

: PREVALENCE RATE/INCIDENCE RATE/NOSOCOMIAL INFECTION

SATAPORN SRICHALEORNCHOB :PREVALENCE RATE AND INCIDENCE RATE OF NOSOCOMIAL INFECTION AND RELATED FACTORS IN CHAOPHAYAAPAIPUBASE HOSPITAL, PRACHIN BURI PROVINCE. THESIS ADVISOR : ASSO.PROF.DR. MUNEE SRESHTHABUTRA, ASSO. PROF. DR. PANPIT SUWANNAKON, 91 PP. ISBN 974-584-078-5

This research is a study of the prevalence rate and the incidence rate of nosocomial infection and their related factors at Chaophayaapaipubase Hospital, Prachinburi province by a cross-sectional survey on November 1, 1993 in all patient wards to find the prevalence rate and a prospective study for patients admitted in the hospital for more than 24 hours in all patient wards between November 1 to December 31, 1993 to find the incidence rate and the related factors.

It was found that the prevalence rate of the nosocomial infection was 7.89% of 317 patients. The intensive care unit (ICU) had the highest rate which equaled 100%. The pediatric and Thanasuan-Bon wards were the next ones with the prevalence rates of 23.07% and 16.67% respectively. The cutaneous and subcutaneous infection was the most frequently infected system with the infected rate of 56%. The next ones were the lower respiratory system and the hematologic system with the infected rates of 36% and 24% respectively.

The incidence rate of the nosocomial infection was 2.2% The ward with the highest rate was ICU which equaled 59.46%. The next ones were the newborn ward and female surgical ward, having the rates equaled 5.42% and 4.46% respectively. The most common infection was the lower respiratory system with the rate of 60.3%. The next ones were the cutaneous and subcutaneous system and the urinary tract system of which the infected rate equaled 30.2% and 20.6% respectively. The most common organism was klebsiella spp., Ps.aeruginosa and E.coli respectively.

The type of special equipments, age, sex, length of stay, and anemic condition associated with the nosocomial infection with statistical significance ($P < 0.01$). Active surveillance was 3.7 times effective than Passive surveillance.