

tions, Ehrenkranz et al comment that "... prospective measures are costly, however, and this approach rarely is done even once at most hospitals."¹ I agree that evaluation of surveillance accuracy, an important job performance measure, tends to be done too infrequently. However, interdisciplinary collaboration enabled by a change in the use of infection control committee members' time provides a simple means to support prospective monitoring.² Decreasing the frequency of routine infection control committee meetings in exchange for assigning one "prevalence round" per year to each physician member permits continuing measurement of surveillance accuracy, builds collaborative relationships, provides ongoing educational exchanges, and can identify both problems and approaches to improve cases detection in the spirit of continuous quality improvement.³ The ICP and an accompanying physician, on their annual turn, independently review every chart on a randomly selected ward and then compare their findings. Analysis of discrepancies and of cases not previously known to the surveillance system may improve performance of both the ICP and the system.

David Birnbaum, PhD, MPH
Applied Epidemiology
Sidney, British Columbia, Canada

REFERENCES

1. Ehrenkranz NJ, Shultz JM, Richter EI. Recorded criteria as a 'gold standard' for sensitivity and specificity estimates of surveillance of nosocomial infection: a novel method to measure job performance. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1995;16:697-702.
2. Birnbaum D. Risk management versus infection control committees. *Dimensions in Health Service* 1981;58(12):16-19.
3. Birnbaum D, King LA. Disadvantages of infection surveillance by medical record chart review. *Am J Infect Control* 1981;9:15-17.

The authors reply.

We thank Dr. Birnbaum for his comments. His suggestion to permit each physician member to exchange the participation in one infection control committee meeting with attendance at an interdisciplinary surveillance accuracy "prevalence round" is very creative and probably highly effective in improving surveillance sensitivity and specificity at his hospital. Success in replicating such an activity elsewhere is likely to depend on the availability of knowledgeable

physicians members who, in fact, do attend meetings regularly and are willing to set aside the necessary time to carry out the "prevalence round" as intended.

Several years' experience appears to be required for infection control practitioners (ICPs) to develop proficiency at the Florida Consortium for Infection Control; this may well reflect the period necessary for their acquiring facility in skills of time management and networking with other hospital personnel, who act as referral sources of possibly infected patients, as well as for becoming familiar with application of criteria of infection. In a number of instances, it seems that, as a consequence of increasing burdens currently being placed on ICPs, surveillance receives a lower priority, and established accuracy falls concomitantly. Repeated use of recorded criteria as the "gold standard" of surveillance accuracy then serves to distinguish between what the ICPs are capable of doing and what they actually accomplish.

N. Joel Ehrenkranz, MD
James M. Shultz, MS, PhD
Emily Richter, RRA

Florida Consortium for Infection Control
South Miami, Florida

Is Expressed Breast Milk From Home Safe? A Survey From a Neonatal Intensive-Care Unit

To the Editor:

Human milk is the preferred diet for newborn infants. For infants in neonatal intensive-care units (NICUs) whose mothers may have been discharged from the hospital, it may be appropriate to provide fresh or stored raw human milk brought by the mother from home. We carried out a microbiological examination of 139 consecutive samples of expressed breast milk (EBM) brought from home by 24 mothers during a study period of 1 month. Mothers completed a questionnaire for each sample about the various aspects of breast milk expression, collection, storage, and transportation.

Prior to discharge, the nursing staff gave all mothers detailed instructions regarding hygienic practices needed while expressing, storing, and transporting EBM to the hos-

pital. This was reinforced by a printed pamphlet. Sterile, sealed, empty bottles were supplied for collection. On request, sterilized manual breast pumps were supplied.

Using sterile syringes, milk was obtained and sent for culture from each sample brought in. An average of 5.8 samples per mother were studied. Twenty-two of 24 mothers had understood the instructions given in the postnatal ward. One mother expressed milk manually (six samples); the remaining 23 used the pump. The interval between expression of milk and delivering it to the NICU ranged from 1 to 8 hours. Mothers differed in their practices regarding cleaning of breasts, procedures for maintaining hygiene of the pump, and the mode of milk storage (Table 1).

Of the 24 mothers, there was only one (who had supplied two samples) from whose EBM no bacteria were isolated. The remaining 23 (95%) had bacterial growth from at least one of the samples. Twelve mothers (52.2%) had only nonpathogenic bacteria isolated, and 47 EBM samples (34%) from 11 mothers (46%) grew a mixture of nonpathogens and potential pathogens (Table 2).

We found potential pathogens from one third of the breast milk samples sent for qualitative culture. This is a higher prevalence than reported from previous studies.^{1,2} It is somewhat reassuring that large studies have not found adverse events that could be directly related to ingestion of bacteria in raw breast milk,² nor did we observe any. Routine milk screening programs have not shown any benefit. However, infants in NICUs have low levels of immunity and are easily susceptible to infection, and common sense suggests it is preferable not to feed potentially pathogenic bacteria that could colonize the gut and lead to bacteremia. Pasteurization of breast milk has been practiced in several milk banks, but there is no doubt that it influences and alters the lymphocyte and antibody content of human milk.³

Studies have shown that simple but adequate cleansing of breasts lowers the incidence of contamination.⁴ In addition, breast pumps could be a potential source of contamination. We recommend that educating mothers in proper techniques of expressing, handling, and transporting breast milk should be emphasized. Expressed breast milk should be stored at 3°C to 4°C if it is to be used

within 48 hours and at -20°C or lower if it is to be stored for more than 48 hours.⁵ Microbiological screening of breast milk for random monitoring or as part of a septic screen in sick infants might be useful.

In environments and specific instances where the expression, handling, and storage of breast milk are found consistently to be of unacceptable standards, using only breast milk expressed under supervision in the NICU may be advisable until the health and hygiene education program is strengthened.

Kumar R. Pejaver, DCH, MRCP
Mustafa A. Toonisi, MBBS, DCH
Anil K. Garg, FRCP
Ibrahim Al Hifzi, CABP, MRCP
 NW Armed Forces Hospital
 Tabuk, Saudi Arabia

REFERENCES

1. Meier P, Wilks S. The bacteria in expressed mother's milk. *Matern Child Nurs J* 1987;12(6):420-423.
2. Law BJ, Urian BA, Lertzman J, Robson D, Romance L. Is ingestion of milk-associated bacteria by premature infants fed raw human milk controlled by routine bacteriological screening? *J U Microbiol* 1989;27(7):1560-1566.
3. Liebhaber M, Lewiston NJ, Asquith MY, Aldo-Arrogol Sunshine P. Alterations of lymphocytes and of antibody contents of human milk after processing. *J Pediatr* 1977;91:897-900.
4. Costa KM. A comparison of colony counts of breast milk using two methods of breast cleansing. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 1989;18(3):231-236.
5. Nutrition Committee, Canadian Pediatric Society. Statement on human milk banking. *Can Med Assoc J* 1985;132(7):750-752.

Brita Water Filters

To the Editor:

I am writing in response to a letter published in your August issue (1995;16:440-441), from Drs. Daschner and Rüdén of Germany, that implied that Brita water filters sold in the United States may be contaminated by bacteriological growth, based on tests conducted on German filters. I would like to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

All Brita water filters sold in the United States are bacteriostatic; that is, they are treated to control bacterial growth in the filter. Brita filters are registered with the Environmental Protection Agency, and their bacterio-

TABLE 1

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY: COLLECTION, STORAGE, AND TRANSPORT OF EXPRESSED BREAST MILK

Number of samples submitted	139
Breast hygiene	
Cleaned before and after expression	99 (71.2%)
Cleaned only before expression	29 (20.8%)
Used soap and water	74 (53.2%)
Used only water	54 (38.9%)
Breast pump hygiene*	
Used pump from sterile package	28 (20.1%)
Pump cleaned and immersed in boiling water	52 (37.4%)
Cleaned just with soap and water	23 (16.5%)
Cleaned with water alone	20 (14.5%)
Storage and transport†	
Samples brought in soon after expression (<45 minutes)	16 (11.5%)
Samples stored in refrigerator (4°C)	24 (17.3%)
Samples stored in freezer compartment	60 (43.2%)
Samples left in room air	25 (18.0%)

* Eleven of the answers were unclear.

† Fourteen of the answers were unclear.

TABLE 2

BACTERIOLOGICAL PROFILE OF EXPRESSED BREAST MILK SAMPLES*

Organism	Number (%)
Nonpathogenic bacteria	
<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	104 (74.8)
<i>Bacillus</i> species	1 (0.7)
<i>Streptococcus viridans</i>	3 (2.1)
Potential pathogens	
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	1 (0.7)
<i>Enterobacter</i> and <i>Shigella</i>	2 (1.4)
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	2 (1.4)
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	29 (20.8)
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	6 (4.3)
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	5 (3.5)
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	1 (0.7)
<i>Acinetobacter</i>	1 (0.7)

* Two samples did not have any growth; 18 samples grew more than one organism.

static effectiveness has been proven in independent laboratory tests for the EPA. Furthermore, the bacteriostatic effectiveness of Brita filters sold in the United States has been confirmed by NSF International, the nation's leading certification laboratory for water filtration products. The Brita filter is certified by NSF

International under Standard 42 for bacteriostatic effects. Although there are a number of pour-through water filters sold in this country, Brita is the only one that is bacteriostatic.

Furthermore, US filters use a different formulation than the German filter cartridge tested by the authors. Therefore, the test conduct-