

Letters to the Editor

Ethical Aspects in Infection Control

To the Editor:

The article by Herwaldt¹ reminds us of some of the difficulties encountered in implementing a strict isolation policy for patients with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). From July 1992, this 800-bed regional teaching hospital experienced for 1½ years the continual presence of an MRSA III-29 strain that colonized or infected patients on the intensive-care units and on two surgical wards. New cases regularly were detected and placed in strict isolation, according to the guidelines of the Dutch Working Party on Infection Prevention.² This policy is described easily, but it pays no attention to the impact on the patients involved.

During our MRSA epidemic, most of the patients encountered by the Department of Surgery were cared for on one ward, so that the members of the nursing staff were involved widely with the isolation of the 15 colonized or contact patients. It was noted that a number of sociopsychological effects occurred in these patients, and we would like to focus attention on them.

All patients experienced varying psychological or behavioral disturbances due to the implementation of the strict isolation. Most patients felt "infected" and were inhibited in their personal communication with visiting family members. They felt deprived of normal interhuman relationships. The isolation contributed to depressive feelings in addition to the mental stress already present due to the original reason for hospitalization.

Furthermore, feelings expressing a lack of self-esteem were noted, due to the fact that patients considered themselves as an infection danger for their relatives or neighborhood acquaintances. In the most aggravating form, one patient threatened suicide unless his isolation was terminated. As he was a heavy disperser of MRSA, this unfortunately could not be granted, as the isolation policy mentioned has been advocated strongly nationwide by the Inspectorate of the

Dutch Department of Health. Due to his preexistent postconcentration-camp syndrome³ and his memory of this traumatizing era during the isolation period, continuing psychiatric support was necessary during and after his hospital stay.

It is not surprising that the main burden of these difficulties was carried by the nursing staff, and both the patient and the healthcare workers were relieved greatly when discharge from the hospital eventually became possible. Despite extensive patient information regarding MRSA carrier-ship, not all patients are willing to report their previous MRSA colonization when subsequently readmitted to the hospital. Due to the above-mentioned psychological problems, at least three patients with chronic underlying disease have done their utmost to avoid readmission to the hospital, and this sometimes has been considered by the attending specialist to have been harmful to their medical care.

J.H.T. Wagenvoort, MD, PhD

Chairman

Hospital Infection Control Committee

L.L.G.J. Gelissen, RN

Nurse-in-Chief

Surgical Department

H. Timpert, PhD

Reverend

Hospital Pastoral Service

De Wever Hospital

Heerlen, The Netherlands

REFERENCES

1. Herwaldt LA. Ethical aspects of infection control. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1996;17:108-113.
2. Vandembroucke-Grauls C. Epidemiology of staphylococcal infections—a European perspective. *J Chemother* 1994;(suppl 2)6:67-70.
3. Garland C. The lasting trauma of the concentration camps. *Brit Med J* 1993;307:77-78.

The author replies.

The letter by Wagenvoort et al highlights the emotional and psychological problems that patients in isolation for resistant organisms may experience. In general, infection control personnel have focused on preventing

the spread of resistant organisms from colonized or infected patients to other patients. We would all agree that this is a laudable goal, as it protects numerous patients, visitors, and healthcare workers. However, infection control personnel rarely have evaluated the effect of precautions on the patients who are isolated. These patients are entitled to receive appropriate medical care without undue emotional and psychological stress. Thus, infection control staff and clinicians must work together to devise methods to prevent the spread of resistant organisms and to maintain the isolated patient's autonomy and emotional well-being.

In some instances, both of these goals could be achieved by instituting an isolation ward in which the patients are free to walk around. However, many hospitals may not have enough patients to warrant an isolation ward, and other hospitals may not be able to create isolation wards for other reasons. In such institutions, clinicians and infection control personnel must work together to design solutions for patients who will be isolated for long periods of time. For example, patients could wash their hands with an antiseptic preparation and put on a clean cover gown before they walk in the corridor or outside the hospital. Patients could wash their hands and put on a cover gown and then go to physical therapy at the end of the day. All equipment used by the patient would have to be cleaned thoroughly.

Infection control staff must educate the clinical staff to ensure that they do not complicate the isolation precautions needlessly. We have found that nurses and physicians who do not understand the epidemiology of the organism or the method of isolation often give the patient and family members incorrect information, which only increases their anxiety, frustration, and anger. In addition, infection control personnel and clinicians need to educate the patients and their families and to reassure them that the patients are not a risk to their family members and friends. While teaching patients and families about the organism and the isolation precautions, staff should ask the affected individuals about their main concerns. Some