

CADTH RAPID RESPONSE REPORT: SUMMARY OF ABSTRACTS

Alcohol for Skin Preparation During Minor Procedures: Clinical Effectiveness

Service Line: Rapid Response Service

Version: 1.0

Publication Date: June 07, 2019

Report Length: 6 Pages



Authors: Deba Hafizi, Suzanne McCormack

Cite As: Alcohol for Skin Preparation During Minor Procedures: Clinical Effectiveness. Ottawa: CADTH; 2019 Jun. (CADTH rapid response report: summary of abstracts).

Disclaimer: The information in this document is intended to help Canadian health care decision-makers, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. While patients and others may access this document, the document is made available for informational purposes only and no representations or warranties are made with respect to its fitness for any particular purpose. The information in this document should not be used as a substitute for professional medical advice or as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) does not endorse any information, drugs, therapies, treatments, products, processes, or services.

While care has been taken to ensure that the information prepared by CADTH in this document is accurate, complete, and up-to-date as at the applicable date the material was first published by CADTH, CADTH does not make any guarantees to that effect. CADTH does not guarantee and is not responsible for the quality, currency, propriety, accuracy, or reasonableness of any statements, information, or conclusions contained in any third-party materials used in preparing this document. The views and opinions of third parties published in this document do not necessarily state or reflect those of CADTH.

CADTH is not responsible for any errors, omissions, injury, loss, or damage arising from or relating to the use (or misuse) of any information, statements, or conclusions contained in or implied by the contents of this document or any of the source materials.

This document may contain links to third-party websites. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third-party sites is governed by the third-party website owners' own terms and conditions set out for such sites. CADTH does not make any guarantee with respect to any information contained on such third-party sites and CADTH is not responsible for any injury, loss, or damage suffered as a result of using such third-party sites. CADTH has no responsibility for the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information by third-party sites.

Subject to the aforementioned limitations, the views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of Health Canada, Canada's provincial or territorial governments, other CADTH funders, or any third-party supplier of information.

This document is prepared and intended for use in the context of the Canadian health care system. The use of this document outside of Canada is done so at the user's own risk.

This disclaimer and any questions or matters of any nature arising from or relating to the content or use (or misuse) of this document will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein, and all proceedings shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Province of Ontario, Canada.

The copyright and other intellectual property rights in this document are owned by CADTH and its licensors. These rights are protected by the Canadian *Copyright Act* and other national and international laws and agreements. Users are permitted to make copies of this document for non-commercial purposes only, provided it is not modified when reproduced and appropriate credit is given to CADTH and its licensors.

About CADTH: CADTH is an independent, not-for-profit organization responsible for providing Canada's health care decision-makers with objective evidence to help make informed decisions about the optimal use of drugs, medical devices, diagnostics, and procedures in our health care system.

Funding: CADTH receives funding from Canada's federal, provincial, and territorial governments, with the exception of Quebec.



Research Question

What is the clinical effectiveness of alcohol wipes for adults undergoing skin preparation for minor procedures?

Key Findings

One systematic review, two randomized controlled trials, and two non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of alcohol for skin preparation during minor procedures.

Methods

A limited literature search was conducted by an information specialist on key resources including PubMed, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL)the Cochrane Library, the University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, the websites of Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. The search strategy was comprised of both controlled vocabulary, such as the National Library of Medicine's MeSH (Medical Subject Headings), and keywords. The main search concepts were alcohol, antisepsis and minor procedures. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2009 and May 23, 2019. Internet links were provided, where available.

Selection Criteria

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Selection Criteria

Population	Adults undergoing skin preparation for minor procedures (e.g., intravenous insertion, drawing blood, core biopsies, other procedures performed outside of the operating room)
Intervention	Alcohol swabs/wipes
Comparators	Chlorhexidine gluconate; Other swab preparations; No treatment
Outcomes	Clinical effectiveness (e.g., prevention of skin infections, ease or speed of drying) Safety
Study Designs	Health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies



Results

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials and non-randomized studies.

One systematic review, two randomized controlled trials, and two non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of alcohol for skin preparation during minor procedures. No relevant health technology assessments or meta-analyses were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

Overall Summary of Findings

One systematic review,¹ two randomized controlled trials,²⁻³ and two non-randomized studies⁴⁻⁵ were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of alcohol for skin preparation during minor procedures.

The authors of the systematic review aimed to assess the clinical effectiveness of isopropyl alcohol wipes with isopropyl alcohol in a two-step procedure to prevent contamination of blood collection; however, relevant studies were identified.¹

The authors of one randomized controlled trial aimed to assess the clinical effectiveness of isopropyl alcohol with chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) compared to isopropyl alcohol and CHG alone. The authors found a significant difference in catheter related infections between the three antiseptic solutions, with the CHG-isopropyl alcohol formulation being the most effective in preventing infection.² The authors of a second randomized controlled trial³ aimed to compare 75% isopropyl alcohol to 5% sodium bicarbonate and found that disinfecting central venous catheters with sodium bicarbonate improved pain, and that patient and nurse satisfaction were greater with sodium bicarbonate than when using isopropyl alcohol.³

The authors of a non-randomized study that assessed the effectiveness of isopropyl alcohol in preventing catheter associated infection found that disinfecting catheter caps with isopropyl alcohol reduced contamination, organism density, and central-line associated bloodstream infection.⁴ The authors of another study⁵ compared isopropyl alcohol with isopropyl alcohol with povidone-iodine and found no significant difference in contamination rates between the two groups.

References Summarized

Health Technology Assessments

No literature identified.



Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

 Webster J, Bell-Syer SE, Foxlee R. Skin preparation with isopropyl alcohol versus isopropyl alcohol followed by any antiseptic for preventing bacteraemia or contamination of blood for transfusion. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015 Feb 12(2):Cd007948. <u>PubMed: PM25674776</u>

Randomized Controlled Trials

- Hamed S, Nezarali M, Ebrahim Ebrahimi T, Enayatollah S, Somayeh J. Comparison of the Effects of Isopropyl alcohol, Chlorhexidine and Isopropyl alcohol-Chlorhexidine on Local Catheter-Related Infections Rate: A Double-Blind Clinical Trial Study. *Med Surg Nurs J*. 2018;7(2):1-6.
- Wu HL, Xu YH, Shi JH. 5% NaHCO3 Is Appropriate for Skin Cleaning With Central Venous Catheters. Am J Med Sci. 2017 Jan;353(1):12-16.
 PubMed: PM28104097

Non-Randomized Studies

 Wright MO, Tropp J, Schora DM, et al. Continuous passive disinfection of catheter hubs prevents contamination and bloodstream infection. Am J Infect Control. 2013 Jan;41(1):33-38.

PubMed: PM23084024

 Kiyoyama T, Tokuda Y, Shiiki S, Hachiman T, Shimasaki T, Endo K. Isopropyl isopropyl alcohol compared with isopropyl isopropyl alcohol plus povidone-iodine as skin preparation for prevention of blood culture contamination. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2009 Jan;47(1):54-58.

PubMed: PM18971366



Appendix — Further Information

Previous CADTH Reports

- Chlorhexidine Gluconate for Skin Preparation During Stereotactic Core Biopsy of the Breast: Clinical Effectiveness and Guidelines. (CADTH rapid response report: summary of abstracts). Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2019: https://www.cadth.ca/chlorhexidine-gluconate-skin-preparation-during-stereotactic-core-biopsy-breast-clinical-0 Accessed 2019 May 30
- Use of Chlorhexidine Gluconate with Alcohol for the Prevention of Peripheral Intravenous Device Infections: A Review of Clinical and Cost Effectiveness, and Guidelines. (CADTH rapid response report: summary with critical appraisal). Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2014: https://www.cadth.ca/use-chlorhexidine-gluconate-alcohol-prevention-peripheral-intravenous-device-infections-review Accessed 2019 May 30
- Preoperative Skin Antiseptic Preparations and Application Techniques for Preventing Surgical Site Infections: A Systematic Review of the Clinical Evidence and Guidelines. (CADTH systematic review). Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2011: https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/htis/june-2011/M0025_Pre-Operative_Skin_Prep_Final.pdf Accessed 2019 May 30

Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses - Aqueous versus Alcohol-Based Antiseptics

 Maiwald M, Chan ES. The forgotten role of isopropyl alcohol: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the clinical efficacy and perceived role of chlorhexidine in skin antisepsis. PLoS One. 2012;7(9):e44277.
PubMed: PM22984485

Non-Randomized Studies – Pediatric Population

 Bjorkman L, Ohlin A. Scrubbing the hub of intravenous catheters with an alcohol wipe for 15 sec reduced neonatal sepsis. *Acta Paediatr*. 2015 Mar;104(3):232-236.
PubMed: PM25399485

Review Articles – Aqueous versus Alcohol-Based Antiseptics

- Echols K, Graves M, LeBlanc KG, Marzolf S, Yount A. Role of antiseptics in the prevention of surgical site infections. *Dermatol Surg.* 2015 Jun;41(6):667-676.
 <u>PubMed: PM25984901</u>
- Sidhwa F, Itani KM. Skin preparation before surgery: options and evidence. Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2015 Feb;16(1):14-23.
 PubMed: PM25761076