its emergence as a major community pathogen nationally.[8] The concurrent increase in cases of SSIs caused by MSSA, however, was unexpected. This finding suggests that despite the increase in MRSA, MSSA still plays a large role in causing SSIs. Therefore, preoperative screening for *Staphylococcus* spp., not just MRSA, may help guide preoperative antibiotic selection, skin preparation, and postoperative wound care to minimize the risk of infection with either of these organisms.[9]

The predominance of gram-negative organisms in polymicrobial SSIs suggests that external contamination of the wound, (eg, with fecal matter) plays a major role in polymicrobial SSI pathogenesis. This finding highlights the ongoing importance of postoperative wound management and the need for protective barriers to prevent contamination of the wound.[9]

Our conclusions are limited by our inability to account for potential correlations between patient-level characteristics, such as comorbidities, with particular organisms causing SSIs. [10] Another limitation was our inability to assess the direct influence of specific interventions that occurred in our medical center over the study period.[3] Further study is planned to examine such interactions.

Our study findings indicate that among pediatric patients, skin and bowel flora play a significant role in SSIs. Future interventions to target aspects such as preoperative screening and management of MSSA and MRSA colonization and postoperative wound management to prevent fecal contamination may reduce pediatric SSIs. Further study is planned to assess the effect of patient and procedure factors as well as interventions on both the incidence of and the type of pathogens associated with SSIs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Lou Fitzner for assistance with extraction of SSI data.

Financial support: This study was conducted as part of institutional quality improvement efforts. No external funding was used.

Potential conflicts of interest: All authors report no conflicts of interest relevant to this article.

Jon Woltmann, MD;
Joshua K. Schaffzin, MD, PhD;
Matthew Washam, MD, MPH;
Beverly L. Connelly, MD

Affiliations: Division of Infectious Diseases, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Address correspondence to Jon Woltmann, MD, Clinical Fellow, Division of Infectious Diseases, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, 3333 Burnet Avenue MLC 7017, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45229-3039 (jon.woltmann@cchmc.org).

Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2017;38:380–382

 0899-823X/2017/3803-0025. DOI: 10.1017/ice.2016.310

REFERENCES

1. Zimlichman E, Henderson D, Tamir O, et al. Health care-associated infections: a meta-analysis of costs and financial impact on the US health care system. *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173:2039–2046.
2. Mangram AJ, Horan TC, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR. Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 1999. Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1999;20:250–2578.
3. Schaffzin JK, Harte L, Marquette S, et al. Surgical site infection reduction by the solutions for patient safety hospital engagement network. *Pediatrics* 2015;136:e1353–e1360.
4. Stulberg JJ, Delaney CP, Neuhauser DV, Aron DC, Fu P, Koroukian SM. Adherence to surgical care improvement project measures and the association with postoperative infections. *JAMA* 2010;303:2479–2485.
5. Bratzler DW, Dellinger EP, Olsen KM, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for antimicrobial prophylaxis in surgery. *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 2013;70:195–283.
6. Yokoe DS, Anderson DJ, Berenholtz SM, et al. A compendium of strategies to prevent healthcare-associated infections in acute care hospitals: 2014 updates. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;35:967–977.
7. Surgical site infection (SSI) event. National Healthcare Safety Network patient safety component manual. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website. http://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/PDFs/pscManual/9pscSSIcurrent.pdf. Published 2016. Accessed September 14, 2016.
8. Klevens RM, Morrison MA, Nadle J, et al. Invasive methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in the United States. *JAMA* 2007;298:1763–1771.
9. Vitale MG, Riedel MD, Glotzbecker MP, et al. Building consensus: development of a best practice guideline (BPG) for surgical site infection (SSI) prevention in high-risk pediatric spine surgery. *J Pediatr Orthop* 2013;33:471–478.
10. Subramanyam R, Schaffzin J, Cudilo EM, Varughese AM. Systematic review of risk factors for surgical site infection in pediatric scoliosis surgery. *Spine J* 2015;15:1422–1431.

Oak in Hospitals, the Worst Enemy of *Staphylococcus aureus*?

To the Editor—Although the infection risk to patients from contaminated healthcare surfaces has long been controversial, it is now recognized that the environment may facilitate transmission of several important healthcare-associated bacteria, including vancomycin-resistant enterococci, *Clostridium difficile*, *Acinetobacter* spp., and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA).[1] In addition, the longer a nosocomial pathogen persists on a surface, the longer it may be a source for transmission to a susceptible patient or healthcare worker.[2] Therefore, regular and conscientious cleaning is a necessary measure for keeping surfaces free from microbes. The nature of surfaces can also be considered.[1] Although the use of wood is not banned in hospitals,[3] this material still generates controversy in terms of infection

control.[2,4] Concurrently, the benefits of a wood interior in a hospital room have been acknowledged by hospital staff,[5] and although it was demonstrated that the use of wooden wall panels in hospital rooms had no effect on the amount of volatile organic compounds.[6] Considering those benefits, we aimed to test the potential antimicrobial activity of oak on a panel of *S. aureus* with different resistance patterns to antibiotics.

In total, 8 *S. aureus* clinical isolates (4 MRSA and 4 methicillin-susceptible *S. aureus*) were tested using disc diffusion according to the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) recommendations.[7] Of those bacteria, 2 had been isolated from sputum samples from cystic fibrosis patients, 2 from abscesses, 3 from blood cultures, and 1 from a urine sample. Samples of oak (*Querceus* spp.) used for the wood disks were derived from mature trees grown in France. Each oak sample was cut into a10-cm-thick board and was further cut by electric saw (Altendorf-F45, Minden, Germany) into thinner (2.5 mm) sheets with respect to the radial (R) or longitudinal (L) section. These oak sheets were used to prepare circular wood disks using a laser cutting machine (Trotec-SP500, C60, Wels, Austria). The diameter of 9 mm was selected because of the minimum accurate circle-making capacity of the machine. Disks of antibiotics currently used in our lab for clinical microbiology (ie, linezolid, trimethoprim + sulfamethoxazole, kanamycin, tobramycin, gentamicin, ofloxacin, fosfomycin, rifampicin, minocycline, all from Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK) were used for the study. Blank paper disks (ie, without an antimicrobial substance) were included as negative controls.

According to EUCAST break points, 3 isolates were resistant to kanamycin and tobramycin, 1 isolate was resistant to all aminoglycosides tested, 5 isolates were resistant to ofloxacin, and 2 isolates were resistant to rifampicin. All isolates were susceptible to trimethoprim + sulfamethoxazole, linezolid, and minocycline (Table 1). The major result of this report is that oak showed an antimicrobial activity on all the isolates tested. When considering both R and L disks, the inhibition diameters around the disks were ~20 mm and homogeneously distributed (standard deviation < 3 mm). Notably, methicillin resistance did not really influence those diameters. The means of inhibition diameters around oak disks (19.4 ± 2.7 mm) and around aminoglycoside disks (18.8 ± 6.9 mm) were similar. Lastly, diameters around R disks were slightly greater than diameters around L disks.

We demonstrated that wooden materials, and more particularly oak in this study, have an antimicrobial activity against a small but diverse panel of *S. aureus*. These results are somewhat discordant with those of some preceding reports. In a study comparing the recoverable proportion of MRSA from wood-free paper (containing < 5% wood pulp and therefore essentially composed of cellulose pulp) and paper containing wood, Kacmaz et al[4] demonstrated that the counts of recoverable bacteria were significantly higher in paper containing wood at the different point measures (ie, 24 h, 48 h, 120 h,

TABLE 1. Inhibition Diameters Recorded Using the Disk Diffusion Method With 4 Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA)and 4 Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* (MSSA) Isolates[a]

Isolates	Oak (R)	Oak (S)	NC	LNZ (19–19)[b]	SXT (14–17)[b]	K (14–18)[b]	TM (18–18)[b]	GM (18–18)[b]	OFX (20–20)[b]	RIF (23–26)[b]	MN (20–23)[b]
16514759301 (MSSA)	20	20	6	25	34	24	22	28	26	32	30
15015019102 (MSSA)	24	20	6	30	43	6	6	24	10	6	23
16006004401 (MSSA)	25	21	6	24	26	24	22	23	28	34	28
16513145401 (MSSA)	18	14	6	21	32	22	27	22	36	30	27
Means ± SD (MSSA)	21.8 ± 3.3	18.8 ± 3.2	6	25.0 ± 3.7	33.8 ± 7.0	19.0 ± 8.7	19.3 ± 9.1	24.3 ± 2.6	25.0 ± 10.9	25.5 ± 13.1	27.0 ± 2.9
16005880401 (MRSA)	18	16	6	24	23	6	9	8	14	32	26
16009349201 (MRSA)	20	17	6	30	33	6	6	25	14	30	28
14528592702 (MRSA)	22	22	6	29	31	23	24	23	10	6	28
16518868104 (MRSA)	18	16	6	26	30	24	23	24	8	30	26
Means ± SD (MRSA)	19.5 ± 1.9	17.8 ± 2.9	6	27.3 ± 2.8	29.3 ± 4.3	14.8 ± 10.1	15.5 ± 9.3	20.0 ± 8.0	11.5 ± 3.0	24.5 ± 12.4	27.0 ± 1.2
Means ± SD (overall)	20.6 ± 2.8	18.3 ± 2.9	6	26.1 ± 3.3	31.5 ± 5.9	16.9 ± 9.0	17.4 ± 8.8	22.1 ± 6.0	18.3 ± 10.3	25.0 ± 11.8	27.0 ± 2.1

NOTE. NC, negative control; LNZ, linezolid; SXT, trimethoprim + sulfamethoxazole; K, kanamycin; TM, tobramycin; GM, gentamicin; OFX, ofloxacin; RIF, rifampicin; MN, minocycline; SD, standard deviation.

[a]All data are presented in millimeters.

[b]EUCAST 2016 break points (in mm) are indicated under the name of each antibiotic.

https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2016.304 Published online by Cambridge University Press

144 h, and 168 h after the initial contamination). They proposed the use of paper containing wood to a lesser degree and for shorter periods in hospitals, especially when the compliance for hand hygiene is poor. By using a model of bacterial transmission from wood fomites artificially contaminated with MRSA USA300 to pigskin at different times after the initial contamination, Desai et al[8] demonstrated that USA300 was transmitted from wood to skin up to 3 days. Lastly, in a study conducted in 3 intensive care units (16 rooms in total) with weekly measures over a 43-month period, Schmidt et al[2] demonstrated that 61% of wooden chair arms were contaminated by high bacterial loads (microbial burden, >250 CFU/100 cm^2). Our results are more consistent with those reported by Da Costa et al.[9] By observing the spontaneous contamination of tiles cut from oak, stainless steel, and high-density polyethylene, they demonstrated that wooden tiles were contaminated significantly less often than plastic tiles (10.3% vs 33.3%; $P = .028$) and were less often contaminated than metal tiles (10.3% vs 30.1%; $P = 0046$). They concluded that oak is a more hostile environment for bacteria than the other surfaces tested.

The difference of the results between R and L could be explained by a difference in the diffusion of antimicrobial products in the agar medium depending upon the wood-cutting method. This finding is also consistent with the existence of antimicrobial products inside oak. Another interesting result is absence of impact of methicillin-resistance on the diameters around L and R. A hypothesis to explain this result could be the diversity of effective antimicrobial molecules that can be potentially present in vegetal resources like essential oils.[10]

These results should be completed by testing other bacteria potentially isolated from environmental surfaces to evaluate the microbial safety of using oak in the hospital setting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was conducted with the collaboration of the MANIMAL Master program (IDEFI ANR 11-0003).

Financial support: No financial support was provided relevant to this article.

Potential conflicts of interest: All authors report no conflicts of interest relevant to this article.

Hélène Pailhoriès, PharmD, PhD;[1]
Muhammad Tanveer Munir, MSc;[2]
Florence Aviat, PhD;[2]
Michel Federighi, DVM, PhD;[3]
Christophe Belloncle, PhD;[2]
Matthieu Eveillard, PharmD, PhD[1]

Affiliations: 1. ATOMycA, Inserm Equipe Avenir, L'UBL Université Bretagne-Loire, Angers, France; 2. Laboratoire Innovation Matériau Bois Habitat Apprentissage (LIMBHA), Ecole Supérieure du Bois, Nantes, France; 3. Hygiène et qualité des aliments, Oniris, Nantes, France.

Address correspondence to Matthieu Eveillard, PharmD PhD, L'UBL Université Bretagne-Loire, ATOMycA, Inserm Equipe Avenir, CRCNA, Inserm U892, 6299 CNRS, IRIS, CHU, 4 rue Larrey, 49933 Angers cedex, France (MaEveillard@chu-angers.fr).

Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2017;38:382–384

 0899-823X/2017/3803-0026. DOI: 10.1017/ice.2016.304

REFERENCES

1. Dancer SJ. Controlling hospital-acquired infections: focus on the role of the environment and new technologies for decontamination. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2014;27:665–90.
2. Schmidt MG, Attaway HH, Sharpe PA, et al. Sustained reduction of microbial burden on common hospital surfaces through introduction of copper. *J Clin Microbiol* 2012;50: 2217–23.
3. Sehulster L, Chinn RYW. Guidelines for environmental infection control in healthcare facilities. Recommendations of CDC and the Healthcare Infection Control Practice Advisory Committee (HICPAC). *MMWR* 2003;52:1–42.
4. Kacmaz B, Gul S. A comparison of the recoverable proportion of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* from two different types of papers. *GMS Hyg Infect Control* 2016; 11:1–4.
5. Nyrud AQ. Benefits from wood interior in a hospital room: a preference study. *Architect Sci Rev* 2014;57:125–31.
6. Nyrud AQ, Bringslimark T, Englund F. Wood use in a hospital environment: VOC emission and air quality. *Eur J Wood Prod* 2012;70:541–3.
7. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing EUCAST disk diffusion method. European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing website. http://www.eucast.org/fileadmin/src/media/PDFs/EUCAST_files/Disk_test_documents/Manual_v_5.0_EUCAST_Disk_Test.pdf. Published 2015. Accessed November 25, 2016.
8. Desai R, Pannaraj PS, Agopian J, Sugar CA, Liu GY, Miller LG. Survival and transmission of community-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* from fomites. *Am J Infect Control* 2011;39:219–25.
9. Da Costa AR, Kothari A, Bannister GC, Blom AW. Investigating bacterial growth in surgical theatres: establishing the effect of laminar airflow on bacterial growth on plastic, metal and wood surfaces. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2008;90:417–9.
10. Montagu A, Saulnier P, Cassisa V, Rossines E, Eveillard M, Joly-Guillou ML. Aromatic and terpenic compounds loaded in lipidic nanocapsules: activity against multi-drug resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* assessed in vitro and in a murine model of sepsis. *J Nanomed Nanotechnol* 2014;5:206.