

Preoperative Screening And Preparation Of Patients For Orthopedic Surgery

L. Janashvili¹, T. Didbaridze², Gogoladze M.³, Zaalishvili Z.⁴

¹New Vision Medical University, PhD student (Georgia)

²TSMUMicrobiology department, Associate Professor MD, PhD (Georgia)

³New Vision Medical University, Associate Professor, MD, PhD (Georgia)

⁴AmericanMD program of Tbilisi State Medical University, Georgia.



Abstract

Introduction: *Staphylococcus aureus* is a major pathogen implicated in orthopedic infections worldwide. Preoperative decolonization has been promoted but different strategies present mixed results. *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) is an independent risk factor for orthopedic surgical site infection (SSI). We studied whether or not local treatment with bacteriophage could eliminate nasal colonization with *S. aureus*.

Materials and Methods: A total of 696 patients were screened for *S. aureus* nasal colonization between 2017–2021 at a single institution. There were 23% (159 patients) initially *S. aureus* colonization preoperatively. They were decolonized with various medications: I group – with Mupirocin 35% (56), II group- with bacteriophage 65% - (103). In the II group *Pyo* bacteriophage were including 32% (33) and *Staphylococcal* bacteriophage 68% (70). After treatment, bacteriological control was done post-decolonization on the 5th–8th days. MSSA persisted in 4% (7). Five patients who were persistently colonized for MSSA were not compliant with the decolonization protocol. There were 2 patients who had undergone decolonization and were persistently positive for MSSA at the time of surgery.

Results: Decolonization of orthopedic surgical patients using the bacteriophage into nasal is a practical and effective regimen for reducing MSSA and MRSA surgical site infections, treatment processes were without any post-decolonization complications.

Conclusion: We hope the bacteriophage will be successfully used in the practice of decolonization *S. aureus* and this therapy will reduce the resistant *S. aureus* to mupirocin.

Keywords – *Staphylococcus aureus*; MSSA/ MRSA orthopedic surgery; bacteriophage.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rate of *Staphylococcus aureus* colonization in the nares of the general population is reported to be as high as 30% (1). In addition, genotyping studies reveal that as high as 80% of *S. aureus* infections are caused by the patient's own nasal flora (2). Furthermore, there is an association between the presence of nasal *S. aureus* and an increased risk of surgical site infection (SSI), which has been extensively demonstrated in orthopedic surgery *Staphylococcus aureus* colonization in the nares of patients undergoing elective orthopedic surgery increases the potential risk of surgical site infections (3). Methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) has gained recognition as a pathogen that is no longer only just a hospital-acquired pathogen. Patients positive for MRSA are associated with higher rates of morbidity and mortality following infection. MRSA is commonly found in the nares, and

methicillin-sensitive *S. aureus* (MSSA) is even more prevalent(4). A nasal mupirocin treatment is shown to significantly reduce the colonization of the pathogen. However, this treatment is expensive. Thus, in this study, we first sought to determine the prevalence of MSSA/MSRA in patients undergoing elective orthopedic surgery and then, we treated the positive patients with a nasal bacteriophage. Here, we demonstrate a successful reduction in the colonization of *S. aureus*. We propose that this treatment could serve as a cost-effective means of eradicating this pathogen in patients undergoing elective orthopedic surgery, which might reduce the rate of surgical site infections and also treatment with bacteriophages will be reduce the AMR of *S. aureus*.

Surgical site infection (SSI) is an infrequent but serious complication of total joint arthroplasty (TJA) (5), with rates ranging from 0.2% for primary total hip arthroplasty to 1.5% for total knee arthroplasty (6,7]. Orthopedic SSIs cause substantial morbidity, prolonging hospital stay by a median of 2 weeks, doubling re hospitalization rates, and more than tripling overall healthcare costs (8). Nasal decolonization of methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* (MSSA) and methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) is currently used in some countries for specific patient groups(9,10).

Aim of this study was determination of effectiveness broad spectrum lytic phage as a decolonizing agent for the nasal colonization.

II. MATERIAL AND METHODS

A total of 696 (564 total hips, 132 total knees) patients were screened for *S.aureus* nasal colonization preoperatively between 2017– 2021 at a single institution. Patients were screened for *S. aureus* colonization, on average, 19 days (range: 2–3 weeks) prior to surgery. 22.8% (159) patients were colonized with MSSA, and no one with MRSA. Colonized patient demographics were as follows: 71 females, 88 males, Average age = 61 years, Average body mass index = 30.1

Samples were collected from both nares on a single swab. The inside circumference of each anterior nares was rubbed for 3 to 5 seconds to obtain adequate sampling. *S. aureus* strains were identified throughout conventional methods, based on phenotypic properties: morphology, Gram stain, coagulase (Pastorex™ Staph plus, Bio-Rad, France) and catalase test. Specimens were inoculated onto Blood agar plate and mannitol salt agar plate, which were incubated for 18 to 24 hours at 35°C to 37°C. Negative plates were incubated for an additional 24 hours. The identification of the isolated *S. aureus* strains was made also throughout semiautomatic (Api Staph Bio Merieux) system. Yellow color on mannitol- salt media were reported as *Staphylococcus aureus*. All isolates were tested using conventional methods -the **Cefoxitin** disk diffusion. The antibiotic susceptibility testing was performed throughout the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method using antibiotic discs from Bio-Rad (France). The phages susceptibility testing was performed according to the SOP provided by the G. Eliava Institute of Bacteriophages, Microbiology and Virology (Georgia).

Colonized patients, depends on local susceptibility test results, were treated with bacteriophage (Pyo bacteriophage and *Staphylococcal* bacteriophage - Eliava Institute of Bacteriophages Georgia) according to manufacturer instructions. Among the 159 *Staphylococcus aureus* 154 (97 %) were *Staphylococcal* bacteriophage susceptible and 5 (3 %) resistant. With Pyo bacteriophage were susceptible 28% (45).

In case of resistance to the phage and other cases Mupirocin applied to the anterior nares twice daily for five days. In case of resistance to the Mupirocin, phage applied to the anterior nares twice or third daily for five days.

Among the 159 *Staphylococcus aureus* 153 (96 %) were mupirocin susceptible and 6 (4 %) resistant by 5µg disc diffusion method. After treatment, MSSA persisted in only 7 patients. Five patient who was persistently colonized for MSSA was not compliant with the decolonization protocol. There were 2 patients who had undergone decolonization and were persistently positive for MSSA at the time of surgery. Nasal colonization was eliminated in 96% of colonized patients. Bacteriophage was well tolerated with no side effects noted.

For a total of 159 strains, the antibiotic susceptibility testing was performed throughout the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method using antibiotic discs from Bio-Rad, for Antibiotics: β-lactams, Macrolides (Erythromycin, Clarithromycin), Glycopeptides (Vancomycin, Teicoplanin, Lincosamides (Clindamycin, L) Oxazolidones (Linezolid), Aminoglycosides: (Gentamicin, Amikacin, Tobramycin), Quinolones, Tetracyclines, Cotrimoxazole (Sulphamethoxazol & Thrimetoprim (SXT). Interpretation: European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing documents. The rate of methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* prevalence were determined by Cefoxitin (30µg) disk diffusion method. We interpreted Mupirocin susceptibility by Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) susceptibility documents (10,11).

III. RESULTS

The decolonization treatment was given for 5 days before the surgery. After treatment course, all patients (159 the patients that were positive for MSSA) were screened again to determine whether the MSSA was decolonized from the patients' nostrils. The result from showed that 7 patients were positive for MSSA colonization, showing a 96 % successful decolonization. However, 7 patients were positive for MSSA colonization.

Decolonization of orthopedic surgical patients using the bacteriophage intro nasal is a practical and effective regimen for reducing MSSA and MRSA surgical site infections, and also treatment with bacteriophages will be reduce the resistant *S. aureus* to mupirocin.

IV. CONCLUSION

1. Phage was able to significantly reduce MSSA strains on patients nasal epithelial cells
2. Phage, given along was able to effectively eradicate the colonizing MSSA population from the nares of patients by day 5.
3. Use of bacteriophage for decolonize the nose of MSSA will be beneficial, especially when bacterial resistance to mupirocin is rising, and so it will become less effective.
4. Staphylococcal bacteriophage may be useful in controlling nasal colonization with *S. Aureus* in the health care settings

REFERENCES

- [1] Whitehouse JD, Friedman ND, Kirkland KB, Richardson WJ, Sexton DJ. The impact of surgical-site infections following orthopedic surgery at a community hospital and a university hospital: adverse quality of life, excess length of stay, and extra cost. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2002; 23: 183–189, doi: 10.1086/502033.
- [2] Berthelot P, Grattard F, Cazorla C, Passot JP, Fayard JP, Meley R, et al. Is nasal carriage of *Staphylococcus aureus* the main acquisition pathway for surgical-site infection in orthopaedic surgery? *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2010; 29: 373–382, doi: 10.1007/s10096-009-0867-5.
- [3] National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System report, data summary from October 1986-April 1998, issued June 1998. *Am J Infect Control*. 1998;26:522–533. [PubMed]
- [4] Hervey SL, Purves HR, Guller U, Toth AP, Vail TP, Pietrobon R. Provider volume of total knee arthroplasties and patient outcomes in the HCUP-Nationwide Inpatient Sample. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2003;85:1775–1783. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [5] Mahomed NN, Barrett JA, Katz JN, Phillips CB, Losina E, Lew RA, Guadagnoli E, Harris WH, Poss R, Baron JA. Rates and outcomes of primary and revision total hip replacement in the United States Medicare population. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2003;85:27–32
- [6] Whitehouse JD, Friedman ND, Kirkland KB, Richardson WJ, Sexton DJ. The impact of surgical-site infections following orthopedic surgery at a community hospital and a university hospital: adverse quality of life, excess length of stay, and extra cost. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2002;23:183–189. doi: 10.1086/502033
- [7] Avr Jeya Sanju , Sridharan Sathyamoorthy Kopula , Kennedy Kumar Palraj Screening for Mupirocin Resistance in *Staphylococcus*. PMID: 26557517 PMCID: PMC4625236 DOI: 10.7860/JCDR/2015/15230.6678 Free PMC article
- [8] Alverdy JC, Hyman N, Gilbert J. Re-examining causes of surgical site infections following elective surgery in the era of asepsis. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
- [9] Pelfort X, Romero A, Brugues M, et al. Reduction of periprosthetic *Staphylococcus aureus* infection by preoperative screening and decolonization of nasal carriers undergoing total knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc*. 2019;53(6):426–31.
- [10] Liu Z, Norman G, Ihezor-Ejiofor Z, et al. Nasal decontamination for the prevention of surgical site infection in *Staphylococcus aureus* carriers. *Cochrane Database System Rev*. 2017;5:CD012462

- [11] Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2019;10:ED000142
- [12] Shrem G, Egozi T, Naeh .A, et al. Pre-cesarean *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal screening and decolonization: a prospective randomized controlled trial. J Mater-Fetal Neonatal Med. 2016;29(23):3906–11.