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CONTEXT AND POLICY ISSUES:

The proportion of Canadians requiring some degree of assistance with foot care is increasing.¹ Foot care may be required due to problems associated with foot architecture or with diseases such as diabetes.¹ Foot care may also be required in cases of foot infections.¹ One source of foot infection is through contact with contaminated instruments used for foot care.¹ Foot care instruments include nail clippers and files, scalpels, and callus parers.¹ In 1997, Health Canada published infection control guidelines related specifically to foot care and recommended that “all instruments used in foot care must be sterile.”¹ The guideline is also part of a larger overview of recommendations published by Health Canada in 1998 regarding infection control in health care facilities.² In the latter report, Health Canada recommends that critical items, including all instruments used for foot care, be sterilized by dry heat, autoclave, or by chemical sterilization.² This report will review the evidence-based guidelines regarding the sterilization of instruments used for foot care.

RESEARCH QUESTION:

What are the evidence-based guidelines for the sterilization of foot care instruments?

METHODS:

A limited literature search was conducted on key health technology assessment resources, including OVID Medline and Embase, the Cochrane Library (Issue 3, 2009), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, ECRI, EuroScan, international health technology agencies, and a focused Internet search. The search was limited to English language articles published between 2004 and August 2009. Filters were applied to limit the retrieval to health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and guidelines.

Disclaimer: The Health Technology Inquiry Service (HTIS) is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. HTIS responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources and a summary of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. HTIS responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material. It may be copied and used for non-commercial purposes, provided that attribution is given to CADTH.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

One evidence-based guideline was identified from the literature search. No health technology assessments, systematic reviews, or meta-analyses were identified.

A document detailing the best practices for cleaning, disinfecting, and sterilizing within health care settings was produced by the Provincial Infectious Diseases Advisory Committee for the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC). Expert opinions on the reuse of medical equipment were used to develop the best practices. At least two other Canadian jurisdictions have used the Ontario MOHLTC document to assist in developing their own guidelines and standards.4,5

Instruments used for foot care are considered to be critical medical equipment or devices. The categorization of medical equipment or devices as critical, semi-critical, or non-critical is based on a classification system that was developed by Spaulding in 1971. A critical device is one that enters sterile tissues including the vascular system and is associated with a high risk of infection if the equipment becomes contaminated. The MOHLTC guidelines recommend that for re-use, critical devices should be cleaned and sterilized. The recommended sterilization approaches for critical devices include: dry heat, steam, 100% ethylene oxide, formaldehyde, 2.5% to 3.5% glutaraldehyde (10 hours at 20°C), hydrogen peroxide gas plasma (75 minutes at 50°C), 6% to 25% hydrogen peroxide liquid (six hours), 7% accelerated hydrogen peroxide (six hours at 20°C), and 0.2% peracetic acid (30 to 45 minutes). No specific information regarding foot care instruments is reported.

Limitations

Our search identified one evidence-based guideline on sterilization of medical equipment including instruments used for foot care. The best practices document was based on expert opinion rather than on a search of the published literature. Information pertaining specifically to foot care instruments was not reported.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR DECISION OR POLICY MAKING:

The Canadian guideline recommends sterilization of foot care instruments by dry heat, steam, or by chemical means. No specific information regarding which chemical sterilization procedure to use for foot care instruments was reported. Further information regarding the comparative effectiveness of chemical sterilization procedures may be helpful. The choice between sterilization approaches may depend on variety of factors including: the availability of sterilization equipment (e.g. autoclave), the time required for sterilization, the medical setting (i.e. community versus in-hospital), the sensitivity of the medical device to heat, the toxicity of a particular chemical, and the comparative costs of different sterilization approaches.
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