



## Infection complicating 794 primary and revision arthroscopies. Accuracy of actual prophylactic procedures against infection and results from a single orthopedic centre in Poland.

**Introduction**: Septic arthritis after arthroscopy (SAAA) is a devastating complication which reported frequency varies about **0,04%** - **5,7%**. The aim of the study is to analyze frequency of SAAA at one orthopedic center, risk factors and accuracy of actual prophylactic measures.

**Methods:** A retrospective study includes 794 (665 primary and 129 revision) "clean" arthroscopies performed in the years 2017-2018 with confirmed joint infection during 30 days after operation without the use of non-resorbable implants and up to 1 year after procedures with non-resorbable implants. Demographic and medical data about potential risk factors of SAAA were analyzed: patients age, sex, operated joint, type of procedure, primary or revision procedure, the use of drains, usage of non-absorbable implant, time of surgery, BMI, time lapse from index operation to diagnosis of SAAA, length of hospital stay, causative microorganisms.

Table 1.								
	Total	Knee	Shoulder	Hip	Ankle	Wrist	MTP joint	Elbow
Number of analyzed cases	794	644	65	52	22	6	3	2
Age (mean, SD, range)	37,19±15,8 (7-79)	36,51±15,9 (7-79)	42,63±16,91 (15-78)	36,81±10,7 (14- 65)	43,77±14,9 (23-78)	27,33±14,4 (13-52)	46,67±10,4 (37-61)	16,5±11,5 (15-38)
Sex	F274:M520	F226:M418	F16:M49	F16:M49	F6:M16	F4:M2	F1:M2	F0:M2
Primary Revision	83,8% (665 <u>vs</u> . 129)	81,5% (525 <u>vs</u> . 119)	100% (65 vs.0)	100% (52vs.0)	63,63%% (14vs.8)	100% (6vs.0)	100% (3vs.0)	100% (2vs.0)
The use of nonabsorbable implant (%)	55,8% (443vs.351)	54,66%(352vs.292)	72,31%(47vs.18)	72,31%(47vs.18)	0%(0vs.22)	0%(0vs.6)	0%(0vs.3)	0%(0vs.2)
The use of drains (%)	85,26% (677 <u>vs</u> . 117)	99,38% (640vs.4)	21,54% (14vs.51)	21,54% (14vs.51)	95,45%% (21vs.1)	0% (0vs.6)	0% (0vs.3)	0%(0vs.2)
Time of surgery (mean, SD, range)	1:25±00:48 (00:15- 5:35)	1:20±00:49(00:15- 5:35)	1:25±00:47 (00:30-3:20)	1:58±00:30 (01:15-3:20)	1:43±00:39 (00:45- 3:20)	1:14±00:13 (00:55- 01:30)	00:52±00:09 (00:40- 01:00)	1:00±00:20 (00:40- 01:20)
BMI (mean, SD, range)	25,3±4,48 (14-45,44)	25,15±4,33 (14- 45,44)	26,56±5,4(17,4- 39,8)	25,2±4,34(17,2- 38,06)	27,12±5,14 (19,7-40,6)	23,77±2,37 (21,4-28,3)	22,05±4,51 (18,38-28,4)	24,47±5,37 (19,1- 29,83)
Length of stay in the hospital (mean, SD, range)	2,12±0,94 (1-8)	2,15±0,93 (1-7)	2±1,13 (1-8)	1,87±0,7 (1-3)	2,41±0,83 (1-4)	1,5±0,5 (1- 2)	2,33±0,47 (2-3)	2±0 (2)

Table 2. Demographic data, details of surgery, risk factors for SAAA in infected cases MB EW HG Area of the body, procedure shoulder, knee knee, knee, arthrolysis arthrolysis ACL rotator cuff reconstruction reconstruct 50 Age 63 M м F Primary/revision primary revision revision revisio Using of nonabsorbable no no yes yes mplant Using of drains no 01:45 01:20 Time of surgery 01:30 03:20 BMI 26,6 26 21,9 30 Length of stay in the hospital Onset of infection from 7 days 13 days 47 days 5 month 2 weeks athogen Staphylococcus Propionibacteriun unknow ubau

Details: All operations were performed by eight different but experienced surgeons, in operation theatre with vertical laminar flow with the capacity of 50 air exchanges per hour. All patients were prepared to the operation according the same protocol. Prior to the surgery they took a shower with the use of the antimicrobial soap with octenidine dihydrochloride. Hair removal with a clipper was performed only if absolutely necessary. We used alcohol-based antiseptic solutions for surgical site skin preparation in the operation theatre. The antibiotic prophylaxis was administrated to every patient according to the internal protocol of perioperative prophylaxis based on national and international recommendations. The patients received Biofazolinum 1 g intravenous (or 2g if their weight was over 80 kg or they have another indications to elevate the dose) in 30 minutes prior to clamping the Esmarch band (if used) and skin incision. In case of the use of non-absorbable implant during the operation (55,8% of patients), the antibiotic prophylaxis was prolonged to 24 hours. These patients got two additional doses of Biofazolinum 1 g in 8 and 16 hours after the first dose.

	Without infection (n = 790)		$\frac{\text{Infected}}{(n=4)}$				95% Cl		
	М	SD	М	SD	t	p	LL	UL	d Cohena
Age	37,15	15,81	45,25	15,48	-1,02	0,307	-23,65	7,46	0,51
BMI	25,30	4,49	26,15	3,36	-0,38	0,706	-5,26	3,56	0,19
Time of surgery	84,85	47,88	118,75	55,13	-1,41	0,158	-81,04	13,24	0,71
Length of stay in the hospital	2,11	0,92	4,50	2,52	-1,90	0,154	-6,39	1,62	2,57

Table 4.	Without infection (n = 641)		$\frac{\text{Infected}}{(n=3)}$					∋5% <i>CI</i>		
	м	SD	м	SD	t	ŀ	. 1	L	UL	d Cohena
Age	36,52	15,5	3 39	33 12	,22 -0	,31 (	,760 -	20,90	15,27	0,18
BMI	25,16	4,34	24	83 2,5	6 0,	13 (	,898 -	4,61	5,25	0,07
Time of surgery	80,64	49,0	2 91	67 12	,58 -0	,39 (	,697 -	66,65	44,60	0,23
Longth of stay in the bosnital	2.15	0.04	2 2	2 11	5 .2	19 (	029 -	2 25	0 12	1 26
able 5. Comparison of 129 re	evision an	d 665	non-re	evision	cases w	ith reg	ard to p	atients	age, B	MI, time
able 5. Comparison of 129 re urgery and hospital stay. Table 5.	evision an	d 665 riman n = 66	i non-re ( 5)	Revision (n = 1)	cases w	ith reg	ard to p	95% C	age, B	MI, time
Fable 5. Comparison of 129 re surgery and hospital stay. Table 5.	evision an	d 665 riman n = 66	i non-re ( 5) SD	Revision (n = 1) M	cases w in 29) SD	ith reg	ard to p	95% C	age, B	MI, time
Fable 5. Comparison of 129 re urgery and hospital stay. Table 5.	evision an P ( M 3	d 665 riman n = 66 1 8,14	( 5) 5D 16,31	Revision ( (n = 1) M 32,29	cases w (29) SD 11,81	ith reg t 4,80	p <0,00	95% C	age, B	d Coher 0,37
Table 5. Comparison of 129 re aurgery and hospital stay. Table 5.	evision an P ( M 3 2	d 665 riman n = 66 f 8,14 5,41	( 5) 5D 16,31 4,50	Revision (n = 12 M 32,29 24,75	cases w (1) (29) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3	t 1,52	p <0,000 0,130	95% C	age, B 7 UL 8,24 1,50	d Coher 0,37 0,15
Table 5. Comparison of 129 re urgery and hospital stay. Table 5. Age BMI Time of surgery	evision an P ( M 3 2 8	d 665 riman n = 66 4 8,14 5,41 2,51	( 5) 5D 16,31 4,50 45,11	Revision of (n = 1: M 32,29 24,75 97,95	cases w 29) 5D 11,81 4,39 59,00	t 4,80 1,52 -2,82	p <0,005 0,130 0,005	95% C LL 3,45 -0,19 -26,26	UL 8,24 1,50 5 -4,6	d Coher 0,37 0,15 1 0,32

**Results:** From 794 cases 4 have been infected: 2 after knee arthrolysis, one after ACL reconstruction and one after rotator cuff repair. There were 2 early, with manifestation within 30 days, and 2 late-onset SAAA. Infections occurred in **0,5% of all arthroscopies** and in 0,47% of knee arthroscopies alone. Patients age and time of surgery have not been found significantly different in infected and non-infected cases, whereas age and time of surgery have been significantly different in revision and non-revision cases.

**Conclusions:** Primarily aseptic arthroscopic procedures performed with respect to actual perioperative preventive measures have a low risk of postoperative septic arthritis. The risk increases with patients age and time of operation, but not significantly.