risk that the overall results contain bias. Some studies with large sample and effect sizes may skew the results. The heterogeneity of the definitions of contamination and methodology used to assess contamination will lead to differences in the reporting of results. Many of the studies reported used multiple interventions simultaneously, which makes it difficult to discern the effect of each intervention; however, in a multifactorial problem such as blood culture contamination this may be a positive attribute. Incomplete data was reported in some studies which may introduce bias into the analysis presented.

Conclusions

Eight groups of interventions were identified in this review aimed at reducing blood culture contamination in acute care. Dedicated phlebotomy teams, diversion devices, intervention bundles, and staff education and training led to significant reductions in blood culture contamination.

References

1. Bowen CM, Coleman T, Cunningham D. Reducing Blood Culture Contaminations in the Emergency Department: It Takes a Team. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. 2016;42(4):306-11.
2. Wilson ML, Mitchell M, Morris A, Murray P, Reimer L, Reller L, et al. Principles and procedures for blood cultures; approved guideline. CLSI document M47-A Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2007.
3. Ramos M. Reducing Blood Culture Contaminations. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. 2017;43(1):7.
4. Nair A, Elliott SP, Al Mohajer M. Knowledge, attitude, and practice of blood culture contamination: A multicenter study. *American Journal of Infection Control* 2017;45(5):547-8.
5. Rupp ME, Cavalieri RJ, Marolf C, Lyden E. Reduction in Blood Culture Contamination Through Use of Initial Specimen Diversion Device. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2017;65(2):201-5.
6. Roth A, Wiklund AE, Palsson AS, Melander EZ, Wullt M, Cronqvist J, et al. Reducing blood culture contamination by a simple informational intervention. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 2010;48(12):4552-8.
7. Alahmadi YM, Aldeyab MA, McElnay JC, Scott MG, Darwish Elhajji FW, Magee FA, et al. Clinical and economic impact of contaminated blood cultures within the hospital setting. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2011;77(3):233-6.
8. Ryan C. Implementation of the Theory of Planned Behavior to Promote Compliance with a Chlorhexidine Gluconate Protocol. *Journal of the Association for Vascular Access*. 2017;22(2):64-70.
9. Self WH, Mickanin J, Grijalva CG, Grant FH, Henderson MC, Corley G, et al. Reducing blood culture contamination in community hospital emergency departments: a multicenter evaluation of a quality improvement intervention. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2014;21(3):274-82.
10. Denno J, Gannon M. Practical steps to lower blood culture contamination rates in the emergency department. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. 2013;39(5):459-64.
11. Long B, Koyfman A. Best Clinical Practice: Blood Culture Utility in the Emergency Department. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2016;51(5):529-39.
12. Dempsey C, Skoglund E, Muldrew KL, Garey KW. Economic health care costs of blood culture contamination: a systematic review. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2019;47(8):963-7.
13. Chriseleit D. Use of Simulation to Reinforce Evidence-based Collection Processes For Blood Cultures: University of North Florida; 2011.
14. Hughes JA, Cabilan CJ, Williams J, Ray M, Coyer F. The effectiveness of interventions to reduce peripheral blood culture contamination in acute care: A systematic review protocol 11 Medical and Health Sciences 1117 Public Health and Health Services. *Systematic Reviews*. 2018;7(1).
15. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2010;8(5):336-41.
16. Cochrane Collaboration. Suggested risk of bias criteria for EPOC reviews. Oxford: Cochrane Collaboration; 2013.
17. Collaboration C. Review manager (RevMan)[computer program]. Version; 2014.
18. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *British Medical Journal*. 2003;327(7414):557.
19. Opota O, Croxatto A, Prod'hom G, Greub G. Blood culture-based diagnosis of bacteraemia: state of the art. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infection Control*. 2015;21(4):313-22.
20. Al-Hamad A, Al-Ibrahim M, Alhajhouj E, Al-Alshaikh Jaffer W, Altowaileb J, Alfaraj H. Nurses' competency in drawing blood cultures and educational intervention to reduce the contamination rate. *Journal of infection and public health*. 2016;9(1):66-74.
21. Bentley J, Thakore S, Muir L, Baird A, Lee J. A change of culture: reducing blood culture contamination rates in an Emergency Department. *BMJ quality improvement reports*. 2016;5(1).
22. Eskira S, Gilad J, Schlaeffer P, Hyam E, Peled N, Karakis I, et al. Reduction of blood culture contamination rate by an educational intervention. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2006;12(8):818-21.
23. Ge Y, Liu XQ, Xu YC, Xu S, Yu MH, Zhang W, et al. Blood collection procedures influence contamination rates in blood culture: A prospective study. *Chinese Medical Journal*. 2011;124(23):4002-6.

24. Hopkins K, Huynh S, McNary C, Walker A, Nixon R, Craighead JE. Reducing blood culture contamination rates: A systematic approach to improving quality of care. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2013;41(12):1272-4.
25. Lin CM, Lee WS, Lin FY, Yu FL, Ou TY, Teng SO. Reducing Blood Culture Contamination Rates by Educational Intervention and one-on-one Feedback in the Emergency Department. *Journal of Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2012;4(3):154-6.
26. Suzuki N, Katayama M. Reducing blood culture contamination by an educational intervention with a simple procedure sheet at an acute care hospital. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2018;46(6):S55.
27. Alahmadi YM, McElnay JC, Kearney MP, Aldeyab MA, Magee FA, Hanley J, et al. Tackling the problem of blood culture contamination in the intensive care unit using an educational intervention. *Epidemiology and Infection*. 2015;143(9):1964-71.
28. Gibb AP, Hill B, Choresel B, Brandt R. Reduction in blood culture contamination rate by feedback to phlebotomists. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine*. 1997;121(5):503-7.
29. Park WB, Myung SJ, Oh MD, Lee J, Kim NJ, Kim EC, et al. Educational intervention as an effective step for reducing blood culture contamination: a prospective cohort study. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2015;91(2):111-6.
30. Ramirez P, Gordón M, Cortes C, Villarreal E, Perez-Belles C, Robles C, et al. Blood culture contamination rate in an intensive care setting: Effectiveness of an education-based intervention. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2015;43(8):844-7.
31. Robert RR. Reducing blood-culture contamination through an education program. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*. 2011;34(1):49-54.
32. Robertson P, Russell A, Inverarity DJ. The effect of a quality improvement programme reducing blood culture contamination on the detection of bloodstream infection in an emergency department. *Journal of Infection Prevention*. 2015;16(2):82-7.
33. Sanchez-Sanchez MM, Arias-Rivera S, Fraile-Gamo P, Jareno-Collado R, Lopez-Roman S, Vadillo-Obesso P, et al. Effect of a training programme on blood culture contamination rate in critical care. *Enfermeria Intensiva*. 2018;29(3):121-7.
34. Zimmerman FS, Assous MV, Yinnon AM, Wiener-Well Y. Reducing blood culture contamination using a departmental report card. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2018;99:236-7.
35. Bae M, In Kim H, Park JH, Ryu BH, Chang J, Sung H, et al. Improvement of blood culture contamination rate, blood volume, and true positive rate after introducing a dedicated phlebotomy team. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*. 2018.
36. Foggiato GF, Tuon FF, Becker G, dos Santos AH, Pereira BR, de Souza GL, et al. Reduction of blood culture contamination rates after implementation of a phlebotomist team. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2017;45(6):698-9.
37. Gander RM, Byrd L, DeCrescenzo M, Hirany S, Bowen M, Baughman J. Impact of blood cultures drawn by phlebotomy on contamination rates and health care costs in a hospital emergency department. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 2009;47(4):1021-4.
38. Weinbaum FI, Lavie S, Danek M, Sixsmith D, Heinrich GF, Mills SS. Doing it right the first time: quality improvement and the contaminant blood culture. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 1997;35(3):563-5.
39. Bamber AI, Cunniffe JG, Nayar D, Ganguly R, Falconer E. Effectiveness of introducing blood culture collection packs to reduce contamination rates. *British Journal of Biomedical Science*. 2009;66(1):6-9.
40. Dhillon RH, Clark J, Azadian BS. Reducing blood culture contamination. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2009;73(1):97-9.
41. Madeo M, Davies D, Owen L, Wadsworth P, Johnson G, Martin CR. Reduction in the contamination rate of blood cultures collected by medical staff in the accident and emergency department. *Clinical Effectiveness in Nursing*. 2003;7(1):30-2.
42. Thomas S, Cheesbrough J, Plumb S, Bolton L, Wilkinson P, Walmsley J, et al. Impact of a blood culture collection kit on the quality of blood culture sampling: fear and the law of unintended consequences. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2011;78(4):256-9.
43. Yan YZ, Yang HZ, Zhao JX, Xia R. A Quality Control Circle Process to Reduce Blood Culture Contamination Rates. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology*. 2019;40(1):119-20.

44. Bell M, Bogar C, Plante J, Rasmussen K, Winters S. Effectiveness of a Novel Specimen Collection System in Reducing Blood Culture Contamination Rates. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. 2018;44(6):570-5.
45. Patton RG, Schmitt T. Innovation for reducing blood culture contamination: initial specimen diversion technique. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 2010;48(12):4501-3.
46. Sutton J, Fritsch P, Moody M, Dinero K, Holder C. A novel solution to prevent blood culture contamination using an engineered passive blood diversion device. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2018;46(6):S63.
47. Self WH, Speroff T, Grijalva CG, McNaughton CD, Ashburn J, Liu D, et al. Reducing blood culture contamination in the emergency department: An interrupted time series quality improvement study. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2013;20(1):89-97.
48. Kiyoyama T, Tokuda Y, Shiiki S, Hachiman T, Shimasaki T, Endo K. Isopropyl alcohol compared with isopropyl alcohol plus povidone-iodine as skin preparation for prevention of blood culture contamination. *Journal of clinical microbiology*. 2009;47(1):54-8.
49. Madeo M, Barlow G. Reducing blood-culture contamination rates by the use of a 2% chlorhexidine solution applicator in acute admission units. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2008;69(3):307-9.
50. Barenfanger J, Drake C, Lawhorn J, Verhulst SJ. Comparison of chlorhexidine and tincture of iodine for skin antisepsis in preparation for blood sample collection. *Journal of clinical microbiology*. 2004;42(5):2216-7.
51. Tepus D, Fleming E, Cox S, Hazelett S, Kropp D. Effectiveness of CHLORAPREP in reduction of blood culture contamination rates in emergency department. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*. 2008;23(3):272-6.
52. McLellan E, Townsend R, Parsons HK. Evaluation of ChlorPrep (2% chlorhexidine gluconate in 70% isopropyl alcohol) for skin antisepsis in preparation for blood culture collection. *Journal of Infection*. 2008;57(6):459-63.
53. Trautner BW, Clarridge JE, Darouiche RO. Skin antisepsis kits containing alcohol and chlorhexidine gluconate or tincture of iodine are associated with low rates of blood culture contamination. *Infection control and hospital epidemiology*. 2002;23(7):397-401.
54. Smart D, Baggoley C, Head J, Noble D, Wetherall B, Gordon DL. Effect of needle changing and intravenous cannula collection on blood culture contamination rates. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*. 1993;22(7):1164-8.
55. Thamlikitkul V, Chokloikaew S, Tangtrakul T, Siripoonkiat P, Wongpreedee N, Danchaivijitr S. Blood culture: comparison of outcomes between switch-needle and no-switch techniques. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 1992;20(3):122-5.
56. Zimmerman FS, Assous MV, Zevin S, Wiener-Well Y. Reducing blood culture contamination using an initial specimen diversion device. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2019;47(7):822-6.
57. Kim NH, Kim M, Lee S, Yun NR, Kim KH, Park SW, et al. Effect of routine sterile gloving on contamination rates in blood culture: a cluster randomized trial. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2011;154(3):145-51.
58. Calfee DP, Farr BM. Comparison of four antiseptic preparations for skin in the prevention of contamination of percutaneously drawn blood cultures: a randomized trial. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2002;40(5):1660-5.
59. Martinez J, Macias JH, Arreguin V, Alvarez JA, Macias AE, Mosqueda-Gomez JL. Isopropyl alcohol is as efficient as chlorhexidine to prevent contamination of blood cultures. *American Journal of Infection Control* [Internet]. 2017; (no pagination).
60. Schifman RB, Pindur A. The effect of skin disinfection materials on reducing blood culture contamination. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology* [Internet]. 1993; 99(5):[536-8 pp.].
61. Story-Roller E, Weinstein MP. Chlorhexidine versus Tincture of Iodine for Reduction of Blood Culture Contamination Rates: a Prospective Randomized Crossover Study. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2016;54(12):3007-9.
62. Suwanpimolkul G, Pongkumpai M, Suankratay C. A randomized trial of 2% chlorhexidine tincture compared with 10% aqueous povidone-iodine for venipuncture site disinfection: Effects on blood culture contamination rates. *Journal of Infection*. 2008;56(5):354-9.

63. Wilson ML, Weinstein MP, Mirrett S, Reimer LG, Fernando C, Meredith FT, et al. Comparison of iodophor and alcohol pledgets with the Medi-Flex blood culture prep kit II for preventing contamination of blood cultures. *Journal of clinical microbiology*. 2000;38(12):4665-7.
64. Shahar E, Wohl-Gottesman BS, Shenkman L. Contamination of blood cultures during venepuncture: fact or myth? *Postgraduate medical journal*. 1990;66(782):1053-8.
65. Washer LL, Chenoweth C, Kim HW, Rogers MA, Malani AN, Riddell J, et al. Blood culture contamination: a randomized trial evaluating the comparative effectiveness of 3 skin antiseptic interventions. *Infection control and hospital epidemiology* [Internet]. 2013; 34(1):[15-21 pp.].
66. Mimos O, Karim A, Mercat A, Cosseron M, Falissard B, Parker F, et al. Chlorhexidine compared with povidone-iodine as skin preparation before blood culture. A randomized, controlled trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 1999;131(11):834-7.
67. Little JR, Murray PR, Traynor PS, Spitznagel E. A randomized trial of povidone-iodine compared with iodine tincture for venipuncture site disinfection: effects on rates of blood culture contamination. *The American journal of medicine*. 1999;107(2):119-25.
68. Harding AD, Bollinger S. Reducing Blood Culture Contamination Rates in the Emergency Department. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. 2013;39(1):e1-e6.
69. Moeller D. Eliminating Blood Culture False Positives: Harnessing the Power of Nursing Shared Governance. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. 2017;43(2):126-32.
70. Strand CL, Wajsbort RR, Sturmman K. Effect of iodophor vs iodine tincture skin preparation on blood culture contamination rate. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 1993;269(8):1004-6.
71. Moeller D. Eliminating Blood Culture False Positives: Harnessing the Power of Nursing Shared Governance. *Journal Of Emergency Nursing: JEN: Official Publication Of The Emergency Department Nurses Association*. 2017;43(2):126-32.
72. Smart D, Baggoley C, Head J, Noble D, Wetherall B, Gordon DL. Effect of needle changing and intravenous cannula collection on blood culture contamination rates. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* [Internet]. 1993; 22(7):[1164-8 pp.].
73. McLellan E, Townsend R, Parsons HK. Evaluation of Chloraprep (2% chlorhexidine gluconate in 70% isopropyl alcohol) for skin antisepsis in preparation for blood culture collection. *The Journal of infection*. 2008;57(6):459-63.
74. Madeo M, Barlow G. Reducing blood-culture contamination rates by the use of a 2% chlorhexidine solution applicator in acute admission units. *The Journal of hospital infection*. 2008;69(3):307-9.
75. Suwanpimolkul G, Pongkumpai M, Suankratay C. A randomized trial of 2% chlorhexidine tincture compared with 10% aqueous povidone-iodine for venipuncture site disinfection: Effects on blood culture contamination rates. *The Journal of infection*. 2008;56(5):354-9.
76. Bowen CM, Coleman T, Cunningham D. Reducing Blood Culture Contaminations in the Emergency Department: It Takes a Team. *Journal of emergency nursing: JEN : official publication of the Emergency Department Nurses Association*. 2016;42(4):306-11.
77. Bae M, In Kim H, Park JH, Ryu BH, Chang J, Sung H, et al. Improvement of blood culture contamination rate, blood volume, and true positive rate after introducing a dedicated phlebotomy team. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Disease*. 2019;38(2):325-30.
78. Rupp ME, Cavalieri RJ, Marolf C, Lyden E. Reduction in Blood Culture Contamination Through Use of Initial Specimen Diversion Device. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2017;65(2):201-5.
79. Self WH, Mickanin J, Grijalva CG, Grant FH, Henderson MC, Corley G, et al. Reducing blood culture contamination in community hospital emergency departments: a multicenter evaluation of a quality improvement intervention. *Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2014;21(3):274-82.
80. Ryan C. Implementation of the Theory of Planned Behavior to Promote Compliance with a Chlorhexidine Gluconate Protocol. *JAVA - Journal of the Association for Vascular Access*. 2017;22(2):64-70.