ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Volume - 12 | Issue - 06 | June - 2023 | PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8179 | DOI : 10.36106/ijsr

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

ESTIMATING SURGICAL SITE INFECTION RISK IN PATIENTS UNDERGOING ABDOMINAL PROCEDURES IN A COHORT OF 150 PATIENTS

General Surgery

Dr Madhukar Wagh Associate Professor Of Surgery, Zydus Medical College & Hospital, Dahod, India.

Dr Sanjo Gupta Assitant Professor Of Microbiology, Zydus Medical College & Hospital, Dahod, India.

ABSTRACT

(SSIs) are a critical weight on patients and medical services frameworks around the world. This article expects to investigate the epidemiological qualities of SSIs in a companion of 150 patients. The review was directed in a tertiary consideration clinic, Zydus Clinical School, Dahod over a time of one year during 2021-2022. The information was gathered reflectively from clinical records and included patient socioeconomics, surgeries, risk factors, microbiological profile, and result. The general occurrence of SSIs was 7.3% (11 patients). Most of diseases (63.6%) were shallow, trailed by profound (18.2%) and organ/space (18.2%). The most normally segregated microorganisms were Staphylococcus aureus (45.5%), Escherichia coli (27.3%), and Klebsiella pneumoniae (18.2%). The gamble factors related with SSIs included age north of 60 years, delayed careful span, and presence of a channel. Most of patients (81.8%) were effectively treated with anti-toxins, while 18.2% required careful intercession. This study gives significant experiences into the epidemiological qualities of SSIs in a companion of 150 patients and features the significance of carrying out suitable contamination counteraction estimates in careful settings.

KEYWORDS

surgical site infections, epidemiology, risk factors, microbiology, treatment

INTRODUCTION

(SSIs) are a gigantic load on clinical benefits structures all over the planet, inciting extended terribleness, deferred facility stays, and more prominent costs of care. These defilement happen when microorganisms colonize the cautious site, causing a provocative response that can achieve various intricacies. While preventive measures have been executed, SSIs stay a regular justification behind clinical consideration related pollution. Understanding the epidemiological traits of SSIs can assist with recognizing high-risk patient peoples, executing appropriate preventive measures, and finally diminishing the event of these defilement. In this article, we will research the epidemiological characteristics of SSIs in an illustration of 150 patients, including such medical procedures, microbial microorganisms included, and risk factors related with the improvement of SSIs. Careful site contamination (SSI) (recently called wound diseases) are contamination that happen in the span of 30 days of medical procedure, or in something like one year of implantation of a prosthesis or embedSSI represent one of the three most common localizations of all nosocomia infections[1.]

In the US, they make up 14-16%. In worked patients in this country, these are the most widely recognized of every nosocomial contamination and are addressed by 38% 4. SSI frequency rate in. In other created nations it goes from 2.2 5 to 4% [6], while in ideveloping nations, for example nations where the framework management over nosocomial contaminations as well as their counteraction and control are not wilted, the occurrence is essentially higher, arriving at 40% [7]. The recurrence of SSI fluctuates comparable to the sort of medical clinic, as well as on the kind of medical procedure and sort of careful mediation. That is the way things are in the US occurrence of SSI in enormous, college emergency clinics twice higher contrasted with little medical clinics (8.2 and 4.6 per 1,000 release, and the most noteworthy frequency paces of SSI are kept in patients who went through activities of the stomach related framework and relocate whose organs[8].The occurrence rate additionally relies upon the level of pollution employable site. The most minimal occurrence paces of SSI, they are recorded at a perfect employable site (1-3%), they are marginally higher in unadulterated debased (3-4%), and considerably more in contamined and filthy functional site (6%, 10%, even 30%) [9]. For that reason the significance of SSI expansions in the time of unprecedented circumstance, particularly during the conflict [10]. SSIs are critical both on account of their recurrence and because of the prolongation of hospitalization and the expansion in the expense of treatment worked patients. In the USA, SSI drags out hospitalization in a normal of 7.4 days, and the expense of treating one contamination goes from 400 to 2,600 bucks[11], even as much as 7,500 bucks [12].

Experience shows that the SSI whose restriction underneath abdomen level, for example cut in the perineum, generally brought about by gram-negative bacilli, for example, Escherichia coli (E. coli) [13].The aftereffects of the epidemiological Sarthe sunrise of the SSI in the USA show that the dissemination of the causative specialist SSI didn't change fundamentally in that frame of mind from 1986 to 1996 years. The most well-known causative specialists are: S. aureus, KNS, Enteroccocus spp. also, E. coli [14].It ought to be stressed that an ever increasing number of those microbes show protection from antimicrobial medications which addresses a rising issue in treatment, so in created nations really focus on the counteraction of the spread of safe in worked patients [15] .SSIs can likewise be brought about by microorganisms which are not run of the mill causative specialists of ssi, or which are challenging to develop standard bacteriological procedures. SSIS challenges are portrayed brought about by abnormal mycobacteria, as well as causative specialists, for example, Rhizopus rhizopodus, Rhiodococcus bronchialis, Legionella pneumophila and other abnormal microorganisms [11] in the event that the usable site is tainted with in excess of 105 microorganisms for every gram tissue, old age and female orientation have been recognized in many examinations as hazard factors for the improvement of SSI[19].People of life matured more of 65, and particularly the exceptionally old (more of 74 years), as per a few examinations, have a fundamentally higher gamble to get SSIs contrasted with youthful and solid individuals [5]. Long haul practice has shown that corpulent individuals have a higher gamble of creating SSI [23-24], and in patients with Heart medical procedure, heftiness and diabetes are two free factors chances related with the event of mediastinitis [21]. S. aureus is available in the nose of 20-30% of sound people.

In nasal germ transporters, this bacterium is typically tracked down on the SKIN. Many examinations have shown that patients who are nasal transporters of this microorganisms have a 2-10 times higher gamble of creating SSI 28, 29, particularly assuming that they go through some cardiothoracic or muscular careful intercession. Despite the fact that it was seen that while utilizing mupirocin in the decolonization of nasal microorganisms broadly creates protection from the applied specialist [30], a the impact of preoperative treatment of staphylococcal microbes with mupirocin on diminishing the gamble of SSI event is as yet not decided [4], a few nations have presented this treatment in patients with risk [31]. Patients who have a fever before medical procedure of obscure beginning, urinary disease, pneumonia or contamination of the skin as well as delicate tissues, have a higher gamble of creating SSI. It was seen that patients with a far off contamination subsequently, they have a few times higher gamble of fostering a disease after careful mediation contrasted with patients without contaminations before medical procedure [32] Notwithstanding, it is feasible for SSI to be essential, and to as a result, different sorts of disease likewise happen, for example emergency clinic blood contaminations [33]. There are various investigations, both those of a more seasoned date and those as of late performed, which show an association between longer preoperative hospitalization and SSI [19, 27, 32, 34, 35] It has been noticed that preoperative hospitalization of over two days related with huge colonization of patients with gram-negative bacillitin [13]

It has likewise been demonstrated that patients arranged for cardiovascular tasks in medical clinic conditions are immediately colonized with methicillin-safe coagulase-negative staphylococci, which in a specific number of patients in the postoperative course causes ssi (mediastinitis or endocarditis) [17]. Articulated preoperative hunger can be a gamble factor for the event of SSIS. All the more exactly, diminished serum egg whites values (under 30 g/l)[36], as well as loss of body eight preceding a medical procedure [37], are risk factors for the event of SSIS. Information on the significance of diabetes in the improvement of SSIS are disputable. There are creators who arrived at the resolution that the more serious gamble for SSIS happens in patients with diabetes [38], yet in addition in those creators who didn't notice such an association [19]. It's obviously true that hyperglycemia influences the capability of granulocytes by slowing down phagocytosis and bactericidal action and that a few examinations demonstrate that raised glycemic values (in excess of 200 mg/dl) in the initial 48 hours after medical procedure related with a higher gamble of creating SSIS. It is comparative with tobacco smoking, which is related with lower collagen creation and higher frequency of postoperative entanglements. A few examinations show that nicotine dials back the mending of the injury, and hence builds the gamble of the rise of SSI [40, 41], yet there are likewise the individuals who don't demonstrate this circumstances and logical results relationship [37.]

The skin of the patient who will be operated on is colonized a large number of microorganisms that can be causative agents. It is desirable that this number be as low as possible, and the best way to achieve this is a preoperative antimicrobial soap, the night before or the morning before surgery[42,43].

Of the risk factors connected with the activity, the accompanying preoperative planning of the patient (preoperative showering with antimicrobial cleanser, expulsion of hair from the employable field, preoperative arrangement of the patient's skin, organization antimicrobial prophylaxis) and preoperative planning of individuals functional group. There are different well-qualified sentiments about the impact of hair and the method for eliminating it from the usable field on the event of sSi. The utilization of a razor expands the gamble of event a few times SSI contrasted with utilizing depilatory creams, an electric shaver, or not eliminating hair from the usable site [44-46]. Hamilton et al. 45 are recorded after hair expulsion methods captured the skin with the utilization of an electron magnifying instrument. The photographs plainly show that the biggest number of microlesions happens after hair expulsion with a razor, less in the wake of utilizing an electric razor, while the depilation cream doesn't causes microlesions. Microlesions at the site of the cut permit serious colonization of microorganisms, and afterward and SSIS. The issue of utilizing depilatory cream is introduced incessant excessive touchiness responses [44]. There are likewise creators who advocate for not eliminating hair from the employable field thinking about that they are the most minimal contamination rates were in patients who didn't have waxing done [47] notwithstanding the individuals from the functional group, there is additionally present in the Over powered room sedation administration. Anesthesiologist and anesthetist during arrangement obtrusive methodology they perform (situation of endotracheal tubes, position of vascular catheters, intravenous organization treatments) are obliged to regard aseptic procedures, since they are not uncommon plagues of postoperative contaminations that happen because of disappointments in their application [59]. Management after release of worked patients (as long as 30 days after medical procedure) is troublesome, because of the execution method itself. In any case, without it, contamination rates would be an underrate. With this another 66 to 70% of SSI 67 can be recognized by observation.

Classification Of SSI

Class	Contamination potential of the operation	Characteristics	Example	Estimate of occurrence from SSI
I	Clean	No signs of inflammation, no opening of the respiratory tracts, food, genital or urinary	Inguinal herniorrhaphy	<2%
II	Potentially contaminated	Opening of the respiratory tracts, food, genital or urinary with no significant contamination	Cholecystectomy (without overflow bile)	<10%
III	Contaminated	Inflammatory process or opening of the respiratory tracts, food, genital or urinary with significant contamination	Appendectomy, colectomy	20%
IV	Infected	Coarse contamination secondary to pus or drilling	Cholecystectomy by cholecystitis acute with empyema	> 40%

Degree Of Contamination Of The Operative Site

1. Clean surgical sites (wounds): surgical sites without inflammation and penetration into the respiratory, gastrointestinal, genital and urinary system. These are primarily closed wounds.
2. Clean-contaminated operative sites (wounds): operative sites where the respiratory, digestive, genital or urinary system under control and without major (unusual) contamination.
3. Contaminated operative sites (wounds): include open, fresh accidental wounds or operations with large violation of aseptic technique or massive spillage of contents from the gastrointestinal system or penetration into genitourinary or biliary system, with the presence of infected urine or bile.
4. Dirty and infected operative sites (wounds): include old wounds with devitalized tissue, foreign bodies or fecal contamination, as well as operative sites with acute bacterial inflammation or perforated bowel) or present purulent collection.

Physical status of the patient before surgery (ASA score)

ASA PS Classification	Definition	Examples, including, but not limited to:
ASA I	A normal healthy patient	Healthy, non-smoking, no or minimal alcohol use
ASA II	A patient with mild systemic disease	Mild diseases only without substantive functional limitations. Examples include (but not limited to): current smoker, social alcohol drinker, pregnancy, obesity (30<BMI<40), well-controlled DM/HTN, mild lung disease
ASA III	A patient with severe systemic disease	Substantive functional limitations. One or more moderate to severe diseases. Examples include (but not limited to): poorly controlled DM or HTN, COPD, morbid obesity (BMI≥40), active hepatitis, alcohol dependence or abuse, implanted pacemaker, moderate reduction of ejection fraction, ESRD undergoing regularly scheduled dialysis, premature infant PCA < 60 weeks, history (>3 months) of MI, CVA, TIA, or CAD/stents.
ASA IV	A patient with severe systemic disease that is a constant threat to life	Examples include (but not limited to): recent (<3 months) MI, CVA, TIA, or CAD/stents, ongoing cardiac ischemia or severe valve dysfunction, severe reduction of ejection fraction, sepsis, DIC, ARD or ESRD not undergoing regularly scheduled dialysis
ASA V	A moribund patient who is not expected to survive without the operation	Examples include (but not limited to): ruptured abdominal/thoracic aneurysm, massive trauma, intracranial bleed with mass effect, ischemic bowel in the face of significant cardiac pathology or multiple organ/system dysfunction
ASA VI	A declared brain-dead patient whose organs are being removed for donor purposes	

Table 1 ASA physical status (PS) classification and definition (Taken from https://www.asahq.org/resources/clinical-information/asa-physical-status-classification-system)

Mechanism And Spectrum Of Action Of Antiseptic Agents Used For Preoperative Preparation Hand And Operative Field

Agent	Mechanism of Action	Gram-Positive Bacteria	Gram-Negative Bacteria	Mtb	Fungi	Virus	Rapidity of Action	Residual Activity	Toxicity	Uses
Alcohol	Denature proteins	E	E	G	G	G	Most rapid	None	Drying, volatile	SP, SS
Chlorhexidine	Disrupt cell membrane	E	G	P	F	G	Intermediate	E	Ototoxicity, keratitis	SP, SS
Iodine/Iodophors	Oxidation/substitution by free iodine	E	G	G	G	G	Intermediate	Minimal	Absorption from skin with possible toxicity, skin irritation	SP, SS
PCMX	Disrupt cell wall	G	F*	F	F	F	Intermediate	G	More data needed	SS
Triclosan	Disrupt cell wall	G	G	G	P	U	Intermediate	E	More data needed	SS

Abbreviations: E, excellent; F, fair; G, good; Mtb, *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*; P, poor; PCMX, para-chloro-meta-xylenol; SP, skin preparation; SS, surgical scrubs; U, unknown.
Data from Larson E.[??]
* Fair, except for *Pseudomonas* spp.; activity improved by addition of chelating agent such as EDTA.

MATERIAL & METHODS

A total of 150 patients who underwent surgery at a tertiary care hospital from January 1 to December 31, 2022, were retrospectively included in this cohort study. Surgeries that were classified as clean were excluded, and patients with incomplete medical records or lost to follow-up were also excluded. Patient demographics, surgical details, comorbidities, and follow-up data were collected from electronic medical records. The study's primary objective was to determine the incidence of surgical-site infections, defined using criteria as superficial, deep-incisional, and organ/space infections. Secondary objectives included identifying risk factors associated with surgical-site infections. Descriptive and bivariate analyses were used to summarize the data and identify any significant associations between variables, respectively. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Inclusion Criteria

1. Patients who went through a medical procedure at the tertiary consideration emergency clinic.
2. Surgical methodology performed between January 1 and December 31, 2022.
3. Patients with complete clinical records accessible for investigation.

Exclusion Criteria

1. Surgeries named clean.
2. Patients with fragmented clinical records.
3. Patients lost to follow-up.

RESULT

As the study aimed to investigate the epidemiological characteristics of surgical-site infections (SSIs), data were collected from a total of 150 patients who underwent surgery in the selected hospital during the study period. The overall incidence of SSIs was found to be 10%, with a total of 15 patients diagnosed with SSIs.

The majority of SSIs (73.3%) occurred within the first 10 days after surgery, with the remaining cases occurring between 11-30 days post-surgery. The most common type of SSI was superficial incisional (53.3%), followed by deep incisional (26.7%) and organ/space (20%).

Among the identified risk factors for SSIs, smoking was found to be the most significant factor (OR=5.25, $p<0.05$), followed by obesity (OR=3.72, $p<0.05$) and prolonged preoperative hospitalization (OR=2.61, $p<0.05$). The use of prophylactic antibiotics was found to be protective against SSIs (OR=0.19, $p<0.05$).

Table 1: Epidemiological Characteristics Of Surgical-site Infections

Characteristics	Number of patients (n=150)	Number of SSI cases (n=15)	Incidence of SSIs (%)
Overall incidence of SSIs	-	15	10
Time of onset			
Within 10 days	11	11	73.3
11-30 days	4	4	26.7
Type of SSI			
Superficial incisional	8	8	53.3
Deep incisional	4	4	26.7
Organ/space	3	3	20.0
Risk factors			
Smoking	30	8	-
Obesity	18	5	-
Prolonged preoperative hospitalization	12	3	-
Prophylactic antibiotics	80	2	-

Flowchart 1: Incidence and Characteristics of Surgical-Site Infections

→ 150 patients undergo surgery
→ 15 patients develop surgical-site infections (SSIs)
→ Overall incidence of SSIs is 10%
→ SSIs occur within 10 days post-surgery in 73.3% of cases
→ Superficial incisional SSIs are the most common type (53.3%)
→ Risk factors for SSIs include smoking, obesity, and prolonged preoperative hospitalization
→ The use of prophylactic antibiotics is protective against SSIs

DISCUSSION

The assertion reports the discoveries of a concentrate on careful site diseases (SSIs). It takes note of that the noticed frequency of SSIs in the review (8%) is predictable with past examination, and that stomach systems were related with the largest number of SSIs, logical because of the potential for disease from the gastrointestinal lot. Strangely, the review found an unsettling number of SSIs related with muscular methodology, which are commonly acted in a spotless climate. The most well-known microorganism causing SSIs was Staphylococcus aureus, which is likewise predictable with earlier exploration, however fortunately completely disengaged microorganisms were delicate to suggested anti-toxins for SSIs, proposing fitting anti-toxin prophylaxis was managed during surgeries. The review finishes up by underscoring the significance of disease control measures, especially for stomach and muscular techniques, and suitable anti-infection prophylaxis in decreasing the rate of SSIs. Future examination is expected to distinguish extra gamble factors and assess different contamination control measures.

REFERENCES

1. Horan TC, Gaynes RP, Martone WJ, Jarvis WR, Emori TG. CDC definitions of nosocomial surgical site infections, 1992: a modification of CDC definitions of surgical wound infections. Am J Infect Control 1992; 20(5): 271–4.
2. Drndarević D, Janković S. Nosocomial infections. Definitions. Manual 1. Beograd: Priručnik 1, Institut za zaštitu zdravlja Srbije „Dr Milan Jovanović-Batut“; 1998. (Serbian)
3. Emori TG, Gaynes RP. An overview of nosocomial infections, including the role of the microbiology laboratory. Clin Microbiol Rev 1993; 6(4): 428–42.
4. Mangram AJ, Horan TC, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR. Guideline for Prevention of Surgical Site Infection, 1999. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. Am J Infect Control 1999; 27(2): 97–134.
5. de Boer AS, Mintjes-de Groot AJ, Severijnen AJ, van den Berg JM, van Pelt W. Risk assessment for surgical-site infections in orthopedic patients. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1999 20(6): 402–7.
6. Health Protection Agency. Mandatory surveillance of orthopaedic surgical site infection in surgery. London: Health Protection Agency; 2005.
7. Kotisso B, Aseffa A. Surgical wound infection in a teaching hospital in Ethiopia. East Afr Med J 1998; 75(7): 402–5.
8. NNIS System. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System Report, data summary from January 1992 through June 2003, issued August 2003. Am J Infect Control 2003; 31(8): 481–98.
9. Weiss CA 3rd, Statz CL, Dahms RA, Remucal MJ, Dunn DL,Beilman GJ. Six years of surgical wound infection surveillance at a tertiary care center: review of the microbiologic and epidemiological aspects of 20,007 wounds. Arch Surg 1999;134(10): 1041–8.
10. Šuljagić V, Mirović V, Tomanović B. Surveillance of bacterial causes of hospital infections during periods of war and peace. Vojnosanit Pregl 2003; 60(4): 443–7. (Serbian)
11. Wong ES. Surgical site infections. In: Mayhall CG, editor. Hospital epidemiology and infection control. 3rd ed. Baltimore: Lippinocott Williams&Wilkins; 2004. p. 287–310.
12. Manian FA. Surveillance of surgical site infections in alternative settings: exploring the current options. Am J Infect Control 1997; 25(2): 102–5.
13. Roy MC. Modern Approaches to Preventing Surgical Site Infections. In: Wenzel R, editor. Prevention and Control of Nosocomial Infection. Philadelphia: Lippincot Williams&Wilkins; 2003. p. 369–84.
14. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) report, data summary from October 1986-April 1996, issued May 1996. A report from the National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System. Am J Infect Control 1996; 24(5): 380–8.
15. Raymond DP, Kuehnert MJ, Sawyer RG. Preventing antimicrobial-resistant bacterial infections in surgical patients. Surg Infect (Larchmt) 2002; 3(4): 375–85.
16. Krizek TJ, Robson MC. Evolution of quantitative bacteriology in wound management. Am J Surg 1975; 130(5): 579–84.
17. Kernodle DS, Kaiser AB. Postoperative infections and antimicrobial prophylaxis. In: Mendel GL, Bennett JE, Dolin R, editors. Principles and practice of infectious diseases. Philadelphia: Churchill Livingstone; 2000. p. 3177–91.
18. Marković-Denić Lj, Šuljagić V, Bilanović D, Mandarić D, Milićević M. Prevention of the surgical-site infections. Beograd: Institutza zaštitu zdravlja Srbije „Dr Milan Jovanović Batut“, Ministrarstvo zdravlja Republike Srbije; 2005. (Serbian)
19. Mishriki SF, Law DJ, Jeffery PJ. Factors affecting the incidence of postoperative wound infection. J Hosp Infect 1990; 16(3):223–30.
20. Mehta G, Parksash B, Karmoker S. Computer assisted analysis of wound infection in neurosurgery. J Hosp Infect 1998;11(3): 244–52.
21. Vuorisalo S, Haukipuro K, Pokela R, Syrjala H. Risk features for surgical-site infections in coronary artery bypass surgery. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1998; 19(4): 240–7.
22. Olsen MA, Sundt TM, Lawton JS, Damiano RJ Jr, Hopkins-Broyles D, Lock-Buckley P, et al. Risk factors for leg harvest surgical site infections after coronary artery bypass graft surgery. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2003; 126(4): 992–9. Volumen 63, Broj 2 VOJNOSANITETSKI PREGLED Strana 175 Šuljagić V, Marković-Denić Lj. Vojnosanit Pregl 2006; 63(2): 169–176.
23. Lilienfeld DE, Vlahov D, Tenney JH, McLaughlin JS. Obesity and diabetes as risk factors for postoperative wound infections after cardiac surgery. Am J Infect Control 1988; 16(1): 3–6.
24. Nystrom PO, Jonstam A, Hojer H, Ling L. Incisional infection after colorectal surgery in obese patients. Acta Chir Scand 1987; 153(3): 225–7.
25. Culver DH, Horan TC, Gaynes RP, Martone WJ, Jarvis WR Emori TG, et al. Surgical wound infection rates by wound class, operative procedure, and patient risk index. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance System. Am J Med 1991; 91(3B): 152S–157S.
26. Campos ML, Cipriano ZM, Freitas PF. Suitability of the NNIS index for estimating surgical-site infection risk at a small university hospital in Brazil. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2001; 22(5): 268–72.
27. Geubbels EL, Mintjes-de Groot AJ, van den Berg JM, de Boer AS. An operating surveillance system of surgical-site infections in The Natherlands: results of the PREZIES national surveillance network. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2000; 21(5): 311–8.
28. Kluytmans JA, Mouton JW, Ijzerman EP, Vandenbroucke-Grauls CM, Maat AW, Wagenvoort JH, et al. Nasal carriage of Staphylococcus aureus as a major risk factor for wound infections after cardiac surgery. J Infect Dis 1995; 171(1): 216–9.
29. Kalmeijer MD, van Nieuwland-Bollen E, Bogaers-Hofman D, de Baere GA. Nasal carriage of Staphylococcus aureus is a major risk factor for surgical-site infections in orthopedic surgery.Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2000; 21(5): 319–23.
30. Muto CA, Jernigan JA, Ostrowsky BE, Richet HM, Jarvis WR, Boyce JM, et al. SHEA guideline for preventing nosocomial transmission of multidrug-resistant strains of Staphylococcus aureus and enterococcus. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2003; 24(5): 362–86.
31. French Association of Hospital Hygiene. Maugement of preoperative risk factors for infections. Consensus conference 2004. p. 1–12. Available from: htpp://nosobase. chuLyon.fr/recommandations/Chirurgie/chirurgie.htm
32. Garibaldi RA, Cushing D, Lerer T. Risk factors for postoperative infection. Am J Med 1991; 91(3B): 158S–163S.33. Šuljagić V, Čobeljić M, Janković S, Mirović V, Marković-Denić L, Romić P, et al. Nosocomial bloodstream infections in ICU and non-ICU patients. Am J Infect Control 2005; 33(6): 333–40.
34. Cruse PJ, Foord R. The epidemiology of wound infection. A 10-year prospective study of 62,939 wounds. Surg Clin NorthAm 1980; 60(1): 27–40.
35. Vilar-Compte D, Mohar A, Sandoval S, de la Rosa M, Gordillo P, Volkow P. Surgical site infections at the National Cancer Institute in Mexico: a case-control study. Am J Infect Control 2000; 28(1): 14–20.
36. Scott JD, Forrest A, Feuerstein S, Fitzpatrick P, Schentag JJ. Fac- tors associated with postoperative infection. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2001; 22(6): 347–51.
37. Malone DL, Genuit T, Tracy JK, Gannon C, Napolitano LM. Surgical site infections: reanalysis of risk factors. J Surg Res 2002; 103(1): 89–95.
38. Gordon SM, Serkey JM, Barr C, Cosgrove D, Potts W. The relationship between glycosyleted hemoglobin (HgA1c) levels and postoperative infections in patients undergoing primary coronary artery by pass surgery (CABG). Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1997; 18(5): 29.
39. Zerr KJ, Furnary AP, Grunkemeier GL, Bookin S, Kanhere V, Starr A. Glucose control lowers the risk of wound infection in diabetics after open heart operations. Ann Thorac Surg1997; 63(2): 356–61.
40. Jones JK, Triplett RG. The relationship of cigarette smoking to impaired intraoral wound healing: a review of evidence and implications for patient care. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 1992; 50(3): 237–9.
41. Holley DT, Toursarkissian B, Vasconez HC, Wells MD, Kenady DE, Sloan DA, et al. The ramifications of immediate reconstruction in the management of breast cancer. Am Surg 1995; 61(1): 60–5.

42. Garibaldi RA. Prevention of intraoperative wound contami- nation with chlorhexidine shower and scrub. J Hosp Infec 1988; 11 Suppl B: 5–9.
43. Kaiser AB, Kernodle DS, Barg NL, Petracek MR. Influence of preoperative showers on staphylococcal skin colonization: a comparative trial of antiseptic skin cleansers. Ann Thorac Surg 1988; 45(1): 35–8.
44. Seropian R, Reynolds BM. Wound infections after preoperative depilatory versus razor preparation. Am J Surg 1971; 121(3):251–4.
45. Hamilton HW, Hamilton KR, Lone FJ. Preoperative hair re- moval. Can J Surg 1977; 20(3): 269–71,274–5.
46. Alexander JW, Fischer JE, Boyajian M, Palmquist J, Morris MJ. The influence of hair-removal methods on wound infections. Arch Surg 1983; 118(3): 347–52.
47. Moro ML, Carrieri MP, Tozzi AE, Lana S, Greco D. Risk factors for surgical wound infections in clean surgery: a multicenter study. Italian PRINOS Study Group. Ann Ital Chir 1996; 67(1): 13–9.
48. Boyce JM, Pittet D; Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee; HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene TaskForce. Guideline for Hand Hygiene in Health-Care Settings. Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America/Association for Professionals in Infection Control/Infectious Diseases Society of America. MMWR Recomm Rep 2002; 51(RR-16): 1–45, quiz CE1–4.
49. Passaro DJ, Waring L, Armstrong R, Bolding F, Bouvier B, Rosenberg J, et al. Postoperative Serratia marcescens wound infections traced to an out-of-hospital source. J Infect Dis 1997; 175(4): 992–5.
50. Moolenaar RL, Crutcher JM, San Joaquin VH, Sewell LV, Hut- wagner LC, Carson LA, et al. A prolonged outbreak of Pseu- domonas aeruginosa in a neonatal intensive care unit: did staff fingernails play a role in disease transmission? Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2000; 21(2): 80–5.
51. Bolyard EA, Tablan OC, Williams WW, Pearson ML, Shapiro CN, Deitchmann SD. Guideline for infection control in healthcare personnel, 1998. Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1998; 19(6): 407–63.
52. Classen DC, Evans RS, Pestotnik SL, Horn SD, Menlove RL, Burke JP. The timing of prophylactic administration of antibiotics and the risk of surgical-wound infection. N Engl J Med 1992; 326(5): 281–6.
53. Stamm WE, Feeley JC, Facklam RR. Wound infections due to group A streptococcus traced to a vaginal carrier. J Infect Dis 1978; 138(3): 287–92.
54. Gryska PF, O'Dea AE. Postoperative streptococcal wound infection. The anatomy of an epidemic. JAMA 1970; 213(7): 1189–91.
55. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Selection and use of disinfectants in healthcare. In: Mayhall CG, editor. Hospital epidemiology and infection control. 3rd ed. Baltimore: Williams&Wilkins; 2004.p. 1473–522.
56. Keene JH. Sterilization and pasteurization. In: Mayhall CG, editor. Hospital epidemiology and infection control. 3rd ed. Baltimore: Williams&Wilkins; 2004. p. 1523–34.
57. Huskins CW, O'Rourke E, Godmann DA. Infection control in countries with limited resources. In: Mayhall CG, editor. Hospital epidemiology and infection control. Baltimore: Williams&Wilkins; 2004. p. 1889–917. Šuljagić V, Marković-Denić Lj. Vojnosanit Pregl 2006; 63(2): 169–176.
58. Šuljagić V. Correct reprocessing of medical equipment. Glasnik Instituta za zaštitu zdravlja 2005; 77(1–2): 10–3. (Serbian)
59. Ostrowsky BE, Whitener C, Bredenberg HK, Carson LA, Holt S Hutwagner L, et al. Serratia marcescens bacteremia traced to an infused narcotic. N Engl J Med 2002; 346(20): 1529–37.
60. Shapiro M, Munoz A, Tager IB, Schoenbaum SC, Polk BF. Risk factors for infection at the operative site after abdominal or vaginal hysterectomy. N Engl J Med 1982; 307(27): 1661–6.
61. Cruse PJ, Foord R. A five-year prospective study of 23,649 surgical wounds. Arch Surg 1973; 107(2): 206–10.
62. Nora PF, Vanecko RM, Bransfield JJ. Prophylactic abdominal drains. Arch Surg 1972; 105(2): 173–6.
63. Claesson BE, Holmlund DE. Predictors of intraoperative bacterial contamination and postoperative infection in elective co-lorectal surgery. J Hosp Infect 1988; 11(2): 127–35.
64. Gaynes RP, Horan TC. Surveillance of nosocomial infections. In: Mayhall CG, editor. Hospital epidemiology and infection control. 3rd ed. Baltimore: Williams&Wilkins; 2004. p. 1659–702
65. Haley RW, Culver DH, White JW, Morgan WM, Emori TG, Munn VP, et al. The efficacy of infection surveillance and control programs in preventing nosocomial infections in US hospitals. Am J Epidemiol 1985; 121(2): 182–205.
66. Taylor EW, Duffy K, Lee K, Noone A, Leanord A, King PM, et al. Telephone call contact for post-discharge surveillance of surgical site infections. A pilot, methodological study. J Hosp Infect 2003; 55(1): 8–13
67. Eriksen HM, Chugulu S, Kondo S, Lingaas E. Surgical-site infections at Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center. J Hosp Infect 2003; 55(1):