

## Innovative techniques for infection control and surveillance in hospital setting and Long-Term Care Facilities: a Scoping review

### Study protocol

#### 1. Introduction

Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) are among the major adverse events encountered by patients in any healthcare system, and are associated with significant mortality, morbidities and increasing healthcare cost.

Surveillance of HAIs and their risk factors is the cornerstone of programs for their control, but in its active form requires resources not always available; for example, a point prevalence survey- the most used measure of disease frequency to report HAI - can take up to 756-man hours or an estimated 1.5 fulltime equivalent (FTE) per 10,000 admissions.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is being increasingly used in medicine for diagnostic purposes and may be applied to surveillance of HAIs. Automated surveillance can support (semi-automated) or completely replace (fully automated) manual surveillance thanks to the use of algorithms based on AI. AI can cope to the increased availability of data from different sources, which can be digitally stored in a single structured data system called data warehouse (DW).

#### 2. Scope and objectives

The aim of this study is to explore the innovative tools for healthcare associated Infections surveillance and their applications in hospital settings and long-term care facilities. The second aim is highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the innovative techniques compared to traditional one.

**Scoping review:** *Innovative tools for healthcare associated Infections surveillance among hospital and LTCF patients.*

Specific objectives:

- i. Describe innovative tools for healthcare associated infections surveillance and their applications.
- ii. Compare the innovative techniques to the traditional ones.

#### 3. Proposed methodology

The scoping reviews will follow PRISMA-P guidelines. PRISMA-P ensures the transparency and completeness of a scoping review protocol.

##### 3.1. *Research questions*

The research question for the scoping review has been formulated as:

What are the innovative surveillance techniques to identify HAI in hospital/LTCF?

**Table S1. Scoping review PICO's framework question**

##### ***PICO's Framework***

<b><i>P - population</i></b>	Patients admitted in hospital and LTCF
------------------------------	--

<i>I - intervention</i>	Innovative tools for infection control in hospital setting (e.g., ICU)
<i>C - comparator</i>	No comparator
<i>O - outcome</i>	Qualitative (primary): description of innovations in infection control and surveillance. Quantitative (secondary): evaluation and comparison between Innovative Vs. Traditional in terms of accuracy.
<i>S - setting</i>	Hospital settings including all hospital wards and long-term facilities
<i>S - study</i>	Prospective, retrospective observational studies; Clinical studies including RCTs; Case series

### 3.2. *Definitions*

The following definitions are used for the purpose of this study:

- Innovative surveillance techniques: any new technology applied to the detection, control and surveillance of the HAI. Laboratory techniques and innovation related to clinical case management are excluded.
- Surveillance: the ongoing, systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of health-related data with the purpose of preventing or controlling disease or injury, or of identifying unusual events of public health importance, followed by the dissemination and use of information for public health action
- LCTF: facilities which provide supervision and assistance in activities of daily living with medical and nursing services when required.
- HAI: Any infection which a patient contracts in a health-care institution.
- Hospitalised patient: is defined as an adult or paediatric patient admitted to any ward of a general, tertiary or university hospital.

### 3.3. *Search strategy*

The search strategies will be developed to include the following facets:

- Healthcare associated infections
- Hospital and LTCF settings
- Surveillance
- Innovation technologies

Proposed search limits:

- Language: All languages
- Time: 2018-2023
- Geographic: All worldwide countries

The literature search will be conducted using MEDLINE (Ovid), SCOPUS and Web of Science.

### 3.4. *Records selection procedure*

The results of searches will be downloaded and loaded in a bibliographic management software (Rayyan) and deduplication will be performed. The selection procedure will take place in three phases as described below. The selection of records will be performed by a team of reviewers and may be performed either via the independent and double screening

of all records or through an iterative double screening of a subset of records to achieve a concordance >95%, followed by single screening of the remaining records. Disagreements will be adjudicated by the group of reviewers. Studies excluded after assessment of the full text will be reported alongside reasons for exclusion.

1. Screening of title and abstract (first selection phase): this step will yield the articles that will be assessed in full text. In this first phase, titles of publications are screened based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria (see section 3.5). If the title is inconclusive, the abstract is read. If the title is inconclusive and no abstract is available, the full text of the article will be checked in the second selection step. Articles with titles and abstracts that suggest that they do not contain information relevant to the research objective will not be selected for full text assessment. Whenever it is clear that the article does not fulfil the eligibility criteria it will be excluded. In case of doubt, the article will be checked full text in the second selection step. Articles that have been excluded during screening of title and abstract will be stored in Microsoft Excel sheet.
2. Screening of full article (second selection phase): the articles selected during the first phase will be assessed in full text. PDF-files of the original articles will be downloaded and stored. Articles will be included if the reported information is relevant (based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria, see section 3.5). The reasons for exclusion of full text papers will be documented per article and summarised in an exclusion table. In this way the selection procedure is transparent and will assure reproducibility.
3. Screening during data-extraction phase: further scrutiny of the article during the data-extraction phase might lead to exclusion. For example, when articles make use of the same dataset and present identical outcome measures, the most recent or the most complete article will be included.

### 3.5. *Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

The draft list of inclusion and exclusion criteria is presented in Table 2. Should other relevant criteria emerge during the preliminary stage of the screening phase, the list will be adapted.

**Table S2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for scoping review**

<i>Variable</i>	<b>Inclusion</b>	<b>Exclusion</b>
<i>Study design/ type</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Randomised controlled trials (RCTs)</li> <li>• Non-randomised, prospective comparative studies</li> <li>• Prospective observational studies (e.g. cohort studies)</li> <li>• Retrospective observational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative review</li> <li>• Case reports</li> <li>• Non-pertinent publication types (e.g. expert opinions, letters to the editor, editorials, comments, viewpoints)</li> <li>• Animal studies</li> <li>• Genetic studies, biochemistry or molecular studies</li> </ul>

	studies (e.g. case-control studies) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross-sectional studies</li> <li>• Meta-analysis or systematic review</li> <li>• Conference Proceedings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mathematical modelling studies</li> <li>• <i>Study protocols</i></li> </ul>
<b>Country</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All worldwide countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No exclusion</li> </ul>
<b>Study subject</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovative technologies for infection control and surveillance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other types of surveillance</li> </ul>
<b>Study population</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hospitalised individuals (any hospital ward) and LTCF individuals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-hospitalised individuals</li> </ul>
<b>Specific outcomes of interest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative (primary): description of innovations in infection control</li> <li>• Quantitative (secondary): evaluation and comparison of accuracy (innovative Vs. traditional methods)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes not related to research question.</li> </ul>

If high quality systematic reviews and/or meta-analysis are identified, their primary studies included will be included in the analysis.

### 3.6. *Critical appraisal*

Based on three methodological streams: quantitative (randomized group comparison, non-randomized group comparison and descriptive surveys), qualitative and mixed-methods (use of quantitative and qualitative methods), we will apply different quality appraisal tools as described in Table 3 below. For retrospective and prospective studies that are not valuable with standardised quality appraisal tool, we will use an adapted scale reported in the following supplementary materials.

The quality appraisal will be performed by one single reviewer.

**Table S3. Quality Appraisal Tools**

Type of Study Design	Quality Appraisal Tool	Link to the tool
Qualitative Study Design (including content Analysis)	Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP)	<a href="http://www.casp-uk.net/#!casp-tools-checklists/c18f8">http://www.casp-uk.net/#!casp-tools-checklists/c18f8</a>
Mixed Methods	Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) – Version 2011	Pluye, P., Robert, E., Cargo, M., Bartlett, G., O’Cathain, A., Griffiths, F., Boardman, F., Gagnon, M.P., & Rousseau, M.C. (2011). <i>Proposal: A mixed methods appraisal tool for systematic mixed studies reviews</i> . Retrieved on [date] from <a href="http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com">http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com</a> . Archived by WebCite® at <a href="http://www.webcitation.org/5tTRTc9yJ">http://www.webcitation.org/5tTRTc9yJ</a>
RCT	Cochrane Risk of Bias (RoB 2)	<a href="https://methods.cochrane.org/risk-bias-2">https://methods.cochrane.org/risk-bias-2</a>
Cohort Study	The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale	<a href="https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp">https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp</a>
Case control Study	The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale	<a href="https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp">https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp</a>
Retrospective observational	Adapted Quality Assessment Tool for Retrospective and prospective observational studies	See the following supplementary material
Prospective observational	Adapted Quality Assessment Tool for Retrospective and prospective observational studies	See the following supplementary material

### 3.7. Data extraction

A set of variables will be defined and relevant information will be extracted from the included records. Should it not be possible to extract meaningful data from an included study, this will be excluded and tagged as “non-extractable data” in the list of excluded full-text records.

The included references will be summarised by collecting relevant information in a standardised Excel format, per study. Where possible, a pre-defined list of options per variable will be created (e.g. on study design, aim of the technology, etc.). The unit for data extraction will be study, instead of article. A study is defined as a screening approach and/or follow up for a defined population group, in a defined country, over a discrete period of time. According to this definition, a single study may be presented in more than one article. Whether both articles or just one (and in that case, which) article will be selected for data extraction will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

The Table 4 reports the information extracted in the Excel sheet.

**Table S4. Data Extraction form.**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Type of variable</b>
<b>PMID</b>	PubMed ID	<i>Number</i>
<b>Title</b>	Article title	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Journal</b>	Journal of publication	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Year of publication</b>	Year of publication of the article	<i>Number</i>
<b>Study design</b>	Type of the study (as stated by the author)	<i>Prospective observational, Retrospective observational, Case-control, Cohort, Quasi-experimental, RCT</i>
<b>Country</b>	Country of the study	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Period of study</b>	Study period when the study was conducted	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Duration (Months)</b>	Duration of study	<i>Number</i>
<b>Last year of the study</b>	Last year of the study	<i>Number</i>
<b>Single/ Multicentre</b>	Single: study conducted in one hospital/LCTF; Multicenter: more than one hospital/LCTF	<i>Single, Multicentre</i>
<b>Comparative study</b>	Does the study compare the new technology with something else?	<i>Yes, No, Unclear</i>
<b>Study aims/objectives</b>	Aims/objectives of the study	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Setting of study</b>	Study setting (hospital and/or LCTF)	<i>General Hospital, LCTF, University, Tertiary non-university, Other</i>
<b>Other (specific) - ward</b>	Ward where was conducted by the study	<i>ICU, Renal transplant, Liver transplant, Maternity ward, All, More than one, Other, Haematology, Burn unit, Orthopedy, Geriatric, Oncology, Coronary care unit, ER, Internal medicine, Pediatric</i>
<b>Digital technology classification</b>	Type of technology investigated	<i>Robotics, Blockchain, Cloud computing, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning, Natural Language processing, Big data analytics, Health informatics, Digital health/e-health/m-</i>

		<i>health, Electronic health records (EHRs), Virtual reality, Smartphone and tablet computing devices, Internet of things (IoT), Wearables</i>
<b>Concise description of digital technology</b>	Short description of the digital technology (when/if described by the authors)	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Aim of technology</b>	Purpose of the technology under study	<i>Surveillance, Outbreak detection</i>
<b>Intervention under surveillance</b>	Type of intervention (surgical site infection control, follow-up after discharge, etc.) on which the new tool was applied	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Infectious disease under investigation</b>	Infectious disease targeted by digital technology	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Potential benefits</b>	Potential benefits of the technology for public health functions	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Potential negative impacts</b>	Potential negative aspects for public health functions	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Obstacles</b>	Obstacles/barriers to implementation	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Comments</b>	Additional comments	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Target population</b>	Target population of the study	<i>Number</i>
<b>Sex (M)</b>	Number of male subjects	<i>Number</i>
<b>Age</b>	Age (median or average)	<i>Number (Median or Mean)</i>
<b>Comparative population</b>	Control population	<i>Number</i>
<b>Sex (M)</b>	Number of male subjects in the control population	<i>Number</i>
<b>Age</b>	Age (median or mean) of control population	<i>Number (Median or Mean)</i>
<b>Pros and cons for the new technologies vs old one</b>	What do the authors say are the pros or cons of the new method used compared to the previous traditional one	<i>Free text</i>
<b>Quality assessment tool</b>	Used quality assessment tools	<i>Cochrane Risk of Bias (RoB 2), The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) – Version 2011, Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP), Adapted Quality</i>

		<i>Assessment Tool for Retrospective and prospective observational studies</i>
<b>Quality value</b>	Quality value (result of the quality assessment tool)	<i>Free text</i>

### 3.8. Data synthesis

The extracted data will be analysed, summarised sorted by research question. Data on innovative approaches will be presented by country, setting ward and aim of the new technology. If appropriate, data will also be analysed comparing traditional and innovative techniques for surveillance. Data will be reported for qualitative and quantitative analysis.

## 4. Manuscript writing

The findings from the project will be reported in a scientific manuscript to be published in an international peer-reviewed journal. Authorship will be attributed according to ICMJE recommendations <https://www.icmje.org>

**Table S5. Search string**

<b>PubMed</b>	
<b>Concept 1</b>	<b>Healthcare Associated Infection</b>
(Cross Infection[MeSH Terms] OR "Cross Infection"[Title/Abstract]) OR (urinar* OR "urinary tract" OR ("Surgical site" AND infection*) OR sepsis OR "Healthcare-Associated Pneumonia"[Title/Abstract]) OR (Bacteriuria OR Pyuria OR "Catheter-Related Infections" OR "Surgical Wound Dehiscence" OR "Surgical Wound Infection*" OR "Prosthesis-Related Infection*" [Title/Abstract]) OR ("Surgical Wound Infection"[MeSH Terms] OR "Puerperal Infection"[Title/Abstract]) OR (enterobacteriaceae OR enterobacterales OR citrobacter OR Enterobacter* OR escherichia OR hafnia OR klebsiella OR morganell* OR proteus OR providencia OR serratia OR "e coli" OR "e.coli" OR Citrobacter[MeSH Terms] OR Escherichia[MeSH Terms] OR Hafnia[MeSH Terms] OR Morganella[MeSH Terms] OR Proteus[MeSH Terms] OR Providencia[MeSH Terms] OR	1,503,191 results



<p>Serratia[MeSH Terms] OR "E.aerogenes" OR "e aerogenes" OR "k.oxytoca" OR "k oxytoca" OR "k pneumonia*" OR "k.pneumonia*" OR "e cloacae" OR "e.cloacae" OR Enterobacter[MeSH Terms] OR Klebsiella[MeSH Terms][Title/Abstract]) OR (Acinetobacter[MeSH Terms] OR "acinetobacter baumannii"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("pseudomonas aeruginosa"[MeSH Terms] OR (pseudomonas AND aeruginosa) OR "pseudomonas aeruginosa" OR Stenotrophomonas[Title/Abstract]) OR (Candida[MeSH Terms]) OR ("Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci" OR VRE[Title/Abstract]) OR ("Staphylococcus aureus" OR MRSA OR "Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus"[Title/Abstract])</p>	
<b>Concept 2</b>	<b>Setting</b>
<p>((ward*[Title/Abstract] OR hospital*[Title/Abstract] OR unit*[Title/Abstract] OR ICU[Title/Abstract] OR ICU [MeSH Terms] OR HDU*[Title/Abstract] OR PICU*[Title/Abstract] OR SCBU*[Title/Abstract] OR CCU*[Title/Abstract] OR NICU*[Title/Abstract] OR ITU*[Title/Abstract] OR er*[Title/Abstract] OR "emergency room"[Title/Abstract] OR "emergency department"[Title/Abstract] OR "casualty department"[Title/Abstract] OR clinic*[Title/Abstract] OR facility*[Title/Abstract]) OR "Academic Medical Cent*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Teaching Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Birthing Centers"[Title/Abstract] OR "Health Facility Environment"[Title/Abstract] OR "Hospital Units"[Title/Abstract] OR "Community Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "General Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Group Practice Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "High-Volume Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Low-Volume Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Private Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Public Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Rural Hospital*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Satellite</p>	<p>7,589,641 results</p>

<p>Hospital*[Title/Abstract] OR "Special Hospital*[Title/Abstract] OR "Teaching Hospital*[Title/Abstract] OR "Urban Hospital*[Title/Abstract] OR "Secondary Care Center*[Title/Abstract] OR "Tertiary Care Center*[Title/Abstract] OR "Nursing Home*[Title/Abstract] OR "Intermediate Care Facilit*[Title/Abstract] OR "Skilled Nursing Facilit*[Title/Abstract] OR "Residential Facilit*[Title/Abstract] OR "Assisted Living Facilit*[Title/Abstract] OR "Group Home*[Title/Abstract] OR "Homes for the Aged"[Title/Abstract] OR hospitals[MeSH Terms] OR Hospital Units [MeSH Terms] OR Rehabilitation Centers [MeSH Terms] OR Academic Medical Centers [MeSH Terms] OR Residential Facilities [MeSH Terms] OR Nursing Homes [MeSH Terms])</p>	
<b>Concept 3</b>	<b>Surveillance</b>
<p>((screen*[Title/Abstract] OR surveill*[Title/Abstract] OR monitor*[Title/Abstract] OR control[Title/Abstract]) AND (carriage*[Title/Abstract] OR coloni*[Title/Abstract] OR infect*[Title/Abstract]))</p>	537,576 results
<b>Concept 4</b>	<b>Innovation</b>
<p>(Algorithm*[MeSH Terms] OR Algorithm[Title/Abstract]) OR (digital technolog*[tw] OR "information technology"[MeSH Terms] OR information technolog*[tw] OR communication technolog*[tw] OR "ICT"[tw] OR new technolog*[tw] OR digital innovation*[tw] OR emerging technolog*[tw] OR machine learning[tw] OR blockchain[tw] OR "data mining"[tw] OR datamining[tw] OR automation[tw] OR "augmented reality"[tw] OR "virtual reality"[tw] OR virtual setting*[tw] OR cloud[tw] OR "internet of things"[tw] OR "iot"[tw] OR 3G[tw] OR 4G[tw] OR 5G[tw] OR "artificial intelligence"[tw] OR "ai"[tw] OR "big data"[tw] OR "deep learning"[tw] OR "nano"[tw] OR "digital health"[tw] OR</p>	1,028,774 results

robotic*[tw] OR quantum comput*[tw] OR "additive manufacturing"[tw] OR ((cellular phone*[tw] OR cell phone*[tw] OR mobile phone*[tw]) AND (health technol*[tw] OR biomedical technol*[tw] OR medical technol*[tw])) OR remote sensing technol*[tw] OR smart fabric*[tw] OR wearables[tw] OR wearable technol*[tw] OR wearable electronic device*[tw] OR "Data Mining"[MeSH Terms] OR "Automation"[MeSH Terms] OR "Virtual Reality"[MeSH Terms] OR "Cloud Computing"[MeSH Terms] OR "Artificial Intelligence"[MeSH Terms] OR "Big Data"[MeSH Terms] OR ("Cell Phone"[MeSH Terms] AND "Biomedical Technology"[MeSH Terms]) OR "Remote Sensing Technology"[MeSH Terms] OR "Wearable Electronic Devices"[MeSH Terms])	
Concept 1 AND Concept 2 AND Concept 3 AND Concept 4	1,362 results
<b>Time restriction</b>	
From 20180101 to 20231027	644 results

<b>Scopus query</b>	
( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "Cross Infection" OR urinar* OR "urinary tract" OR ( "Surgical site" AND infection* ) OR sepsis OR "Healthcare-Associated Pneumonia" OR bacteriuria OR pyuria OR "Catheter-Related Infections" OR "Surgical Wound Dehiscence" OR "Surgical Wound Infection*" OR "Prosthesis-Related Infection*" OR "Surgical Wound Infection" OR "Puerperal Infection" OR enterobacteriaceae OR enterobacterales OR citrobacter OR enterobacter* OR escherichia OR hafnia OR klebsiella ORmorganell* OR proteus OR providencia OR serratia OR "e coli" OR "e.coli" OR "E.aerogenes" OR "e aerogenes" OR "k.oxytoca" OR "k oxytoca" OR "k pneumonia*" OR "k.pneumonia*" OR "e cloacae" OR "e.cloacae" OR acinetobacter	368 results

OR "acinetobacter baumannii" OR  
 "pseudomonas aeruginosa" OR (  
 pseudomonas AND aeruginosa ) OR  
 "pseudomonas aeruginosa" OR  
 stenotrophomonas OR candida OR  
 "Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci" OR vre  
 OR "Staphylococcus aureus" OR mrsa OR  
 "Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus  
 Aureus" ) ) AND ( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( (  
 carriage\* OR coloni\* OR infect\* ) ) ) AND ( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( (  
 screen\* OR surveill\* OR  
 monitor\* OR control ) ) ) AND ( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( (  
 ward\* OR hospital\* OR unit\* OR icu  
 OR hdu\* OR picu\* OR scbu\* OR ccu\* OR  
 nicu\* OR itu\* OR er\* OR "emergency room"  
 OR "emergency department" OR "casualty  
 department" OR clinic\* OR facility\* OR  
 "Academic Medical Cent\*" OR "Teaching  
 Hospital\*" OR "Birthing Centers" OR  
 "Health Facility Environment" OR "Hospital  
 Units" OR "Community Hospital\*" OR  
 "General Hospital\*" OR "Group Practice  
 Hospital\*" OR "High-Volume Hospital\*" OR  
 "Low-Volume Hospital\*" OR "Private  
 Hospital\*" OR "Public Hospital\*" OR "Rural  
 Hospital\*" OR "Satellite Hospital\*" OR  
 "Special Hospital\*" OR "Teaching Hospital\*" OR  
 "Urban Hospital\*" OR "Secondary Care  
 Center\*" OR "Tertiary Care Center\*" OR  
 "Rehabilitation Cent\*" OR "Residential  
 Facilit\*" OR "Assisted Living Facilit\*" OR  
 "Group Home\*" OR "Homes for the Aged"  
 OR "Nursing Home\*" OR "Intermediate  
 Care Facilit\*" OR "Skilled Nursing Facilit\*" ) ) ) AND ( ALL ( ( algorithm OR digital AND  
 technolog\* OR "information technolog\*" OR  
 communication AND technolog\* OR  
 "ICT" OR new AND technolog\* OR digital  
 AND innovation\* OR emerging AND  
 technolog\* OR "machine learning" OR  
 blockchain OR "data mining" OR datamining  
 OR automation OR "augmented reality" OR  
 "virtual reality" OR virtual AND setting\* OR  
 cloud OR "internet of things" OR "iot" OR  
 3g OR 4g OR 5g OR "artificial intelligence"  
 OR "ai" OR "big data" OR "deep learning"  
 OR "nano" OR "digital health" OR robotic\*

OR "quantum comput*" OR "additive manufacturing" OR ( cellular AND phone* OR "cell phone*" OR "mobile phone*" ) AND ( health AND technol* OR biomedical AND technol* OR medical AND technol* ) OR "remote sensing technol*" OR "smart fabric*" OR wearables OR wearable AND technol* OR "wearable electronic device*" ) ) AND PUBYEAR > 2017 AND PUBYEAR < 2025	
---	--

Web of Science query	
Concept 1	Healthcare associated infection
AB=(("Cross Infection" OR urinar* OR "urinary tract" OR ( "Surgical site" AND infection* ) OR sepsis OR "Healthcare-Associated Pneumonia" OR bacteriuria OR pyuria OR "Catheter-Related Infections" OR "Surgical Wound Dehiscence" OR "Surgical Wound Infection*" OR "Prosthesis-Related Infection*" OR "Surgical Wound Infection" OR "Puerperal Infection" OR enterobacteriaceae OR enterobacterales OR citrobacter OR enterobacter* OR escherichia OR hafnia OR klebsiella OR morganell* OR proteus OR providencia OR serratia OR "e coli" OR "e.coli" OR "E.aerogenes" OR "e aerogenes" OR "k.oxytoca" OR "k oxytoca" OR "k pneumonia*" OR "k.pneumonia*" OR "e cloacae" OR "e.cloacae" OR acinetobacter OR "acinetobacter baumannii" OR "pseudomonas aeruginosa" OR (pseudomonas AND aeruginosa) OR "pseudomonas aeruginosa" OR stenotrophomonas OR candida OR "Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci" OR vre OR "Staphilococcus aureus" OR mrsa OR "Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus"))	814,463 results
Concept 2	Setting
AB=((ward* OR hospital* OR unit* OR icu OR hdu* OR picu* OR scbu* OR ccu* OR nicu* OR itu* OR er* OR "emergency room" OR "emergency department" OR "casualty department" OR clinic* OR facility* OR "Academic Medical Cent*" OR "Teaching	9,201,432 results

Hospital*" OR "Birthing Centers" OR "Health Facility Environment" OR "Hospital Units" OR "Community Hospital*" OR "General Hospital*" OR "Group Practice Hospital*" OR "High-Volume Hospital*" OR "Low-Volume Hospital*" OR "Private Hospital*" OR "Public Hospital*" OR "Rural Hospital*" OR "Satellite Hospital*" OR "Special Hospital*" OR "Teaching Hospital*" OR "Urban Hospital*" OR "Secondary Care Center*" OR "Tertiary Care Center*" OR "Rehabilitation Cent*" OR "Residential Facilit*" OR "Assisted Living Facilit*" OR "Group Home*" OR "Homes for the Aged" OR "Nursing Home*" OR "Intermediate Care Facilit*" OR "Skilled Nursing Facilit*"))	
<b>Concept 3</b>	<b>Surveillance</b>
AB=((screen* OR surveill* OR monitor* OR control)) AND ((carriage* OR coloni* OR infect*))	580,802 results
<b>Concept 4</b>	<b>Innovation</b>
AB=((Algorithm OR digital technolog* OR "information technolog*" OR communication technolog* OR "ICT" OR new technolog* OR digital innovation* OR emerging technolog* OR "machine learning" OR blockchain OR "data mining" OR datamining OR automation OR "augmented reality" OR "virtual reality" OR virtual setting* OR cloud OR "internet of things" OR "iot" OR 3G OR 4G OR 5G OR "artificial intelligence" OR "ai" OR "big data" OR "deep learning" OR "nano" OR "digital health" OR robotic* OR "quantum comput*" OR "additive manufacturing" OR (cellular phone* OR "cell phone*" OR "mobile phone*") AND (health technol* OR biomedical technol* OR medical technol*) OR "remote sensing technol*" OR "smart fabric*" OR wearables OR wearable technol* OR "wearable electronic device*"))	4,343,958 results
#5 AND #4 AND #3 AND #2 AND #1 and 2023 or 2022 or 2021 or 2020 or 2019 or 2018 (Publication Years)	651 results

## Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool for Randomized Controlled Trials

<b>RANDOM SEQUENCE GENERATION</b> <b>Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate generation of a randomised sequence.</b>	
Criteria for a judgment of 'Low risk' of bias.	<p>The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referring to a random number table;</li> <li>• Using a computer random number generator;</li> <li>• Coin tossing;</li> <li>• Shuffling cards or envelopes;</li> <li>• Throwing dice;</li> <li>• Drawing of lots;</li> <li>• Minimization*.</li> </ul> <p>*Minimization may be implemented without a random element, and this is considered to be equivalent to being random.</p>
Criteria for the judgment of 'High risk' of bias.	<p>The investigators describe a non-random component in the sequence generation process. Usually, the description would involve some systematic, non-random approach, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sequence generated by odd or even date of birth;</li> <li>• Sequence generated by some rule based on date (or day) of admission;</li> <li>• Sequence generated by some rule based on hospital or clinic record number.</li> </ul> <p>Other non-random approaches happen much less frequently than the systematic approaches mentioned above and tend to be obvious. They usually involve judgement or some method of non-random categorization of participants, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation by judgement of the clinician;</li> <li>• Allocation by preference of the participant;</li> <li>• Allocation based on the results of a laboratory test or a series of tests;</li> <li>• Allocation by availability of the intervention.</li> </ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'Unclear risk' of bias.	Insufficient information about the sequence generation process to permit judgement of 'Low risk' or 'High risk'.

**ALLOCATION CONCEALMENT**

**Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate concealment of allocations prior to assignment.**

Criteria for a judgment of 'Low risk' of bias.	Participants and investigators enrolling participants could not foresee assignment because one of the following, or an equivalent method, was used to conceal allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Central allocation (including telephone, web-based and pharmacy-controlled randomization);</li><li>• Sequentially numbered drug containers of identical appearance;</li><li>• Sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes.</li></ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'High risk' of bias.	Participants or investigators enrolling participants could possibly foresee assignments and thus introduce selection bias, such as allocation based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Using an open random allocation schedule (e.g. a list of random numbers);</li><li>• Assignment envelopes were used without appropriate safeguards (e.g. if envelopes were unsealed or non-opaque or not sequentially numbered);</li><li>• Alternation or rotation;</li><li>• Date of birth;</li><li>• Case record number;</li><li>• Any other explicitly unconcealed procedure.</li></ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'Unclear risk' of bias.	Insufficient information to permit judgement of 'Low risk' or 'High risk'. This is usually the case if the method of concealment is not described or not described in sufficient detail to allow a definite judgement – for example if the use of assignment envelopes is described, but it remains unclear whether envelopes were sequentially numbered, opaque and sealed.

**SELECTIVE REPORTING**

**Reporting bias due to selective outcome reporting.**

Criteria for a judgment of 'Low risk' of bias.	Any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The study protocol is available and all of the study's pre-specified (primary and secondary) outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way;</li><li>• The study protocol is not available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified (convincing text of this nature may be uncommon).</li></ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'High risk' of bias.	Any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not all of the study's pre-specified primary outcomes have been reported;</li><li>• One or more primary outcomes is reported using measurements, analysis methods or subsets of the data (e.g. subscales) that were not pre-specified;</li><li>• One or more reported primary outcomes were not pre-specified</li></ul>



	<p>(unless clear justification for their reporting is provided, such as an unexpected adverse effect);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more outcomes of interest in the review are reported incompletely so that they cannot be entered in a meta-analysis;</li> <li>• The study report fails to include results for a key outcome that would be expected to have been reported for such a study.</li> </ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'Unclear risk' of bias.	Insufficient information to permit judgement of 'Low risk' or 'High risk'. It is likely that the majority of studies will fall into this category.

<b>OTHER BIAS</b> <b>Bias due to problems not covered elsewhere in the table.</b>	
Criteria for a judgment of 'Low risk' of bias.	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.
Criteria for the judgment of 'High risk' of bias.	<p>There is at least one important risk of bias. For example, the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had a potential source of bias related to the specific study design used; or</li> <li>• Has been claimed to have been fraudulent; or</li> <li>• Had some other problem.</li> </ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'Unclear risk' of bias.	<p>There may be a risk of bias, but there is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient information to assess whether an important risk of bias exists; or</li> <li>• Insufficient rationale or evidence that an identified problem will introduce bias.</li> </ul>
<b>BLINDING OF PARTICIPANTS AND PERSONNEL</b> <b>Performance bias due to knowledge of the allocated interventions by participants and personnel during the study.</b>	
Criteria for a judgment of 'Low risk' of bias.	<p>Any one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No blinding or incomplete blinding, but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding;</li> <li>• Blinding of participants and key study personnel ensured, and unlikely that the blinding could have been broken.</li> </ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'High risk' of bias.	<p>Any one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No blinding or incomplete blinding, and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding;</li> <li>• Blinding of key study participants and personnel attempted, but likely that the blinding could have been broken, and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.</li> </ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'Unclear risk' of bias.	<p>Any one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient information to permit judgment of 'Low risk' or 'High risk';</li> <li>• The study did not address this outcome.</li> </ul>

**BLINDING OF OUTCOME ASSESSMENT****Detection bias due to knowledge of the allocated interventions by outcome assessors.**

Criteria for a judgment of 'Low risk' of bias.	Any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding;</li><li>• Blinding of outcome assessment ensured, and unlikely that the blinding could have been broken.</li></ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'High risk' of bias.	Any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No blinding of outcome assessment, and the outcome measurement is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding;</li><li>• Blinding of outcome assessment, but likely that the blinding could have been broken, and the outcome measurement is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.</li></ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'Unclear risk' of bias.	Any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Insufficient information to permit judgment of 'Low risk' or 'High risk';</li><li>• The study did not address this outcome.</li></ul>

**INCOMPLETE OUTCOME DATA****Attrition bias due to amount, nature or handling of incomplete outcome data.**

Criteria for a judgment of 'Low risk' of bias.	Any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No missing outcome data;</li><li>• Reasons for missing outcome data unlikely to be related to true outcome (for survival data, censoring unlikely to be introducing bias);</li><li>• Missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention groups, with similar reasons for missing data across groups;</li><li>• For dichotomous outcome data, the proportion of missing outcomes compared with observed event risk not enough to have a clinically relevant impact on the intervention effect estimate;</li><li>• For continuous outcome data, plausible effect size (difference in means or standardized difference in means) among missing outcomes not enough to have a clinically relevant impact on observed effect size;</li><li>• Missing data have been imputed using appropriate methods.</li></ul>
Criteria for the judgment of 'High risk' of bias.	Any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reason for missing outcome data likely to be related to true outcome, with either imbalance in numbers or reasons for missing data across intervention groups;</li><li>• For dichotomous outcome data, the proportion of missing outcomes compared with observed event risk enough to induce clinically relevant bias in intervention effect estimate;</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For continuous outcome data, plausible effect size (difference in means or standardized difference in means) among missing outcomes enough to induce clinically relevant bias in observed effect size;</li> <li>• ‘As-treated’ analysis done with substantial departure of the intervention received from that assigned at randomization;</li> <li>• Potentially inappropriate application of simple imputation.</li> </ul>
Criteria for the judgment of ‘Unclear risk’ of bias.	<p>Any one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of ‘Low risk’ or ‘High risk’ (e.g. number randomized not stated, no reasons for missing data provided);</li> <li>• The study did not address this outcome.</li> </ul>

## Thresholds for Converting the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool to AHRQ Standards (Good, Fair, and Poor)

**Good quality:** All criteria met (i.e. low for each domain)

Using the Cochrane ROB tool, it is possible for a criterion to be met even when the element was technically not part of the method. For instance, a judgment that knowledge of the allocated interventions was adequately prevented can be made even if the study was not blinded, if EPC team members judge that the outcome and the outcome measurement are not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.

**Fair quality:** One criterion not met (i.e. high risk of bias for one domain) or two criteria unclear, and the assessment that this was **unlikely** to have biased the outcome, and there is no known important limitation that could invalidate the results

**Poor quality:** One criterion not met (i.e. high risk of bias for one domain) or two criteria unclear, and the assessment that this was **likely** to have biased the outcome, and there are important limitations that could invalidate the results

**Poor quality:** Two or more criteria listed as high or unclear risk of bias

# Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool

Use the modified Cochrane Collaboration tool to assess risk of bias for randomized controlled trials. Bias is assessed as a judgment (high, low, or unclear) for individual elements from five domains (selection, performance, attrition, reporting, and other).

## AUB KQ1 Risk of Bias Assessment (Reference ID # )

Domain	Description	High Risk of Bias	Low Risk of Bias	Unclear Risk of Bias	Reviewer Assessment	Reviewer Comments
<i>Selection bias</i> <b>Random sequence generation</b>	Described the method used to generate the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to allow an assessment of whether it should produce comparable groups	Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate generation of a randomized sequence	Random sequence generation method should produce comparable groups	Not described in sufficient detail	<b>High Low Unclear</b>	
<i>Selection bias</i> <b>Allocation concealment</b>	Described the method used to conceal the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to determine whether intervention allocations could have been foreseen before or during enrollment	Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate concealment of allocations prior to assignment	Intervention allocations likely could not have been foreseen in before or during enrollment	Not described in sufficient detail	<b>High Low Unclear</b>	
<i>Reporting bias</i> <b>Selective reporting</b>	Stated how the possibility of selective outcome reporting was examined by the authors and what was found	Reporting bias due to selective outcome reporting	Selective outcome reporting bias not detected	Insufficient information to permit judgment†	<b>High Low Unclear</b>	
<i>Other bias</i> <b>Other sources of bias</b>	Any important concerns about bias not addressed above*	Bias due to problems not covered elsewhere in the table	No other bias detected	There may be a risk of bias, but there is either insufficient information to assess whether an important risk of bias exists or insufficient rationale or evidence that an identified problem will introduce bias	<b>High Low Unclear</b>	

\* If particular questions/entries were pre-specified in the study's protocol, responses should be provided for each question/entry.

† It is likely that the majority of studies will fall into this category.

Assess each main or class of outcomes for each of the following. Indicate the specific outcome.

## AUB KQ1 Risk of Bias Assessment (Reference ID # )

Outcome:

Domain	Description	High Risk of Bias	Low Risk of Bias	Unclear Risk of Bias	Reviewer Assessment	Reviewer Comments
<i>Performance bias</i> <b>Blinding (participants and personnel)</b>	Described all measures used, if any, to blind study participants and personnel from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provided any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective.	Performance bias due to knowledge of the allocated interventions by participants and personnel during the study.	Blinding was likely effective.	Not described in sufficient detail	High Low Unclear	
<i>Detection bias</i> <b>Blinding (outcome assessment)</b>	Described all measures used, if any, to blind outcome assessors from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provided any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective.	Detection bias due to knowledge of the allocated interventions by outcome assessors.	Blinding was likely effective.	Not described in sufficient detail	High Low Unclear	
<i>Attrition bias</i> <b>Incomplete outcome data</b>	Described the completeness of outcome data for each main outcome, including attrition and exclusions from the analysis. Stated whether attrition and exclusions were reported, the numbers in each intervention group (compared with total randomized participants), reasons for attrition/exclusions where reported.	Attrition bias due to amount, nature or handling of incomplete outcome data.	Handling of incomplete outcome data was complete and unlikely to have produced bias	Insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgment (e.g., number randomized not stated, no reasons for missing data provided)	High Low Unclear	

## NEWCASTLE- OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE

### CASE CONTROL STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

#### Selection

- 1) Is the case definition adequate?
  - a) yes, with independent validation \*
  - b) yes, eg record linkage or based on self reports
  - c) no description
- 2) Representativeness of the cases
  - a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases \*
  - b) potential for selection biases or not stated
- 3) Selection of Controls
  - a) community controls \*
  - b) hospital controls
  - c) no description
- 4) Definition of Controls
  - a) no history of disease (endpoint) \*
  - b) no description of source

#### Comparability

- 1) Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis
  - a) study controls for \_\_\_\_\_ (Select the most important factor.) \*
  - b) study controls for any additional factor \* (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

#### Exposure

- 1) Ascertainment of exposure
  - a) secure record (eg surgical records) \*
  - b) structured interview where blind to case/control status \*
  - c) interview not blinded to case/control status
  - d) written self report or medical record only
  - e) no description
- 2) Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls
  - a) yes \*
  - b) no
- 3) Non-Response rate
  - a) same rate for both groups \*
  - b) non respondents described
  - c) rate different and no designation

## NEWCASTLE-OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE COHORT STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability

### Selection

- 1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort
  - a) truly representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_ (describe) in the community \*
  - b) somewhat representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_ in the community \*
  - c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
  - d) no description of the derivation of the cohort
- 2) Selection of the non exposed cohort
  - a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort \*
  - b) drawn from a different source
  - c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort
- 3) Ascertainment of exposure
  - a) secure record (eg surgical records) \*
  - b) structured interview \*
  - c) written self report
  - d) no description
- 4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study
  - a) yes \*
  - b) no

### Comparability

- 1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis
  - a) study controls for \_\_\_\_\_ (select the most important factor) \*
  - b) study controls for any additional factor \* (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

### Outcome

- 1) Assessment of outcome
  - a) independent blind assessment \*
  - b) record linkage \*
  - c) self report
  - d) no description
- 2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur
  - a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) \*
  - b) no
- 3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts
  - a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for \*
  - b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > \_\_\_\_\_ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost) \*
  - c) follow up rate < \_\_\_\_\_ % (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost
  - d) no statement



Thresholds for converting the Newcastle-Ottawa scales to AHRQ standards (good, fair, and poor):

Good quality: 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain

Fair quality: 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/ exposure domain

Poor quality: 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome/ exposure domain

## Adapted Quality Assessment Tool for Before and After Studies

Criteria	Yes	No	Other (CD, NR, NA)*
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?			
2. Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described?			
3. Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?			
4. Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled?			
5. Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings?			
6. Was the test/service/intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population?			
7. Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants?			
8. Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?			
9. Was the statistical approach used to analyze the data clearly described and appropriate?			

Criteria	Yes	No	Other (CD, NR, NA)*
10. Were the basic data results adequately described?			
11. Were the results presented for all the analyses described in the methods?			

\*CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

#### Number of “Yes” Answer / Total elements

If the study does not present any data regarding the acquisition or progression rates of colonization to infection, we may not answer question 8 by excluding it from the evaluation.

Number of “Yes” Answers	Total elements	Quality rate
11	11	High Quality
10	11	High Quality
9	11	High Quality
8	11	Low Quality
7	11	Low Quality
6	11	Low Quality
5	11	Low Quality
4	11	Very Low Quality
3	11	Very Low Quality
2	11	Very Low Quality
1	11	Very Low Quality
0	11	Very Low Quality

Number of “Yes” Answers	Total elements	Quality rate
10	10	High Quality
9	10	High Quality
8	10	High Quality
7	10	Low Quality
6	10	Low Quality
5	10	Low Quality
4	10	Low Quality
3	10	Very Low Quality
2	10	Very Low Quality
1	10	Very Low Quality
0	10	Very Low Quality

## Articles excluded in full text

PMID	Title	Authors	Year	DOI	Inclusion FT	Aim of exclusion
31893042	Molecular surveillance of carbapenemase-producing <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> at three medical centres in Cologne, Germany	Schäfer E, Malecki M, Tellez-Castillo	2019	10.1186/s13756-019-0665-5	No	No new technologies
126	Application of intelligent nursing based on cloud computing of internet of things in children with pneumonia and sepsis treated with	Qin, AH; Liu, LY; Shao, CM; Dong, HY	2023	10.1177/1721727X231194144	No	Outcome
28807836	Development and evaluation of the automated risk assessment system for multidrug-resistant organisms (autoRAS-MDRO)	Hur EY, Jin YJ, Jin TX, Lee SM.	2018	10.1016/j.jhin.2017.08.004	No	No new technologies
29439746	Antimicrobial Stewardship Program Implementation of a Quality Improvement Intervention Using Real-Time Feedback and an Electronic	Rosa R, Zavala B, Cain N, Anjan S, Ar	2018	10.1017/ice.2017.325	No	Outcome
38	Machine Learning Algorithms to Predict Healthcare Associated Infections in a Neonatal Intensive Care Unit	Montella E.; Marino M.R.; Scala A.; T	2023	10.1007/978-3-031-25191-7_38	No	Outcome
34184637	Rapid feedback on hospital onset SARS-CoV-2 infections combining epidemiological and sequencing data	Stirrup O, Hughes J, Parker M, Parthi	2021	10.7554/eLife.65828	No	Outcome
37369173	Development and clinical impact assessment of a machine-learning model for early prediction of late-onset sepsis	van den Berg MAM, Medina OOAG,	2023	10.1016/j.combiomed.2023.107156	No	Outcome
35700927	Reducing CAUTI in patients with acute urinary retention in the critical care setting: A pilot study with electronic medical record analysis	Lilley T, Teixeira-Poit S, Wenner J, Pr	2023	10.1016/j.ajic.2022.06.005	No	Outcome
29366555	Feasibility of an Image-Based Mobile Health Protocol for Postoperative Wound Monitoring	Gunter, RL; Fernandes-Taylor, S; Rah	2018	10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2017.12.013	No	Type of study
35249794	Healthcare-associated infections in adult intensive care unit patients: Changes in epidemiology, diagnosis, prevention and contribution	Blot S, Ruppé E, Harbarth S, Asehnoui	2022	10.1016/j.iccn.2022.103227	No	Type of study
94	Systematic development of an mHealth app to prevent healthcare-associated infections by involving patients: 'Participatient'	Bentvelsen R.G.; van der Vaart R.; Ve	2021	10.1016/j.ceh.2021.03.001	No	Type of study
34496983	A computerized indicator for surgical site infection (SSI) assessment after total hip or total knee replacement: The French ISO-ORTH	Grammatico-Guillon L, Miliani K, Bar	2022	10.1017/ice.2021.371	No	No extractable data
37800568	Prediction models of surgical site infection after gastrointestinal surgery: a nationwide prospective cohort study	Yang Y, Zhang X, Zhang J, Zhu J, Wan	2023	10.1097/JS9.0000000000000808	No	No extractable data
34745489	Susceptible-Infected-Removed Mathematical Model under Deep Learning in Hospital Infection Control of Novel Coronavirus	Pneun Liu T, Bai Y, Du M, Gao Y, Liu Y.	2021	10.1155/2021/1535046	No	Type of study
37386032	Influenza transmissibility among patients and health-care professionals in a geriatric short-stay unit using individual contact data	Gustin M.-P.; Pujo-Menjouet L.; Van	2023	10.1038/s41598-023-36908-5	No	Outcome
36618079	Machine learning-assisted ensemble analysis for the prediction of urinary tract infection in elderly patients with ovarian cancer after	Al J, Hu Y, Zhou FF, Liao YX, Yang T.	2022	10.5306/wjco.v13.i12.967	No	Outcome
33711939	A spatiotemporal simulation study on the transmission of harmful microorganisms through connected healthcare workers in a hospital	van Niekerk J.M.; Stein A.; Doting M.	2021	10.1186/s12879-021-05954-7	No	Outcome
30069472	WMSS: A Web-Based Multitiered Surveillance System for Predicting CLABSI	Noaman AY, Ragab AHM, Al-Abdulla	2018	10.1155/2018/5419313	No	No extractable data
28482161	Gamification and Microlearning for Engagement With Quality Improvement (GAMEQI): A Bundled Digital Intervention for the Prevention	Orwoll B.; Diane S.; Henry D.; Tsang	2018	10.1177/1062860617706542	No	Outcome
31525183	Fast and near-optimal monitoring for healthcare acquired infection outbreaks	Adhikari B, Lewis B, Vullikanti A, Jimi	2019	10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007284	No	No extractable data
37753703	Preoperative Prediction of Postoperative Infections Using Machine Learning and Electronic Health Record Data	Zhuang Y, Dyas A, Meguid RA, Hendri	2023	10.1097/SLA.00000000000006106	No	No extractable data
29486341	Predicting central line-associated bloodstream infections and mortality using supervised machine learning	Parreco JP, Hidalgo AE, Badilla AD, Il	2018	10.1016/j.jccr.2018.02.010	No	No extractable data
29413730	Healthcare-associated ventriculitis and meningitis in a neuro-ICU: Incidence and risk factors selected by machine learning approach	Savin I, Ershova K, Kurdyumova N, Et	2018	10.1016/j.jccr.2018.01.022	No	Outcome
32371082	Prospective evaluation of an easy and reliable work flow for the screening of OXA-48-producing <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> in endemic	Rodríguez-Lucas C, Rodicio MR, Rose	2020	10.1016/j.jhin.2020.04.044	No	Outcome
36961857	A novel, integrated approach for understanding and investigating Healthcare Associated Infections: A risk factors constellation analysis	Carestia M, Andreoni M, Buonomo E	2023	10.1371/journal.pone.0282019	No	No new technologies
34725404	Probabilistic modelling of effects of antibiotics and calendar time on transmission of healthcare-associated infection	Laager, M; Cooper, B; Eyre, DW	2021	10.1038/s41598-021-00748-y	No	No new technologies
110	Optimal Decision of Dynamic Bed Allocation and Patient Admission with Buffer Wards during an Epidemic	Wang, CL; Yang, FF; Li, QL	2023	10.3390/math11030687	No	Outcome
35372245	Critical Care Database Comprising Patients With Infection	Xu P, Chen L, Zhu Y, Yu S, Chen R, Hu	2022	10.3389/fpubh.2022.852410	No	No new technologies
29061499	Reducing Inappropriate Testing for the Evaluation of Diarrhea Among Hospitalized Patients	Tewell C.E.; Talbot T.R.; Nelson G.E.;	2018	10.1016/j.amjmed.2017.10.006	No	Outcome
31525449	Use of health databases to deal with underreporting of surgical site infections due to suboptimal post-discharge follow-up	Gagliotti C, Buttazzi R, Ricciardi A, Ri	2020	10.1016/j.jhin.2019.09.009	No	No new technologies
35726554	Semiautomated surveillance of deep surgical site infections after colorectal surgeries: A multicenter external validation of two surveys	Verberk JDM, van der Kooij TIL, Heter	2023	10.1017/ice.2022.147	No	No new technologies
31884977	A framework to develop semiautomated surveillance of surgical site infections: An international multicenter study	van Rooden SM, Tacconelli E, Pujol M	2020	10.1017/ice.2019.321	No	No new technologies
33359550	National Infection Control Program in Turkey: The healthcare associated infection rate experiences over 10 years	Gozel, MG; Hekimoglu, CH; Gozel, E	2021	10.1016/j.ajic.2020.12.013	No	No new technologies
31462548	Pilot Evaluation of a Fully Automated Bioinformatics System for Analysis of Methicillin-Resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> Genomes	a Brown NM, Blane B, Raven KE, Kume	2019	10.1128/JCM.00858-19	No	Outcome
34039877	Modeling transmission of pathogens in healthcare settings	Stachel A, Keegan LT, Blumberg S; Ci	2021	10.1097/QCO.0000000000000742	No	Type of study
31761522	A Process Approach to Decreasing Hospital Onset <i>Clostridium difficile</i> Infections	Abbasi S, Singh F, Griffel M, Murphy	2020	10.1016/j.jcjq.2019.10.006	No	Outcome
37474597	Predicting sepsis onset using a machine learned causal probabilistic network algorithm based on electronic health records data	Valik JK, Ward L, Tanushi H, Johansson	2023	10.1038/s41598-023-38858-4	No	Outcome
36924997	The use of smart environments and robots for infection prevention control: A systematic literature review	Piaggio D, Zarro M, Pagliara S, Andel	2023	10.1016/j.ajic.2023.03.005	No	Outcome
37529839	Comorbidities directly extracted from the hospital database for adjusting SSI risk in the new national semiautomated surveillance system	Picard J, Nkoumazok B, Arnaud I, Ve	2023	10.1017/ice.2023.123	No	Outcome
32145358	Can natural language processing provide accurate, automated reporting of wound infection requiring reoperation after lumbar disc surgery?	Karhade AV, Bongers MER, Groot OC	2020	10.1016/j.spinee.2020.02.021	No	Outcome
35942941	Prediction models for carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales carriage at liver transplantation: A multicenter retrospective study	Freire MP, Rinaldi M, Terrabuio DRB	2022	10.1111/tid.13920	No	Outcome
35726257	Machine-learning based prediction and analysis of prognostic risk factors in patients with candidemia and bacteraemia: a 5-year analysis	Gao Y, Tang M, Li Y, Niu X, Li J, Fu C,	2022	10.7717/peerj.13594	No	Outcome
32579600	Comprehensive integrated NGS-based surveillance and contact-network modeling unravels transmission dynamics of vancomycin-resistant	Neumann B, Bender JK, Maier BF, W	2020	10.1371/journal.pone.0235160	No	Outcome
37448774	Using multiple indicators to predict the risk of surgical site infection after ORIF of tibia fractures: a machine learning based study	Ying H, Guo BW, Wu HJ, Zhu RP, Liu Y	2023	10.3389/fcimb.2023.1206393	No	Outcome
35005696	Admissions to a Low-Resource Neonatal Unit in Malawi Using a Mobile App and Dashboard: A 1-Year Digital Perinatal Outcome Study	Aur M, Gusha Y, Nkhoma DB, Chiume M,	2021	10.3389/fdgth.2021.761128	No	No new technologies
29576042	A Generalizable, Data-Driven Approach to Predict Daily Risk of <i>Clostridium difficile</i> Infection at Two Large Academic Health Centers	Oh J.; Makar M.; Fusco C.; McCaffrey	2018	10.1017/ice.2018.16	No	No new technologies
30922931	Development and validation of a semi-automated surveillance system-lowering the fruit for non-ventilator-associated hospital-acquired	Woffensberger A, Jakob W, Faes Hes	2019	10.1016/j.cmi.2019.03.019	No	No new technologies
34988091	Development and Internal Validation of Supervised Machine Learning Algorithms for Predicting the Risk of Surgical Site Infection	From Wang H, Fan T, Yang B, Lin Q, Li W, Y	2021	10.3389/fmed.2021.771608	No	Outcome
35057734	Spatiotemporal prediction of vancomycin-resistant <i>Enterococcus</i> colonisation	van Niekerk JM, Lokate M, Braakma	2022	10.1186/s12879-022-07043-9	No	Outcome
35790097	Using Temporal Data Mining on Patient Data for Clinical Decision Making in the Care of the Sick Newborn	Tan S, Unnikrishnan KP.	2022	25	No	Outcome
35799456	A non-randomised pragmatic trial for the early detection and prevention of surgical wound complications using an advanced hydrogel	Sandy-Hodgetts K, Norman R, Edmond	2022	10.1111/iwj.13823	No	Outcome
37395708	Reorganization of nurse scheduling reduces the risk of healthcare associated infections	Valdano E, Poletto C, Boëlle PY, Coliz	2021	10.1038/s41598-021-86637-w	No	No new technologies
32308875	Using Natural Language Processing to Improve EHR Structured Data-based Surgical Site Infection Surveillance	Shi J, Liu S, Pruitt LCC, Luppens CL,	2021	21	No	Outcome
29893653	Validation of semiautomated surgical site infection surveillance using electronic screening algorithms in 38 surgery categories	Cho SY, Chung DR, Choi JR, Kim DM,	2018	10.1017/ice.2018.116	No	Outcome
37726843	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> surgical site infection rates in 5 European countries	Mellinghoff SC, Bruns C, Albertsmeier	2023	10.1186/s13756-023-01309-w	No	Outcome
150	An Application of Convolutional Neural Networks for the Early Detection of Late-onset Neonatal Sepsis	Hu, YF; Lee, VCS; Tan, K	2019	10.1109/IJCNN.2019.8851683	No	Outcome

32032262 Identification of Pediatric Sepsis for Epidemiologic Surveillance Using Electronic Clinical Data	Weiss SL, Balamuth F, Chilutti M, Rai	2020	10.1097/PCC.0000000000002170	No	No new technologies
33157307 Preventing infectious diseases in Intensive Care Unit by medical devices remote control: Lessons from COVID-19	Garzotto F, Comoretto RI, Osterman	2021	10.1016/j.jcrc.2020.10.014	No	Type of study
124 Modelling and Classification of Sepsis using Machine Learning	Amrita, I; Martis, RJ; Ashwini, K	2021	10.1109/ICECCOT52851.2021.9707934	No	Outcome
34116215 External validation of a predictive model of adverse events following spine surgery	Fatemi P, Zhang Y, Han SS, Puringtor	2022	10.1016/j.spinee.2021.06.006	No	No new technologies
35047054 Prediction of Lung Infection during Palliative Chemotherapy of Lung Cancer Based on Artificial Neural Network	Guo W, Gao G, Dai J, Sun Q.	2022	10.1155/2022/4312117	No	Outcome
37163757 Comparison of Administrative versus Electronic Health Record-based Methods for Identifying Sepsis Hospitalizations	Karlic KJ, Clouse TL, Hogan CK, Garla	2023	10.1513/AnnalsATS.202302-105OC	No	Outcome
151 Big data-based grey forecast mathematical model to evaluate the effect of Escherichia coli infection on patients with lupus nephriti	Fan, MX; Gu, SS; Jin, YS; Ding, L; Gho	2021	10.1016/j.rinp.2021.104339	No	Outcome
36050996 Construct and Validate a Predictive Model for Surgical Site Infection after Posterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion Based on Machine Le	Xiong C, Zhao R, Xu J, Liang H, Zhang	2022	10.1155/2022/2697841	No	Outcome
37773495 Use of Electronic Clinical Data to Track Incidence and Mortality for SARS-CoV-2-Associated Sepsis	Shappell, CN; Klompas, M; Chan, CS	2023	10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.35728	No	Outcome
35962320 Harmonized procedure coding system for surgical procedures and analysis of surgical site infections (SSI) of five European countrie	Mellinghoff SC, Bruns C, Al-Monajjed	2022	10.1186/s12874-022-01702-w	No	No new technologies
125 A Machine Learning-Based Missing Data Imputation with FHIR Interoperability Approach in Sepsis Prediction	Beltran, CFT; Ibañez, EDV; Orejuela,	2022	10.1007/978-3-031-23821-5_9	No	Outcome





**Figure S1: Digital technologies for country study**

NUMBER OF ARTICLES INCLUDED	Digital technology classification						Grand Total
	Digital health/e-health/m-health	Electronic health records ( EHRs )	Health informatics	Machine Learning	Natural Language processing	Smartphone and tablet computing devices	
Canada				2			2
China				3			3
France			1	1			2
Germany			2	1			3
Italy			1	1			2
Multicountry				1			1
Netherlands	1						1
Norway			1				1
Pakistan				1			1
Rwanda				1			1
Spain				1			1
Sweden				2	2		4
Switzerland				1			1
Thailand				1			1
UK	1		1			3	5
US	1	1	1	8	3		14
Grand Total	3	1	7	24	5	3	43



**Figure S2: Key function for country study**

Number of articles included	Public health key function	
	Outbreak detection	Surveillance
Canada		2
China		3
France		2
Germany	1	2
Italy		2
Multicountry	1	
Netherlands		1
Norway	1	
Pakistan		1
Rwanda		1
Spain		1
Sweden	1	3
Switzerland	1	
Thailand		1
UK		5
US	1	13

**Figure S3: Digital technologies for microorganism and AMR**

	Studies included	Digital technology classifications					
		Digital health/e-health/m-health	Electronic health records (EHRs )	Health informatics	Machine Learning	Natural Language processing	Smartphone and tablet computing devices
Individually named or groups of infectious diseases	Antimicrobial resistant organisms			3	3		
	COVID-19			1	1		
	Pseudomonas				1		
	VRE				1		
	Unknown	3	1	3	18	5	3