



1275 K Street, NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20005-4006  
Phone: 202/789-1890  
Fax: 202/789-1899  
[apicinfo@apic.org](mailto:apicinfo@apic.org)  
[www.apic.org](http://www.apic.org)

September 16, 2010

Scientific Resource Center, Oregon EPC  
Mail code: BICC  
3181 S.W. Sam Jackson Park Road  
Portland, Oregon 97239-3098

The Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc. (APIC) is pleased to respond to the Agency for Healthcare Quality and Research request for comments on the Draft Comparative Effectiveness Review of Effectiveness of Screening and Treatment of *C. difficile* Infections. We found the document to be very comprehensive and well written in highlighting the challenges and complexities involved in diagnosis, management, and treatment of *C. difficile* infections. We would like to submit the following brief comments. (Because the computer page and document page numbers do not correspond, comments will be listed with both references.)

1. Page 12 (Document page 3), Key Question 3: the last sentence in the paragraph just prior to the new heading (Diagnostics (KQ1) Results) ends with a comma. We are unsure if there was more to that sentence and thought.
2. Page 35 (Document page 26), under the heading immunoassays for toxins, the date written as 198's should be 1980's.
3. Page 35 (Document page 26), in the paragraph following the above, APIC is incorrectly identified and should be changed to the Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology.
4. Page 38 (Document page 29), APIC believes that breaking routes of transmission is a focus of institutional infection prevention and control programs rather than institutional infectious disease programs.
5. Page 106 (Document page 97), we would like to see an expansion of the statement regarding the nature of decisions faced by infection preventionists (IP) as being qualitatively different from clinical decisions. This is an excellent point and focuses on the need to develop more consistent and accurate definitions, for example, diarrhea, the context in which studies occur, and intervention bundles, that can be used across all settings. The issue of IP surveillance activities being different from clinical definitions is another area that could benefit from additional explication.



6. Finally, the term “infection control professionals” is used throughout. We would ask the Agency to consider instead the terms “infection prevention and control professionals” or “infection preventionists.”

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this draft document.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cathryn Murphy", written in a cursive style.

Cathryn Murphy, RN, PhD, CIC  
President