

In conclusion, *C. laurentii* is an opportunistic pathogen of immunosuppressed or severely ill hospitalized patients, and a critical risk factor is the previous use of antibiotic therapy. However, the isolation of urinary *C. laurentii* in the correct clinical setting may be nonsignificant. What to do in patients at risk, such as neutropenic patients, and patients before urologic instrumentation who have a urine culture positive for *C. laurentii*, has not yet been determined.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank the microbiology laboratory and the medical education department from The Hospital General de Zona 27.

Financial support. No financial support was provided.

Conflicts of interest. The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- Smith N, Sehring M, Chambers J, Patel P. Perspectives on non-neoformans cryptococcal opportunistic infections. *J Community Hosp Intern Med Perspect* 2017;7:214–217.
- Khawcharoenporn T, Apisarnthanarak A, Mundy LM. Non-neoformans cryptococcal infections: a systematic review. *Infection* 2007;35:51–58.
- Ferreira-Paim K, Ferreira TB, Andrade-Silva L, *et al.* Phylogenetic analysis of phenotypically characterized *Cryptococcus laurentii* isolates reveals high frequency of cryptic species. *PLoS One* 2014;9(9):e108633.
- Pappas PG, Kauffman CA, Andes DR, *et al.* Executive summary: clinical practice guideline for the management of candidiasis: 2016 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2016;62:409–417.
- Warren WA, Franco-Palacios D, King CS, Shlobin OA, *et al.* A 24-year-old woman with precipitous respiratory failure after lung transplantation. *Chest* 2018;153(3):e53–e56.
- Bernal-Martinez L, Gomez-Lopez A, Castelli MV, *et al.* Susceptibility profile of clinical isolates of non-*Cryptococcus neoformans*/non-*Cryptococcus gattii* *Cryptococcus* species and literature review. *Med Mycol*. 2010 Feb;48(1):90–6.
- Arendrup MC, Boekhout T, Akova M, Meis JF, Cornely OA, Lortholary O; European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases Fungal Infection Study Group; European Confederation of Medical Mycology. ESCMID and ECMM joint clinical guidelines for the diagnosis and management of rare invasive yeast infections. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2014;20 suppl 3:76–79.

Age: A variable whose definition we should not ignore

Anne F. Voor in 't holt PhD

Department of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, Erasmus MC University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

To the Editor—The age of included patients is described as a demographic patient characteristic in many research articles, and handled as a continuous variable, expressed as a mean with standard deviation or median with interquartile range, or as a categorical variable. However, in the methods section of articles, how the age of patients was calculated was almost never explained. The starting point is obvious: the birth date of the included patient. However, the second date is not always that obvious; especially when dealing with different follow-up and inclusion times, it can become difficult. What should one do—calculate age at time of inclusion in the study, calculate age at time of the outcome measure, or maybe calculate age at time of hospital admission? Additionally, should age be considered a discrete value or a continuous value including months? To gain insight into how authors handled the demographic variable age, I considered the original articles in the latest issue of *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology*, volume 40, issue 8 (August 2019).

Of 8 original articles in this issue, 6 (75%) described age as a demographic patient characteristic. Fridkin *et al*¹ classified age as a categorical value. In their article, age was described as the average age of residents followed by a median, but the point in the study at which the age was calculated was not stated. Dyer *et al*² were more clear: age was classified as a continuous variable

and described as mean age. A footnote of their table 3 states that pediatric admission was defined as 0–17 years of age at hospital admission. Asundi *et al*³ conducted a cohort study including 2,059 patients with a median age of 71.7 years, but how was age determined? In the methods section, they stated that age was part of the prospectively collected data; however, for the variable age, was age considered at the moment of the procedure considered or age at admission? Elman *et al*⁴ classified age as a categorical variable, and they described 4 different age groups, but was age taken at time of detecting the outcome measure (ie, urinary tract infection) or at admission? Jiang *et al*⁵ calculated a median age; however, which dates were taken into account when calculating age, such as age at time of enrollment, was not stated. Neshier *et al*⁶ presented age as a mean in their table 2; however, its definition was not described in the methods section of the article. Was age taken as age at the time of diagnosis? In the methods section, they stated that all data were collected prospectively, but similar to Asundi *et al*, it is unclear how the age of patients was handled in this study.

None of the articles stated whether age was considered a discrete value from the start, or whether months were taken into account for individual patients during analyses. In only 1 of these 6 articles was it somewhat clear that age at admission was used. One might think, what is the problem with being a few months off, or when dealing with discrete values, possibly a year off? This is the reason: Our goal is to conduct research in the best way we can. Even small things matter because when data are combined, they may reveal something larger. Therefore, I feel that age of patients should be described in a more specific and consistent manner. Future studies should investigate which definition is best and should propose which measurement should be used.

Author for correspondence: Dr. Anne F. Voor in 't holt, Department of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, Erasmus MC University Medical Center, Dr. Molewaterplein 40, 3015 GD, Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Email: a.voorintholt@erasmusmc.nl

Cite this article: Voor in 't holt AF. (2019). Age: A variable whose definition we should not ignore. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, 40: 1444–1445, <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2019.271>

© The Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America and Cambridge University Press 2019. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Acknowledgments. None.

Financial support. No financial support was provided relevant to this article.

Conflicts of interest. The author reports no conflicts of interest relevant to this article.

References

1. Fridkin SK, Pack J, Licitra G, *et al.* Creating reasonable antibiograms for antibiotic stewardship programs in nursing homes: analysis of 260 facilities in a large geographic region, 2016–2017. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2019;40:839–846.
2. Dyer AP, Dodds Ashley E, Anderson DJ, *et al.* Total duration of antimicrobial therapy resulting from inpatient hospitalization. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2019;40:847–854.
3. Asundi A, Stanislawski M, Mehta P, *et al.* Real-world effectiveness of infection prevention interventions for reducing procedure-related cardiac device infections: insights from the veterans affairs clinical assessment reporting and tracking program. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2019;40:855–862.
4. Elman MR, Williams CD, Bearden DT, *et al.* Healthcare-associated urinary tract infections with onset post hospital discharge. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2019;40:863–871.
5. Jiang L, McGeer A, McNeil S, *et al.* Which healthcare workers work with acute respiratory illness? Evidence from Canadian acute-care hospitals during 4 influenza seasons: 2010–2011 to 2013–2014. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2019;40:889–896.
6. Neshet L, Tsaban G, Dreier J, *et al.* The impact of incorporating early rapid influenza diagnosis on hospital occupancy and hospital acquired influenza. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2019;40:897–903.