

## Review

# Antibiotic prophylaxis in orthopaedic surgery: A review of evidence and best practices

George A. Komnos<sup>1</sup>, Efstathios Konstantinou<sup>2</sup>, Nikolaos Stefanou<sup>3</sup>, Sokratis Varitimidis<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece

<sup>2</sup>Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece

<sup>3</sup>Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece (Corresponding Author)

<sup>4</sup>Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece

## Abstract

The use of prophylactic antibiotics in Orthopaedic and Trauma surgery is well-established. Superficial and periprosthetic joint infections are dreaded complications that increase morbidity, disability, and mortality. Despite the various guidelines and the wide employment of antibiotics, there is still controversy about their optimal use. The main factors that have to be taken into account are the choice of the most effective antibiotic, the timing of administration, and the duration of the treatment. This review deepens into the evidence behind commonly argued topics in antibiotic prophylaxis and highlights the fundamental aspects that lead our current practice.

## Keywords

Antibiotics; prophylaxis; surgical site infection; orthopaedics



Corresponding  
author

Nikolaos Stefanou  
nikvsteph@gmail.com

## Introduction

Infection is one of the most disastrous complications in Orthopaedic surgery. It is associated with increased morbidity, disability, and mortality.<sup>1</sup> The use of antibiotics against infections, which was once considered a panacea, remains an integral part of Orthopaedic practice as it has been proved that antibiotic prophylaxis is effective in reducing the incidence of surgical site infection (SSI) subsequent to arthroplasty from roughly 4% to 1%. SSIs can result in extended hospital stays, increased healthcare expenses, and patient discomfort.<sup>2</sup>

Infection control methods have been extensively disseminated, but guidelines are frequently disregarded. The World Health Organization (WHO) has recommended a 19-item surgical safety checklist to reduce complications before any surgical procedure, which includes prophylactic antibiotics.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, the antibiotic resistance that has arisen due to inconsiderate use presents a major threat and the WHO has warned about a new era in which trivial infections and minor injuries will once again threaten human life.<sup>4</sup>

Despite the widespread acceptance of antibiotic prophylaxis in Orthopaedic surgery, significant variability in practice patterns persists.<sup>5</sup> Discrepancies in adherence to guidelines, debates over the most effective antibiotic choices, and concerns about the optimal timing and duration of administration highlight a need for clarity.<sup>6</sup> This review aims to compile the latest research and guidelines to support evidence-based practices in Orthopaedic antibiotic prophylaxis, addressing areas of controversy and emphasizing the need for consistency and compliance in clinical practice.

## Risk factors for infection in Orthopaedic surgery

Infections in orthopaedics remain a significant concern, as SSIs can significantly affect patient recovery and healthcare costs.<sup>7</sup> Advances in surgical techniques and the increased use of implants, while improving outcomes, have also increased the risk of SSIs.<sup>8</sup> Factors such as diabetes mellitus and hypertension are well-established risk factors, with diabetic patients being six times more

likely to develop infections.<sup>9</sup> Hypertension has similarly been linked to higher SSI risk.<sup>10</sup> Additionally, the influence of age on infection rates is debated; while younger patients may face lower risks, older adults often experience higher susceptibility due to weaker immune system and existing chronic comorbidities.<sup>11</sup> Surgical factors, including the type of incision, also play a crucial role; fresh, open wounds present the highest risk, while clean, sterile incisions are associated with the lowest infection rates.<sup>12</sup>

Moreover, complex and prolonged surgeries increase the likelihood of SSIs, highlighting the need for surgical precision and strict adherence to infection control protocols.<sup>13</sup> Operating room conditions, such as proper air filtration and use of laminar flow systems, contribute to maintaining a sterile environment. Finally, the presence of multidrug-resistant organisms adds another complicated burden, making targeted antibiotic prophylaxis essential. Despite extensive research, inconsistency in identifying specific SSI risk factors remains a challenge.<sup>14</sup> Improving our understanding of these variables can result in more effective preventative strategies and decreased SSI rates in Orthopaedic patients, thus improving outcomes and reducing healthcare costs.

## Surgical site infection

Orthopaedic procedures, such as joint replacement or fracture fixation, include bone and soft tissue manipulation, and often implantation of prosthetic devices. These procedures are threatened by the likelihood of surgical site infections, which can result in serious complications such as implant failure, septic arthritis, and osteomyelitis. This risk is mitigated by antibiotic prophylaxis, which prevents the colonization and subsequent infection of the surgical site by bacteria introduced during surgery.<sup>15</sup>

Airborne organisms and patient microbiota are the most prevalent causes of SSIs, frequently acquired in the operating theater. *Staphylococcus aureus* and coagulase-negative staphylococci such as *Staphylococcus epidermidis* are the most common infectious agents.<sup>2</sup>

It has been demonstrated that the overall incidence of SSI following hip fracture surgery is approximately 5%, with roughly one-third of these cases involving a deep infection.<sup>16</sup> Within a year, approximately fifty percent of patients who develop an SSI after hip fracture surgery will pass away.<sup>17</sup> Around twenty-three percent of revisions after total knee arthroplasty (TKA) and between 7% and 13% of revisions after total hip arthroplasty (THA) in elective surgery is caused by infection with the mortality rates associated with prosthetic joint infection (PJI) ranging between 2% and 18%.<sup>18,19,20</sup>

### Timing of antibiotic administration

The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of antibiotic levels must be exceeded throughout the duration of the operation for prophylaxis to be effective against bacterial growth.<sup>21</sup> The majority of studies support that prophylactic antibiotics should be administered 30–60 minutes prior to skin incision. Antibiotic concentrations in blood and bone usually arise within 20 and 60 minutes, respectively, and must be maintained until skin closure above the MIC.<sup>22</sup> When antibiotics are administered after tourniquet application, prophylaxis is probably ineffective. Therefore, the extremity remains without high antibiotic prophylaxis for an extended period of time. To prevent this unfortunate circumstance, the antibiotics should be administered at least 10 minutes prior to the incision and tourniquet inflation; they should have a sufficient half-life to maintain MIC throughout the procedure, and they should be effective against the most common pathogenic organisms.<sup>23</sup>

Generally, the initial two hours following an incision or contamination are the most crucial for preserving antibiotic concentration and the antibiotics should ideally be administered within an hour of the incision; however, some authors argue that the administration within two hours is acceptable.<sup>24</sup> Surgical site infection incidence increases two- to six-fold when we fail to provide antibiotic prophylaxis during this 2-hour time-frame.<sup>25</sup>

In the case of an open fracture, where contamination precedes treatment, it is not plausible to administer antibiotics to the surgical site prior to exposure to likely pathogens. The standard recommendation for patients with an open fracture is to administer antibiotics within three hours; nonetheless, in a retrospective study conducted by Lack et al., an interval of >66 min was identified between fracture and antibiotic administration as a major independent risk factor for surgical site infection in Gustilo-Anderson Grade III fractures. Urgent antibiotic prophylaxis and soft-tissue coverage within five days were independently correlated with a lower rate of deep infection; the timing of early surgical debridement had no effect on subsequent infection rates.<sup>26</sup>

Another parameter that might additionally impact the administration time frame is the type of antibiotic applied. For instance, vancomycin, which can be administered to patients with a  $\beta$ -lactam allergy, those colonized with MRSA, and those hospitalized in departments experiencing recent MRSA outbreaks, should be dispensed over a period of minimum 60 minutes due to the potential risk of anaphylactic adverse effects.<sup>27</sup> On this particular topic, no definitive recommendation can be implemented; however, the efficacy of antibiotic therapy has been demonstrated, and it should be administered as soon as possible.

### Choice of antibiotics

The selection of antibiotic prophylaxis in Orthopaedic and Trauma surgery should prioritize cost-effectiveness, safety, and broad-spectrum coverage. While there is substantial evidence supporting the general use of prophylaxis, there is no clear consensus favoring one specific antibiotic over another. The most common pathogens causing SSIs are Gram-positive organisms, particularly *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, both of which are part of the skin's natural flora. Therefore,  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics, such as cephalosporins and penicillin derivatives like cloxacillin, are frequently used.<sup>19</sup> Among these, cefazolin has been the standard choice in Orthopaedic and Trauma surgeries, including arthro-

Table 1. Antibiotic Selection and Indications in Orthopaedic Surgery

Antibiotic Class	Common Agents	Coverage	Advantages	Limitations	Indications
1st Generation Cephalosporins	Cefazolin	Gram-positive, limited Gram-negative	High safety profile, good bone penetration	Limited coverage for Gram-negative, ineffective against 90% of coagulase-negative staphylococci	Standard for orthopaedic and trauma surgeries, including arthroplasty
2nd Generation Cephalosporins	Cefuroxime	Broader Gram-negative, maintains Gram-positive coverage	Better Gram-negative coverage than 1st generation	Less effective against a wider range of Gram-negative organisms	Broader Gram-negative coverage
3rd Generation Cephalosporins	Ceftriaxone	Gram-negative, some Gram-positive	Broader spectrum	Associated with <i>Clostridium difficile</i> infections, leading to reduced use	Maybe in open fractures
Penicillin Derivatives	Cloxacillin, Flucloxacillin	Gram-positive (Staph. aureus)	Good safety profile	Ineffective against MRSA and 90% of coagulase-negative staphylococci	Commonly used in orthopaedic trauma
Macrolides / Lincosamides	Clindamycin	Gram-positive, anaerobes	Excellent bone penetration	Ineffective against aerobic Gram-negative bacteria	Alternative for $\beta$ -lactam allergic patients, suitable for Grade I and II open fractures
Glycopeptides	Teicoplanin, Vancomycin	Gram-positive (MRSA, MSSA)	Effective against MRSA, good bone penetration	Risk of resistance with vancomycin, potential nephrotoxicity	Used in $\beta$ -lactam allergic patients, added to bone cement in arthroplasty
Fluoroquinolones	Ciprofloxacin	Broad-spectrum (Gram-positive and negative)	Excellent oral bioavailability	High resistance risk, <i>Clostridium difficile</i> risk	Not used as first-line due to resistance risk
Beta-lactam Combinations	Co-amoxiclav	Broad-spectrum (Gram-positive, negative, anaerobes)	Effective for open fractures		Recommended for open fractures
Local Antibiotics	Gentamicin (in PMMA)	Broad-spectrum (local high concentration)	Effective local delivery, minimizes systemic side effects	Systemic coverage is limited	Used in bone cement, beads for open fractures

plasty, due to its proven efficacy.<sup>21</sup>

Second-generation cephalosporins, like cefuroxime, are increasingly favored for their broader

spectrum compared to first-generation cephalosporins. They provide enhanced coverage against Gram-negative organisms while maintaining effi-

cacy against key Gram-positive pathogens. This makes them a suitable alternative for prophylaxis in certain surgical settings, particularly where Gram-negative coverage is a concern.<sup>28,29</sup>

Cephalosporins, in general, have a favorable safety profile, excellent penetration into bone and muscle tissues, and are recommended by the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) for arthroplasty patients.<sup>30</sup> However, they are less effective against a wider range of Gram-negative bacteria and only cover about 10% of coagulase-negative staphylococci.<sup>31</sup> Concerns over third-generation cephalosporins' association with *Clostridium difficile* infections have led to their reduced use as first-line prophylactic agents, particularly in the United Kingdom, where about half of NHS hospitals have transitioned to flucloxacillin to target *Staphylococcus aureus*.<sup>32,33</sup>

For patients with a  $\beta$ -lactam allergy, alternatives such as clindamycin are effective against Gram-positive and anaerobic bacteria, though they lack efficacy against Gram-negative organisms, making them unsuitable for higher-grade open fractures.<sup>34</sup> Vancomycin and teicoplanin are effective antibiotics for Gram-positive bacteria, including MRSA and MSSA, making them suitable options for patients with  $\beta$ -lactam allergies.<sup>11</sup> However, vancomycin requires cautious use due to concerns over resistance and potential nephrotoxicity, limiting its recommendation for routine systemic administration.<sup>35,36,37</sup> In specific clinical contexts, such as arthroplasty and contaminated open fractures, vancomycin can be utilized locally. It can be added to bone cement for arthroplasty prophylaxis, used in antibiotic nanoparticles to prevent infections in open fractures, and employed in spinal surgeries or ACL reconstructions by soaking the graft in a vancomycin solution.<sup>5,38,39</sup> These localized approaches aim to deliver high antimicrobial concentrations directly to the surgical site while minimizing systemic side effects. Similarly, gentamicin-loaded bone cement is commonly used to provide effective local antibiotic delivery in procedures at high risk of infection.<sup>38,40</sup>

The decision to use dual antibiotic prophylaxis against periprosthetic joint infections (PJIs)

remains controversial due to potential risks like acute kidney injury. Thus, considerations regarding antibiotic resistance, cost-effectiveness, and patient-specific factors should guide the choice of prophylactic regimens.<sup>41</sup> In clinical practice, antibiotics targeting Gram-negative organisms are reserved for high-risk joint replacements, provided the patient's renal function allows it. Quinolones, despite their broad-spectrum coverage and good oral bioavailability, are avoided as first-line agents due to increased resistance risks and *Clostridium difficile* concerns.<sup>5</sup> For open fractures, co-amoxiclav, a combination of amoxicillin and clavulanic acid, remains a favored option due to its wide coverage of Gram-positive, Gram-negative, and anaerobic bacteria.<sup>5</sup>

### Duration of antibiotic prophylaxis

The controversy over antibiotic chemoprophylaxis duration in Orthopaedic surgery arises from inconsistent guidelines recommending anywhere from a single dose to 14 days. This variation results from insufficient high-quality evidence, as decisions are frequently influenced by expert opinion and institutional practices rather than reliable clinical data.<sup>23,42,43</sup> Overall, there is a trend toward a decrease in the necessary doses of prophylactic antibiotics. The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) recommends that chemoprophylaxis should not exceed 24 hours<sup>14</sup>, and even stricter, the 2017 U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guideline advises against administering antibiotic prophylaxis after surgical site closure in clean or clean-contaminated operations. In the orthopaedic setting, this includes procedures such as elective joint replacements without existing infections (clean) and minimally invasive surgeries with minor exposure to sterile areas (clean-contaminated), to prevent antibiotic overuse and resistance.<sup>44</sup> Williams and Gustilo found no difference in the infection rate between those who received prophylaxis for one and three days, in a retrospective study of patients undergoing total hip and knee arthroplasty.<sup>45</sup> A randomized controlled trial (RCT) reinforced the previous results, as no dif-



ference in the incidence of SSI between patients who received prophylaxis for 24 hours or seven days after THA or TKA was observed.<sup>46</sup>

In both elective and trauma surgery, evidence suggests that a single dose of antibiotic prophylaxis may be adequate;<sup>47,48</sup> however, the recommendation to shorten prophylaxis remains controversial, especially in high-risk situations like surgeries involving wound drainage or prosthetic implants, where the consequences of a SSI could be severe. Patients with total hip or knee arthroplasties who were not given extended oral antibiotic prophylaxis were up to five times more likely to develop periprosthetic joint infection (PJI), according to a retrospective analysis.<sup>49</sup> Long-term use was linked to drug-resistant pathogens, drug-induced hepatic/nephropathy, and burdensome healthcare costs.<sup>1</sup> The optimal duration of postoperative antibiotics is not yet clearly established, although the majority of reports indicate that prophylactic antibiotics administered for more than 24 hours postoperatively provide virtually no extra benefit.<sup>50,51,52,53</sup>

The authors' experience and everyday clinical practice contain the application of antibiotics for 24 hours in soft tissue procedures and for 48 hours

when implantation of prostheses is performed. This clinical practice has led to significantly low infection rates, without severe side effects for many years. An individualized approach is of paramount importance, though.

## Conclusion

Without a doubt, the utilization of surgical prophylactic antibiotics is of great importance in everyday orthopaedic practice. Regarding the timing, choice, and duration of prophylactic antibiotics in Orthopaedic surgery, general guidelines exist but an ongoing debate is also present. As a general rule, we could summarize that the current trend and the authors' proposal are to administer mainly cephalosporins (first or second-generation), but also vancomycin, clindamycin or penicillin-derivatives as prophylactic antibiotics 30 minutes to one hour prior to skin incision, preferably via intravenous infusion for 24 hours to three days postoperatively, depending on the type of the procedure and the patient characteristics. Exact antibiotic selection should be decided depending on cost, availability, allergies and local microbiology characteristics. A dual antibiotic scheme could be considered in selected cases.

## References

1. Dhammi IK, UlHaq R, Kumar S. Prophylactic antibiotics in orthopedic surgery. Controversial issues in its use. *Indian J Orthop.* 2015 Jul-Aug;49(4):373-6. doi: 10.4103/0019-5413.159556.
2. Uçkay I, Hoffmeyer P, Lew D, Pittet D. Prevention of surgical site infections in orthopaedic surgery and bone trauma: state-of-the-art update. *J Hosp Infect.* 2013 May;84(1):5-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2012.12.014.
3. WHO. The Surgical Safety Checklist. Geneva: World Health Organisation; 2008. Available at: [http://www.who.int/patientsafety/safesurgery/tools\\_resources/SSSL\\_Manual\\_finalJun08.pdf](http://www.who.int/patientsafety/safesurgery/tools_resources/SSSL_Manual_finalJun08.pdf).
4. World Health Organization. (2014). Antimicrobial resistance: global report on surveillance. World Health Organization. Available at: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/112642>
5. Bryson DJ, Morris DL, Shivji FS, Rollins KR, Snape S, Ollivere BJ. Antibiotic prophylaxis in orthopaedic surgery: difficult decisions in an era of evolving antibiotic resistance.

- Bone Joint J. 2016 Aug;98-B(8):1014-9. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.98B8.37359.
6. Bardia A, Treggiari MM, Michel G, et al. Adherence to Guidelines for the Administration of Intraoperative Antibiotics in a Nationwide US Sample. *JAMA Net Open*. 2021;4(12):e2137296. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.37296
  7. Cassini A, Plachouras D, Eckmanns T, et al. Burden of Six Healthcare-Associated Infections on European Population Health: Estimating Incidence-Based Disability-Adjusted Life Years through a Population Prevalence-Based Modelling Study. *PLoS Med*. 2016;13(10):e1002150. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002150
  8. Dominion L, Imperatori A, Rotolo N, Rovera F. Risk factors for surgical infections. *Surg Infect (Larchmt)*. 2006;7Suppl2:S9-S12. doi:10.1089/sur.2006.7.s2-9
  9. Martin ET, Kaye KS, Knott C, et al. Diabetes and Risk of Surgical Site Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*. 2016;37(1):88-99. doi:10.1017/ice.2015.249
  10. Meng F, Cao J, Meng X. Risk factors for surgical site infections following spinal surgery. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2015;22(12):1862-1866. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2015.03.065
  11. Ercole FF, Starling CE, Chianca TC, Carneiro M. Applicability of the national nosocomial infections surveillance system risk index for the prediction of surgical site infections: a review. *Braz J Infect Dis*. 2007;11(1):134-141. doi:10.1590/s1413-86702007000100028
  12. Herman TF, Bordoni B. Wound Classification. [Updated 2023 Aug 17]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024 Jan-. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK554456/>
  13. 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 (Larchmt)*. 2017;18(6):722-735. doi:10.1089/sur.2017.089
  14. Anderson PA, Savage JW, Vaccaro AR, et al. Prevention of Surgical Site Infection in Spine Surgery. *Neurosurgery*. 2017;80(3S):S114-S123. doi:10.1093/neuros/nyw066
  15. Kaufman MG, Meaike JD, Izaddoost SA. Orthopedic Prosthetic Infections: Diagnosis and Orthopedic Salvage. *SeminPlastSurg*. 2016 May;30(2):66-72. doi: 10.1055/s-0036-1580730.
  16. Ridgeway S, Wilson J, Charlet A, Kafatos G, Pearson A, Coello R. Infection of the surgical site after arthroplasty of the hip. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2005 Jun;87(6):844-50. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.87B6.15121.
  17. Edwards C, Counsell A, Boulton C, Moran CG. Early infection after hip fracture surgery: risk factors, costs and outcome. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2008 Jun;90(6):770-7. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.90B6.20194.
  18. Vanhegan IS, Morgan-Jones R, Barrett DS, Haddad FS. Developing a strategy to treat established infection in total knee replacement: a review of the latest evidence and clinical practice. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2012 Jul;94(7):875-81. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.94B7.28710.
  19. AlBuhairan B, Hind D, Hutchinson A. Antibiotic prophylaxis for wound infections in total joint arthroplasty: a systematic review. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2008 Jul;90(7):915-9. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.90B7.20498.
  20. Matar WY, Jafari SM, Restrepo C, Austin M, Purtil JJ, Parvizi J. Preventing infection in total joint arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2010 Dec;92 Suppl 2:36-46. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.J.01046.
  21. Bratzler DW, Houck PM; Surgical Infection Prevention Guidelines Writers Workgroup; American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons; American Association of Critical Care Nurses; American Association of Nurse Anesthetists; American College of Surgeons; American College of Oste-

- opathic Surgeons; American Geriatrics Society; American Society of Anesthesiologists; American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons; American Society of Health-System Pharmacists; American Society of PeriAnesthesia Nurses; Ascension Health; Association of periOperative Registered Nurses; Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology; Infectious Diseases Society of America; Medical Letter; Premier; Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America; Society of Thoracic Surgeons; Surgical Infection Society. Antimicrobial prophylaxis for surgery: an advisory statement from the National Surgical Infection Prevention Project. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004 Jun 15;38(12):1706-15. doi: 10.1086/421095.
22. Thonse R, Sreenivas M, Sherman KP. Timing of antibiotic prophylaxis in surgery for adult hip fracture. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*. 2004 Jul;86(4):263-6. doi: 10.1308/147870804560.
  23. Yeap JS, Lim JW, Vergis M, Au Yeung PS, Chiu CK, Singh H. Prophylactic antibiotics in orthopaedic surgery: guidelines and practice. *Med J Malaysia*. 2006 Jun;61(2):181-8.
  24. Meehan J, Jamali AA, Nguyen H. Prophylactic antibiotics in hip and knee arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2009 Oct;91(10):2480-90. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.H.01219.
  25. Burke JP. Maximizing appropriate antibiotic prophylaxis for surgical patients: an update from LDS Hospital, Salt Lake City. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2001 Sep 1;33 Suppl 2:S78-83. doi: 10.1086/321861.
  26. Lack WD, Karunakar MA, Angerame MR, Seymour RB, Sims S, Kellam JF, Bosse MJ. Type III open tibia fractures: immediate antibiotic prophylaxis minimizes infection. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2015 Jan;29(1):1-6. doi: 10.1097/BOT.0000000000000262. Erratum in: *J Orthop Trauma*. 2015 Jun;29(6):e213.
  27. Bryson DJ, Gulihar A, Aujla RS, Taylor GJ. The hip fracture best practice tariff: early surgery and the implications for MRSA screening and antibiotic prophylaxis. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol*. 2015 Jan;25(1):123-7. doi: 10.1007/s00590-014-1448-6.
  28. Krasin E, Warschawski Y, Morgan S, Dekel M. Antibiotic prophylaxis in orthopedic surgery; has the time to reconsider the current practice arrived? *J Orthop*. 2022 May 13;32:68-71. doi: 10.1016/j.jor.2022.05.008. PMID: 35601208;
  29. Bui T, Patel P, Preuss CV. Cephalosporins. [Updated 2024 Feb 17]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024 Jan-. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK551517/>
  30. Prokuski L. Prophylactic antibiotics in orthopaedic surgery. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2008 May;16(5):283-93. doi: 10.5435/00124635-200805000-00007.
  31. Aujla RS, Bryson DJ, Gulihar A, Taylor GJ. Trends in orthopaedic antimicrobial prophylaxis in the UK between 2005 and 2011. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*. 2013 Oct;95(7):495-502. doi: 10.1308/003588413X13629960047038. PMID: 24112496;
  32. Privitera G, Scarpellini P, Ortisi G, Nicastro G, Nicolin R, de Lalla F. Prospective study of *Clostridium difficile* intestinal colonization and disease following single-dose antibiotic prophylaxis in surgery. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1991 Jan;35(1):208-10. doi: 10.1128/AAC.35.1.208.
  33. Brown AR, Vicca AF, Taylor GJ. A comparison of prophylactic antibiotic regimens against airborne orthopaedic wound contamination. *J Hosp Infect*. 2001 Jun;48(2):117-21. doi: 10.1053/jhin.2001.0993.
  34. Vasenius J, Tulikoura I, Vainionpää S, Rokkanen P. Clindamycin versus cloxacillin in the treatment of 240 open fractures. A randomized prospective study. *Ann Chir Gynaecol*. 1998;87(3):224-8. PMID: 9825068.
  35. Periti P, Mini E, Mosconi G. Antimicrobial prophylaxis in orthopaedic surgery: the role of teicoplanin. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 1998 Mar;41(3):329-



40. doi: 10.1093/jac/41.3.329. Erratum in: J Antimicrob Chemother 1998 Dec;42(6):840. Erratum in: J Antimicrob Chemother 1998 Nov;42(5):682.
36. Svetitsky S, Leibovici L, Paul M. Comparative efficacy and safety of vancomycin versus teicoplanin: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2009 Oct;53(10):4069-79. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00341-09.
37. Bratzler DW, Houck PM, Richards C, Steele L, Dellinger EP, Fry DE, Wright C, Ma A, Carr K, Red L. Use of antimicrobial prophylaxis for major surgery: baseline results from the National Surgical Infection Prevention Project. *Arch Surg*. 2005 Feb;140(2):174-82. doi: 10.1001/archsurg.140.2.174.
38. Jiranek WA, Hanssen AD, Greenwald AS. Antibiotic-loaded bone cement for infection prophylaxis in total joint replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2006 Nov;88(11):2487-500. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.E.01126.
39. Banios K, Komnos GA, Raoulis V, Bareka M, Chalatsis G, Hantes ME. Soaking of autografts with vancomycin is highly effective on preventing postoperative septic arthritis in patients undergoing ACL reconstruction with hamstrings autografts. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2021 Mar;29(3):876-880. doi: 10.1007/s00167-020-06040-2.
40. Webb JC, Spencer RF. The role of polymethylmethacrylate bone cement in modern orthopaedic surgery. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2007 Jul;89(7):851-7. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.89B7.19148.
41. Gaudias J. Antibiotic prophylaxis in orthopedics-traumatology. *OrthopTraumatol Surg Res*. 2021 Feb;107(1S):102751. doi: 10.1016/j.otsr.2020.102751.
42. Appelbaum RD, Farrell MS, Gelbard RB, Hoth JJ, Jawa RS, Kirsch JM, Mandell S, Nohra EA, Rinderknecht T, Rowell S, Cuschieri J, Stein DM. Antibiotic prophylaxis in injury: an American Association for the Surgery of Trauma Critical Care Committee clinical consensus document. *Trauma Surg Acute Care Open*. 2024 Jun 3;9(1):e001304. doi: 10.1136/tsaco-2023-001304.
43. Mahmood B, Weisberg M, Baribeau Y, Buehring W, Razi A, Saleh A. Duration of antibiotics for penetrating spine trauma: a systematic review. *J Spine Surg*. 2020 Sep;6(3):606-612. doi: 10.21037/jss-20-451. PMID: 33102898; PMCID: PMC7548826.
44. Keely Boyle K, Rachala S, Nodzo SR. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2017 Guidelines for Prevention of Surgical Site Infections: Review and Relevant Recommendations. *Curr Rev MusculoskeletMed*. 2018 Sep;11(3):357-369. doi: 10.1007/s12178-018-9498-8.
45. Williams DN, Gustilo RB. The use of preventive antibiotics in orthopaedic surgery. *Clin Orthop-RelatRes*. 1984 Nov;(190):83-8. PMID: 6386263.
46. Nelson CL, Green TG, Porter RA, Warren RD. One day versus seven days of preventive antibiotic therapy in orthopedic surgery. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1983 Jun;(176):258-63. PMID: 6851335.
47. Tang WM, Chiu KY, Ng TP, Yau WP, Ching PT, Seto WH. Efficacy of a single dose of cefazolin as a prophylactic antibiotic in primary arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2003 Sep;18(6):714-8. doi: 10.1016/s0883-5403(03)00201-8.
48. Slobogean GP, Kennedy SA, Davidson D, O'Brien PJ. Single- versus multiple-dose antibiotic prophylaxis in the surgical treatment of closed fractures: a meta-analysis. *J Orthop-Trauma*. 2008 Apr;22(4):264-9. doi: 10.1097/BOT.0b013e31816b7880.
49. Kheir MM, Dilley JE, Ziemba-Davis M, Meneghini RM. The AAHKS Clinical Research Award: Extended Oral Antibiotics Prevent Periprosthetic Joint Infection in High-Risk Cases: 3855 Patients With 1-Year Follow-Up. *J Arthroplasty*. 2021 Jul;36(7S):S18-S25. doi: 10.1016/j.arth.2021.01.051.

50. Takemoto RC, Lonner B, Andres T, et al. Appropriateness of Twenty-four-Hour Antibiotic Prophylaxis After Spinal Surgery in Which a Drain Is Utilized: A Prospective Randomized Study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2015;97(12):979-986. doi:10.2106/JBJS.L.00782
51. Eshghpour M, Khajavi A, Bagheri M, Banihashemi E. Value of prophylactic postoperative antibiotic therapy after bimaxillary orthognathic surgery: a clinical trial. *Iran J Otorhinolaryngol*. 2014;26(77):207-210.
52. Jansisyanont P, Sessirisombat S, Sastravaha P, Bamroong P. Antibiotic prophylaxis for orthognathic surgery: a prospective, comparative, randomized study between amoxicillin-clavulanic acid and penicillin. *J Med Assoc Thai*. 2008;91(11):1726-1731.
53. Global Guidelines for the Prevention of Surgical Site Infection. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018. Web Appendix 25, Summary of a systematic review on surgical antibiotic prophylaxis prolongation. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK536429/>



Cite this  
paper as

Komnos GA, Konstantinou E, Stefanou N, Varitimidis S. Antibiotic prophylaxis in orthopaedic surgery: A review of evidence and best practices. *AOTH*. 2025; 76(2):5-14.