

Povidone-iodine-alcohol is superior to chlorhexidine-alcohol in its antimicrobial efficacy on the anaerobic microbial flora in surgical skin preparation of the shoulder Region

Dorothea Dörfel

Universitätsmedizin Greifswald

Georg Daeschlein

MVZ Dessau

Matthias Maiwald

National University Singapore Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine

Gerald Müller

Universitätsmedizin Greifswald

Robert Hudek

Rhön-Klinikum AG, Shoulder and Elbow

Ojan Assadian

Landeskrankenhaus Neunkirchen

Günther Kampf

Universitätsmedizin Greifswald

Thomas Kohlmann

Universitätsmedizin Greifswald

Julian-Camill Haross

Universitätsmedizin Heidelberg

Axel Kramer (✉ kramer@uni-greifswald.de)

Universitätsmedizin Greifswald <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4193-2149>

Research

Keywords: Skin antisepsis, shoulder surgery, chlorhexidine, povidone-iodine, alcohol

Posted Date: June 23rd, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-37611/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published on January 22nd, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-020-00874-8>.

Abstract

Background

Cutibacterium acnes is part of the anaerobic skin microbiome and resides in deeper skin layers. The organism is an agent of surgical site infections (SSI) in shoulder surgery and is difficult to target with skin antisepsis. We hypothesized that prolonged preparation with an agent that penetrates more deeply into the skin is more effective in shoulder surgery. Thus, we compared two different classes of antiseptics, each combined with alcohol, and each applied with two different contact times.

Methods

Using a cross-over study design, shoulders of 16 healthy volunteers were treated for 2.5 min (standard) or 30 min (prolonged) with alcohol-based chlorhexidine (CHG-ALC; 2% w/v CHG, 55% w/v [70% v/v] 2-propanol) or alcohol-based povidone-iodine (PVP-I-ALC; 3.24% w/v PVP-I, 38.9% w/v 2-propanol, 37.3% w/v ethanol). Skin sites were sampled before, immediately after, and 3 h after treatment, using a standardized cup-scrub technique.

Results

Aerobic skin flora was reduced more effectively by PVP-I-ALC than by CHG-ALC after 2.5 min application and immediate sampling (reduction factor [RF] 2.55 ± 0.75 vs. 1.94 ± 0.91 , $p = 0.04$), but not after prolonged contact times and 3-h sampling. Coagulase-negative staphylococci were completely eliminated after PVP-I-ALC application, but still recovered from 3 of 16 and 1 of 16 samples after 2.5-min and 30-min CHG-ALC application and immediate sampling, respectively. Anaerobic flora, mostly consisting of *C. acnes*, was reduced more effectively by PVP-I-ALC than by CHG-ALC after standard (RF 3.96 ± 1.46 vs. 1.74 ± 1.24 , $p < 0.01$) and prolonged (RF 3.14 ± 1.20 vs. 1.38 ± 1.16 , $p < 0.01$) contact times. Sampling 3 h after treatment did not show any significant difference. None of the volunteers reported adverse events.

Conclusions

PVP-I-ALC is more efficacious than CHG-ALC for topical skin antisepsis concerning the anaerobic flora on the skin of the shoulder. Standard and prolonged contact times demonstrated superiority for PVP-I-ALC for samples taken immediately, but missed significance 3 h after application. The results underscore the need for protection against *C. acnes* and coagulase-negative staphylococci in orthopaedic surgery and the need to prevent infections caused by these organisms. The clinical relevance of these findings, however, should be studied with SSI as an endpoint.

Introduction

The skin flora of patients is one of the most important factors in the pathogenesis of surgical site infections (SSI) [1–4]. Skin antisepsis constitutes an effective measure to reduce the numbers of microorganisms on skin. Therefore, it has been included as a key measure to prevent SSIs in recent international guidelines and recommendations [5–7]. The resident aerobic skin flora consists of organisms such as coagulase-negative staphylococci (CNS), *Micrococcus luteus*, *Corynebacterium* spp., *Malassezia furfur* and *Acinetobacter* spp. [8]. The anaerobic skin flora is located primarily in hair follicles and sebaceous glands. One of its main constituents is *Cutibacterium acnes* (formerly *Propionibacterium acnes*) [9, 10]. One study of lower limb surgery found common colonizing organism on skin and surgical wound edges to be CNS (80%), *Corynebacterium* spp. (25%) and *Cutibacterium* spp. (15%) [11]. Likely due to improvements in microbiological techniques, *C. acnes* is increasingly detected as a cause of SSIs, particularly in prosthetic joint infections [10].

In shoulder surgery, *C. acnes* predominate as the main anaerobic organism in SSI, particularly when prosthetic material is implanted [12–14]. The main reservoir for *C. acnes* is located deep in the skin within hair follicles and the pilo-sebaceous glands. In superficial and deep intraoperative tissue samples collected during surgery, *C. acnes* was isolated in more than 36% of patients who received first-time shoulder surgery [12]. The chance of obtaining *C. acnes*-positive cultures was 2.5-fold greater in males and was smaller when patients reported to have hair loss [15]. In addition, *C. acnes* can be involved in infections after hip and knee joint replacements, after endo-prosthetic reconstructions of the femur [16], polyurethane-coated breast implants [17] and various other implants [18].

Thus, the anaerobic skin flora represents a major challenge for skin antisepsis. Lee et al. [19] reported that 7 out of 10 volunteers had *C. acnes* detectable in dermal punch biopsies after skin antisepsis with 2% chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) with 70% isopropanol (IPA). Experiments with excised human skin in diffusion chambers showed that CHG penetrates relatively poorly into deep skin layers [20], while iodine released from povidone (PVP) molecules possesses substantially better penetration capabilities and penetrates through full-thickness skin in relevant concentrations in a time-dependent fashion [21]. Thus, PVP-I with alcohol (PVP-I-ALC) is hypothesised to have a greater antimicrobial effect against the deep resident skin flora when compared to CHG with alcohol (CHG-ALC). Although PVP-I in contrast to CHG has no appreciable residual antimicrobial effect [22], it exerts a long-lasting effectiveness on skin due to the delayed release of iodine from PVP-I by a second-order reaction.

The aim of this study was to compare the efficacy of a commercially-available 2% w/v CHG with 55% w/v IPA preparation with that of a commercially-available antiseptic containing PVP-I and alcohol (3.24% w/v PVP-I, 38.9% w/v IPA, 37.3% w/v ethanol) on the anaerobic and aerobic skin flora in humans.

Methods

Study design. This study was conducted using a randomized cross-over design with participation of 16 healthy volunteers, 9 female and 7 male healthy individuals of Caucasian background and an average age of 31.3 years (range: 22 to 74 years). Two different skin antiseptics (CHG-ALC or PVP-I-ALC) and two

different contact times for each antiseptic (2.5 min or 30 min) were applied on day 1 and 4, based on the assumption that a period of 3 days is sufficient for complete re-colonization of the skin. The application was carried out on both shoulders, using two separate shoulder areas for sampling (immediate and 3-h values) on the antero-lateral site of each shoulder on each day (Fig. 1). Participants were randomized by drawing opaque folded paper tickets from a container, such that two different antiseptic treatments per day were represented in a cross-over design, and each volunteer completed four different treatments. The Ethics Committee of the University of Greifswald approved the study (Reg. No. BB 109/10).

Volunteers. Inclusion criteria were age > 18 years, legal capacity, informed consent after the study procedure was explained, as well as willingness and ability to comply with the test protocol. Exclusion criteria were macroscopically visible lesions of the skin except acne juvenilis, infections of the shoulder areas, dermatosis except acne, participation in another study within the last 30 days, pregnancy, lactation, thyroid disorders, intolerance to CHG or iodine, age under 18, therapy with radioactive iodine, antiseptic procedures on the designated areas within in the last 7 days, and systemic antibiotics within the last 7 days. Two female volunteers suffered from active acne juvenilis at the shoulder areas that was less pronounced in the face; this was confirmed dermatologically.

Tested compounds and application modes. Skin antisepsis was performed using the following commercially available products:

- ChloraPrep® (CHG 2% w/v, IPA 55% w/v [70% v/v], coloured; CareFusion, Leawood, USA): vigorous rubbing using the 26 ml applicator for 30 s, afterwards keeping the treated area wet for 2 min with the antiseptic.
- Chlorhexidine 2% alcoholic (CHG 2% w/v, IPA 55% w/v [70% v/v]; B. Braun Medical, Sempach, CH): vigorous rubbing for 30 s using sterile forceps and gauze for 30 s, afterwards keeping the area wet with the antiseptic using a soaked sterile dressing (Zetuvit®, Hartmann, Heidenheim, Germany, 20 × 40 cm) for 29.5 min.
- Betaseptic® (3.24% w/v PVP-I, 38.9% w/v IPA, 37.3% w/v ethanol; Mundipharma, Limburg, Germany): vigorous rubbing for 30 s by using sterile forceps and gauze for 30 s, afterward keeping the area wet with the antiseptic by using forceps and gauze for 2 min or a soaked sterile dressing (Zetuvit®, 20 × 40 cm) for 29.5 min.

For the two CHG-ALC products, the IPA percentage was converted to 55% w/v from the manufacturers' stated 70% v/v for the purpose of uniformity of measurements.

Sampling. Microbial skin counts were obtained before antiseptic application (pre-values), after application and air-drying of the sampling site (immediate post-values), and 3 h after treatment (3-h post-values). The cup-scrub technique according to ASTM E1874–14 [23] was used on 2.5 cm² of skin, with 1 mL of sampling solution.

A first 10^{-1} dilution was prepared by adding 0.4 mL of sampling solution to 3.6 mL of neutralizer solution. For CHG-containing antiseptics, this was Lipofundin MCT 20% (B. Braun, Melsungen, Germany), for PVP-I-containing antiseptics, this was 3% Tween 80 (BioChemica, AppliChem, Darmstadt, Germany), 0.3% lecithin (AppliChem), 0.1% L-histidine (Roth, Nürnberg, Germany) and 0.5% sodium thiosulfate (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany).

Concurrently with the retrieval of the immediate post-values, another skin area of 4×4 cm was covered with a sterile dressing (Hydrofilm® transparent dressing 12×25 cm, Hartmann, Heidenheim, Germany) to protect a skin area where the 3-h samples were to be collected later.

Microbiological techniques. After 5 min neutralization in the first 10^{-1} dilution, further dilutions of 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} were prepared in the respective neutralization solution, and 0.1 mL of each dilution was plated onto Columbia agar with 5% sheep blood (Becton Dickinson, Heidelberg, Germany) for aerobic incubation (37°C , 48 h) and onto Schaedler agar (BioMérieux, Nürtingen, Germany) for anaerobic incubation (37°C , 7 days). The anaerobic atmosphere was generated in anaerobic jars using Anaerocult A sachets (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany). After aerobic incubation, the colony forming units (CFU) were counted and a representative sample of colonies was picked for identification, such that at least one colony of each morphologically different colony type was tested. Isolates were subjected to simple phenotypic identification, including Gram stain, catalase and coagulase tests, followed by VITEK® Cards (BioMérieux). The anaerobic CFUs were counted after 7 days incubation, and again representative colonies were analysed by Gram stain and VITEK® Cards.

For uniformity of measurements, we converted the numbers of colonies counted to CFU per 5 cm^2 of skin and expressed these as \log_{10} values. Then, we calculated the reduction factors (RFs) as the differences between the \log_{10} pre-values and the \log_{10} post-values. To calculate the reduction factors and transform to \log_{10} , plates without growth were set to a value of 1.

Sampling and validation of neutralization. Skin bacteria from five volunteers were collected by the cup-scrub technique [23] and pooled. Using the methodology of ASTM E1054-08 [24], pooled bacteria were used to verify the effectiveness of Lipofundin to inactivate CHG, of sodium thiosulfate to diminish the oxidizing agent iodine, and to ensure that the inactivation solutions did not significantly influence the bacterial counts, quantitatively and qualitatively. Final concentrations of 0.4% CHG and 0.6% PVP-I in 1 ml 0.9% NaCl were tested for neutralizer effectiveness. The concentration of the active agent was calculated using the treated skin area of 300 cm^2 ($17.5\text{ cm} \times 17.5\text{ cm}$) with 17 mL of antiseptic solution from the applicator and 3 mL of additional antiseptic solution, which arises from the equilibrium of the soaked dressing with the antiseptic liquid film on the skin. Finally, an area of 2.5 cm^2 served as the basis for the microbiological examinations after scrubbing.

Validation of neutralization was conducted according to the methodology of ASTM E1054-08 [24]. The suitable neutralizers, lecithin for inactivating biguanides and thiosulfate for quenching iodine, were derived from Table 1 in ASTM E1054 [24] and Annex B in EN 1040 [25] and EN 13727 [26]. Lipofundin

containing 1.2% egg yolk lecithin inactivated 0.4% CHG without any inhibitory effect on growth of pooled skin bacteria after aerobic and anaerobic incubation, and sodium thiosulfate, the quenching agent for iodine in the neutralization mixture, was effective for 0.6% PVP-I without influencing bacterial counts. Similar results were obtained in tests of neutralizer effectiveness, neutralizer toxicity and organism viability under aerobic and anaerobic culture conditions, using test solutions containing the residual antimicrobial agent which were derived from volunteers after skin antiseptics. Therefore, it was ascertained that CHG or PVP-I were effectively inactivated by the respective neutralization solutions without influencing bacterial growth after aerobic and anaerobic incubation.

Table 1

Efficacy of chlorhexidine-alcohol (CHG-ALC) versus povidone-iodine-alcohol (PVP-I-ALC) against aerobic flora at 2.5 and 30 min contact time, immediate and 3-h values

Preparation	Contact time (min)	Pre-values (\log_{10})	Immediate effect		3-h effect	
			RF ^a	n (0 cfu) ^b	RF ^a	n (0 cfu) ^b
CHG-ALC	2.5	2.26±0.93	1.94±0.91	13	1.74±1.08	10
	30	2.17±0.73	2.17±0.73	16	1.93±0.92	13
PVP-I-ALC	2.5	2.55±0.75	2.55±0.75	16	2.25±1.05	13
	30	2.20±0.87	2.11±0.93	15	1.94±1.11	13
^a Mean reduction factor (RF) and standard deviation.						
^b Number of volunteers with “0” cfu counts.						

Statistical analysis. The analysis of the raw data was performed using Graphpad Prism (GraphPad, La Jolla, CA, USA) and SPSS (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA) software. Mann-Whitney- and Wilcoxon-tests were calculated. A p-value < 0.05 was considered to indicate a statistically significant difference. Presence of carry-over effects was tested using linear mixed models, including treatment, sequence, period and treatment x period interaction effects (MIXED procedure in SPSS). Sample size calculations for testing differences in RFs were based on two-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank tests for matched pairs at p = 0.05. Effect sizes (i.e. differences in RFs divided by the standard deviation of the differences) of 0.75 and 1.0 were assumed. Based on a required power of 0.80, results of sample size calculation indicated that a sample between n = 10 and n = 16 cases was required (G*Power 3.1).

Skin tolerability. All volunteers received a questionnaire for self-assessment of skin tolerability to evaluate the following parameters on an analogue scale from 1 to 10. Items “redness”, “burning”, “pruritus”, “scaliness”, and “pain” were assessed. In case of skin irritation, volunteers were asked to contact the investigators to have the nature of the irritation evaluated, and if necessary, to obtain treatment.

Results

Skin tolerability. The skin antiseptics were well tolerated after 2.5 and 30 min exposure without any irritations. None of the volunteers reported any of the five listed adverse events on the skin tolerability scale. One female volunteer with acne at the test site reported that the skin felt subjectively better for 4 days after application of CHG-ALC for 30 min.

Pre-values

The validity of the cross-over design was confirmed by a comparison of the pre-values on day 1 and day 4. There was no significant difference (mean log value day 1 aerobically, 2.23, standard deviation [SD], 0.80, 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.80–2.66; mean log value day 4 aerobically, 2.17, SD, 0.88, 95% CI, 1.70–2.64; mean log value day 1 anaerobically, 3.68, SD, 1.47, 95% CI, 2.90–4.46; mean log value day 4 anaerobically, 3.80, SD 1.44, 95% CI, 3.03–4.57).

Aerobic skin flora. The aerobic flora consisted of more than 70% of CNS (mainly *S. epidermidis*, *S. hominis*, *S. saprophyticus* and *S. lugdunensis*). In addition, *S. aureus* (6% of aerobic flora) and *M. luteus* were found on the aerobic plates. PVP-I-ALC was significantly more effective than CHG-ALC when applied for 2.5 min, at the sampling time immediately after application (Tables 1 and 2), but this did not apply to the prolonged application time of 30 min and not to any 3-h values. There was no difference between the short and prolonged application times for each of the antiseptic agents, both immediately and 3 h after application ($p = 0.09$ and $p = 0.16$ for PVP-I-ALC; $p = 0.37$ and $p = 0.51$ for CHG-ALC). No statistically significant period or sequence effects or treatment x period interaction were found (p -values for immediate effect: 0.911 [period], 0.175 [sequence] and 0.987 [treatment x period]; p -values for 3 h effect: 0.197 [period], 0.213 [sequence] and 0.489 [treatment x period]).

Table 2
P values for the reduction of aerobic flora by chlorhexidine-alcohol (CHG-ALC) and povidone-iodine-alcohol (PVP-I-ALC) after 2.5 and 30 min contact time, immediate and 3-h values

Preparation	CHG-ALC		CHG-ALC	
	2.5 min contact		30 min contact	
	Immediate	After 3 h	Immediate	After 3 h
PVP-I-ALC 2.5 min contact	0.04	0.08	0.13	0.14
PVP-I-ALC 30 min contact	0.78	0.53	0.54	0.95

While CNS were not found in any samples after PVP-I-ALC treatment under any of the application and sampling conditions, they were still recovered with counts of up to 5 CFU per sample after CHG-ALC

treatment from 3 of 16 samples after 2.5-min application and 1 of 16 samples after 30 min application and immediate sampling, respectively. None of the samples collected after 3 hours yielded CNS.

Anaerobic skin flora. The majority of the bacteria on anaerobic plates were *C. acnes*. Only a negligible number of other anaerobic species were recovered and a few anaerobic cultures yielded CNS. When comparing the RFs of the immediate post-values of PVP-I-ALC to the immediate post-values of CHG-ALC, the antiseptics with PVP-I-ALC was significantly more effective for both application times (Tables 3 and 4). Comparing the 3-h post-values, PVP-I-ALC applied for 30 min was significantly more effective than CHG-ALC applied for 2.5 min ($p < 0.01$), but narrowly missed significance when CHG-ALC was applied for 30 min ($p = 0.06$; Table 4). When looking at the short (2.5 min) versus prolonged (30 min) application times, there was only one significant difference, in that PVP-I-ALC applied for 2.5 min appeared better than applied for 30 min after immediate sampling, while all other 2.5–30 min comparisons, both immediately and 3 h after application, showed no significant differences ($p = 0.03$ and $p = 0.24$ for PVP-I-ALC; $p = 0.36$ and $p = 0.87$ for CHG-ALC). However, we consider this significant value a likely experimental outlier, because the log pre-values for the 2.5 min application of PVP-I were substantially higher (4.24 ± 1.27) than those for the 30 min application (3.50 ± 1.40), and in both instances, there was a majority of immediate post-values (12 and 13 of 16, respectively) with no CFU counts. Again, no statistically significant period or sequence effects or treatment x period interaction were found (p -values for immediate effect: 0.537 [period], 0.568 [sequence] and 0.584 [treatment x period]; p -values for 3 h effect: 0.392 [period], 0.230 [sequence] and 0.710 [treatment x period]).

Table 3

Efficacy of chlorhexidine-alcohol (CHG-ALC) versus povidone-iodine-alcohol (PVP-I-ALC) against *C. acnes* at 2.5 and 30 min contact time, immediate and 3-h values

Preparation	Contact time (min)	Pre-values (\log_{10})	Immediate effect		3-h effect	
			RF ^a	n (0 cfu) ^b	RF ^a	n (0 cfu) ^b
CHG-ALC	2.5	3.99±1.52	1.74±1.24	6	1.46±1.23	4
	30	3.55±1.52	1.38±1.16	7	1.59±1.85	7
PVP-I-ALC	2.5	4.24±1.27	3.96±1.46	12	2.14±1.65	4
	30	3.50±1.40	3.14±1.20	13	2.71±1.36	10
^a Mean reduction factor (RF) and standard deviation.						
^b Number of volunteers with “0” CFU counts.						

Table 4 was not provided in this version.

Table 5

P values for the reduction of *C. acnes* by chlorhexidine-alcohol (CHG-ALC) and povidone-iodine-alcohol (PVP-I-ALC) after 2.5 and 30 min contact time, immediate and 3 h values

Preparation	CHG-ALC 2.5 min contact		CHG-ALC 30 min contact	
	Immediate	After 3 h	Immediate	After 3 h
PVP-I-ALC 2.5 min contact	< 0.01	0.31	< 0.01	0.28
PVP-I-ALC 30 min contact	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.06 ^a

^aWhen samples without detectable CFU were excluded from the analysis of 3-h post-values, the P value was 0.0

Discussion

The choice of the right preoperative skin antiseptic has been the topic of intense research, both microbiologically and in the form of clinical trials, and the subject of intense debate and controversies. The debate frequently focused on comparisons between “chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine” and which one of the two would be better; however, this did not take into account the important role of alcohols as potent ingredients in combination antiseptics [27]. In fact, many comparisons in the literature consisted of unequal two-against-one comparisons, for example, CHG-ALC combinations against aqueous PVP-I, or of comparisons of antiseptics with unknown or inadequate active ingredient content [28, 29]. Uncertainty surrounding these questions is also reflected by differences between recommendations in recent major guidelines; while the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guideline recommends an alcohol-based antiseptic with either CHG or PVP-I [6], the World Health Organization guideline recommends CHG-ALC over PVP-I-ALC [5].

The results of our study demonstrate that both antiseptic compounds, CHG-ALC and PVP-I-ALC effectively decreased the aerobic skin flora at shoulder sites. No growth at all was observed in 60 of 64 immediate post-values and in 49 of 64 3-h post-values. In aerobic cultures, PVP-I-ALC was better than CHG-ALC only after 2.5 min contact time and immediate sampling (Table 2), but not in any other of the tested parameters, including prolonged application time and sampling after 3 h. The relative improvement of performance of CHG-ALC after prolonged application and late sampling appears consistent with the relatively slow skin penetration kinetics of CHG [20].

CNS, which grow both aerobically and anaerobically, were not completely eliminated by CHG-ALC. This is consistent with findings from an earlier study in which CNS were frequently detected in the surgical field after 3 minutes of preoperative skin antiseptics with CHG-ALC (unpublished findings). This is also consistent with data from another study [4] that showed growth of residual bacteria directly after skin antiseptics with 70% v/v isopropanol in 35% of operations in orthopedic surgery. Among the isolates

recovered after antiseptics, 53% were identified as CNS, and clonally related strains were subsequently found in surgical wounds in 10% of operations [4]. These data underscore the need for better protection against CNS in surgery by potent antiseptics.

More pronounced differences between the antiseptic compounds became apparent when tested against the anaerobic skin flora. PVP-I-ALC, when applied for 2.5 or 30 min, was better than CHG-ALC at all four immediate sampling points (Table 4), but not at the relevant 3-h sampling points when both received the equivalent application times of 2.5 and 30 min, respectively. Overall, 6 of a total of 16 mean RFs obtained in this study were statistically significantly better for PVP-I-ALC than for CHG-ALC, and 15 out of 16 measurement points were in simple numerical terms better for PVP-I-ALC (Tables 1 and 3). On the other hand, no statistically significant differences were observed in any comparisons of the same agents between 2.5 min and 30 min application time.

Our results are indirectly supported by a clinical trial that compared the treatment of abdominal incision sites. This trial demonstrated that 0.7% iodine povacrylex with 74% IPA was more effective in reducing SSI than 2% CHG with 70% IPA [30]. Furthermore, another trial comparing 0.5% CHG with 70% alcohol and 1% PVP-I with 70% alcohol in hip and knee arthroplasty showed no difference in superficial wound complications [31]. However, on secondary end-point analysis, skin antiseptics with CHG-ALC was associated with significantly higher odd ratios for overall SSI, including prosthetic joint infection [31]. In another trial, skin antiseptics with 7.5% PVP-I in aqueous solution did not show a significant difference to 2% CHG in 70% IPA in the SSI rate after neurosurgical spine procedures in adults [32].

The shoulder region was chosen as test area for skin antiseptics because of its known tendency to be colonized with *C. acnes*, which is due to its high density of hair follicles and sebaceous glands [33]. Furthermore, *C. acnes* is a major pathogen of SSI in shoulder surgery [34, 35]. The standard method for preoperative skin antiseptics consists of initially rubbing the skin with either an applicator, or with forceps and a swab, for 30 s and of afterwards keeping the skin wet with the antiseptic agent for 2 min. The efficacy of both application methods is comparable with each other [36]. We did not use the applicator with CHG-ALC for the prolonged application time, because we wanted to avoid a potential mechanical irritation that might occur when keeping the area wet with an applicator.

It is considered beneficial to use an extended application time on areas of skin that has a high density of sebaceous glands [37], and this appears important for surgical procedures performed in those areas. The recommended application time for PVP-I-ALC solution that we used, according to the manufacturer, is 1 min on skin with a low density of sebaceous glands and at least 10 min on skin with a high density of sebaceous glands. The extended contact time of 30 min in the present study was chosen because we assumed that with an extended contact time, the deep skin flora would be reached more effectively. If confirmed, the clinical implications for preoperative shoulder preparation would be substantial. Indeed, after a contact time of 29.5 min under a soaked sterile dressing, the area still appeared to be moist.

It is thought that the physiological flora of the human skin is regenerated completely after 3 days, because the re-colonization already starts 60 min after alcohol-based skin antiseptics [38]. After 24 hours,

the skin flora is nearly completely regenerated [39]. Therefore, the study was performed as a crossover study with an interval of 3 days between the tests. In accordance with our hypothesis, the pre-values on day 1 and day 4 did not differ significantly.

The validity and interpretation of our results depends heavily on the selection of effective neutralizing solutions. A final concentration of 3% (w/v) soy bean or egg yolk lecithin may be used as effective neutralizer for CHG, but also Lipofundin, which contains 1.2% egg yolk lecithin, may be applied as an effective and non-toxic neutralizer, especially for membrane (phospholipid)-attacking antiseptic agents, such as chlorhexidine, octenidine and poly(hexamethylene) biguanide. Neutralization effectiveness and suitability of Lipofundin was previously confirmed in a study using octenidine- and chlorhexidine-containing mouth rinses [40], and also in a study determining the antimicrobial efficacy of poly(hexamethylene) biguanide coating of titanium implant material [41].

Our study has two important limitations. First, an ideal trial should compare CHG and PVP-I combined with the same alcohol species with identical concentrations, if conclusions concerning the activity of the CHG or PVP-I component are to be made. However, we had to use readily available commercial formulations, due to the fact that PVP-I formulations are too difficult to prepare in-house. The CHG comparator contained 55% w/v (70% v/v) straight IPA, and the PVP-I comparator contained 76% w/v of a mix between IPA and ethanol in nearly equal parts. Therefore, there is a theoretical possibility that this study's results may be due to the different alcohol compositions. Future studies may be able to address the microbicidal activity of CHG and PVP-I when combined with equal comparator alcohols. Second, a majority of our immediate and 3-h post-values had no detectable CFUs, and this was more frequently observed for PVI-ALC than for CHG-ALC (Tables 1 and 3). This means that our study unintentionally captured measurement values that were often located at the bottom end of the measurable range of the experimental setup. This also means that any differences between the two antiseptics, contact times and immediate versus 3-h effects were likely underestimated as a result. A scenario in which most of the measured values would be located well within the measurable range would have a greater chance of showing statistically significant differences if they exist. This appears particularly likely for the comparison of PVP-I-ALC versus CHG-ALC after 30 min contact time and sampling after 3 h, where the P value was 0.06, but 10 samples showed no detectable growth for PVP-I-ALC versus 7 for CHG-ALC. Future studies may be able to address this with larger numbers of volunteers than just 16 participants, larger sampled skin sites, larger sample volumes or lower starting dilutions (e.g. neat, 10^{-1} , 10^{-2} instead of 10^{-1} , 10^{-2} , 10^{-3}) plated on agar, or a combination of these variables.

Commonly recommended contact times for surgical skin preparation, including the 2.5 min chosen in this study, are neither experimentally nor clinically well founded. Starting from the hypothesis that a prolonged application time achieves better penetration and reaches deeper skin compartments and hair follicles, it was decided to examine a contact time of 30 min in addition to 2.5 min. However, no relevant significant differences were observed between these contact times. In addition, the question arises whether a contact time of 30 min is practicable in a busy operating room setting. This means that contact times shorter than 30 min should be investigated in future studies. For example, some antiseptic

preparations, when applied for 2.5 min on areas with high density of sebaceous glands, meet or even exceed the efficacy of the experimental reference antiseptic that is applied for 10 min [42]. The 3-h values in our study aimed at assessing the sustained activity of the antiseptic and the intraoperative skin recolonization under surgical drapes, as would be expected during typical operations.

Common efficacy testing of skin antiseptics only assesses aerobic flora, and in Europe the samples are typically collected by swabbing the skin surface [43] and do not mobilise the deep resident skin flora to the same extent as the ASTM cup scrub method does [23]. One possibility to address this in future studies would be to take dermal punch biopsies after antiseptics of the shoulder area, so that the effects of prolonged contact times can be measured in deeper skin layers.

Conclusions

PVP-I in combination with alcohol (3.24% w/v with $\geq 76\%$ w/v alcohol) was superior in its immediate efficacy in reducing the anaerobic skin flora on the shoulder compared to 2% w/v CHG with 55% w/v IPA. No significant difference was seen between standard and prolonged contact times. PVP-I-ALC seems to be a promising option for antiseptics on skin with a high density of sebaceous glands at a contact time of 2.5 min, especially in shoulder surgery. Future studies should expand upon these investigations with greater numbers of participants and contact times closer to 2.5 min, and ultimately should focus on clinical trials with SSIs as the endpoint.

Declarations

Availability of data and materials

Original (de-identified) data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Greifswald (Reg. No. BB 109/10).

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

Mundipharma GmbH, the sponsor of the study, had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. The authors declare no conflict of interest in relation to this work. O. Assadian and A. Kramer report institutional and consultant advisory grants from

B. Braun Medical AG, Becton Dickinson, CareFusion Inc., J&J/Ethicon, Mundipharma GmbH, Schülke & Mayr GmbH, Smith & Nephew Ltd., and Uluru Inc. outside the submitted work in the past.

Funding

Mundipharma GmbH provided funding for this work. All three antiseptic companies (Mundipharma GmbH, B. Braun Medical AG, CareFusion Inc.) provided antiseptics free of charge, and Hartmann AG provided sterile dressings free of charge.

Authors' contributions

D.D., A.K., and G.D. had the idea for the study and planned and supervised the experiments, analysed and interpreted the data, and drafted the first version of the manuscript. G.M. and R.H. participated in the technical design of the study, performed laboratory measurements and analysed and interpreted the data. G.K., M.M., and O.A. participated in the study's design and coordination, analysed and interpreted the data, and revised the manuscript. T.K. analysed and interpreted the data, and conducted the statistical analyses. All authors participated in drafting the manuscript and revising it critically for important intellectual content, and read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. John C. Allen, Duke-National University of Singapore Graduate Medical School, Singapore, for statistical advice.

References

1. Altemeier WA, Culbertson WR, Hummel RP. Surgical considerations of endogenous infections – sources, types, and methods of control. *Surg Clin North Am.* 1968;48:227–40.
2. Bitkover CY, Marcusson E, Ransjo U. Spread of coagulase-negative staphylococci during cardiac operations in a modern operating room. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2000;69:1110–5.
3. Kuhme T, Isaksson B, Dahlin LG. Wound contamination in cardiac surgery. A systematic quantitative and qualitative study of the bacterial growth in sternal wounds in cardiac surgery patients. *Acta Pathol Microbiol Immunol Scand.* 2007;115:1001–7.
4. Daeschlein G, Napp M, Layer F, et al. Antimicrobial efficacy of preoperative skin antisepsis and clonal relationship to postantiseptic skin-and-wound flora in patients undergoing clean orthopedic surgery. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2015;34:2265–73.
5. World Health Organization. Global guidelines for the prevention of surgical site infection. Geneva: WHO; 2016.

6. Berríos-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, et al. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guideline for the prevention of surgical site infection, 2017. *JAMA Surg.* 2017;152:784–91.
7. Hansis M, Kramer A, Mittelmeier W, et al. Prevention of surgical site infections – Recommendations of the Commission for Hospital Hygiene and Infection Prevention (KRINKO) at the Robert-Koch-Institute. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt.* 2018;61:448–73.
8. Peleg AY, Seifert H, Paterson DL. *Acinetobacter baumannii*: Emergence of a successful pathogen. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2008;21:538–82.
9. Funke G, Graevenitz A, Clarridge JE, et al. Clinical microbiology of coryneform bacteria. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 1997;10:125–59.
10. Boisrenoult P. *Cutibacterium acnes* prosthetic joint infection: Diagnosis and treatment. *Orth Traumatol Surg Res.* 2018;104:19–24.
11. Turtiainen J, Hakala T, Hakkarainen T, et al. The impact of surgical wound bacterial colonization on the incidence of surgical site infection after lower limb vascular surgery: a prospective observational study. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2014;47:411–7.
12. Hudek R, Sommer F, Kerwat M, et al. *Propionibacterium acnes* in shoulder surgery: true infection, contamination, or commensal of the deep tissue? *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2014;23:1763–71.
13. Kadler BK, Mehta SS, Funk L. *Propionibacterium acnes* infection after shoulder surgery. *Int J Shoulder Surg.* 2015;9:139–44.
14. Brolin TJ, Hackett DJ, Abboud JA, et al. Routine cultures for seemingly aseptic revision shoulder arthroplasty: are they necessary? *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2017;26:2060–6.
15. Hudek R, Sommer F, Abdelkawi AF, et al. *Propionibacterium acnes* in shoulder surgery: is loss of hair protective for infection? *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2016;25:973–80.
16. Dramis A, Aldlyami E, Grimer RJ, et al. What is the significance of a positive *Propionibacterium acnes* culture around a joint replacement? *Int Orthop.* 2009;33:829–33.
17. Rieger UM, Djedovic G, Pattiss A, et al. Presence of biofilms on polyurethane-coated breast implants: preliminary results. *J Long Term Eff Med Implants.* 2016;26:237–43.
18. Portillo ME, Corvec S, Borens O, et al. *Propionibacterium acnes*: An underestimated pathogen in implant-associated infections. *Biomed Res Int.* 2013;2013:804391.
19. Lee MJ, Pottinger PS, Butler-Wu S, et al. *Propionibacterium* persists in the skin despite standard surgical preparation. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2014;96:1447–50.
20. Karpanen TJ, Worthington T, Conway BR, et al. Penetration of chlorhexidine into human skin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2008;52:3633–6.
21. Nesvadbova M, Crosera M, Maina G, et al. Povidone iodine skin absorption: an ex-vivo study. *Toxicol Lett.* 2015;235:155–60.
22. Müller G, Langer J, Siebert J, et al. Residual antimicrobial effect of chlorhexidine digluconate and octenidine dihydrochloride on reconstructed human epidermis. *Skin Pharmacol Physiol.* 2014;27:1–8.

23. American Society for Testing and Materials. ASTM E1874–14. Standard test method for recovery of microorganisms from skin using the cup scrub technique. West Conshohocken: ASTM International; 2014.
24. American Society for Testing and Materials. ASTM E1054–08. Standard test methods for evaluation of inactivators of antimicrobial agents. West Conshohocken: ASTM International; 2013.
25. European Committee for Standardization. EN 1040:2005. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics. Quantitative suspension test for the evaluation of basic bactericidal activity of chemical disinfectants and antiseptics. Test method and requirements (phase 1). Brussels: CEN; 2006.
26. European Committee for Standardization. EN 13727:2012 + A2:2015. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics. Quantitative suspension test for the evaluation of bactericidal activity in the medical area. Test method and requirements (phase 2, step 1). Brussels, Europe: CEN; 2015.
27. Maiwald M, Chan ES. The forgotten role of alcohol: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the clinical efficacy and perceived role of chlorhexidine in skin antiseptics. PLoS ONE. 2012;7:e44277.
28. Maiwald M, Petney TN, Assam PN, et al. Use of statistics as another factor leading to an overestimation of chlorhexidine's role in skin antiseptics. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2013;34:872–3.
29. Maiwald M, Widmer AF. WHO's recommendation for surgical skin antiseptics is premature. Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17:1023–4.
30. Swenson BR, Hedrick TL, Metzger R, et al. Effects of preoperative skin preparation on postoperative wound infection rates: a prospective study of 3 skin preparation protocols. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2009;30:964–71.
31. Peel TN, Dowsey MM, Buising KL, et al. Chlorhexidine-alcohol versus iodine-alcohol for surgical site skin preparation in an elective arthroplasty (ACAISA) study: a cluster randomized controlled trial. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2019;25:1239–45.
32. Ghobrial GM, Wang MY, Green BA, et al. Preoperative skin antiseptics with chlorhexidine gluconate versus povidone-iodine: a prospective analysis of 6959 consecutive spinal surgery patients. J Neurosurg Spine. 2018;28:209–14.
33. Patel A, Calfee RP, Plante M, et al. *Propionibacterium acnes* colonization of the human shoulder. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2009;18:897–902.
34. Athwal GS, Sperling JW, Rispoli DM, et al. Deep infection after rotator cuff repair. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2007;16:306–11.
35. Singh JA, Sperling JW, Schleck C, et al. Periprosthetic infections after total shoulder arthroplasty: a 33-year perspective. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2012;21:1534–41.
36. Ulmer M, Lademann J, Patzelt A, et al. New strategies for preoperative skin antiseptics. Skin Pharmacol Physiol. 2014;27:283–92.
37. Hübner NO, Kellner NB, Partecke LI, et al. Determination of antiseptic efficacy of rubs on the forearm and consequences for surgical hand disinfection. J Hosp Infect. 2011;78:11–5.

38. Falk-Brynhildsen K, Söderquist B, Friberg O, et al. Bacterial recolonization of the skin and wound contamination during cardiac surgery: a randomized controlled trial of the use of plastic adhesive drape compared with bare skin. *J Hosp Infect.* 2013;84:151–8.
39. Dettenkofer M, Jonas D, Wiechmann C, et al. Effect of skin disinfection with octenidine dihydrochloride on insertion site colonization of intravascular catheters. *Infection.* 2002;30:282–5.
40. Welk A, Zahedani M, Beyer C, et al. Antibacterial and antiplaque efficacy of a commercially available octenidine-containing mouth rinse. *Clin Oral Invest.* 2016;20:1469–76.
41. Müller G, Benkhail H, Matthes R, et al. Poly(hexamethylene biguanide) adsorption on hydrogen peroxide treated Ti-Al-V alloys and effects on wettability, antimicrobial efficacy, and cytotoxicity. *Biomaterials.* 2014;35:5261–77.
42. Kampf G, Pitten FA, Heeg P, et al. Efficacy of two ethanol-based skin antiseptics on the forehead at shorter application times. *BMC Microbiol.* 2007;7:85.
43. Reichel M, Heisig P, Kohlmann T, et al. Alcohols for skin antiseptics at clinically relevant skin sites. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2009;53:4778–82.

Figures



Figure 1

The sampled skin area is marked in green on a right male shoulder. Most of the incisional regions in arthroscopic and open shoulder surgery are included within this area.