

## Letter to the Editor

### Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Numbers

#### To the Editor:

In their survey of Iowa and Virginia hospitals, Beekmann et al. report estimates of percutaneous injury rates for nursing personnel relative to two prior multihospital and several single-hospital studies, and comment that these injuries remain common even after promulgation of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's Bloodborne Pathogens Standard.<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to compare injury rates unless they incorporate corrections for underreporting and, especially in overtime-prone understaffed units, number of hours worked (thus, at risk). A decade ago, a study of 312 critical care nurses in 11 self-selected, acute-care Canadian hospitals found injury attack and incidence density rates commensurate with rates published prior to the era of Universal Precautions and Body Substance Isolation, no significant reduction in rates following adoption of Universal Precautions and Body Substance Isolation, no correlation between reduction of needlestick injury and extent of recapping (estimated by inspection of disposal containers), and significant underreporting of

employee injuries.<sup>2,3</sup> At that time, the strategy perceived as least effective in discouraging recapping also was the most prevalent.<sup>4</sup>

These 11 hospitals were a subset of the large number of hospitals participating in a survey of infection control program practices.<sup>5</sup> Overall, we found the staffing levels of infection control programs to be consistent with the finding of Beekmann et al. that the smallest hospitals were least likely to have infection control staff, but also found low staffing ratios of infection control professionals in larger hospitals (Table).

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

#### REFERENCES

1. Beekmann SE, Vaughn TE, McCoy KD, et al. Hospital bloodborne pathogens programs: program characteristics and blood and body fluid exposure rates. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2001;22:73-82.
2. Birnbaum D. Needlestick injuries among critical care nurses before and after adoption of Universal Precautions or Body Substance Isolation. *Journal of Healthcare Material Management* 1993;11:38-42.
3. Gunter B. Bootstrapping. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1994;15:543-547.
4. Birnbaum D, Schulzer M, Mathias RG, et al. Needlestick injury: do preventive measures work? *Dimensions in Health Service* 1990; 67:29-32.
5. Birnbaum D, Schulzer M, Mathias RG, et al. Adoption of guidelines for Universal Precautions and Body Substance Isolation in Canadian acute-care hospitals. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1990;11:465-472.

#### The authors reply.

Dr. Birnbaum raises some very important issues relative to the reporting of percutaneous injury rates. We agree that a standard method for presenting injury rates is vital to allow comparisons between articles, which was why we suggested reporting injury rates based on a denominator of personnel at risk. Eleven of the 14 reports detailing percutaneous injury rates presented in our Table 6 used incident reports to determine these rates, and, unfortunately, underreporting is inherent to this method of data collection. We suggest that, rather than applying an arbitrary (and perhaps incorrect) correction factor, authors indicate their data collection method and present uncorrected data. This would allow other researchers to either compare rates as reported by staff or apply their own correction factors.

Dr. Birnbaum also suggested that injury rates should incorporate corrections for the number of hours worked. Although we agree that

TABLE  
HOSPITAL SIZE (AS BEDS) VERSUS INFECTION CONTROL PROFESSIONAL STAFFING (AS FTEs)

Beds	FTEs								
	0	< 1.0	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0
< 25	65.0	31.3	3.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
25-49	32.0	58.3	9.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	28.6	62.9	8.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
100-199	13.5	64.0	21.4	1.1	-	-	-	-	-
200-299	2.0	50.0	44.0	4.0	-	-	-	-	-
300-499	1.3	26.6	58.2	6.3	6.3	-	-	1.3	-
500+	2.0	6.0	36.0	10.0	26.0	2.0	14.0	2.0	2.0
All*	23.4	46.2	22.8	2.3	3.2	0.2	1.3	0.4	0.2

FTEs = full-time equivalents.

\*Weighted means across all bed ranges. Numbers represent percent of hospitals with a given staffing level. Row totals are each 100%.