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NAME OF TECHNOLOGY: MODIFIED URINE COLLECTION PAD (UCP) METHOD

PURPOSE AND TARGET GROUP: URINARY TRACT INFECTION DIAGNOSIS IN INFANTS

STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT (IN AUSTRALIA):

☒ Yet to emerge  ☐ Established
☐ Experimental  ☐ Established but changed indication or modification of technique
☐ Investigational  ☐ Should be taken out of use
☐ Nearly established

AUSTRALIAN THERAPEUTIC GOODS ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL

☐ Yes  ARTG number
☐ No  ☒ Not applicable

INTERNATIONAL UTILISATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>LEVEL OF USE</th>
<th>Trials Underway or Completed</th>
<th>Limited Use</th>
<th>Widely Diffused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>☒ Trials Underway or Completed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT SUMMARY:

The diagnosis of urinary tract infections in young children is often delayed due to difficulties in obtaining an uncontaminated urine sample. This summary describes a modified urine collection pad (UCP) method in young children with suspected urinary tract infection (UTI).

BACKGROUND

There are several methods available to collect urine samples for the purpose of diagnosing or excluding a diagnosis of UTI.

Several non-invasive methods exist for the collection of urine samples. The clean catch method requires a sample to be collected mid-stream during urination into a specimen container and are easily obtained from older children but with little success in infants. The most common method of sampling urine is by using sterile adhesive bags, which has several drawbacks: bags may not adhere adequately, causing leakage; the adhesive often causes discomfort, particularly for children with skin disorders; and urine samples are often contaminated. In addition the adhesive bags are costly. The UCP method involves placing a pad inside the infant’s nappy and urine is extracted after the pad is removed (Ahmad et al, 1991, Farrell et al 2002).

Previous studies comparing urine collection pad methods to bag samples have found that although the UCP method is easy to employ, it results in high rates of contamination (Macfarlane et al, 2004). A sample contaminated by faecal and perineal flora may hide
infection and may need to be repeated. Clean catch methods may result in less bacterial contamination in urine samples but are not the preferred method for parents to collect samples in young children (Liaw et al 2000). In elderly patients, urine samples are usually collected by catheterisation, which may cause pain and discomfort (Shvartzman and Nasri, 2003).

This summary describes a modification to the use of urine pads for sample collection where UCPs placed inside the nappy of a child are changed every 30 minutes to prevent bacterial contamination. An enuresis alarm is placed inside the nappy to alert staff to the presence of urine.

**CLINICAL NEED AND BURDEN OF DISEASE**

Urinary tract infection (UTI) is a common clinical problem in the elderly population, infants and young children. In 2002-3 urinary tract infections accounted for 1.2% of problems managed in GP consultations and was one of the 20 most common problems encountered in GP consultations in Australia (AIHW, 2004a).

Urinary tract infections are fairly common in children. About 2% of boys and 8% of girls will have a urinary infection during their childhood. If infections happen often they can cause damage to the kidneys (Child and Youth Health, South Australia, 2004).

In 2002-03 there were 1,743 and 1,270 separations in children aged<1 and 1-4 years respectively for a diagnosis of N39.0 Urinary tract infection (AIHW 2004b).

**DIFFUSION**

It is likely that this method of urine sample collection in young children could be applied in clinical settings and avoid the problem of contamination and excess time associated with bag and clean catch methods.

**COMPARATORS**

Apart from the non-invasive methods previously mentioned, other methods available include bladder (transurethral) catheterisation and suprapubic percutaneous bladder aspiration where a needle is through the abdominal wall into the bladder. These methods are commonly used in neonates or babies.

Current practice at the Women's and Children’s Hospital, South Australia for the collection of urine samples in young children in emergency and medical wards is the bag method (personal communication, clinical manager and emergency department triage nurse, Womens and Childrens Hospital).

**EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY ISSUES**

In the study conducted by Rao et al (level II evidence) children with fever under 2 years of age who were candidates for a diagnosis of UTI were randomised to two urine collection methods: single UCP, (where children wore UCP with alarm) or UCP and alarm with replacement of the UCP every 30 minutes (Rao et al, 2003). Of the eighty children recruited to the study a total of 37 samples were collected in the single UCP method and 31 by the replaced UCP method. Urine collection failed in 15% (12) children mainly due to faecal soiling of the pad. UTI occurred in three (4%) of the 68 samples.

This study found that replacing UCPs every 30 minutes reduced the rate of urine sample contamination compared to leaving a single UCP in place. Heavy mixed growth (>105 mixed growth organisms/ml) was significantly higher in the single UCP group (10/35, 29%) than in the replaced UCP group ((1/30, 3%), \( p = 0.008 \)). In the replacement UCP group, the number of pads used ranged between 1 and 7 (median 2).
COST IMPACT

No information was available regarding the possible cost impact of the UCP method compared to other urine sample collection methods. Although the above study was conducted in a young population, the UCP methods could also be applied to the elderly incontinent population, which may result in less time allocated to the collection of urine samples.

ETHICAL, CULTURAL OR RELIGIOUS CONSIDERATIONS

No issues were identified/raised in the sources examined.

CONCLUSION:

There is limited, although high quality, level of evidence (level II) currently available for the use of single and replacement UCP method and the potential for the easy adoption of the urine collection method in different clinical settings.

HEALTHPACT ACTION:

The UCP will not impact significantly in terms of policy or cost burden on the Australian health system it is therefore recommended that this technology be archived.
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