University of Glasgow Limitations of a qualitative risk assessment framework for MRSA colonisation in dogs)) Scottish Funding Council



J Heller^a, LA Kelly^{b,c}, SWJ Reid^a, DJ Mellor^{a,d}

^a Comparative Epidemiology and Informatics, Institute of Comparative Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Glasgow, UK. ^b Department of Statistics and Modelling Science, University of Strathclyde, Livingstone Tower, Richmond Street, Glasgow G1 1XH, UK ^c Centre for Epidemiology and Risk Analysis, Veterinary Laboratories Agency, New Haw, Addlestone, Surrey KT15 3NB, UK ^d Health Protection Scotland, Clifton House, Clifton Place, Glasgow G3 7LN, UK MATERIALS AND METHODS INTRODUCTION Meticillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) is a clinically important • A conceptual model was developed (Figure 2) to describe the pathways by which a dog could be colonised with MRSA within a 24 hour period. pathogen in humans and dogs (Figure 1). • MRSA may also exist as a commensal organism. Dogs may be reservoirs of • A gualitative description of risk for the parameters within each step (1-7) for MRSA for humans, and the same strains are found in dogs and humans in close each pathway (A-D) was obtained from a review of the literature, using both published and unpublished data. contact. However, the relationship between MRSA carriage in humans and dogs is Categorical risk estimates ranged from 'negligible' to 'high' poorly defined An overall risk estimate was obtained using stepwise matrix combinations • A risk-based approach was proposed to assess the potential contribution of (Table 1) of the parameters used to inform individual steps and associated dogs to the occurrence of MRSA in humans and the contribution of humans to transmission routes for each pathway MRSA in dogs • A qualitative assessment of the risk of MRSA acquisition in a dog was undertaken as the first step in this data-sparse area Goes to ve (1) 161 (2) Figure 1: MRSA infection in dogs Table 1: Combination of occurrence probabilities of parameters (Moutou et al., 2001) Contact witi colonised vet (7) Result of assessment Result of assessment of parameter 1 of parameter 2 Negligible Moderate High Low Negligible Negligible Low Low Moderate Low Low Low Moderate Moderate Moderate Low Moderate Moderate High High Moderate Moderate High High RESULTS MRSA negative dog In attempting to adopt this approach, many limitations were encountered. Some of these have been defined previously (Cox et al., 2005); Figure 2: Conceptual model of MRSA acquisition in any dog in a given 24 hour period. Flow is not directional (i.e. steps (1)-(4) and (5)-(7) may not be sequential). 1. A direct qualitative rating system that satisfies monotonicity cannot represent the product risk function as required by this model (Figure 1). CONCLUSIONS 2. Loss of information occurs due to inconsistencies in categorical parameters with successive layers of qualitative coding. Qualitative and semi-quantitative risk assessment approaches have limited applicability for this problem. 3. Inability to model dependencies results in loss of discriminative ability of • It is likely that the limitations are generalisable to other complex disease the output. scenarios (in contrast to the more familiar uses of these techniques for import However, using a semi-quantitative approach, whereby upper and lower and food safety risk assessments). bounds for each parameter were estimated was also limited due to: Non conformity to sequential step-wise progression through defined events 1. Inability to account for variability and uncertainty. or modules and numerous complex dependencies and permutations require 2. Inability to represent proportional spread between categories. consideration. 3. Lack of discriminative ability and misleading classification of outcome • The resulting inability to undertake model-driven data-sourcing, invitation of measures that result from forcing qualitative measures into arbitrary comment and assessment of the potential benefit of subsequent quantitative assessments is regrettable, particularly in data-sparse areas such as this quantitative bounds. 4. Rapid divergence of upper and lower estimates after multiplicative • A qualitative approach is not always the most appropriate first step to risk combination to span the entire range of probability estimates. assessment. REFERENCES

Cox, L.A. Jr., Babayev, D. & Huber, W. (2005). Some Limitations of Qualitative Risk Rating Systems. Risk Analysis, 25(3), 651-662

Moutou, F., Dufour, B. & Ivanov, Y. (2001). A Qualitative Assessment of the Risk of Introducing Foot and Mouth Disease into Russia and Europe from Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. Rev. sci. tech. Off. Int. Epiz., 20(3), 723-730