JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
ISSN: 2576-0017
2024, VOL 7, NO S8

Updates In Sterilization Techniques in Operative Theatre

Randah Mohammed Alshomrani[1], Zakeyah Ali Alsharif[2], Mashail Ibrahim Alomair[3], Azzah Ahmed Baashirah[4], Athil Khaled Batays[5], Hind Muslih Salih Aljabri[4], Wejdan Mohammad Khalifa[6], Salma Mohammed Habibullah[4], Batool Alhassan Mohammed Althumayri[6], Ahd Hussain Alsuliman[7], Hanan Ahmed Alradini[8], Ghada Abdullah Al-Jahni[9], Mohammed Ali Wasli[10], Taghreed Hamoud Abdul Karim Al-Bati[11], Alaa Khaled Dakhil Allah Al-Saedi[12] , Kholoud Hamad Al-Omari[13]

1 Sterilization, King Fahad General Hospital, Jeddah, KSA
2 Sterilization, King Fahad Hospital, Medina, KSA
3 Medical Sterilization Specialist, King Fahad University Hospital, Khobar - Eastern Province, KSA
4 Medical Sterilization Specialist, King Fahad General Hospital, Jeddah, KSA
5 Medical Sterilization Specialist, King Fahad General Hospital, Jeddah, KSA
6 Medical Sterilization, King Fahad General Hospital, KSA
7 Sterilization Specialist, King Abdullah University Hospital- Riyadh, KSA
8 Medical Sterilization Specialist, Dumat Al-Jandal General Hospital, Al-Jouf - Dumat Al-Jandal, KSA
9 Medical Sterilization, King Fahad Hospital, Madinah, KSA
10 Central Sterilization, King Fahd Central Hospital In Jazan, Jazan Region, KSA
11 Medical Sterilization, Specialist King Khaled Eye Specialist Hospital, Riyadh, KSA
12 Medical Sterilization, Heart Disease and Cardiology Center, Madinah, KSA
13 Sterilization Specialist, King Fahd Hospital, Madinah, KSA

Abstract:
Maintaining a sterile environment in operative theatres is crucial for minimizing the risk of healthcare-associated infections (HAIs), which can lead to prolonged recovery, increased healthcare costs, and significant morbidity or mortality. This study explores the historical evolution of sterilization methods, assesses current standards and guidelines, and identifies challenges faced in sterilization processes. Historically, sterilization techniques have transitioned from rudimentary practices, such as boiling water used by ancient civilizations, to the introduction of steam sterilization, which revolutionized infection control in

surgical settings. Pioneers like Louis Pasteur and Joseph Lister laid the groundwork for modern aseptic techniques, significantly reducing postoperative infection rates. Today, sterilization practices are guided by authoritative organizations such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the World Health Organization (WHO), which advocate for standardized protocols to ensure patient safety. The most prevalent sterilization methods include steam sterilization, ethylene oxide gas sterilization, and hydrogen peroxide vapor sterilization, each with specific applications and limitations. Steam sterilization remains the gold standard due to its efficacy and cost-effectiveness, but the complexity of modern surgical instruments presents ongoing challenges. Innovative heat-based sterilization techniques, particularly moist heat methods, have emerged as effective solutions for pathogen elimination. Recent advancements, such as pulsating vacuum technology, enhance steam penetration and improve sterilization outcomes for porous materials. However, challenges persist, including the variability in microbial resistance, the impact of biofilms on sterilization efficacy, and the compatibility of materials with various sterilization methods. The growing trend towards minimally invasive surgery further complicates sterilization efforts due to the intricate designs of instruments used. This study underscores the need for continuous updates to sterilization protocols, informed by the latest research and technological advancements, to ensure optimal patient outcomes and mitigate the risks associated with surgical procedures.

Keywords: Operating theatre, surgical site infections, sterilization

Introduction:

In the realm of modern medicine, the imperative of maintaining a sterile environment within operative theatres cannot be overstated. Surgical interventions, while often lifesaving, carry inherent risks, particularly in terms of infection. Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) remain a significant concern across medical institutions, leading to prolonged patient recovery times, increased healthcare costs, and in some cases, severe morbidity or mortality. The global healthcare landscape has made considerable advancements in surgical techniques and technologies, yet the foundational principle of effective sterilization remains at the forefront of patient safety and surgical success [1]. Historically, the processes of sterilization have evolved significantly from the rudimentary methods of yesteryears to the complex, multifaceted approaches employed today. Early methods relied heavily on physical means such as boiling water and the use of chemical agents that often lacked efficacy in eradicating all forms of microbial life. The advent of steam sterilization, commonly known as autoclaving, marked a transformative moment, allowing for the effective killing of bacterial spores and other pathogens. However, as our understanding of microbiology advanced, it became clear that a more nuanced approach to

sterilization was required, particularly in an era marked by antibiotic resistance and the emergence of new pathogens [2].

The progressive implementation of technological innovations has significantly shaped the landscape of sterilization practices over recent decades. Innovations such as lowtemperature plasma gas sterilization, ethylene oxide gas sterilization, and hydrogen peroxide vapor sterilization have broadened the scope of materials and instruments that can be effectively sterilized, thus enhancing surgical safety. Furthermore, these advancements have been accompanied by the increased adoption of evidence-based guidelines and protocols that standardize sterilization practices across surgical settings. Despite these advancements, challenges remain in the consistent application of sterilization protocols [3]. Variability in practices across healthcare settings, differences in staff training, and the harmonization of sterilization techniques among various surgical disciplines often lead to gaps in compliance. Additionally, the increasing complexity of surgical instruments—particularly those with intricate designs or that are made from multiple materials—continues to challenge the effectiveness of existing sterilization methods. These complexities necessitate continuous updates to sterilization protocols, drawing from the latest research and technological advancements to ensure optimal patient outcomes. As global health continues to grapple with rising infection rates and increasing surgical volumes, the role of robust sterilization techniques becomes ever more critical. The evolution of sterilization practices within the operative theatre not only serves to protect patients but also reflects a broader commitment to quality healthcare delivery. Multidisciplinary collaboration, ongoing research, and education are vital in cultivating a culture of safety and vigilance against the threat of infections [4].

This study aims to provide an updated overview of sterilization techniques employed in operative theatres, focusing on the latest advancements, challenges, and best practices. By evaluating current sterilization methods and their efficacy, we seek to highlight the importance of adapting to ever-evolving microbial challenges faced in surgical settings. The goal is to enhance understanding and implementation of effective sterilization protocols, ensuring that the operative theatre remains a beacon of safety for patients undergoing surgical procedures [5].

Objectives:

The main objectives of this study are to:

1. explore the historical perspective on sterilization methods.
2. identify the current standards and guidelines for sterilization
3. assess challenges and limitations in sterilization processes

Historical Perspective on Sterilization Methods:

The evolution of sterilization techniques in the operative theater has a rich and complex history that reflects advancements in medical knowledge, technology, and an increasing understanding of microbial pathology. The earliest methods of sterilization can be traced back to ancient cultures where rudimentary sanitation practices were observed. For instance, the Egyptians utilized boiling water to clean surgical instruments as early as 3000

BCE, suggesting an intuitive acknowledgment of the need to mitigate infection during medical procedures [6].

However, it was not until the 19th century that significant strides were made in the field, largely influenced by the advent of germ theory. The work of pioneers such as Louis Pasteur and Robert Koch fundamentally changed the perception of infection and its management. Pasteur's research in the 1860s demonstrated that microorganisms could cause spoilage and disease, prompting a reevaluation of sterile practices in both clinical and laboratory settings. This paradigm shift laid the foundation for aseptic techniques, gaining traction in surgical procedures and profoundly influencing hospital practices [7]. Following these advancements, Joseph Lister introduced the practice of antisepsis in the operating room in the 1860s. By employing carbolic acid (phenol) as a disinfectant, Lister showcased the profound effects of sterilizing instruments and cleaning operating fields, effectively reducing the incidence of postoperative infections. His methods prompted widespread adoption among surgeons and catalyzed the development of increasingly sophisticated sterilization techniques [8].

The dawn of the 20th century saw the introduction of steam sterilization, or autoclaving, which employs high-pressure steam to attain temperatures sufficient to kill microorganisms. This method, recognized for its efficacy and reliability, quickly became a standard practice in surgical settings. Moreover, the introduction of ethylene oxide and hydrogen peroxide gas sterilization in the mid-20th century offered alternatives for heatsensitive instruments, further diversifying the sterilization arsenal available to healthcare practitioners. As the century progressed, technological advancements perpetuated the evolution of sterilization methods. The incorporation of disposable instruments and packaging minimized the need for complex sterilization processes while simultaneously reducing the risk of cross-contamination. The advent of high-tech sterilization systems, including ultra-violet (UV) light and ozone-based methods, opened a new frontier in the quest for effective sterilization, promising enhanced efficiency and safety profiles [9]. The fundamental principles of sterilization remain rooted in the balance of risk versus benefit tailored to the specific context of surgical procedures. Regulatory bodies such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the World Health Organization (WHO) have outlined guidelines that underscore the importance of using validated sterilization techniques. These guidelines emphasize the necessity of infection control protocols, thereby ensuring patient safety in operative settings.

In modern healthcare settings, sterilization practices continue to evolve, influenced by research and technological innovations. Continuous monitoring and assessment of sterilization efficacy have become paramount, with validation protocols established to ensure instruments are adequately sterilized before use. Additionally, there is a growing emphasis on training healthcare professionals in infection prevention and control, underscoring the multifaceted approach necessary to maintain high standards of surgical safety [10].

Current Standards and Guidelines for Sterilization:

Sterilization in the operative theatre is a critical aspect of infection control, ensuring that surgical instruments and materials are free from viable microorganisms. The current standards and guidelines for sterilization are shaped by various authoritative bodies, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation (AAMI). These organizations provide comprehensive frameworks that healthcare facilities must adhere to in order to minimize the risk of surgical site infections (SSIs) and ensure patient safety. One of the fundamental principles of sterilization is the understanding of the different methods available, each with its specific applications and limitations [11]. The most commonly employed sterilization techniques include steam sterilization (autoclaving), ethylene oxide (EtO) gas sterilization, hydrogen peroxide plasma sterilization, and radiation sterilization. Steam sterilization remains the gold standard due to its efficacy, cost-effectiveness, and ability to penetrate porous materials. The CDC recommends that steam sterilization be conducted at a temperature of 121°C for a minimum of 30 minutes or at 134°C for 3 minutes, depending on the load type and the manufacturer's instructions. Monitoring the sterilization process through biological indicators, such as spore tests, is essential for validating the effectiveness of the procedure [12].

Ethylene oxide sterilization is particularly useful for heat-sensitive instruments and devices, such as those made from plastics or certain electronics. However, its use is accompanied by safety concerns due to the toxicity of the gas and the need for aeration post-sterilization to eliminate residuals. The AAMI guidelines emphasize the importance of proper aeration times based on the load size and material composition, recommending a minimum aeration period of 12 hours at room temperature for most items [13]. Hydrogen peroxide plasma sterilization has gained popularity as a low-temperature alternative, especially in facilities that prioritize environmental safety. This method is effective against a broad spectrum of microorganisms and is compatible with various materials. However, it requires specific equipment and is limited to items that can withstand the low humidity and temperature conditions necessary for the process. The AAMI guidelines suggest that healthcare facilities ensure thorough cleaning of instruments prior to hydrogen peroxide plasma sterilization, as organic load can impede the effectiveness of the process. In addition to the sterilization methods, current guidelines emphasize the importance of proper cleaning and disinfection protocols prior to sterilization [14]. The effectiveness of sterilization is significantly compromised if instruments are not adequately cleaned to remove blood, tissue, and other contaminants. The CDC recommends a two-step process: manual cleaning followed by mechanical cleaning using ultrasonic cleaners or washerdisinfectors. This ensures that all surfaces and lumens of instruments are thoroughly cleaned and prepared for sterilization. Moreover, the implementation of standard operating procedures (SOPs) is crucial for maintaining consistency and reliability in sterilization practices. Healthcare facilities are encouraged to develop and regularly update their SOPs to reflect the latest evidence-based practices and technological advancements. Training staff on these SOPs is vital to ensure compliance and to foster a culture of safety within the operative theatre.

Monitoring and documentation are also essential components of effective sterilization processes. Facilities should maintain detailed records of sterilization cycles, including

parameters such as temperature, pressure, and time, as well as the results of biological indicator tests. This documentation not only serves as a quality assurance measure but also provides critical information in the event of a sterilization failure, allowing for timely corrective actions [15].

Innovative Heat-Based Sterilization Techniques:

Sterilization in the operative theatre is a critical component of infection control during surgical procedures. Among the advancements in sterilization methods, innovative heatbased techniques have gained significant attention due to their efficacy in eliminating pathogens while minimizing risks associated with traditional methods. Heat-based sterilization techniques can be broadly classified into dry heat and moist heat methods, each with its unique mechanisms, applications, and technological innovations. (Moist Heat Sterilization) is perhaps the most widely adopted sterilization method, commonly implemented through steam sterilization or autoclaving [16]. This technique utilizes steam under pressure to achieve higher temperatures, typically exceeding 121°C. The efficacy of moist heat lies in its ability to achieve rapid penetration and denaturation of proteins in microorganisms, ultimately leading to cell death. Innovations in this area have focused on optimizing cycle parameters, such as time and temperature, to enhance sterilization efficacy while reducing energy consumption. For instance, recent studies have suggested that incorporating pulsating vacuum technology into steam sterilization can improve the efficiency of steam penetration, especially for porous materials and goods containing lumens, thereby ensuring more reliable sterilization outcomes [17].

On the other hand, (Dry Heat Sterilization) employs high temperatures without moisture, often ranging from 160°C to 180°C. This method operates through the oxidation of cellular components and dehydration of microorganisms. While traditionally perceived as less effective than moist heat methods due to longer cycle times, recent innovations in thermodynamic monitoring and controlled environments have enhanced its reliability. For instance, the introduction of advanced monitoring systems that utilize thermocouples allows for real-time assessment of temperature distribution within the sterilization chamber. This results in accurate verification of sterilization conditions, significantly improving process validation [18]. Moreover, modern innovations have also led to the development of novel heat-based sterilization devices integrating microwave and radiofrequency technologies. These devices leverage electromagnetic radiation to produce rapid heating, offering a promising alternative to traditional methods. Studies have demonstrated that microwave-assisted sterilization can effectively reduce microbial load in surgical instruments while preserving their structural integrity, providing advantages in terms of time and energy efficiency. Additionally, researchers have explored the safety and efficiency of radiofrequency sterilization to target specific pathogens prevalent in the clinical setting, especially in the context of biofilm-forming organisms that are notoriously resistant to conventional methods [19].

Temperature monitoring and control have also improved dramatically with digitization and automation, contributing to the precision of heat-based sterilization techniques. The

implementation of computerized systems allows for the continual logging of temperature and pressure parameters, facilitating compliance with regulatory standards and enhancing traceability in the sterilization process. These systems can analyze historical data to predict potential failures or fluctuations, enabling administrators to take proactive measures to maintain optimal conditions. Furthermore, a growing awareness of material compatibility has led to the development of heat-stable surgical products, promoting the use of heatbased sterilization techniques [20]. Manufacturers are now innovating materials that can withstand prolonged exposure to high temperatures without degrading, thereby broadening the scope of heat-based sterilization applications. This compatibility ensures that a wider range of surgical instruments can be effectively sterilized, reducing the reliance on chemical sterilants with inherent risks of residues and toxicity. Despite the advancements, challenges remain in the successful implementation of heat-based sterilization techniques. Variable load configurations often present challenges in achieving uniform temperatures across all instruments within a sterilization chamber [21]. To address this, researchers are exploring the role of simulation and dynamic modeling to predict heat penetration in complex loads, further fine-tuning sterilization cycles to achieve optimal outcomes. Additionally, ensuring staff training and adherence to best practices within the operative theatre is crucial for maintaining high sterilization standards and ensuring patient safety.

Challenges and Limitations in Sterilization Processes

One of the foremost challenges in sterilization is the variability in the effectiveness of different methods relative to the type of microorganism targeted. Bacterial spores, particularly those from Bacillus and Clostridium species, are known for their resilience against standard sterilization techniques. The presence of biofilms, which can form on medical instruments, complicates the sterilization process further by providing a protective environment for bacteria and making it difficult for sterilizing agents to penetrate effectively [22].

Another significant challenge is the compatibility of materials used in medical devices with various sterilization techniques. For instance, certain plastics may be damaged by hightemperature steam sterilization (autoclaving), while others may not withstand the harsh chemicals used in ethylene oxide sterilization. This necessitates careful consideration of the type of instrument being sterilized and the method chosen, often leading to a limitation on the materials that can be safely sterilized. Additionally, the rising trend of minimally invasive surgical techniques means that a variety of complex and intricate instruments are used, which can be challenging to sterilize thoroughly [23].

Human factors also play a critical role in the efficacy of sterilization processes. Proper training in disinfection and sterilization protocols is essential, and lapses in protocol adherence, whether intentional or unintentional, can lead to sterilization failures. The workflow in operating theatres can be hectic, and the pressure to move rapidly from one procedure to the next can result in shortcuts or mistakes in the sterilization process. Moreover, maintaining the sterility of instruments from the moment of sterilization to the point of use is challenging; environmental factors such as air quality, handling practices, and storage conditions contribute to this risk [24].

Furthermore, regulatory compliance and validation of sterilization processes pose challenges for healthcare facilities. Each sterilization method requires specific validation procedures to confirm efficacy, which can demand time, resources, and expertise. The need for ongoing education regarding updates in guidelines from health authorities, such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), places an additional burden on staff responsible for maintaining sterilization standards. Resistance to adhere to stringent sterilization protocols can stem from the lack of resources or institutional support, leaving medical facilities vulnerable to increased rates of hospital-acquired infections (HAIs) [25].

Capacity limitations within healthcare facilities can also impede effective sterilization. In many settings, there is an inadequate number of sterilization units or insufficient time allotted for the sterilization of instruments between surgical procedures. This can lead to a backlog of instruments waiting for sterilization, which undermines the principle of timely and effective patient care. Moreover, some healthcare settings, particularly those in lowresource or developing countries, may lack access to advanced sterilization technologies altogether, relying instead on antiquated or less reliable methods [26].

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the evolution of sterilization practices in surgical settings has been pivotal in enhancing patient safety and reducing the incidence of healthcare-associated infections. This study highlights the historical advancements that have shaped current sterilization methods, underscoring the transition from rudimentary techniques to sophisticated approaches that leverage technological innovations. While contemporary guidelines established by leading health organizations provide a robust framework for sterilization protocols, challenges persist. Variability in practice, differences in staff training, and the complexities associated with modern surgical instruments continue to pose significant obstacles to effective sterilization. Furthermore, the emergence of antibiotic-resistant pathogens necessitates ongoing research and adaptation of sterilization techniques to ensure they remain effective. As the healthcare landscape evolves, it is imperative that healthcare institutions prioritize adherence to established standards and invest in continuous education and training for staff. This commitment will ultimately safeguard patient health and improve surgical outcomes in the face of ever-evolving challenges.

References:

1. Vries EN, Ramrattan MA, Smorenburg SM, et al. The incidence and nature of in-hospital adverse events: a systematic review. Qual Saf Health Care. 2008;17:216–223. doi: 10.1136/qshc.2007.023622. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. World Alliance for Patient Safety , author. WHO guidelines for safe surgery. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2008. [Google Scholar]
3. Weigelt JA, Lipsky BA, Tabak YP, et al. Surgical site infections: Causative pathogens and associated outcomes. Am J Infect Control. 2010;38:112–120. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2009.06.010. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

4. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. New disinfection and sterilization methods. Emerg Infect Dis. 2001;7(2):348–53. doi: 10.3201/eid0702.010241. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Batista Neto S, Graziano KU, Padoveze MC, Kawagoe JY. The sterilization efficacy of reprocessed single use diathermy pencils. Rev Latino-Am Enfermagem. 2010;18(1):81–6. doi: 10.1590/s0104-11692010000100013. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Du C, Shang C, Wang T. A portable plasma sterilizer. Plasma Chem Plasma Process. 2017;37:77. [Google Scholar]
7. Sousa CS, Torres LM, Azevedo MPF, Camargo TC, Graziano KU, Lacerda RA. Sterilization with ozone in health care: An integrative literature review. Revista da Escola de Enfermagem da USP. 2011;45(5):1243–9. doi: 10.1590/s0080-62342011000500030. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Murphy L. Ozone-the latest advance in sterilization of medical devices. Can Oper Room Nurs J. 2006;24(2):28–38. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Cheng H, Chen BP, Soleas IM, Ferko NC, Cameron CG, Hinoul P. Prolonged operative duration increases risk of surgical site infections: a systematic review. Surg Infect. 2017;18(6):722–735. doi: 10.1089/sur.2017.089. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Haley RW, Culver DH, Morgan WM, White JW, Emori TG, Hooton TM. Identifying patients at high risk of surgical wound infection: a simple multivariate index of patient susceptibility and wound contamination. Am J Epidemiol. 1985;121(2):206–215. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a113991. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. .Edmiston CE, Lee CJ, Krepel CJ, Spencer M, Leaper D, Brown KR, Lewis BD, Rossi PJ, Malinowski MJ, Seabrook GR. Evidence for a standardized preadmission showering regimen to achieve maximal antiseptic skin surface concentrations of chlorhexidine gluconate, 4%, in surgical patients. JAMA Surg. 2015;150(11):1027–1033. doi: 10.1001/jamasurg.2015.2210. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
12. Datarkar A, Purohit S, Tayal S, Bhawalkar . Operating room protocols in OMFS during Corona virus (Covid-19) pandemic. J Maxillofac Oral Surg. 2020;19(3):327–31. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed]
13. Eggers M, Koburger-Janssen T, Eickmann M, Zorn J. In vitro bactericidal and virucidal efficacy of povidone-iodine gargle/mouthwash against respiratory and oral tract pathogens. Infect Dis Ther. 2018;7:249–259. doi: 10.1007/s40121-018-0200-7. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Saito R, Uetera Y, Saito Y. Evaluation of the efficacy of a low-temperature steam and formaldehyde steriliser by using biological indicators. Journal of Hospital Infection. 2009;73(2):179–80. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2009.06.018. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Timmons S, Tanner J. A disputed occupational boundary: operating theatre nurses and operating department practitioners. Sociol Health Illn 2004; 26(5): 645–666. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

16. Cadman V. Career opportunities for theatre practitioners. J Periop Pract 2017; 27(11): 246–247. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Høyland S, Aase K, Hollund JG. Exploring varieties of knowledge in safe work practices—an ethnographic study of surgical teams. Patient Saf Surg 2011; 5: 21. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
18. Shomali M, Opie D, Avasthi T, Trilling A. Wu M-H, editor. Nitrogen Dioxide Sterilization in Low-Resource Environments: A Feasibility Study. PLoS ONE. 2015;10(6):e0130043. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0130043. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0130043. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
19. Patwardhan N, Kelkar U. Disinfection, sterilization and operation theater guidelines for dermatosurgical practitioners in India. Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol. 2011 JanFeb;77(1):83-93. doi: 10.4103/0378-6323.74965. PMID: 21220895.
20. Mawalla B, Mshana SE, Chalya PL, et al. Predictors of surgical site infections among patients undergoing major surgery at Bugando Medical Centre in Northwestern Tanzania. BMC Surg 2011; 11: 21. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. Allard J, Bleakley A, Hobbs A, et al. “Who’s on the team today?” The status of briefing amongst operating theatre practitioners in one UK hospital. J Interprof Care 2007; 21(2): 189–206. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. Li Y, Zeng L, Li Z, et al. Emergency trauma care during the outbreak of corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. World J Emerg Surg 2020; 15: 33. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. Fisha K, Azage M, Mulat G, et al. The prevalence and root causes of surgical site infections in public versus private hospitals in Ethiopia: a retrospective observational cohort study. Patient Saf Surg 2019; 13: 26. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
24. Coe R, Gould D. Disagreement and aggression in the operating theatre. J Adv Nurs 2008; 61(6): 609–618. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
25. McElroy L, Woods DM, Yanes AF, et al. Applying the WHO conceptual framework for the International Classification for Patient Safety to a surgical population. Int J Qual Health Care 2016; 28(2): 166–174. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
26. Patwardhan N, Kelkar U. Disinfection, sterilization and operation theater guidelines for dermatosurgical practitioners in India. Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol 2011; 77(1): 83. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]