Open Access Journal of Surgery & Case Studies

Article Type: Review Article
Published: 11/11/2021

Maintenance of Operation Theatre Quality as a Preventive Measure of Surgical Site Infections: A Review

Maria Fayyaz[1], Aqsa Iqbal[1], Hafiza Sidra Yaseen[2], Umar Farooq Gohar[1]*, Madiha Maqsood[3]

[1]Institute of Industrial Biotechnology, Government College University Lahore 54000, Pakistan

[2]Department of Pharmacy, COMSATS University Islamabad, Lahore Campus, Pakistan

[3]Department of Allied Health Sciences, Afro Asian Institute Lahore 54000, Pakistan

Abstract

Introduction: Surgical site infections (SSIs) represent index of healthcare system and are third most commonly reported nosocomial infection. SSIs are responsible for high morbidity and mortality ratio and account round about 1/4 of hospital acquired infections which produce adverse impacts on patients. Moreover, they increase patient stay in hospital resultantly responsible for economical loss of patient and family.

Objective: The aim of present review is to assemble already known information regarding incidence of SSIs, pathological as well as microbiological risk factors and mitigation strategies (pre-operative, intraoperative and postoperative) for patients posted for any surgery in hospital. Additionally, importance of SSIs related preventive measures and prophylactic antibiotic therapy for better healthcare is also highlighted.

Methodology: Several research, review articles, clinical reports and survey-based reports were searched by using different databases to gather the information regarding SSIs.

Results: Complete ten published clinical studies were thorough reviewed to highlight importance of operation theater quality management to prevent SSIs. Data obtained showed that implementation of pre, intra and postoperative strategies can cut down mortality rate associated with SSIs around the world. Moreover, surveillance of SSIs risk factors and decline in them may also decrease nosocomial infections.

Conclusion: SSIs surveillance is a well-established and comprehensive approach to reduce incidence of SSIs. Along with, maintenance of operation theater quality is hallmark for reduction in SSIs. However, further studies are still required to improve standards for periodic surveillance and management of hospital acquired infections.

Keywords: SSIs, operation theater, pre-operative, nosocomial infection, surveillance programs

*Correspondence:
Umar Farooq Gohar, Institute of Industrial Biotechnology, Government College University Lahore 54000, Punjab, Pakistan

Article Type: Review Article
Received: 30/10/2021
Published: 11/11/2021

Citation:
Maria Fayyaz[1], Aqsa Iqbal[1], Hafiza Sidra Yaseen[2], Umar Farooq Gohar[1*], Madiha Maqsood[3]. Maintenance of Operation Theatre Quality as a Preventive Measure of Surgical Site Infections: A Review

Op Acc Jour of Sur & Case Stud 3(1)-2021.

Introduction

Surgical site infections (SSIs) represent major health care complications and account for 38% of hospital acquired infections. SSIs usually occur within one month of procedure execution or maximum in 1 year in patients who has received implants [1]. These contaminations could be deep or superficial incisional infections and generally involve body organs/spaces. In particular, superficial diseases that affect skin only can be SSIs such as operative wounds (involvement of surface tissues, organs, or soft masses) [2]. Extreme SSIs account for about half of all SSIs in deep incisions or organ gaps [3]. One clinical study has reported that an estimated 11% of entire disease burden were associated with operating procedure [4]. Moreover, 1 in 10 patients admitted to hospital face nosocomial infection. Among all on them, majority of in-hospital events are linked to surgical incisions and administration of medications [5]. SSIs are responsible for high morbidity and mortality ratio as SSI patients remain 2-11 times more expected to die than non-SSI patients therefore, management of SSIs is a significant clinical concern globally. Moreover, surgical site infected patients stay in hospital for around 7-10 additional days which resultantly drop economic conditions of patients [6].

According to Centers for Disease Control National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (CDCNNIS) system four major types of risk of injuries related to operating procedure are categorized as 1) clean wounds, an uninfected operational wound in which no inflammation is observed and alimentary, respiratory, genital, or uninfected urinary tract is not accessed; 2) operative incisional wounds that accompany blunt trauma; 3) clean-contaminated wounds, a surgical wound in which gastrointestinal, respiratory, genital, or urinary tracts are entered under sterile environments and without unusual contamination and 4) contaminated wounds including open, fresh or accidental wounds. For example, procedures with major disruptions due to leakage from GIT tract and the incisions in which non-purulent, acute inflammation is encountered mainly involve dirty-infected wounds, traumatic wounds and lacerated viscera [2,7,8] (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Surgical Site Infections (SSIs) classification according to CDCNNIS.

Besides this, risk of developing SSI differs considerably depending on procedure type and individual's characteristics undertaking surgery [9]. Different studies have reported both internal (related to patient i.e. dehydration, older age, co-existing disease and diabetes) and external (related to procedure i.e. length of procedure, working ethics of surgeon, stability of pre-operative skin preparation, adequacy of antimicrobial prophylaxis and addition of foreign objects) factors responsible for SSIs [10]. A research conducted by Dominioni et al. has shown that serum albumin accumulation, older age and standard of operation theater can increase chances of SSIs [11]. Various studies have been revealed prominent role of microorganisms in surgical site infections. Findings showed Staphylococcus aureus and methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) strains related medical complications which consequently increase post-operative medical stay and related hospital expenses [12]. Likewise, occurrence of concomitant infections due to inevitable growth of bacterial species (e.g., S. aureus, coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS), Enterococcus and Escherichia coli) are accountable for SSIs in patients undergoing any implantation or other prosthesis. Hence, use of prophylaxis antibiotic may significantly reduce rate of nosocomial infections [13]. Considering this all information, operating care has become an integral measure of global health care with approximately 234 million procedures per year.

Rarely, pathogenic microorganisms are originated from an exogenous source like operating theatre (OT) environment, surgical personnel or employees [9] and total tools including instruments as well as materials used during a surgery [10,14]. Giacometti et al. studied 676 patients of surgery with signs and symptoms suggestive of wound infections, who presented over course of six years. Findings showed bacterial pathogens in 614 victims and most of them were aerobic bacteria (S. aureus, P. aeruginosa, E. coli, S. epidermidis and Enterococcus faecalis) with percentages of 28.2, 25.2, 7.8, 7.1 and 5.6 respectively (Table 1) [15].

Methodology

Numerous numbers of research and review articles have been analyzed for acquisition of information about surgical site infections and their remedial measures especially concerning operation theater quality. Different databases have been investigated to find out the information about respective topic. Keywords used were "surgical site infection", surgical site prevention", "operation theater infections", risk factors responsible for SSIs", strategies to reduce SSIs", "SSIs related complications", "etiology of SSIs", "intra-operative SSIs", "post-surgical site infections", "exposure time for surgical site treatment", "nosocomial

Table 1: Pathogens commonly linked with majorly performed surgical procedures.

Type of surgery	Common Pathogens
Colorectal	Anaerobes ; Gram-negative bacilli
Implant or prosthesis	*Staphylococcus aureus*; Coagulase-negative *Staphylococci*
Appendectomy	Anaerobes ; Gram-negative bacilli
Gastro-duodenal	Streptococci; Oro-pharyngeal anaerobes ; Gram-negative bacilli
Cardiac	Coagulase-negative staphylococci ; *Staphylococcus aureus*
Ophthalmic	*S. aureus*; Coagulase-negative staphylococci; Streptococci; Gram-negative bacilli
Urological	Gram-negative bacilli

infection types" and so on. It was a qualitative type of review so no specific software was used for data analysis. Articles having supposititious and un-authentic information regarding SSIs were excluded from the review process.

Results and Discussion

For the avoidance of surgical site infections, few strategies are adopted including preoperative, intra-operative and post-operative strategies as summarized in Figure 2.

Pre-operative strategies

For pre-operative preparation of skin, most commonly used agents are alcohol-containing products, iodophors, and chlorhexidine gluconate. According to FDA, alcohol is well-established agent having active constituents including ethyl alcohol (C2H5OH) 60-95% or isopropyl alcohol 50-91.3% by volume [16]. Alcohol remains most effective, readily available, inexpensive, rapidly acting agent and have bactericidal, fungicidal and virucidal activity, but spores can show resistance [17]. The technique for application of antiseptic is in concentric circle, starting from area of supposed incisional site to periphery [18]. According to Center for Disease Control (CDC) guidelines maintenance of "hand hygiene" including trimming of nails, use of proper antiseptic agent for scrubbing and drying can help to reduce pathogen transfer from medical workers to patients [10]. For removing hairs, shaving of surgical site causes a significant increase in SSI (5.6%) as compared to other hair removal agents (0.6%). Shaving causes microscopic traumas in skin that later act as a center for replication of bacteria [19].

OT workers may have interactions during medical procedures with individual skin and/or mucous membranes and there is a chance of sharp injury leads towards chronic infections. Sharp wounds placed employees at threat of exposure to blood-borne diseases as well [20]. Proper educational programmers and policies must be developed among health sector personals in order to limit chances of pathogen transfer to patients which in turn decreases hospital acquired infections among post-surgery patients. Before surgery, administration of antimicrobial prophylaxis has been shown to significantly decrease severity of wound infections associated with surgical procedures. The usage of antibiotic drug prophylactically prior to surgery allow availability of appropriate concentration in tissue thus, reduce microbial concentration and occupancy at incisional site [21].

Intra-operative Strategies

SSIs may result from bacteria surviving on surgical tools or penetrating directly into operational site [22]. Ventilation and humidity in the OT are important factors to minimize chance of infection. In order to avoid getting potentially polluted air to reach surgical suite, surgical operation room (SOR) must be hold on to positive pressures in comparison to the hallways outside the room [23]. As best practice,

Figure 2: Strategies for surgical site infections (SSIs) prevention

DOI: *10.51931/OAJCS.2021.03.000042*

there must also be at least 15 air changes per hour (3 of fresh air). To stop development of molds and fungi, humidity should be conserved at a definite level [24]. The Ventilation health care facility suggests that the OT must be managed at 20-24oC, with positive pressure and humidity of 20-60% [25]. Flash sterilization is a procedure designed for instant use of instruments (e.g., for reprocessing of an accidentally dropped instrument). However, it is not recommended for implants because of a viable risk of infection [26]. Various studies did not prefer this method as a routine sterilization for convenience, to save time and to minimize sterilization cycle factors (i.e., temperature and time) [27] (Table 2).

Table 3: Parameters for flash sterilization cycles.

Gravity displacement	Minimum time for exposure	Temperature (°C)
Non-porous items	3 minutes	132°C
Non-porous and porous items	10 minutes	132°C
Pre vacuum	**Minimum time for exposure**	**Temperature (°C)**
Non-porous items	3 minutes	132°C
Non-porous and porous items	4 minutes	132°C

Environmental surfaces are hardly concerned for expansion of SSIs. When surfaces get visibly soiled during a procedure, a hospital disinfectant approved by environmental protection agency (EPA) would be used before next procedure [28]. According to Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirement, environmental surfaces should be disinfected after interaction with infectious material or blood [29]. After the end of night or day, a disinfectant approved from environmental protection agency (EPA) is used on regular basis for wet-vacuuming of floor of operating room [30]. The tacky mats have not been played significant role in reduction of microorganism present on stretcher wheels or shoes. So, there is no need to use them for controlling infection [31].

Microbiological sampling and counting can regularly be used to determine condition of air in OTs, but the relationship between two approaches has rarely been tested. A study indicated that there is no need to substitute microbiological sampling with particle counting in conventionally ventilated operating theatres for routine assessment of pathogenic organisms [32]. Surgical attire is worn to minimize release of microbes into atmosphere of operation theater. Clean, freshly washed scrubs should be worn by each medical staff member [33] just to prevent spread of possible pathogens to the wounds. In addition, sterile drapes can also be used for the same purpose [34].

Strict obedience to codes of asepsis by scrubbed staff as well as by anesthesia personnel is base for controlling SSIs. Different surveys related to operation theater visits revealed that anesthesia personnel were involved as source of pathogen when placing intra-vascular devices, endotracheal tubes (ETT), and when administrating intravenous (IV) drugs [35]. Improper implementation of aseptic-principles throughout performance is associated with outbreaks of post-operative infections. It is believed that risk of SSIs can be reduced through application of surgical technique in operation theatre [36]. Presence of some type of foreign body like suture material, an implant, or drain, might stimulate inflammation at surgical site and may enhance chance of SSIs [37]. Moreover, studies have been showed that risk of SSIs drop when closed suction drains are used instead of open drains [38] (Table 3).

Post-operative strategies

After performing a surgery, the care of surgical site incision is mandatory depending upon the type of incision the patient had. There are three forms of incision sites including closed skin edges incision, open edges incision which is closed later and open incision site for healing purpose. Postoperative incision care in case of closed edges, the incision is covered with germ free bandage for up to 48 hours [39]. In case of open edges incision, it must be packed with sterile dressing for minimizing the contamination of surgical site. When the incision site left open for healing purpose, it is also filled with germ free damped gauze and covered with bandage. The American College of Surgeons (ACS) and other authorities have suggested usage of germ-free gloves and tools while exchanging dressings of surgical incision [40] .

Presently, patients are discharged momentarily even afore surgical incisions have restored. Physician will provide specific instructions about when and how to adjust it. After a few days, most wounds do not require taking off the gauze but wrapping of area and change dressing on regular basis by maintaining proper hand hygiene it may help to protect cut from infection and it may heal more quickly. The discharge planning intent is to sustain reliability of restorative incision, let the patient to know almost signs and symptoms of infection and direct patient about whom to interact to account any issues [41]. Previous studies which have worked to identify the risk factors responsible for surgical site infections and strategies for preventing them are summarized below (Table 4).

Data obtained exhibited that an area where all

Table 4: Summary of clinical studies on maintenance of operation theater quality to reduce SSIs rate.

Aim	Methodology	Results	References
To see that behavioral and structural interventions would reduce intra-operative infection during knee and hip replacements.	Comparative study was performed to see the positive outcomes in operations done under controlled conditions. In group 1, behavioral measures were introduced and cultures were taken during operations using better use of plenum. In group 2, disciplinary measures, and installation of air-flow system with use of plenum was introduced.	Group 1 showed contamination in 34.3% and Group 2 showed in 8.6% of cases. Reduction of SSI in group 2 showed that combination of systemic and behavioral changes in an OR lessened the incidence of intra-op contamination which showed positive outcomes during post-operative period.	[46]
To see factors accountable for contamination and by using which strategies, rate of SSI can be decreased.	Charnley evaluated 5,800 surgical operations to observe factors responsible for causing intra-op contamination and shows a major risk to success of joint replacement.	When unidirectional airflow regimes with a high number of hourly air exchanges used and surgical staff wore special suits, the rate of SSI dropped noticeably from 7 to 0.5%.	[47]
To evaluate risk factors and efficacy of prophylactic antibiotics for SSI among patients with uncomplicated open appendectomy.	A prospective cohort study was conducted in eight hospitals in Thailand by using the National Nosocomial Infection Surveillance (NNIS) system criteria to identify SSI associated with appendectomy.	Antibiotic prophylaxis was linked with decreased risk. A combined single dose of metronidazole and gentamicin administered preoperatively or intra operatively appears sufficient to decrease SSIs in patients with uncomplicated appendicitis.	[48]
To provide latest and modernized evidence-based recommendations for the prevention of SSI.	A targeted systematic review of the literature was conducted. A modified Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach was used to assess the quality of evidence and the strength of the resulting recommendation.	Public reporting of procedure, result, and other quality improvement measures is now needed for treating SSI. It has been estimated that approximately half of SSIs are preventable by application of evidence-based strategies.	[49]
To summarize interventional studies performed in Sub-Saharan Africa that had attempted to reduce the risk of post-op SSI.	Searched Medline, Embase and Global Health databases for studies published between 1995 and 2010 without language restrictions and extracted data from full-text articles.	Proper use of antibiotic prophylaxis in surgery can dramatically reduce the risk of SSI and alcohol-based preparations may provide a low-cost alternative to traditional surgical hand-washing and skin preparation methods.	[50]
To investigate the application of nasal de-contamination with topical formulations for prevention of SSI.	The literature from the years 2002 to 2012 was investigated. Websites of international and Greek organizations, scientific guidelines and databases (e.g., PUBMED) were searched for staphylococcus articles as well as articles for nasal decontamination and SSI.	Pre- operatively, nasal decontamination is used to avoid SSI in countries where staphylococcus is prevalent.	[51]
To develop a consensus-based "Best Practice" Guideline (BPG), informed by both the available evidences and expert opinion.	A panel of 20 pediatric spine surgeons and three infectious disease specialists from North America was created, with each member chosen for their extensive expertise in the field of pediatric spine surgery.	This study presented a consensus-based Best Practice" Guideline (BPG) consisting of 14 recommendations for the prevention of SSIs after spine surgery in high-risk pediatric patients.	[52]
To see how effective chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine were at preventing post-op SSI.	PUBMED, Web of Science, EMBASE, and CNKI were used to check for research on "skin antiseptic" and "SSI." There were 30 studies in total, with 29,006 participants. Revman 5.3 was used to analyze all of the results.	In the clean-contaminated surgery, chlorhexidine was superior to povidone-iodine in preventing postoperative SSI.	[53]
To assess risk factors and to confirm existing SSI prevention strategies.	The prospective observational cohort study included 6,283 consecutive general surgery procedures monitored for evidence of SSI up to 1 year after surgery. By using multiple logistic regression analysis, the dataset was scrutinized for the impact of possible SSI risk factors, such as the timing of surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis (SAP), glove puncture, anemia and transfusion.	SAP should be directed between 74 and 30 mins before surgery and double gloving is recommended to prevent SSI. Anemia and transfusion do not rise the risk of SSI.	[54]
To identify the best antiseptic agent in terms of skin preparation for reducing SSI.	The incidence of SSI linked with pre-op skin antiseptic preparation was explored through these given databases: British Nursing Index, The Allied and Complementary Medicine Database, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health, PubMed, The Mohammed Abdullah Al Maqbali Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and MEDLINE.	Chlorhexidine with alcohol is the most effective in terms of reducing SSI.	[55]

contaminating factors and micro-environmental changes are kept under controlled supervision is considered as a safe operating unit. By giving thorough attention, this task can be done by proper management and frequent inspections, as well as by adequate ongoing employee training [42]. Indeed, OT is an extremely complex environment in which there are various risk factors, including not only infrastructure characteristics and its equipment but also the administration and actions of workers in healthcare system [43]. Design of OT is one of the most important parameters to maintain quality of procedure. In specific description, it is essential to separate clean and dirty areas and maintain organized and logical movement of patients from their entrance to exit. For execution of medical procedures and for preparation of equipment separate rooms should be allocated. In these rooms, it is essential to limit the level of movement and activities of people as both factors can manipulate microbial contents and therefore can influence possibility of infections. The size of storage area should be determined according to workload and types of materials need to be placed in it. Windows of operating room (OR) should have a surface that are easy to clean and free from collecting dust [44]. Design of operation room, furniture, floor finishing and its covering will influence cleaning condition of operation room. In order to assist infection control, surface of floor should be impermeable, easy to clean, anti-stain and suitable for moving equipment's of operating room [45-55].

Conclusion

To summarize, surgical site infections can be avoided through implementation of well-planned pre-operative, intra-operative and post-operative strategies as well as by practicing infection management through execution of sterile technique while conducting procedures. It's important to remember that much of the morbidity and mortality ratio associated with SSIs can be reduced by modifying a variety of variables, including surgical environment, patient-related or procedure-related risk factors along with personnel behavior. Furthermore, SSIs surveillance is a well-documented and well-established method of reducing incidence of SSIs. Despite its usefulness, many hospitals continue to ignore this advice. The importance of good patient preparation, aseptic conditions and adherence to sterile surgical procedure are highlighted in the CDC guidelines for prevention of SSIs and antimicrobial prophylaxis is also guided in particular circumstances. Altogether, SSIs prevention necessitates a comprehensive approach and the contribution of all individuals involved, including those responsible for the design, layout, and management of operating rooms. However, further research into prevention strategies, as well as strict adherence to the implementation of established evidence-based methods to mitigate SSIs is still required to reduce infection even more.

References

1. Weigelt JA, Lipsky BA, Tabak YP, Derby KG, Kim M, et al. (2010) Surgical site infections: causative pathogens and associated outcomes. American journal of infection control 38(2): 112-120.
2. Mangram AJ, Horan TC, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR, et al. (1999) Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 1999. American journal of infection control 27(2): 97-134.
3. Astagneau P, L'Hériteau F (2010) Surveillance of surgical-site infections: impact on quality of care and reporting dilemmas. Current opinion in infectious diseases 23(4): 306-310.
4. Bhasin SK, Roy R, Agrawal S, Sharma R (2011) An epidemiological study of major surgical procedures in an urban population of East Delhi. Indian Journal of Surgery 73(2): 131-135.
5. de Vries EN, Ramrattan MA, Smorenburg SM, Gouma DJ, Boermeester MA (2008) The incidence and nature of in-hospital adverse events: a systematic review. BMJ Quality & Safety 17(3): 216-223.
6. Anderson DJ, Kaye KS, Classen D, Arias KM, Podgorny K, et al. (2008) Strategies to prevent surgical site infections in acute care hospitals. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology 29(S1): S51-S61.
7. Garner JS (1986) Guideline for prevention of surgical wound infections, 1985: Hospital Infections Program, Center for Infectious Diseases, Centers for
8. Sherertz RJ, Garibaldi RA, Marosok RD, Mayhall CG, Scheckler WE, et al. (1992) Consensus paper on the surveillance of surgical wound infections. American journal of infection control 20(5): 263-270.
9. Kirby JP, Mazuski JE (2009) Prevention of surgical site infection. Surgical Clinics of North America 89(2): 365-389.
10. Owens C, Stoessel K (2008) Surgical site infections: epidemiology, microbiology and prevention. Journal of hospital infection 70: 3-10.
11. Dominioni L, Imperatori A, Rotolo N, Rovera F (2006) Risk factors for surgical infections. Surgical infections, 7(2): s-9-s-12.
12. Engemann JJ, Carmeli Y, Cosgrove SE, Fowler VG, Bronstein MZ, et al S. (2003) Adverse clinical and economic outcomes attributable to methicillin resistance among patients with Staphylococcus aureus surgical site infection. Clinical infectious diseases, 36(5): 592-598.
13. Gottrup F, Melling A, Hollander DA (2005) An overview of surgical site infections: aetiology, incidence and risk factors. EWMA journal 5(2): 11-15.
14. Wolcott R, Gontcharova V, Sun Y, Zischakau A, Dowd S (2009) Bacterial diversity in surgical site infections: not just aerobic cocci any more. Journal of wound care 18(8): 317-323.
15. Giacometti A, Cirioni O, Schimizzi A, Del Prete M, Barchiesi F, et al. (2000) Epidemiology and microbiology of surgical wound infections. Journal of clinical microbiology 38(2): 918-922.
16. Food U, Administration D (1994) Topical antimicrobial drug products for over-the-counter human use; tentative final monograph (TFM) for health-care antiseptic drug products. Federal Register 59: 31402-31452.
17. Larson E (1988) Guideline for use of topical antimicrobial agents. American journal of infection control 16(6): 253-266.
18. Hardin W, Nichols R (1997) Handwashing and patient skin preparation. Critical Issues in Operating Room Management. Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven 133: 49.
19. Seropian R, Reynolds BM (1971) Wound infections after preoperative depilatory versus razor preparation. The American Journal of Surgery 121(3): 251-254.
20. Akduman D, Kim LE, Parks RL, L'Ecuyer PB, Mutha S, et al. (1999) Use of personal protective equipment and operating room behaviors in four surgical subspecialties: personal protective equipment and behaviors in surgery. Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology: The Official Journal of the Society of Hospital Epidemiologists of America 20: 2.
21. Ludwig KA, Carlson MA, Condon RE (1993) Prophylactic antibiotics in surgery. Annual review of medicine 44(1): 385-393.
22. Diab-Elschahawi M, Berger J, Blacky A, Kimberger O, Oguz R, et al. (2011) Impact of different-sized laminar air flow versus no laminar air flow on bacterial counts in the operating room during orthopedic surgery. American journal of infection control, 39(7): e25-e29.

23. Wenzel RP, Bratzler D, Hunt D, van Rijen M, Bonten M, et al. (2010) Minimizing surgical-site infections. New England Journal of Medicine 362(1): 75.
24. Chinn RY, Sehulster L (2003) Guidelines for environmental infection control in health-care facilities; recommendations of CDC and Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC).
25. ANSI/ASHRAE (2017) Standard-170 (2017). Ventilation of Healthcare Facilities. In: ANSI/ASHRAE Atlanta, GA.
26. Instrumentation AftAoM (1996) Flash sterilization: Steam sterilization of patient care items for immediate use: AAMI.
27. Favero M, Manian F (1993) Is eliminating flash sterilization practical? Infection control and hospital epidemiology 14(8): 479-480.
28. Altemeier W, Burke J, Pruitt B (1976) Committee on Control of Surgical Infections of the Committee on Pre-and Postoperative Care, American College of Surgeons. Manual on control of infection in patients. In: Philadelphia: JB Lippincott.
29. (1991) US. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens; final rule (29 CFR Part 1910.1030). Federal Register 56: 64004-64182.
30. Rudnick JR, Beck-Sague CM, Anderson RL, Schable B, Miller JM, et al. (1996) Gram-negative bacteremia in open-heart–surgery patients traced to probable tap-water contamination of pressure-monitoring equipment. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 17(5): 281-285.
31. Ayliffe G (1991) Role of the environment of the operating suite in surgical wound infection. Reviews of infectious diseases, 13(10): S800-S804.
32. Landrin A, Bissery A, Kac G (2005) Monitoring air sampling in operating theatres: can particle counting replace microbiological sampling? Journal of hospital infection 61(1): 27-29.
33. McHugh S, Corrigan M, Hill A, Humphreys H (2014) Surgical attire, practices and their perception in the prevention of surgical site infection. The Surgeon 12(1): 47-52.
34. Whyte W (1988) The role of clothing and drapes in the operating room. Journal of hospital infection 11: 2-17.
35. Paul SM, Genese C, Spitalny K (1990) Postoperative group A β-hemolytic Streptococcus outbreak with the pathogen traced to a member of a healthcare worker's household. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology 11(12): 643-646.
36. Dellinger EP (1997) Surgical infections and choice of antibiotics. Textbook of surgery. The biological basis of modern surgical practice pp. 264-280.
37. B'erard F (1964) Postoperative wound infections: the influence of ultraviolet irradiation of the operating room and of various other factors. Ann Surg 160(1): 1-192.
38. Moro M, Carrieri M, Tozzi A, Lana S, Greco D (1996) Risk factors for surgical wound infections in clean surgery: a multicenter study. Italian PRINOS Study Group. Annali italiani di chirurgia 67(1): 13-19.
39. Bostock R, Stermer B (1989) Perspectives on wound healing in resistance to pathogens. Annual review of phytopathology 27(1): 343-371.
40. Goldmann DA (1980) Infection Control in the Hospital, Chicago, American Hospital Association, 1979. 242 pp. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology 1(2): 114-116.
41. Kravitz M (1996) Outpatient wound care. Critical care nursing clinics of North America 8(2): 217-223.
42. Riley MMS, Suda D, Tabsh K, Flood A, Pegues DA (2012) Reduction of surgical site infections in low transverse cesarean section at a university hospital. American journal of infection control 40(9): 820-825.
43. Spagnolo A, Ottria G, Amicizia D, Perdelli F, Cristina ML (2013) Operating theatre quality and prevention of surgical site infections. Journal of preventive medicine and hygiene 54(3): 131.
44. Authority IWC (2009) Linee guida sugli standard di sicurezza e di igiene del lavoro nel reparto operatorio. Istituto Superiore per la Prevenzione e la Sicurezza del Lavoro. Dipartimento Igiene del Lavoro (ISPESL).
45. Australasian health facility guidelines (2006)
46. Knobben BAS, Van Horn J, Vander Mei H, Busscher H (2006) Evaluation of measures to decrease intra-operative bacterial contamination in orthopaedic implant surgery. Journal of hospital infection 62(2): 174-180.
47. Charnley J (1972) Postoperative infection after total hip replacement with special reference to air contamination in the operating room.
48. Kasatpibal N, Nørgaard M, Sørensen HT, Schønheyder HC, Jamulitrat S, et al. (2006) Risk of surgical site infection and efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis: a cohort study of appendectomy patients in Thailand. BMC infectious diseases 6(1): 1-7.
49. Berríos-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, Leas B, Stone EC, et al. (2017) Centers for disease control and prevention guideline for the prevention of surgical site infection. JAMA surgery 152(8): 784-791.
50. Aiken AM, Karuri DM, Wanyoro AK, Macleod J (2012) Interventional studies for preventing surgical site infections in sub-Saharan Africa–a systematic review. International Journal of Surgery 10(5): 242-249.
51. Efstathiou F, Papageorgiou D (2014) Efficacy of preoperative nasal decontamination in patients as a prevention of surgical site infection by staphylococcus aureus and MRSA. Perioperative Nursing, 3: 71-79.
52. Vitale MG, Riedel MD, Glotzbecker MP, Matsumoto H, Roye DP, et al. (2013) Building consensus: development of a Best Practice Guideline (BPG) for surgical site infection (SSI) prevention in high-risk pediatric spine surgery. Journal of Pediatric Orthopaedics 33(5): 471-478.
53. Chen S, Chen JW, Guo B, Xu CC (2020) Preoperative antisepsis with chlorhexidine versus povidone-iodine for the prevention of surgical site infection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. World journal of surgery 44(5): 1412-1424.
54. Junker T, Mujagic E, Hoffmann H, Rosenthal R, Misteli H, et al. (2012) Prevention and control of surgical site infections: review of the Basel Cohort Study. Swiss medical weekly 142: w13616.
55. Maqbali MAA (2013) Preoperative antiseptic skin preparations and reducing SSI. British Journal of Nursing 22(21): 1227-1233.