# Unveiling the Hidden Costs:

#### THE CLINICAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT OF FALSE-POSITIVE BLOOD CULTURES

Tuesday, January 21, 2025







## **Guest Speakers**



#### Anna Crum

Solution Manager Cardamom Health





#### **Colleen Humphrey**

Senior Manager, Magnolia Analytics Magnolia Medical Technologies



© 2024 Magnolia Medical Technologies® All rights reserved. Confidential and proprietary.

M

## Learning Objectives

- Provide a brief overview of the downstream negative impacts of blood culture contaminations
- Review the pilot outcomes of blood culture contamination reduction with an Initial Specimen Diversion Device<sup>(R)</sup>
- How the study conducted at a large, multi-hospital health system demonstrated the irrefutable impact, clinically and economically, of patients that received a false positive blood culture result in comparison to patients who received a true negative result



## **The Problem & Challenge**

**Blood Culture Contamination** 

2024 Magnolia Medical Technologies® All rights reserved. Confidential and proprietar



## Sepsis is the **#1** cause of **death**, **readmissions**, and **costs** in U.S. hospitals

... and blood cultures remain the gold standard for diagnosing this disease

<sup>1</sup>Liu V, Escobar GJ, Greene JD. Hospital deaths in patients with sepsis from 2 independent cohorts. JAMA. 2014;312(1):90-92. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.5804.

<sup>2</sup>Weiss AJ, Jiang HJ. Overview of clinical conditions with frequent and costly hospital readmissions by payer, 2018. HCUP Statistical Brief #278. July 2021. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD.

Of all positive blood cultures



# On average, **40%** to over **50%** of positive blood culture results are **FALSE POSITIVE**

© 2024 Magnolia Medical Technologies® All rights reserved. Confidential and proprietary

## Hospital Economic Implications of False Positive Blood Cultures





Journal of Hospital Medicine

> THE AMERICAN JOURNAL *of* MEDICINE.

JAMA	The Journal of the American Medical Association
------	--

Publication	Attributable Incremental Hospital Costs	Extended Length of Stay
Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology (2022) <sup>1</sup>	\$2,853 <sup>*</sup>	1.3
Journal of Hospital Infection (2019) <sup>2</sup>	\$4,817	2.4
Journal of Clinical Microbiology (2019) <sup>3</sup>	\$4,739	2.0
Journal of Hospital Infection (2011) <sup>4</sup>	\$3,405 <sup>*</sup>	5.4
Journal of Clinical Microbiology (2009) <sup>5</sup>	\$4,142 <sup>*</sup>	1+
Journal of Hospital Medicine (2006)6	\$3,647 <sup>*</sup>	3.0
The American Journal of Medicine (1999) <sup>7</sup>	\$6,319 <sup>**</sup>	2.0
Clinical Performance Quality Healthcare (1998) <sup>8</sup>	\$3,962 <sup>*</sup>	8.4
Journal of American Medical Association (1991) <sup>9</sup>	\$3,303 <sup>*</sup>	4.5
The American Journal of Medicine (1989) <sup>10</sup>	\$4,431 <sup>*</sup>	4.2
Average Cost Per False-Positive Event	\$4,162	3.4 days

1. Klucher J, Davis K, Lakkad M, Painter JT, Dare RK. Risk factors and clinical outcomes associated with blood culture contamination. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2022;43(3):291-297. doi:10.1017/ice.2021.111. 2. Geisler BP, Jig N, Patton RG, Pietzsch JB. Model to evaluate the impact of hospital-based interventions targeting false-positive blood cultures on economic and clinical outcomes. J Hosp Infect: 2019;102(4):438-444. doi:10.1016/jihin.2019.003.012.3. Skoglund E, Dempsey CJ, Ohen H, Garey KW. Estimated clinical and economic impact through use d'a novel blood culture on transmination in the emergency department a cost-benefit analysis. J Clin Microbiol. 2009;7(1):e01015-18. 4. Akharded M, McElnay JC, et al. Clinical and economic impact of contamination in the emergency department a cost-benefit analysis. J Clin Microbiol. 2009;7(1):e01015-18. 4. Akharded M, Microbiol. 2009;7(1):e01015-18. 4. Akharded M, McElnay JC, et al. Clinical and economic impact of contamination in the emergency department. J Clinikorobiol. 2009;7(1):e01015-18. 4. Akharded M, Microbiol. 2009;7(1):e0105-10:e017;7(



## **Pilot Study Outcome** Steripath® Initial Specimen Diversion Device®

2024 Magnolia Medical Technologies® All rights reserved. Confidential and proprietary

## A 6 Month Pilot Using an Initial Specimen Diversion Device<sup>(R)</sup>

Pilot completed in 3 of the EDs within the health system

#### The Health System

- 10+ hospitals
- 2,000 staffed beds across the entire system
- >60,000 blood cultures performed annually

#### **Baseline Contamination Rate**

 Pre-Steripath<sup>(R)</sup> baseline contamination rate above the national above of 3%

#### **Pilot Results**

A contamination rate of less than 1%



## **Blood Culture Contamination Rates**

Reduction in Contamination Rates since Implementing Steripath

#### Pre-Steripath Baseline Rate: 3.65%



Non-Steripath Rate: *BCC% on draws where Steripath was not used* Blended Rate: *BCC% for both non-Steripath and Steripath draws combined* Steripath Rate: *BCC% for Steripath draws only* 

### **The Patient Impact**



\*Projected # of False Positives calculation: Baseline BCC% \* total blood cultures performed during pilot \*False Positives Avoided calculation: Projected false positives – (total blood cultures performed during pilot \* pilot blended rate)

© 2024 Magnolia Medical Technologies® All rights reserved. Confidential and proprietary.

## **Pilot Summary**

October 1, 2022 - March 31, 2023

- 2.45% blended rate, 32% reduction from 3.65% baseline
  - 0.96% Steripath only rate, 74% reduction
  - **135** avoided false-positives during pilot period
- **\$561,870** in cost savings *based on cost of contamination of \$4,162*



Based on the efficacy proven during the pilot, Steripath would be the catalyst to < 1.0% BCC system wide



## A Comprehensive Data Analysis of Blood Cultures

12-month study results January 1, 2023 – December 31, 2023

© 2024 Magnolia Medical Technologies® All rights reserved. Confidential and proprietal

### Compared False-Positive (case event) to True Negative (control event)



### **Total Profit Loss Per False-Positive**



Each false-positive event incurred an average **total profit loss of \$1,617** to the health system - factoring in both care delivery costs and <u>received</u> reimbursements.

# Despite higher reimbursement for False Positives, increased cost of care leads to loss of \$940 per patient

Avg Per Event	False-Positive	True Negative	Difference (FP - TN)	
Event Count	1,562	27,061	N/A	Total lost profit per blood culture contamination event = \$1,617
Avg Total Charges <sup>1</sup>	\$85,774	\$55,979	\$29,795	
Avg Total Costs <sup>2</sup>	\$22,267	\$14,478	\$7,789	
Avg Total Expected Payment <sup>3</sup>	\$22,048	\$16,007	\$6,041	
Avg Total Payment <sup>4</sup>	\$21,327	\$15,155	\$6,172	
Margin (Payment - Costs	s) <sup>5</sup> -\$940	\$677	-\$1,617	

<sup>1</sup>Total charges posted to the Hospital Account for the patient encounter during which the blood culture was taken.

<sup>2</sup>Total costs calculated using a CCR of 0.277, except for medications, whose cost data is stored within Epic.

<sup>3</sup>Total expected payment based on the expected reimbursement calculated by the contract logic stored within Epic.

<sup>4</sup>Total payments posted to the Hospital Account (from insurance or self-pay) for the patient encounter during which the blood culture was taken.

<sup>5</sup>Margin, also referred to as profit, represents the difference between revenue (payments) and costs.

## Blood Culture Contamination False Positive vs. True Negative Result

Costs calculated using the total charges for the account and multiplying by an estimated Cost-to-Charge Ratio of .2771



<sup>1</sup>Cost-to-Charge Ratio was estimated based on the FY2 1 Medicare Cost Report.

<sup>2</sup>Epic stores cost data for medications (whereas other cost data is typically in disparate systems). To a chieve maximum precision, medication costs were directly queried the healthcare system's database, which aggregates data from Epic, rather than using the CCR for calculations.

#### Hospital Health Blood Culture Contamination Case vs. Control Results

Detailed Breakdown of Lab and Medication Costs Attributable to Blood Culture Contamination





<sup>1</sup>Medication costs were directly queried from the Hospital Qlikview database, which aggregates data from Epic, rather than using the CCR for calculations. <sup>2</sup>Lab costs were determined using a CCR of .277

# Blood culture contamination not only impacts the bottom line but also impacts patient safety



# **Questions?**





#### **Contact Cardamom**



Cardamom@cardamom.health



www.Cardamom.Health

#### **Contact Magnolia Medical Technologies**



Info@magnolia-medical.com



Magnolia-medical.com