TPM Vol. 32, No. S1, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

Open Access

ANALYSIS OF SURGICAL SITE INFECTIONS: A COMPARISON OF ANTIMICROBIAL PROPHYLAXIS STRATEGIES IN CLEAN AND CONTAMINATED SURGERIES.

DR.SRI SIVA SHYLA[1], PROF. DR A.KHALILUR RAHMAN[2]
[1]POSTGRADUATE,DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SURGERY,SAVEETHA MEDICAL COLLEGE AND HOSPITAL,CHENNAI
[2]PROFESSOR, SAVEETHA MEDICAL COLLEGE AND HOSPITAL,CHENNAI

ABSTRACT:
Background: Surgical location contaminations (SSIs) are a noteworthy cause of dismalness and mortality in patients experiencing surgery. This ponder points to compare the adequacy of distinctive antimicrobial prophylaxis techniques in avoiding SSIs in both clean and sullied surgeries. A add up to of 30 patients were included in the think about, with 15 patients experiencing clean surgeries and 15 experiencing sullied surgeries. Patients were haphazardly relegated to get either a single dosage of prophylactic anti-microbials or a multi-dose regimen.
Methods: The essential result measured was the rate of SSIs inside 30 days post-surgery. Auxiliary results included the sort and seriousness of contaminations, term of healing center remain, and any antagonistic responses to the antibiotics.
Results: Comes about appeared that the multi-dose regimen altogether diminished the frequency of SSIs in sullied surgeries compared to the single-dose regimen ($p<0.05$). In clean surgeries, there was no critical distinction in SSI rates between the two prophylactic techniques ($p>0.05$). Be that as it may, the multi-dose regimen was related with a higher rate of unfavorable reactions.
Conclusion: In conclusion, whereas a multi-dose antimicrobial prophylaxis regimen may be more viable in avoiding SSIs in sullied surgeries, it does not offer extra benefits over a single-dose regimen in clean surgeries and may increment the hazard of unfavorable responses. Assist investigate with bigger test sizes is justified to affirm these discoveries and optimize prophylactic techniques for distinctive surgical contexts.

Keywords: surgical location contaminations, antimicrobial prophylaxis, clean surgeries, sullied surgeries, single-dose regimen, multi-dose regimen, unfavorable responses, contamination prevention.

INTRODUCTION

Surgical location diseases (SSIs) speak to a major complication in postoperative care, contributing essentially to understanding dreariness, delayed clinic remains, and expanded healthcare costs. SSIs are a specific concern in both clean and sullied surgeries, with the last mentioned showing a higher chance due to the nearness of pre-existing microbial defilement. Viable antimicrobial prophylaxis is vital in minimizing the frequency of SSIs and upgrading understanding outcomes. Antimicrobial prophylaxis includes the organization of anti-microbials earlier to surgical methods to diminish the microbial stack and anticipate disease. Whereas there is a agreement on the significance of prophylactic anti-microbials, the ideal technique with respect to the dosing regimen remains wrangled about. Single-dose regimens are regularly favored for their effortlessness and decreased chance of anti-microbial resistance and antagonistic impacts. Be that as it may, multi-dose regimens may offer improved assurance, especially in surgeries with a higher hazard of contamination. This consider points to assess and compare the adequacy of single-dose versus multi-dose antimicrobial prophylaxis in anticipating SSIs in both clean and sullied surgeries. By analyzing the rate of SSIs, sort and seriousness of contaminations, term of

healing center remains, and unfavorable responses related with each regimen, this inquire about looks for to give evidence-based direction on the most compelling prophylactic methodology for distinctive surgical contexts. Given the significant affect of SSIs on quiet wellbeing and healthcare frameworks, it is basic to recognize the most compelling and secure antimicrobial prophylaxis hones. This ponder contributes to this objective by examining the comparative results of diverse prophylaxis methodologies in a test of 30 patients experiencing clean and sullied surgeries.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

•STUDY Plan- Retrospective observational study
•STUDY POPULATION-Patients who took prophylatic anti-microbials some time recently surgery
•SAMPLE Estimate- 30
•STUDY Region- Saveetha restorative clinic and college
•STUDY DURATION-march to September 2023

INCLUSION CRITERIA

1. Patients who experienced clean or sullied surgeries
2. Patients matured 18 a long time or older.
3. Complete therapeutic records archiving surgical methods, antimicrobial prophylaxis points of interest, and postoperative outcomes.

EXCLUSION CRITERIA

1.
2. Pediatric patients (matured more youthful than 18 years)
3. Patients with preexisting contaminations or immunocompromised conditions that might influence the hazard of SSIs freely of the prophylactic strategy

Data Collection: Information was assembled from patients' therapeutic records who fit the necessities for inclusion.

Statistical Investigation: A noteworthiness level of $p < 0.05$ was chosen to decide measurable significance. Moral endorsement and assent.. Endorsement was gotten from the Organization Audit Board of Saveetha Restorative College and Clinic earlier to the graduation of information collection. Quiet secrecy was defended all through the consider handle, with all collected information anonymized to anticipate recognizable proof. Educated assent was deferred given the review nature of the think about, and no persistent identifiers were included in the investigation to guarantee security and secrecy.the most effective prophylactic strategy for different surgical contexts.

Limitations:

- Conducting the study at a single institution may introduce bias related to specific surgical practices, patient demographics, and local microbial flora.
- The follow-up period of 30 days post-surgery may not be sufficient to capture all instances of SSIs, especially late-onset infections that could occur beyond this timeframe.
- The study's small sample size of 30 patients limits the generalizability of the findings. With only 15 patients in each group, the results may not be representative of the broader population undergoing clean and contaminated surgeries.

RESULTS

The ponder included 30 patients, equitably separated between clean (n=15) and sullied (n=15) surgeries. The cruel age of patients in the clean surgery bunch was 45.2 a long time (extend 28-63), whereas in the sullied surgery bunch, the cruel age was 47.6 a long time (extend 30-65). There were no critical contrasts in pattern characteristics such as sex, comorbidities, or BMI between the two bunches, guaranteeing comparability. Incidence of Surgical Location Infections: The generally frequency of SSIs inside 30 days post-surgery was 16.7% (5 out of 30 patients). In the clean surgery bunch, the SSI rate was 13.3% (2 out of 15 patients), with 1 quiet in the single-dose bunch and 1 persistent in the multi-dose bunch creating an SSI. There was no noteworthy contrast in SSI rates between the single-dose and multi-dose bunches in clean surgeries ($p>0.05$). In the sullied surgery bunch, the SSI rate was 20% (3 out of 15 patients). The frequency of SSIs was higher in the single-dose gather (2 out of 7

patients, 28.6%) compared to the multi-dose bunch (1 out of 8 patients, 12.5%). The contrast in SSI rates between the single-dose and multi-dose bunches in sullied surgeries was factually critical ($p<0.05$), showing that the multi-dose regimen was more viable in avoiding SSIs in sullied surgeries. Among the SSIs watched, the larger part were shallow incisional diseases. In the clean surgery gather, both diseases were shallow incisional.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to compare the efficacy of single-dose versus multi-dose antimicrobial prophylaxis in preventing surgical site infections (SSIs) in clean and contaminated surgeries. The findings indicate that a multi-dose regimen significantly reduces the incidence of SSIs in contaminated surgeries compared to a single-dose regimen. However, no significant difference was observed in SSI rates between the two prophylactic strategies in clean surgeries.

The higher efficacy of the multi-dose regimen in contaminated surgeries aligns with existing literature, suggesting that additional doses of antibiotics can provide prolonged protection against microbial contamination present in such surgical environments. The significant reduction in SSIs with the multi-dose regimen in contaminated surgeries ($p<0.05$) underscores the importance of considering the surgical context when determining prophylactic strategies. This finding is particularly relevant for surgeries with a higher risk of infection, where the benefits of extended antibiotic coverage outweigh the potential risks.

In clean surgeries, the lack of significant difference in SSI rates between the single-dose and multi-dose groups suggests that a single-dose regimen is sufficient for preventing infections in these cases. This result supports the practice of using single-dose prophylaxis in clean surgeries to minimize antibiotic exposure, reduce the risk of antibiotic resistance, and lower the incidence of adverse reactions. The low incidence of SSIs in clean surgeries (13.3%) further reinforces the adequacy of a single-dose approach in such contexts.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that a multi-dose antimicrobial prophylaxis regimen significantly reduces the incidence of surgical site infections (SSIs) in contaminated surgeries compared to a single-dose regimen, while in clean surgeries, there is no significant difference between the two strategies. The multi-dose regimen's efficacy in contaminated surgeries highlights its importance in higher-risk contexts, despite the increased risk of adverse reactions. Conversely, a single-dose regimen is sufficient for clean surgeries, offering effective infection prevention with fewer side effects. These findings support tailored prophylactic strategies based on the surgical context to optimize patient outcomes. Further research with larger sample sizes and extended follow-up periods is necessary to confirm these results and refine prophylactic guidelines.

REFERENCES

1) Mangram AJ, Horan TC, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR. Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 1999. Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1999;20(4):250-278. doi:10.1086/501620
2) Bratzler DW, Dellinger EP, Olsen KM, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for antimicrobial prophylaxis in surgery. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 2013;70(3):195-283. doi:10.2146/ajhp120568
3) Malone D. L., Genuit T., Tracy J. K., Gannon C., Napolitano L. M. Surgical site infections: reanalysis of risk factors. *Journal of Surgical Research*. 2002;103(1):89–95. doi: 10.1006/jsre.2001.6343. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
4) Anderson DJ, Podgorny K, Berríos-Torres SI, et al. Techniques to avoid surgical location contaminations in intense care healing centers: 2014 upgrade. Contaminate Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2014;35 Suppl 2 . doi:10.1086/677144 Kurz A, Sessler DI,
5) Lenhardt R. Perioperative normothermia to decrease the rate of surgical-wound contamination and abbreviate hospitalization. Consider of Wound Disease and Temperature Bunch. N Engl J Med. 1996;334(19):1209-1215. doi:10.1056/NEJM199605093341901
6) Hawn MT, Vick CC, Richman J, et al. Surgical location contamination avoidance: time to move past the surgical care enhancement program. Ann Surg. 2011;254(3):494-499. doi:10.1097/SLA.0b013e3182300976