Antimicrobial-impregnated and -coated shunt catheters for prevention of infections in patients with hydrocephalus: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Athanasios A. Konstantelias, MD,¹ Konstantinos Z. Vardakas, MD, PhD,^{1,2}
Konstantinos A. Polyzos, MD, MSc,¹ Giannoula S. Tansarli, MD,¹
and Matthew E. Falagas, MD, MSc, DSc^{1–3}

¹Alfa Institute of Biomedical Sciences; ²Department of Medicine-Infectious Diseases, Iaso General Hospital, Iaso Group, Athens, Greece; and ³Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts

OBJECT The aim of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of antimicrobial-impregnated and -coated shunt catheters (antimicrobial catheters) in reducing the risk of infection in patients undergoing CSF shunting or ventricular drainage.

METHODS The PubMed and Scopus databases were searched. Catheter implantation was classified as either shunting (mainly ventriculoperitoneal shunting) or ventricular drainage (mainly external [EVD]). Studies evaluating antibiotic-impregnated catheters (AICs), silver-coated catheters (SCCs), and hydrogel-coated catheters (HCCs) were included. A random effects model meta-analysis was performed.

RESULTS Thirty-six studies (7 randomized and 29 nonrandomized, 16,796 procedures) were included. The majority of data derive from studies on the effectiveness of AICs, followed by studies on the effectiveness of SCCs. Statistical heterogeneity was observed in several analyses. Antimicrobial shunt catheters (AICs, SCCs) were associated with lower risk for CSF catheter-associated infections than conventional catheters (CCs) (RR 0.44, 95% CI 0.35–0.56). Fewer infections developed in the patients treated with antimicrobial catheters regardless of randomization, number of participating centers, funding, shunting or ventricular drainage, definition of infections, de novo implantation, and rate of infections in the study. There was no difference regarding gram-positive bacteria, all staphylococci, coagulase-negative streptococci, and *Staphylococcus aureus*, when analyzed separately. On the contrary, the risk for methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA, RR 2.64, 95% CI 1.26–5.51), nonstaphylococcal (RR 1.75, 95% CI 1.22–2.52), and gram-negative bacterial (RR 2.13, 95% CI 1.33–3.43) infections increased with antimicrobial shunt catheters.

CONCLUSIONS Based on data mainly from nonrandomized studies, AICs and SCCs reduce the risk for infection in patients undergoing CSF shunting. Future studies should evaluate the higher risk for MRSA and gram-negative infections. Additional trials are needed to investigate the comparative effectiveness of the different types of antimicrobial catheters.

<http://thejns.org/doi/abs/10.3171/2014.12.JNS14908>

KEY WORDS cerebrospinal shunt; antibiotic-impregnated catheters; silver-coated shunt; hydrogel-catheters; ventriculoperitoneal shunt; external ventricular drainage; hydrocephalus; infection

CEREBROSPINAL fluid (CSF) shunting is a commonly used surgical procedure for the treatment of hydrocephalus. Infections are among the most common complications following shunt implantation, occurring after 5% to 15% of procedures, and they have been associated with increased morbidity, including lower intellectual ability, higher number of revision surgeries, prolonged hos-

pitalization, and higher cost.^{4,15,49} In addition, CSF shunt infections were identified as predictors of mortality, which in such cases ranges from 1.5% to 22% in individual studies.⁴ Skin flora, including *Staphylococcus* spp., in up to 70% of cases and gram-negative bacilli (*Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella* spp.) in up to 20% of cases are the main causative pathogens in CSF shunt infections.¹⁵ In CSF shunting, the risk

ABBREVIATIONS AIC = antibiotic-impregnated catheter; CC = conventional catheter; CoNS = coagulase-negative streptococci; CSF = cerebrospinal fluid; EVD = external ventricular drainage; HCC = hydrogel-coated catheter; MRSA = methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; RCT = randomized controlled trial; SCC = silver-coated catheter.

SUBMITTED April 23, 2014. **ACCEPTED** December 18, 2014.

INCLUDE WHEN CITING Published online March 13, 2015; DOI: 10.3171/2014.12.JNS14908.

DISCLOSURE The authors report no conflict of interest concerning the materials or methods used in this study or the findings specified in this paper.

factors for shunt infections were younger age, including neonatal period and age less than 6 months, prematurity, and postoperative CSF leakage. The identified risk factors for ventricular drainage were previous shunt insertion, a duration of ventriculostomy for more than 5 days, previous craniotomy, and the etiology of hydrocephalus (including intraventricular and subarachnoid hemorrhage).¹⁵

Several efforts have been made to reduce the incidence of CSF catheter implantation-associated infections, such as using minimal handling protocols, including changing gloves before handling the catheter and laparoscopic placement of the distal catheter instead of conventional laparotomy.^{32,38} Perioperative antibiotic prophylaxis, antibiotic-impregnated sutures for wound closing, and topical application of methicillin to the operative field have also been shown to reduce infections associated with CSF catheter implantation.^{37,42,45} The development of antimicrobial-impregnated and -coated catheters (antimicrobial catheters)—including antibiotic-impregnated catheters (AICs), silver-coated catheters (SCCs), and hydrogel-coated catheters (HCCs)—has been among the most promising advances. AICs contain a combination of antibiotics—rifampin with either clindamycin or minocycline—which are released through the lumen after the placement of the catheter.¹ SCCs contain a combination of metallic silver and an insoluble silver salt that is also released through the lumen of the catheter.¹² HCCs have a hydrophilic surface that impedes bacterial adherence.^{22,24}

Although their use has increased over time and they have virtually replaced conventional catheters (CCs) in daily practice,^{16,24,27} the effectiveness of antimicrobial catheters in reducing CSF catheter implantation infections remains controversial.^{20,25,33,46,50} Additional topics in debate are whether antimicrobial catheters reduce the risk of infection in lower risk populations (for example adults rather than children), their impact on mortality, and whether they prevent colonization. We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to study the effectiveness of antimicrobial catheters in preventing CSF shunting-associated infections.

Methods

Search Strategy, Study Selection, and Data Extraction

Two investigators (A.A.K. and K.A.P.) conducted a systematic search of the PubMed and Scopus electronic databases using the following search terms: “antibiotic OR antimicrobial AND (cerebrospinal fluid OR ventriculoperitoneal OR external ventricular drainage) AND (shunt OR catheter) AND infection.” Additional searches were performed with the keywords: “antibiotic AND shunt”, “external AND ventricular AND drainage”, “silver AND shunt”, “silver AND CSF”, “hydrogel AND shunt”, “hydrogel AND CSF”. The 2 investigators performed a separate, independent search of the literature and extracted relevant data. If discrepancies occurred, they were resolved in meetings with a third investigator (K.Z.V.). We also reviewed the references of the primarily retrieved studies to identify additional potentially eligible studies. The final search was done in January 2014. There was no limit on the year of publication.

A study was eligible for inclusion in the meta-analysis if it met the following criteria: 1) it provided comparative data regarding the development of infection or mortality in patients with any type of antimicrobial and conventional CSF shunt catheters, 2) it was published in a peer-reviewed journal, and 3) it was written in the English language. Both primary insertion and revision procedures were considered eligible surgical interventions. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and nonrandomized studies in adults, children, infants, or neonates were eligible. A study was excluded if: 1) no control group was defined, 2) it was a case report or included fewer than 10 patients, or 3) it was considered part of a bigger study (multiple publications). The extracted data included study design, geographic region, type of catheters, duration of follow-up period, funding, population characteristics, type of neurosurgical procedure, and outcomes (infection, mortality).

Definitions and Outcomes

The definition of shunt infection was based on the definition provided in each of the included studies. Shunting refers to ventriculoperitoneal, ventriculoatrial, ventriculopleural, lumboperitoneal, cystoperitoneal, and subdural shunting. Ventricular drainage included external ventricular drainage (EVD) and ventriculosubgaleal shunting. Early shunt infection for permanent shunting was defined as infection developing during the first 6 months after the shunt implantation. Late shunt infection for permanent shunting was defined as infection developing more than 6 months after the shunt implantation. The primary outcome of the meta-analysis was development of infections with antimicrobial catheters compared with CCs. Infections due to specific microbes and infection-related and all-cause mortality were considered secondary outcomes.

Statistical Analysis

Since it was expected that many nonrandomized studies were to be included in the analysis and significant clinical and possibly statistical heterogeneity was expected, the Mantel-Haenszel random effects model was applied for all analyses. Pooled risk ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated regarding all outcomes. Statistical heterogeneity between studies was assessed by using the chi-square test ($p < 0.10$ was defined to indicate the presence of heterogeneity) and I^2 (for assessing the degree of heterogeneity). Publication bias was assessed using the funnel-plot method. The meta-analysis was performed with Review Manager for Windows, version 5.2.

Quality Assessment

Quality assessment of the randomized and nonrandomized studies was performed with Jadad Scale¹⁸ and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale,⁵¹ respectively.

Results

Characteristics of the Included Studies

We identified a total of 36 studies that evaluated 16,796 procedures eligible for systematic review and meta-analysis.^{1–3,5,6,11–14,16,17,19–24,26–31,34–36,39–41,43,44,52–56} The selection pro-

FIG. 1. Flow diagram of the selection process of the included studies.

cess is depicted in Fig. 1. The main characteristics of included studies are presented in Table 1. Twenty-nine studies were nonrandomized (19 retrospective and 10 prospective) and evaluated 15,335 procedures; 7 were randomized and evaluated 1461 procedures. The quality assessment of the included studies is presented in *Appendix* Tables 1 and 2. For RCTs, scores ranging from 2 to 5 (median 2) were calculated; for nonrandomized studies, the corresponding range was 5–9 (median 7). There were 27 single-center studies and 9 multicenter studies. Eighteen studies were conducted in Europe, 9 studies in the US, 2 in Africa, 1 in Canada, 1 in Asia, 1 in Australia, and 1 in New Zealand. Three studies were international. Eleven studies were funded either by the manufacturer of the catheter or an independent source.

In 22 studies, a positive culture was considered definitive for shunt infection while in 13 studies the diagnosis of infection was based on the presence of symptoms, signs of infection, laboratory findings in CSF and/or blood, and positive cultures. One study did not provide a definition for CSF shunt infection. The populations across and within the studies were characterized by heterogeneity regarding the proportion of the causes of hydrocephalus and the risk factors for shunt infection.

Prevention of Infections

The meta-analysis and subgroup analyses are presented in Table 2.^{1–3,5,6,11–14,16,17,19–24,26–31,34–36,39–41,43,44,52–56} Overall, the meta-analysis showed that the use of antimicrobial

shunt catheters, after the exclusion of studies evaluating HCCs, was associated with lower risk for infection when compared with CCs (15,949 procedures, risk ratio [RR] 0.44, 95% CI 0.35–0.56, Fig. 2). Publication bias was detected, mainly in the region of small studies with negative results (*Appendix* Fig. 1). Fewer CSF infections developed in the antimicrobial catheter group regardless of randomization (Fig. 3), number of participating centers, funding (by the manufacturer or independent sources), shunting or ventricular drainage placement of the catheter, population age, definition of infections, and rate of infections in the study. The risk of infection was lower in de novo placement but not in revision surgery. There was no difference regarding gram-positive, staphylococcal, coagulase-negative streptococci (CoNS), and *Staphylococcus aureus* infections, separately. On the contrary, the risk for methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) infection was higher with antimicrobial catheters than CCs. Finally, patients treated with antimicrobial catheters had a higher risk for infection due to gram-negative bacteria and nonstaphylococcal species (data for a more detailed analysis according to specific pathogens were not available). No or minimal heterogeneity was observed in the analyses according to microbial etiology.

Antibiotic-Impregnated Catheters

Lower risk for infection was observed when AICs were compared with CCs for all types of CSF catheter implantation (RR 0.42, 95% CI 0.32–0.55).^{2,3,5,6,11,13,14,16,17,19–21,}

TABLE 1. Characteristics of the studies included in meta-analysis

Authors & Year	Study Design	Region, Study Period or Duration	Population, Age (mean/range)	Type of Implantation: Type of Catheters	No. of Procedures/ Patients	Definitions of Infection				Frequency of Infection in Both Arms	Follow-Up Duration
						Funding*	Symptoms, Signs, or Other Laboratory Exams	Cultures	Primary Outcome		
Abla et al., 2011	SC, prospective cohort	US, Jan 2007–Jun 2008	Adults, 58.4 yrs/18–89 yrs	VD: AICs††	129/129	None	-	+	CSF VD infection	0%	NR
Albanese et al., 2009	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, Oct 2005–Oct 2007	Adults, § 61.8 yrs/40–79 yrs	S: AICs‡ CCs	18/18	None	-	+	CSFS infection	38.8%	Min 12 mos
Aryan et al., 2005	SC, retrospective cohort	US, Apr 2001–Apr 2003	Children, 4.5 yrs/6 mos–17 yrs	S: AICs‡ CCs¶¶	78/NR	None	+	+	CSFS infection	10.25%	14–37 mos
Eymann et al., 2009	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, Jan 2002–Dec 2007	Children, 2 days–100 mos	S: AICs‡ CCs	56/56	None	-	+	CSFS infection	7.14%	6–75 mos
Eymann et al., 2008	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, 1998–2006	Adults, 18–86 yrs	S: AICs‡ CCs	269/269	No	-	+	CSFS infection	1.85%	Min 6 mos
Farber et al., 2011	SC, retrospective cohort	US, 2004–2009	Adults, 60 yrs/21–93 yrs	S: AICs‡ CCs	500/500	Funded	-	+	CSFS infection	2.6%	12 mos
Fichtner et al., 2010	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, Jun 2003–Dec 2005	Children & adults, >16 yrs	VD: SCCs, CCs	NR/160	None	-	+	CSF VD infection	3.75%	NR
Govender et al., 2003	SC, RCT	Africa, NR	Children & adults,** 1 mo–72 yrs	S: AICs‡ CCs	135/110	None	+	+	CSFS infection	9.62%	9–28 mos
Gutiérrez-González et al., 2010	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, Jan 2004–Oct 2008	Children & adults	S: AICs‡ CCs VD: AICs‡ CCs	231/NR	None	-	+	CSFS & VD infection	12.55%	PS Min 90 days TS Min 5 days
Harrop et al., 2010	SC, prospective cohort	US, 2003–2008	Children & adults	VD: AICs,†† CCs	1634/NR	None	-	+	CSF VD infection	2.81%	NR
Hayhurst et al., 2008	MC, retrospective cohort	Europe, Jan 2002–Dec 2006	Children, 1 day–16 yrs	S: AICs‡ CCs	291/215	None	+	+	CSFS infection	9.96%	8–42 mos
James et al., 2014	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, 14 yrs	Children, 0–17 yrs	S: AICs‡ CCs	2092/NR	None	+	+	CSFS infection	7.64%	Min 24 mos
Kan & Kestle, 2007	SC, retrospective cohort	US, Jun 2003–Oct 2005	Children	S: AICs‡ CCs¶¶	160/129	None	-	+	CSFS infection	6.87%	Min 9 mos, AICs (11.6 mos), CCs (13.8 mos)

(continued)

TABLE 1. Characteristics of the studies included in meta-analysis (continued)

Authors & Year	Study Design	Region, Study Period or Duration	Population, Age (mean/range)	Type of Implantation: Type of Catheters	No. of Procedures/ Patients	Definitions of Infection				Frequency of Infection in Both Arms	Follow-Up Duration
						Funding*	Exams	Cultures	Primary Outcome		
Kandasamy et al., 2011	MC, prospective cohort	Europe, NR	Children <16 yrs	S: AICs, ‡ CCs	2544/NR	None	+	+	CSF S infection	7.27%	5–47 mos
Kaufmann et al., 2004	MC, RCT	Canada, NR	Adults, >18 yrs	VD: HCC, CCs¶	NR/158	Funded	–	+	CSF VD infection	8.22%	NR
Keong et al., 2012	MC, DB RCT	Europe, Jun 2005–Sep 2009	Adults, 18–84 yrs	VD: SCCs, CCs	278/278	None	+	+	CSF VD infection	16.90%	NR
Kestle et al., 2011	MC, prospective cohort	International, Jun 2007–Feb 2009	Children	S: HCC, CCs	531/NR	Funded	+	+	CSF S infection	7.72%	6–12 mos
Lackner et al., 2008	SC, prospective cohort	Europe, Jun 2006–Jan 2007	Adults, >18 yrs	VD: SCCs, CCs	NR/39	Funded	–	+	CSF VD infection	12.82%	NR
Lajcak et al., 2013	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, Jan 2006–Dec 2008	Children & adults, 1–89 yrs	VD: SCCs, CCs	402/402	None	–	+	CSF VD infection	7.21%	NR
Lane et al., 2014	SC, retrospective cohort	Africa, NR	Children, 11.3 mos	S: AICs, ‡ CCs	160/160	Funded	+	+	CSF S failure (death, revision or removal of shunt)	9.37%	7.6 mos, 113 patients
Lemcke et al., 2012	SC, prospective cohort	Europe, Jul 2003–Jun 2006	Children & adults, 53.6 yrs/12–84 yrs	VD: AICs, ‡ SCCs, CCs	96/95	None	–	+	CSF VD infection	10.41%	19 days
Mikhaylov et al., 2014	SC, retrospective cohort	US, Jul 2007–Jul 2009	Adults	VD: AICs, ‡ CCs	145/145	None	–	+	CSF VD infection	6.89%	NR
Muttiah et al., 2010	SC, prospective cohort	New Zealand, Jul 2005–Aug 2007	Children & adults, 1 mo–87 yrs	VD: AICs, ‡ CCs	144/120	None	–	+	CSF VD infection	8.33%	NR
Parker et al., 2009	SC, retrospective cohort	US, Jan 1997–Dec 2007	Children & adults, 6.5 yrs/1 day–20 yrs	S: AICs, ‡ CCs	1072/NR	None	–	+	CSF S infection	7.46%	AICs (34.6 mos), CCs (72.3 mos)
Pattavilakom et al., 2007	SC, prospective cohort	Australia, Jul 1995–Jun 2005	Children & adults	S: AICs, ‡ CCs	794/NR	None	+	+	CSF S infection	4.91%	15 mos/6–42 mos/min 6 mos
Pople et al., 2012	MC, RCT	International, Nov 2004–Sep 2010	Adults, >18 yrs	VD: AICs, ‡ CCs	357/357	Funded	+	+	CSF VD infection	19.6%	NR

(continued)

TABLE 1. Characteristics of the studies included in meta-analysis (continued)

Authors & Year	Study Design	Region, Study Period or Duration	Population, Age (mean/range)	Type of Implantation: Type of Catheters	No. of Procedures/ Patients	Definitions of Infection				Frequency of Infection in Both Arms	Follow-Up Duration
						Funding*	Symptoms, Signs, or Other Laboratory Exams	Cultures	Primary Outcome		
Richards et al., 2009	MC, retrospective registry	Europe, NR	Children & adults	S: AICs NR, CCs	1988/NR	Funded	-	-	CSF S infection	3.87%	Min 9 mos
Ritz et al., 2007	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, 2 yrs	Children & adults	S: AIC, ‡ CCs	598/258	None	-	+	CSF S infection	2.50%	NR
Rivero-Garvía et al., 2011	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, 2000–2006	Children, <16 yrs	VD: AICs, ‡ CCs	458/NE	None	-	+	CSF VD infection	3.27%	NR
Steinbok et al., 2010	MC, prospective registry	International, Jan 2006–Jan 2008	Children & adults, 0–84 yrs	S: AICs, ‡ CCs	433/433	Funded	+	+	CSF S infection	3.23%	Max 90 days
Tamburrini et al., 2008	SC, prospective cohort	Europe, Nov 2000–Mar 06	Children	VD: AICs, ‡ CCs	91/91	None	-	+	CSF VD infection	16.48%	NR
Winkler et al., 2013	SC, RCT	Europe, Feb 2011–Jun 2012	Adults, 56.5 yrs/18–80 yrs	VD: AICs, ‡ SCCs	61/40	Funded	+	+	CSF VD infection	18%	15 days, 3–30 days
Woernle et al., 2011	SC, retrospective cohort	Europe, Aug 2007–Jun 2009	Children & adults, § 2–89 yrs	VD: AICs, ‡ CCs	124/NE	None	-	+	Hemorrhage, infection & malplacement of catheters	11.29%	NR
Wong et al., 2010	SC, RCT	Asia, Apr 2004–Dec 2008	Adults, >18 yrs	VD: AICs, ‡ CCs	184/184	Funded	-	+	Nosocomial infections	2.17%	>3 mos
Wright et al., 2013	SC, retrospective cohort	US, Feb 2007–Nov 2008	Adults, 53.8 yrs/>18 yrs	VD: AICs NR, CCs	98/98	Funded	+	+	CSF VD infection	16.32%	NR
Zabramski et al., 2003	MC, RCT	US, Dec 1998–Mar 2001	Adults, >18 yrs	VD: AICs, † CCs	288/288	Funded	-	+	CSF VD infection	5.2%	NR

DB = double-blinded; MC = multicenter; NE = not estimable; NR = not reported; PS = permanent shunting; S = Shunting; SC = single center; TS = temporary shunting; VD = ventricular drainage.

* Any type of funding from the manufacturer of the catheter or any other independent source was included.

† Minocycline/rifampin impregnated.

‡ Clindamycin/rifampin impregnated.

§ Patients with higher risk for infection included.

¶ Presoaked with bacitracin.

** Including 6 HIV patients.

28–31,34–36,39–41,43,44,53–56 Subgroup analyses (Table 3) showed that AICs were associated with lower risk for infections regardless of randomization (for randomized studies, a trend toward a significant difference was observed), number of participating centers in the study, funding (by the manufacturer or independent sources), shunting or ventricular drainage, early-onset infections in permanent shunting, age of studied population, definition of infection, de novo catheter implantation, and rate of infection in the participating center(s). AICs were not associated with fewer infections in revision surgery in any type of implantation or late-onset infections in permanent shunting. After excluding from sensitivity analyses studies that had significant differences in their designs (studies were excluded because of the use of bacitracin-soaked catheters instead of CCs) and studies involving more than 1000 procedures, we found that the development of CSF shunt infections was also lower with AICs than with CCs. Finally, no difference was observed when rifampin-minocyclin impregnated catheters were compared with rifampin-clindamycin impregnated catheters (RR 1.14, 95% CI 0.25–5.24). No difference was observed in risk for infections due to *Staphylococcus* spp. (regardless of the type of shunting), CoNS, *S. aureus*, or gram-positive bacteria, but the risk was higher for infection due to gram-negative bacteria, nonstaphylococcal species, and MRSA.

Silver-Coated and Hydrogel-Coated Catheters

Data regarding the comparative effectiveness of SCCs and CCs were available only for ventricular drainage catheter placement (Table 4).^{12,23,26,27,29} SCCs were associated with lower risk for infection compared with CCs (RR 0.60, 95% CI 0.40–0.89). The difference was significant in the single multicenter, randomized trial (RR 0.57, 95% CI 0.33–0.99) but not in the analysis of 4 single-center, non-randomized studies. SCCs were associated with lower risk for infection in nonfunded studies and in center(s) with a high rate of infection (> 10%), but no difference was found between SCCs and CCs with regard to population age, definition of infection, low rate of infection < 10%, or microbial etiology. Heterogeneity was not observed in these analyses.

Two multicenter studies (a randomized trial involving adults and a prospective cohort study involving children) evaluated HCCs compared with CCs for the prevention of shunt infections.^{22,24} HCCs were not associated with fewer infections than CCs (689 procedures, RR 1.63, 95% CI 0.21–12.96).

Silver-Coated Versus Antibiotic-Impregnated Catheters

SCCs were compared with AICs for ventricular drainage in 2 studies (a randomized trial involving adults and a prospective cohort involving children and adults).^{29,52} No difference in the risk for infection was observed in either of these studies or the pooled analysis (RR 1.37, 95% CI 0.55–3.41).

Mortality

Eleven studies provided data for all-cause mortality (1910 patients);^{1,2,12,13,23,26,28,30,43,44,54} 8 studied AICs and 3

TABLE 2. Development of infections in subgroup analyses of all studies evaluating antimicrobial catheters

Studied Characteristic	No. of Procedures	No. of Studies	RR (95% CI), I ²
All studies	16,638	34	0.46 (0.36–0.58), 48%
Randomized studies	1400	6	0.59 (0.39–0.89), 27%
Nonrandomized studies	15,238	28	0.44 (0.33–0.57), 50%
Single-center studies	9770	25	0.38 (0.28–0.50), 41%
Multicenter studies	6868	9	0.68 (0.54–0.86), 13%
Funded studies, funded by any source	4736	11	0.50 (0.33–0.77), 37%
Funded studies, funded by manufacturer	3607	8	0.58 (0.40–0.85), 24%
Nonfunded studies	11,902	23	0.44 (0.34–0.59), 52%
Permanent (shunting)	11,838	18	0.48 (0.37–0.64), 33%
Temporary (ventricular drainage)	4800	18	0.44 (0.30–0.65), 60%
Children	6461	10	0.58 (0.42–0.80), 23%
Adults	2334	11	0.43 (0.28–0.67), 36%
Mixed adults & children	7843	14	0.43 (0.29–0.64), 61%
Clinical & laboratory definition of infection	7791	12	0.58 (0.45–0.76), 29%
Definition of infection by cultures only	7511	22	0.39 (0.28–0.53), 41%
Rate of infection >10%	1442	10	0.46 (0.29–0.73), 48%
Rate of infection 5–10%	7738	11	0.55 (0.40–0.75), 43%
Rate of infection <5%	7458	13	0.36 (0.23–0.57), 51%
De novo implantation	1820	9	0.50 (0.33–0.74), 0%
Revision implantation	1908	3	0.83 (0.55–1.26), 0%
Gram-positive infections	441	20	0.95 (0.83–1.08), 15%
Staphylococcal infections	385	17	0.86 (0.73–1.01), 0%
CoNS infections	305	16	0.83 (0.58–1.19), 22%
<i>S. aureus</i> infections	342	12	1.02 (0.79–1.31), 0%
MRSA infections	124	5	2.64 (1.26–5.51), 0%
Nonstaphylococcal infections	371	14	1.75 (1.22–2.52), 10%
Gram-negative infections	412	16	2.13 (1.33, 3.43), 0%

studied SCCs, all in comparison with CCs. No data for mortality was available for HCCs. When all types of antimicrobial catheters were compared with CCs, no difference was observed in all-cause mortality (RR 1.17, 95% CI 0.92–1.49). Table 5 shows the subgroup analyses; no difference in mortality was seen for AICs compared with CCs for ventricular drainage or shunting and no difference

FIG. 2. Forest plot depicting the risk ratios for CSF shunting- and ventricular drainage-associated infections for antimicrobial catheters (AMICs [AICs and SCCs]) compared with CCs (studies on HCCs were not included in the figure). The vertical line indicates the “no difference” point between the 2 regimens; *squares* indicate risk ratios; *diamonds*, pooled risk ratios for all studies; *horizontal lines*, 95% confidence intervals; events represent numbers of infections; total refers to number of procedures. M-H = Mantel Haenszel. Figure is available in color online only.

FIG. 3. Forest plot depicting the risk ratios for CSF shunting- and ventricular drainage-associated infections for antimicrobial catheters (AMICs [AICs and SCCs]) compared with CCs (studies on HCCs were not included in the figure). The vertical line indicates the “no difference” point between the 2 regimens; *squares* indicate risk ratios; *diamonds*, pooled risk ratios for all studies; *horizontal lines*, 95% confidence intervals; events represent numbers of infections; total refers to number of procedures. Figure is available in color online only.

in mortality was seen for SCCs compared with CCs in ventricular drainage.

Outcomes of Multivariate Analysis of Individual Studies

Multivariate analyses were performed in 8 studies. Two studies showed that AICs were independently associated with lower risk for infection in permanent shunting^{13,14}

while 2 others showed no difference between AICs and CCs.^{20,40} Two studies provided adjusted results in ventricular drainage; in one of them, AICs were independently associated with lower risk for infection,⁵⁶ while in the second they were not.³⁶ In the single study on SCCs that provided adjusted data, SCCs were associated with lower risk for infection.²³ One study showed that HCCs were indepen-

TABLE 3. Development of infections in subgroup analyses of studies with AICs

Studied Characteristic	No. of Procedures	No. of Studies	RR (95% CI), I ²
All studies	15,006	28	0.42 (0.32–0.55), 54%
Randomized studies	964	4	0.43 (0.18–1.03), 54%
Nonrandomized studies	14,042	24	0.41 (0.31–0.55), 54%
Single-center studies	9105	22	0.35 (0.26–0.49), 44%
Multicenter studies	5901	6	0.68 (0.52–0.89), 21%
Funded studies, funded by any source	4008	8	0.47 (0.30–0.73), 37%
Funded studies, funded by manufacturer	3410	6	0.57 (0.37–0.86), 29%
Nonfunded studies	10,998	20	0.41 (0.29–0.57), 58%
Shunting	11,307	17	0.48 (0.37–0.62), 29%
Early infection in permanent shunt	1509	6	0.34 (0.13–0.88), 28%
Late infection in permanent shunt	807	4	1.23 (0.24–6.20), 0%
Ventricular drainage	3699	12	0.36 (0.20–0.64), 71%
Neonates	134	2	0.39 (0.16–0.96), 0%
Children	5930	9	0.58 (0.44–0.76), 12%
Adults	1859	8	0.32 (0.16–0.63), 48%
Mixed adults & children	7217	11	0.39 (0.24–0.63), 67%
Clinical & laboratory definition of infection	6982	10	0.57 (0.42–0.76), 31%
Definition of infection by cultures	6688	20	0.34 (0.24–0.49), 41%
Rate of infection >10%	1061	8	0.40 (0.21–0.78), 60%
Rate of infection 5–10%	6647	8	0.49 (0.34–0.70), 47%
Rate of infection <5%	7298	12	0.35 (0.22–0.57), 54%
De novo implantation	1598	7	0.44 (0.28–0.69), 0%
Revision implantation	1908	3	0.83 (0.55–1.26), 0%
Gram-positive infections	422	18	0.94 (0.82–1.09), 18%
Staphylococcal infections	366	15	0.87 (0.73–1.03), 0%
CoNS infections	286	14	0.86 (0.59–1.25), 27%
<i>S. aureus</i> infections	323	10	1.01 (0.78–1.31), 0%
MRSA infections	119	4	2.64 (1.26–5.51), 0%
Nonstaphylococcal infections	357	13	1.75 (1.16–2.65), 21%
Gram-negative infections	406	15	2.08 (1.29–3.37), 0%
Excluding studies w/ >1000 procedures	5676	23	0.43 (0.32–0.59), 34%

(continued)

TABLE 3. Development of infections in subgroup analyses of studies with AICs (continued)

Studied Characteristic	No. of Procedures	No. of Studies	RR (95% CI), I ²
Excluding studies w/ bacitracin-pres soaked CCs	14,768	26	0.42 (0.32–0.55), 57%
Rifampin-clindamycin vs rifampin-minocyclin	1325	2	1.14 (0.25–5.24), NA

NA = not applicable.

dently associated with higher risk for CSF shunting–associated infection.²⁴

Discussion

This meta-analysis sought to investigate the protective effectiveness of antimicrobial catheters in reducing CSF shunting–associated infections in comparison with CCs. The majority of the included studies (28 studies, approximately 90% of included procedures) evaluated AICs, followed by SCCs; only 2 studies evaluated the effectiveness of HCCs. Antimicrobial catheters were associated with lower risk for infection compared with CCs regardless of randomization status, number of participating centers, funding, permanent or temporary catheter placement, de novo implantation, population age, timing of infection development, definition of infection, and rate of infections in the individual studies. Although no difference in the development of infections due to gram-positive bacteria, all staphylococci, CoNS, or *S. aureus* was observed, antimicrobial shunt catheters were associated with higher risk for MRSA, nonstaphylococcal, and gram-negative bacterial infections. It should be emphasized that only half of the included studies provided data regarding either specific bacterial species or gram-positive and gram-negative status.

Since the majority of the studies evaluated the effectiveness of AICs, the outcomes of the subgroup analyses regarding AICs were similar to that of the primary analysis. In addition, in a sensitivity analysis after the exclusion of studies with large populations (more than 1000 procedures), AICs were still associated with lower risk for infections. However, AICs were not more effective than CCs in randomized trials and in reducing the occurrence of late infections. Despite the trend toward lower risk for infection with the use of AICs in an analysis with a large sample size, the lack of statistical significance indicates that further studies are required to define the patient populations that would benefit more from this intervention. The presence of publication bias in the area of small trials with negative results is also an issue that needs to be addressed. The finding that AICs were not associated with prevention of late-onset infections (developing more than 6 months after catheter placement) in permanent shunting denotes that AICs exert their protective effectiveness during the first months after their implantation. However, it has been noted that early shunt infections account for approximately 70% of all episodes.² Other interventions, and possibly

TABLE 4. Development of infections in subgroup analyses of studies with SCC

Compared Groups	Studied Characteristic	No. of Patients	No. of Studies	RR (95% CI), I ²
SCC vs CC	All studies	943	5	0.60 (0.40–0.89) 0%
SCC vs CC	Nonrandomized studies	665	4	0.62 (0.35–1.10) 0%
SCC vs CC	Single-center studies	531	4	0.62 (0.35–1.10) 0%
SCC vs CC	Nonfunded studies	904	4	0.62 (0.42–0.92) 0%
SCC vs CC	Ventricular drainage	943	5	0.60 (0.40–0.89) 0%
SCC vs CC	Adults	317	2	0.40 (0.09–1.70) 36%
SCC vs CC	Children & adults	626	3	0.67 (0.38–1.20) 0%
SCC vs CC	Definition of infection by cultures	665	4	0.62 (0.35–1.10) 0%
SCC vs CC	Rate of infection >10%	381	3	0.55 (0.33–0.90) 0%
SCC vs CC	Rate of infection <10%	562	2	0.69 (0.36–1.32) 0%
SCC vs CC	Gram-positive infections	19	3	0.88 (0.49–1.58) 23%
SCC vs CC	Staphylococcal infections	19	3	0.68 (0.34–1.37) 0%
SCC vs CC	CoNS infections	19	3	0.43 (0.10–1.82) 0%
SCC vs CC	<i>S. aureus</i> infections	19	3	1.49 (0.28–7.84) 6%
SCC vs CC	Nonstaphylococcal infections	14	2	2.67 (0.46–15.48) 0%
SCC vs AIC	Ventricular drainage	125	2	1.37 (0.55–3.41) 0%

stricter adherence to infection control measures and surgical techniques, are required to reduce the incidence of late-onset infections.

Five studies evaluated the effectiveness of SCCs for ventricular drainage; SCCs were associated with lower risk for infections in all studies and in the single available randomized trial. Overall, far fewer data were available for SCCs. It is possible that the non-statistically significant lower risk for development of infection in the SCC arm was due to the smaller sample size. However, it is noteworthy that statistical heterogeneity was not observed in these analyses. Limited data were also available for the comparative effectiveness of SCCs and AICs as well as of AICs with different antibiotics (rifampin/clindamycin-impregnated vs rifampin/minocycline-impregnated catheters). Although the antimicrobial spectrum of these combinations is quite similar for gram-positive bacteria, the comparative effectiveness could be evaluated in the future.

There are several concerns regarding the use of antimicrobial shunt catheters. The first is the cost-effectiveness of such an approach, which depends on the incidence of infections in an institution, the infection control measures, the surgical technique and expertise, the cost of catheters, and the cost of treatment of a possible subsequent infection in a given country. Klimo et al., in a cost-effectiveness

analysis of AICs compared with CCs, concluded that the yearly cost savings from the use of AICs ranged from \$90,000 to over \$1.3 million in the US.²⁵ In this analysis it was estimated that the total cost to treat a shunt infection accounted for up to \$50,000, while the additional cost of AICs compared with CCs was up to \$400 per kit.²⁵ However, the authors acknowledged that in other countries where the cost to treat an infection is lower, the approach might not be cost-effective. Limited data regarding the cost of other types of antimicrobial shunt catheters did not allow a cost saving analysis compared with conventional catheters.

The second concern is the probability of a shift toward more virulent strains than CoNS. In this meta-analysis, AICs were associated with lower risk for any infection for both CSF shunting and ventricular drainage but higher risk for MRSA, nonstaphylococcal, and gram-negative bacterial infections. A large study performed in children showed that when CCs were used, CoNS were the predominant pathogen, accounting for approximately 52% of isolated pathogens, followed by *S. aureus* (31.6%), *Streptococcus* or *Enterococcus* spp. (8.8%), gram-negative organisms (4.4%), and *Propionibacterium acnes* (2.2%). When AICs replaced CCs, *S. aureus* became the predominant pathogen (40%), followed by *Streptococcus* or *Enterococcus*

TABLE 5. Mortality in patients treated with CSF shunting or ventricular drainage

Comparison	Types of Catheters	No. of Procedures	No. of Studies	RR (95% CI), I ²
AICs & SCCs vs CCs	All types	1819	10	1.17 (0.92–1.49), 0%
AICs vs CCs	VD	617	3	1.08 (0.70–1.65), 41%
AICs vs CCs	Shunting	721	4	1.46 (0.76–2.79), 0%
AICs vs CCs	All types	1331	7	1.17 (0.87–1.56), 0%
SCCs vs CCs	VD	481	3	1.17 (0.76–1.81), 0%

spp. (20%), *P. acnes* and CoNS (both 16%), and gram-negative organisms (4%).¹⁹ Although we were not able to study in depth the reasons behind this finding, one could assume that this is probably due to inactivity of antibiotics used in AICs against such bacteria. Nosocomial MRSA strains are probably not susceptible to rifampin, minocycline, and clindamycin in most settings, while *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strains are definitively not susceptible. Similarly, the susceptibility of *Acinetobacter* spp. and multidrug-resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* to the aforementioned antibiotics is expected to be low. This shift toward more virulent pathogens than CoNS is an issue that warrants further study, since few of the included studies provided data for these comparisons, especially in settings where the incidence of MRSA or multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacteria is high. In addition, the impact of this shift on mortality should be explored.

The third issue is development of infections in patients who require replacement of catheters. Data regarding development of infections after de novo implantation showed that antimicrobial catheters reduce the risk for infections, but no difference was observed after revision implantation. Moreover, 1 study showed that patients requiring revision surgery with AICs who had an AIC implanted during the first operation had a higher infection rate (11.7%) than those undergoing primary AIC insertion (1.6%) and those undergoing revision of CCs using AICs (2.5%).¹⁹

The meta-analysis showed no difference in all-cause mortality between patients treated with antimicrobial or conventional shunt catheters. Some might argue that for an infection with considerable mortality, the intervention could not be considered successful. However, we should bear in mind that antimicrobial catheters are used for prevention and not for treatment of infections. Factors such as the primary offending organism (CoNS in CSF shunt infections, which are less virulent than other bacteria), the antibiotics or other antimicrobials used in manufacturing the catheters, rates of mortality (provided in only 11 of the 36 included studies, range 0%–23.3%) and infection (range 0%–38% in the included studies) in the medical center(s) where the study was performed, the time end point used in every study (which ranged from 3 days up to 7 years), and all-cause or infection-related mortality all deserve significant attention. Several meta-analyses in other fields of infectious diseases have failed to show a difference in mortality after the implementation of a preventive measure, despite a significant reduction in infection rate.^{7–10,47,48}

To our knowledge, 4 meta-analyses have been published thus far.^{25,33,46,50} They included patients with ventricular drainage or shunt catheter implantation and concluded that antimicrobial catheters were more effective than CCs in preventing shunt infections. Besides the addition of recently published data, the present analysis outweighs the former ones for several other reasons. First, it included a greater number of studies (36 compared with 19,⁴⁶ 11,³³ 14,²⁵ and 8⁵⁰) and consequently procedures (almost 17,000 compared with 6171,⁴⁶ 1649,³³ 9049,²⁵ and 2991⁵⁰). It included more randomized trials (7 compared with 3,⁴⁶ 1,¹⁶ 1,¹⁸ and 4⁵⁰), thus increasing the quality of its outcomes, and showed that randomized and nonrandomized studies have produced similar outcomes in most of

the performed analyses. Several subgroup analyses were performed to study the heterogeneity (either statistically proven or suspected due to the different populations included) and provided support for further studies. The previous meta-analyses studied mainly the effects of age, number of participating centers, gram-positive or gram-negative bacteria, and study design on the development of infections. This meta-analysis also evaluated the effects of randomization, shunting or ventricular drainage catheter placement, funding, staphylococcal and nonstaphylococcal species, gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria, CoNS, *S. aureus* and MRSA, timing of infection development, clinical or microbiological diagnosis, the effectiveness of different types of antimicrobial catheters, and rates of infection in the participating centers. However, the majority of the data referred to AICs, and a lot fewer data were available for SCCs and HCCs. Finally, this meta-analysis provides a comprehensive review regarding the use of antimicrobial shunt catheters.

The most important limitation of the present meta-analysis is that it included mainly nonrandomized studies. Although residual confounding that could have affected the outcomes of the meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies cannot be ruled out, the similar findings in the subgroup analyses of randomized (although a marginally nonsignificant difference was observed in AICs probably due to smaller sample size) and nonrandomized studies reduce this possibility. Second, both clinical heterogeneity and statistical heterogeneity were present. Statistical heterogeneity ranged from 0 (no heterogeneity) up to 67% (considerable heterogeneity), even in subgroup analyses. The patients' demographic and clinical characteristics (including age and the etiology of hydrocephalus), the definition of shunt infection, and perioperative prophylaxis varied in the included studies; few of them provided adjusted results and therefore a meta-analysis of adjusted data were not feasible. Furthermore, ventricular drainage and shunt catheter placements are different surgical interventions that are associated with infections with different microbial etiology. The main cause of shunt-related infections is contamination due to skin flora during surgery, while the main cause of the ventricular drainage-related infections is retrograde colonization of the distal part of the catheter.¹⁵ Nevertheless, subgroup analyses did not show differences in outcomes of ventricular drainage and shunting. Finally, the differences in infection rate among the studies reflect the differences in the definition of shunt-associated infections as well as differences in infection control and surgical techniques or expertise.

Conclusions

Based mainly on data from nonrandomized, single-center, retrospective studies, this meta-analysis showed that the use of antimicrobial shunt catheters reduce the risk for CSF infections in patients with hydrocephalus. Several subgroup analyses showed that factors related to study design, type of catheter, duration of catheter placement, and whether the procedure is a de novo implantation or a revision may affect this risk. Publication bias in the region of small negative trials was also observed. In

addition, a higher risk for infections due to more virulent bacteria than CoNS, namely MRSA and gram-negative bacilli, was observed. Due to the small number of studies providing data on such infections in the meta-analysis, this issue warrants further study. The choice as to whether antimicrobial catheters will be employed in an institution depends on both medical and financial variables. Finally, more data regarding the comparative effectiveness of AICs and SCCs, especially on the selection of specific bacterial species, is needed.

References

1. Abba AA, Zabramski JM, Jahnke HK, Fusco D, Nakaji P: Comparison of two antibiotic-impregnated ventricular catheters: a prospective sequential series trial. **Neurosurgery** **68**:437–442, 2011
2. Albanese A, De Bonis P, Sabatino G, Capone G, Marchese E, Vignati A, et al: Antibiotic-impregnated ventriculo-peritoneal shunts in patients at high risk of infection. **Acta Neurochir (Wien)** **151**:1259–1263, 2009
3. Aryan HE, Meltzer HS, Park MS, Bennett RL, Jandial R, Levy ML: Initial experience with antibiotic-impregnated silicone catheters for shunting of cerebrospinal fluid in children. **Childs Nerv Syst** **21**:56–61, 2005
4. Choksey MS, Malik IA: Zero tolerance to shunt infections: can it be achieved? **J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry** **75**:87–91, 2004
5. Eymann R, Chehab S, Strowitzki M, Steudel WI, Kiefer M: Clinical and economic consequences of antibiotic-impregnated cerebrospinal fluid shunt catheters. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** **1**:444–450, 2008
6. Eymann R, Steudel WI, Kiefer M: Infection rate with application of an antibiotic-impregnated catheter for shunt implantation in children – a retrospective analysis. **Klin Padiatr** **221**:69–73, 2009
7. Falagas ME, Fragoulis K, Bliziotis IA, Chatzinikolaou I: Rifampicin-impregnated central venous catheters: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. **J Antimicrob Chemother** **59**:359–369, 2007
8. Falagas ME, Siempos II: Prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia: possible role of antimicrobials administered via the respiratory tract. **Eur Respir J** **31**:1138–1139, 2008
9. Falagas ME, Siempos II, Bliziotis IA, Michalopoulos A: Administration of antibiotics via the respiratory tract for the prevention of ICU-acquired pneumonia: a meta-analysis of comparative trials. **Crit Care** **10**:R123, 2006
10. Falagas ME, Vardakas KZ, Samonis G: Decreasing the incidence and impact of infections in neutropenic patients: evidence from meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials. **Curr Med Res Opin** **24**:215–235, 2008
11. Farber SH, Parker SL, Adogwa O, McGirt MJ, Rigamonti D: Effect of antibiotic-impregnated shunts on infection rate in adult hydrocephalus: a single institution's experience. **Neurosurgery** **69**:625–629, 2011
12. Fichtner J, Güresir E, Seifert V, Raabe A: Efficacy of silver-bearing external ventricular drainage catheters: a retrospective analysis. **J Neurosurg** **112**:840–846, 2010
13. Govender ST, Nathoo N, van Dellen JR: Evaluation of an antibiotic-impregnated shunt system for the treatment of hydrocephalus. **J Neurosurg** **99**:831–839, 2003
14. Gutiérrez-González R, Boto GR, Fernández-Pérez C, del Prado N: Protective effect of rifampicin and clindamycin impregnated devices against *Staphylococcus* spp. infection after cerebrospinal fluid diversion procedures. **BMC Neurol** **10**:93, 2010
15. Gutiérrez-González R, Boto GR, Pérez-Zamarrón A: Cerebrospinal fluid diversion devices and infection. A comprehensive review. **Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis** **31**:889–897, 2012
16. Harrop JS, Sharan AD, Ratliff J, Prasad S, Jabbour P, Evans JJ, et al: Impact of a standardized protocol and antibiotic-impregnated catheters on ventriculostomy infection rates in cerebrovascular patients. **Neurosurgery** **67**:187–191, 2010
17. Hayhurst C, Cooke R, Williams D, Kandasamy J, O'Brien DF, Mallucci CL: The impact of antibiotic-impregnated catheters on shunt infection in children and neonates. **Childs Nerv Syst** **24**:557–562, 2008
18. Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJ, Gavaghan DJ, et al: Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? **Control Clin Trials** **17**:1–12, 1996
19. James G, Hartley JC, Morgan RD, Ternier J: Effect of introduction of antibiotic-impregnated shunt catheters on cerebrospinal fluid shunt infection in children: a large single-center retrospective study. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** **13**:101–106, 2014
20. Kan P, Kestle J: Lack of efficacy of antibiotic-impregnated shunt systems in preventing shunt infections in children. **Childs Nerv Syst** **23**:773–777, 2007
21. Kandasamy J, Dwan K, Hartley JC, Jenkinson MD, Hayhurst C, Gatscher S, et al: Antibiotic-impregnated ventriculoperitoneal shunts—a multi-centre British paediatric neurosurgery group (BPNG) study using historical controls. **Childs Nerv Syst** **27**:575–581, 2011
22. Kaufmann AM, Lye T, Redekop G, Brevner A, Hamilton M, Kozey M, et al: Infection rates in standard vs. hydrogel coated ventricular catheters. **Can J Neurol Sci** **31**:506–510, 2004
23. Keong NC, Bulters DO, Richards HK, Farrington M, Sparrow OC, Pickard JD, et al: The SILVER (Silver Impregnated Line Versus EVD Randomized trial): a double-blind, prospective, randomized, controlled trial of an intervention to reduce the rate of external ventricular drain infection. **Neurosurgery** **71**:394–404, 2012
24. Kestle JR, Riva-Cambrin J, Wellons JC III, Kulkarni AV, Whitehead WE, Walker ML, et al: A standardized protocol to reduce cerebrospinal fluid shunt infection: the Hydrocephalus Clinical Research Network Quality Improvement Initiative. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** **8**:22–29, 2011
25. Klimo P Jr, Thompson CJ, Ragel BT, Boop FA: Antibiotic-impregnated shunt systems versus standard shunt systems: a meta- and cost-savings analysis. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** **8**:600–612, 2011
26. Lackner P, Beer R, Broessner G, Helbok R, Galiano K, Pleifer C, et al: Efficacy of silver nanoparticles-impregnated external ventricular drain catheters in patients with acute occlusive hydrocephalus. **Neurocrit Care** **8**:360–365, 2008
27. Lajcak M, Heidecke V, Haude KH, Rainov NG: Infection rates of external ventricular drains are reduced by the use of silver-impregnated catheters. **Acta Neurochir (Wien)** **155**:875–881, 2013
28. Lane JD, Mugamba J, Ssenyonga P, Warf BC: Effectiveness of the Bactiseal Universal Shunt for reducing shunt infection in a sub-Saharan African context: a retrospective cohort study in 160 Ugandan children. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** **13**:140–144, 2014
29. Lemcke J, Depner F, Meier U: The impact of silver nanoparticle-coated and antibiotic-impregnated external ventricular drainage catheters on the risk of infections: a clinical comparison of 95 patients. **Acta Neurochir Suppl** **114**:347–350, 2012
30. Mikhaylov Y, Wilson TJ, Rajajee V, Thompson BG, Maher CO, Sullivan SE, et al: Efficacy of antibiotic-impregnated external ventricular drains in reducing ventriculostomy-associated infections. **J Clin Neurosci** **21**:765–768, 2014
31. Muttaiyah S, Ritchie S, John S, Mee E, Roberts S: Efficacy of antibiotic-impregnated external ventricular drain catheters. **J Clin Neurosci** **17**:296–298, 2010
32. Park YS, Park IS, Park KB, Lee CH, Hwang SH, Han JW:

- Laparotomy versus laparoscopic placement of distal catheter in ventriculoperitoneal shunt procedure. **J Korean Neurosurg Soc** 48:325–329, 2010
33. Parker SL, Anderson WN, Lilienfeld S, Megerian JT, McGirt MJ: Cerebrospinal shunt infection in patients receiving antibiotic-impregnated versus standard shunts. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** 8:259–265, 2011
  34. Parker SL, Attenello FJ, Sciubba DM, Garces-Ambrossi GL, Ahn E, Weingart J, et al: Comparison of shunt infection incidence in high-risk subgroups receiving antibiotic-impregnated versus standard shunts. **Childs Nerv Syst** 25:77–85, 2009
  35. Pattavilakom A, Xenos C, Bradfield O, Danks RA: Reduction in shunt infection using antibiotic impregnated CSF shunt catheters: an Australian prospective study. **J Clin Neurosci** 14:526–531, 2007
  36. Pople I, Poon W, Assaker R, Mathieu D, Iantosca M, Wang E, et al: Comparison of infection rate with the use of antibiotic-impregnated vs standard extraventricular drainage devices: a prospective, randomized controlled trial. **Neurosurgery** 71:6–13, 2012
  37. Ratilal B, Costa J, Sampaio C: Antibiotic prophylaxis for surgical introduction of intracranial ventricular shunts: a systematic review. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** 1:48–56, 2008
  38. Rehman AU, Rehman TU, Bashir HH, Gupta V: A simple method to reduce infection of ventriculoperitoneal shunts. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** 5:569–572, 2010
  39. Richards HK, Seeley HM, Pickard JD: Efficacy of antibiotic-impregnated shunt catheters in reducing shunt infection: data from the United Kingdom Shunt Registry. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** 4:389–393, 2009
  40. Ritz R, Roser F, Morgalla M, Dietz K, Tatagiba M, Will BE: Do antibiotic-impregnated shunts in hydrocephalus therapy reduce the risk of infection? An observational study in 258 patients. **BMC Infect Dis** 7:38, 2007
  41. Rivero-Garvía M, Márquez-Rivas J, Jiménez-Mejías ME, Neth O, Rueda-Torres AB: Reduction in external ventricular drain infection rate. Impact of a minimal handling protocol and antibiotic-impregnated catheters. **Acta Neurochir (Wien)** 153:647–651, 2011
  42. Rozzelle CJ, Leonardo J, Li V: Antimicrobial suture wound closure for cerebrospinal fluid shunt surgery: a prospective, double-blinded, randomized controlled trial. **J Neurosurg Pediatr** 2:111–117, 2008
  43. Steinbok P, Milner R, Agrawal D, Farace E, Leung GK, Ng I, et al: A multicenter multinational registry for assessing ventriculoperitoneal shunt infections for hydrocephalus. **Neurosurgery** 67:1303–1310, 2010
  44. Tamburrini G, Massimi L, Caldarelli M, Di Rocco C: Antibiotic impregnated external ventricular drainage and third ventriculostomy in the management of hydrocephalus associated with posterior cranial fossa tumours. **Acta Neurochir (Wien)** 150:1049–1056, 2008
  45. Theophilus SC, Adnan JS: A randomised control trial on the use of topical methicillin in reducing post-operative ventriculoperitoneal shunt infection. **Malays J Med Sci** 18:30–37, 2011
  46. Thomas R, Lee S, Patole S, Rao S: Antibiotic-impregnated catheters for the prevention of CSF shunt infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. **Br J Neurosurg** 26:175–184, 2012
  47. Vardakas KZ, Michalopoulos A, Falagas ME: Fluconazole versus itraconazole for antifungal prophylaxis in neutropenic patients with haematological malignancies: a meta-analysis of randomised-controlled trials. **Br J Haematol** 131:22–28, 2005
  48. Vardakas KZ, Samonis G, Michalopoulos A, Soteriades ES, Falagas ME: Antifungal prophylaxis with azoles in high-risk, surgical intensive care unit patients: a meta-analysis of randomized, placebo-controlled trials. **Crit Care Med** 34:1216–1224, 2006
  49. Walters BC, Hoffman HJ, Hendrick EB, Humphreys RP: Cerebrospinal fluid shunt infection. Influences on initial management and subsequent outcome. **J Neurosurg** 60:1014–1021, 1984
  50. Wang X, Dong Y, Qi XQ, Li YM, Huang CG, Hou LJ: Clinical review: Efficacy of antimicrobial-impregnated catheters in external ventricular drainage – a systematic review and meta-analysis. **Crit Care** 17:234, 2013
  51. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al: **The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses.** (<http://www.medicine.mcgill.ca/rtamblyn/Readings/The%20Newcastle%20-%20Scale%20for%20assessing%20the%20quality%20of%20nonrandomised%20studies%20in%20meta-analyses.pdf>) [Accessed December 21, 2014]
  52. Winkler KM, Woernle CM, Seule M, Held U, Bernays RL, Keller E: Antibiotic-impregnated versus silver-bearing external ventricular drainage catheters: preliminary results in a randomized controlled trial. **Neurocrit Care** 18:161–165, 2013
  53. Woernle CM, Burkhardt JK, Bellut D, Krayenbuehl N, Bertalanffy H: Do iatrogenic factors bias the placement of external ventricular catheters?—a single institute experience and review of the literature. **Neurol Med Chir (Tokyo)** 51:180–186, 2011
  54. Wong GK, Ip M, Poon WS, Mak CW, Ng RY: Antibiotics-impregnated ventricular catheter versus systemic antibiotics for prevention of nosocomial CSF and non-CSF infections: a prospective randomised clinical trial. **J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry** 81:1064–1067, 2010
  55. Wright K, Young P, Brickman C, Sam T, Badjatia N, Pereira M, et al: Rates and determinants of ventriculostomy-related infections during a hospital transition to use of antibiotic-coated external ventricular drains. **Neurosurg Focus** 34(5):E12, 2013
  56. Zabramski JM, Whiting D, Darouiche RO, Horner TG, Olson J, Robertson C, et al: Efficacy of antimicrobial-impregnated external ventricular drain catheters: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. **J Neurosurg** 98:725–730, 2003

Author Contributions

Conception and design: Falagas, Konstantelias, Vardakas. Acquisition of data: Konstantelias, Polyzos. Analysis and interpretation of data: all authors. Drafting the article: Konstantelias, Polyzos, Tansarli. Critically revising the article: Vardakas. Reviewed submitted version of manuscript: all authors. Approved the final version of the manuscript on behalf of all authors: Falagas. Statistical analysis: Konstantelias, Vardakas, Tansarli. Administrative/technical/material support: Falagas. Study supervision: Falagas, Vardakas.

Correspondence

Matthew E. Falagas, Alfa Institute of Biomedical Sciences, 9 Neapoleos St., 151 23 Marousi, Athens, Greece. email: m.falagas@aibs.gr.

Appendix

APPENDIX TABLE 1. Quality assessment of randomized studies with the Jadad scale

Authors & Year	Randomization	Assessment of		Description of Withdrawals & Dropouts	Method of Randomization		Method of Blinding
		Randomization	Double Blinding		Was Described, But Was Inappropriate	Was Described, But Was Inappropriate	
Govender et al., 2003	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kaufmann et al., 2004	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Keong et al., 2012	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Pople et al., 2012	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Winkler et al., 2013	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Wong et al., 2010	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Zabramski et al., 2003	1	1	0	1	0	0	0

APPENDIX TABLE 2. Quality assessment of nonrandomized studies with Newcastle-Ottawa Scale

Authors & Year	Representativeness of Exposed Cohort	Selection of Nonexposed Cohort	Ascertainment of Exposure	Demonstration That Outcome of Interest Was Not Present at Start of Study	Comparability	Assessment of Outcome*	Was Follow-Up Long Enough for Outcomes to Occur?†		Adequacy of Follow-Up of Cohorts	Total
Abla et al., 2011	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7
Albanese et al., 2009	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	9
Aryan et al., 2005	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	6
Eymann et al., 2009	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Eymann et al., 2008	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	8
Farber et al., 2011	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	8
Fichtner et al., 2010	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7
Gutiérrez-González et al., 2010	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	8
Harrop et al., 2010	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Hayhurst et al., 2008	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	6
James et al., 2014	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	6
Kan & Kestle, 2007	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	9
Kandasamy et al., 2011	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	6
Kestle et al., 2011	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7
Lackner et al., 2008	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7
Lajcak et al., 2013	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Lane et al., 2014	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Lemcke et al., 2012	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	9
Mikhaylov et al., 2014	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7
Muttaiyah et al., 2010	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	6
Parker et al., 2009	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	8
Pattavilakom et al., 2007	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Richards et al., 2009	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	7
Ritz et al., 2007	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	6
Rivero-Garvia et al., 2011	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Steinbok et al., 2010	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
Tamburrini et al., 2008	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Woernle et al., 2011	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Wright et al., 2013	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	6

* Only studies with definition of infection based on cultures only were considered as a positive result. Clinical definition of infection among the studies was considered as a self-report or a subjective outcome.

† Minimum follow-up for EVD and ventriculoperitoneal shunt were considered 5 days and 1 month after the placement of the catheter, respectively.

APPENDIX FIG. 1. Funnel plot to assess publication bias. More studies are missing near the middle toward the right, indicating asymmetry. Publication bias in the region of small studies with negative results was observed. SE = standard error. Figure is available in color online only.