



Comparison of the Efficacy of Chlorhexidine Gluconate versus Povidone Iodine as Preoperative Skin Preparation for the Prevention of Surgical Site Infections

Authors

**Dr Mohd. Rafik Rao¹, Dr Ashok Kumar², Dr Mahendra Jalthania³,
Dr Bhupendra Sharma⁴, Dr Sundar⁵, Dr Parikshit⁶**

¹Final Year PG, Dept of General Surgery, S.P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan
Email: drmohdrafik@gmail.com, Mobile no.: 08239681958

²Associate Professor & Unit Head, Dept. of General Surgery, S.P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan

^{3,5}Assistant Professor, Dept. of General Surgery, S.P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan

⁴Associate Professor, Dept. of General Surgery, S.P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan

⁶Final year PG, Dept. of General Surgery, S.P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan

Abstract

Background: Infections that occur in the wound created by an invasive surgical procedure are generally referred as surgical site infections (SSIs). The microorganisms that cause SSIs are usually derived from the patient (endogenous infection), being present on their skin or from an opened viscous. Preoperative skin preparation of the surgical site using appropriate antiseptic products is one of the important interventions to prevent SSIs. SSIs can double the length of time a patient stays in hospital and thereby increase the costs of health care. The aim of this study To compare efficacy of Povidone Iodine and Chlorhexidine Gluconate with help of sterile saline swab culture of SSIs.

Methodology: Patients were randomly divided in Group I & Group II each group having equal number of patients undergoing elective clean & clean-contaminated surgeries. The pre operative skin preparation is done with povidone iodine IP 5% w/v in group-I & chlorhexidine gluconate 5% v/v in aqueous base in group II. In both the groups sterile saline swab culture were taken from the incision site pre-painting as well as post-painting.

Results: A total of two hundred surgical cases included in study and age ranges from 14 to 80 years and male:female ratio was 1.24 :1 and bacterial growth in prepainting period in povidone iodine group was 81.70% while in chlorhexidine group is 99.15% which is statistically insignificant and in postpainting period in povidone iodine group 4.8% while in chlorhexidine group is 1.6% which is statistically significant.

Conclusion: Hence it can be safely concluded that chlorhexidine aquaous was associated with reduced risk of postoperative SSI in clean and clean-contaminated surgery when compared to Povidone Iodine. Further studies should evaluate the effectiveness of CHG versus PI in reducing SSI across contaminated surgery.

Keywords: Surgical site infections, Chlorhexidine, Povidone iodine, Painting.

Introduction

Surgical site infections (SSIs) are one of the most important causes of healthcare-associated

infections (HCAIs). Infections that occur in the wound created by an invasive surgical procedure are generally referred as surgical site infections

(SSIs). SSIs most commonly occur 5 to 6 days postoperatively but may develop sooner or later than that. Approximately 80-90% of all postoperative infection occurs within 30 days after the operative procedure.¹

Surveillance of Surgical site infection

Surveillance of SSI provides data that can both inform and influence practice to minimise the risk of SSI, as well as communicate more clearly the risks of infection to patients.² Surveillance was first recognised as an important tool in reducing rates of infection in the 1980s.³

Since some SSIs may take many days to develop, evidence of infection may not become apparent until after the patient has been discharged from hospital. Surveillance focused on detecting SSI during the inpatient stay is thus likely to underestimate the true rate of SSI, a problem that is exacerbated by the increasing trend towards shorter lengths of postoperative hospital stay and day surgery.⁴ Therefore, systems that enable cases of SSI to be identified after discharge from hospital enhance the value of surveillance. However, there are a number of practical difficulties in reliably identifying SSI in community settings and methods that systematically and accurately identify SSI are required if valid comparisons of rates are to be made.⁵

SSIs are associated with considerable morbidity and it has been reported that over one-third of postoperative deaths are related, at least in part, to SSI⁶. However, it is important to recognize that SSIs can range from a relatively trivial wound discharge with no other complications to a life-threatening condition. Other clinical outcomes of SSIs include poor scars that are cosmetically unacceptable, such as those that are spreading, hypertrophic or keloid, persistent pain and itching, restriction of movement particularly when over joints and a significant impact on emotional wellbeing.⁷

Postsurgical infection leads to increased length of postoperative hospital stay, drastically escalated expense, higher rates of hospital readmission, and

jeopardized health outcomes. There are numerous risk factors contributing to the development of SSIs related to patient, environment and the treatment being provided. Most important source of developing SSIs is patient's own microbial flora. Strict antisepsis of surgical site and optimization of pre-operative antisepsis may decrease the incidence of SSIs. The prevention of an SSI is easier, more economical and more feasible than treating an established SSI. As SSIs are usually polymicrobial in nature, prophylactic antibiotics cover is of no use; moreover there is risk of emergence of antibiotic resistance. Preoperative skin preparation of the surgical site using appropriate antiseptic products is one of the important interventions to prevent SSIs.⁸

Any chemical agent for microbial reduction of the skin ideally kills all skin organisms, is nontoxic and hypoallergenic, does not result in significant systemic resorption, has residual activity, and is safe for repetitive use as Antiseptic. Antiseptics are split into 2 major types: iodine/iodophor & chlorhexidine.

Iodine-based surgical antiseptics (Povidone Iodine-PI) are effective against a wide range of gram-positive and -negative organisms (including methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* [MRSA]) as well as tubercle bacillus, fungi and viruses. Systemic absorption of iodine can occur and in rare cases has led to iodine toxicosis and death; care should thus be taken when using this preparation in especially high-risk populations such as severe burn victims and new-borns. Chlorhexidine Gluconate (CHG) is commercially available in aqueous or alcohol formulations, and has broad activity against gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria, anaerobes, yeasts, and some lipid-enveloped viruses, although fungal coverage is reduced when compared with iodophor.⁹

Aqueous-based iodophors such as povidone-iodine (PI) contain iodine complexed with a solubilizing agent that allows for the release of free iodine when in solution. Iodine acts in an antiseptic fashion by destroying microbial proteins and DNA. Iodophor-containing products enjoy

widespread use because of their broad-spectrum antimicrobial properties, efficacy, and safety on nearly all skin surfaces in patients regardless of age. A second product, aqueous-based chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG), works by disrupting bacterial cell membranes. CHG has more sustained antimicrobial activity and is more resistant to neutralization by blood products than the iodophors.^{10,11}

The aim of this study to compare efficacy of Povidone Iodine and Chlorhexidine Gluconate with help of sterile saline swab culture (in terms of colony type & morphology and colonization rates) of SSIs.

Material & Methods

All patients undergoing elective surgeries with clean & clean contaminated surgical wound within study duration (six months) in Dept. of Surgery, S.P.Medical College and P.B.M Hospital, Bikaner and fulfilling eligibility criteria were included in the study.

Inclusion Criteria

1. Patients undergoing elective surgery with clean & clean contaminated surgical wound
2. Patients of all ages, sex & socio economic status.
3. Patients not having any focus of infection at the time of inclusion in study

Exclusion Criteria

1. Allergy to any type of skin preparations
2. Infection at or adjacent to surgery site
3. If patient is unable to stay in hospital for required study duration
4. Emergency surgery
5. Immunocompromised patients and patients on steroids
6. Patients with septicemia and systemic illness
7. Malignancies or undergoing chemo & radiotherapy.
8. Contaminated & dirty surgeries in which viscous was opened were excluded from the study.

Procedure of Data Collection

After admission, informed written consent was obtained from patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria. A short case history was recorded and thorough physical examination was conducted on each patient to establish proper diagnosis and to know about the presence of the risk factors regarding surgical site infection. Only very essential investigations were performed urgently for taking correct decision about the management. Strict aseptic precautions were followed during the operation. Meticulous techniques were practiced as far as possible. The operation procedure and related preoperative factors were observed directly and recorded in the data collection sheet instantly.

During the postoperative period all the patients was closely monitored everyday up to the discharge of the patient from the hospital. If any symptom or sign of infection appear during this period then details were recorded in the form of site involved, type of SSI, presence of discharge if any, rise in local temperature, induration if any and its size. If any collection of pus identified it was drained out and sent for culture and sensitivity test. Proper antibiotic were given to every patient both pre- operative and post-operative periods. Appropriate management was given to each of the patients of surgical site infection. Antibiotic were changed where necessary after getting the report of culture and sensitivity test. Postoperative events were recorded in the data sheet during every day follow up till discharge of patient. After completing the collection of data was compiled in a systematic way.

Patients were randomly divided in Group I (Povidone-iodine) & Group II (Chlorhexidine) each group having equal number of patients undergoing elective clean & clean-contaminated surgeries. The pre operative skin preparation is done with povidone iodine IP 5% w/v marketed as Betadine in group-I & chlorhexidine gluconate 5% v/v in aqueous base in group II. In both the groups sterile saline swab culture were taken from the

incision site pre-painting as well as post-painting. In cases where culture is positive antibiotic sensitivity is done along with morphological characteristics and differences in colonization rates were determined as a measure of efficacy of antiseptic regimen.

Results

In present study observed that maximum number of patients 36 (43.90%) were observed in 31 to 50 years of age in group I and maximum number of patients 50 (42.37%) were observed in 31-50 years of age in group II. Mean age of subjects was 41.18 years (table 1) and the most common surgery was cholecystectomy (31.70%), (37.28%) followed by inguinal hernioplasty (21.95%), (16.10%) in group I and group II respectively (table 2).

In this study observed that the maximum number of patients 65 (79.26%) in group I and 117

(99.16%) patients in group II were stayed 5-10 days followed by 17(20.73%) patients stayed more than 10 days in group I and only 1 (0.84%) cases stayed less than 5 days after surgery in group II (table 3).

In this study showing bacterial growth prepainting in povidone iodine group & chlorhexidine group as 81.70% & 99.15% respectively, which is statistically insignificant in chi square test 17.07 & P-value was 0.461 (table 4) and bacterial growth in postpainting the group I & group II as 4.8% & 1.7% respectively, which is statistically significant in chi square test 10.37 & P-value was 0.043. No growth of organism shown in 78 (95.12%), 116 (98.30%) patients in group I and group II respectively (table 5). The objective symptoms of SSIs, where as all symptoms present in 3 patients in group I and only 1 patients have all symptoms in group II.

Table 1: Age wise Distribution of Study Population

Age group (yrs)	Group I (n=82)		Group II (n=118)		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
11-20	10	12.19%	11	9.32%	21	10.5%
21-30	15	18.29%	26	22.03%	41	20.5%
31-40	18	21.95%	32	27.11%	50	25%
41-50	18	21.95%	18	15.25%	36	18%
51-60	13	15.85%	13	11.01%	26	13%
61-70	7	8.53%	12	10.16%	19	9.5%
71-80	1	1.21%	6	5.08%	7	3.5%

Table 2: Shows Distribution of cases According to Type of Surgery In Study Population

Type of Surgery	Group I (n=82)		Group II (n=118)		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Appendectomy	6	7.31%	18	15.25%	24	12%
Cholecystectomy	26	31.70%	44	37.28%	70	35%
Inguinal Hernioplasty	18	21.95%	19	16.1%	37	18.5%
Umbilical Hernioplasty	7	8.53%	8	6.77%	15	7.5%
Excision Sebaceous cyst	6	7.31%	4	3.38%	10	5%
Cystolithotomy	3	3.65%	2	1.69%	5	2.5%
Excision Lipoma	3	3.65%	5	4.23%	8	4%
Palomo procedure	2	2.43%	3	2.54%	5	2.5%
Modified Radical Mastectomy	2	2.43%	2	1.69%	4	2%
Excision Dermoid cyst	1	1.21%	3	2.54%	4	2%
Whipples Operation	2	2.43%	1	0.84%	3	1.5%
Hemithyroidectomy	1	1.21%	2	1.69%	3	1.5%
Ureterolithotomy	1	1.21%	2	1.69%	3	1.5%
Excision of Lymphnode	0	0%	4	3.38%	4	2%
Excision of Fibroadenoma	0	0%	2	1.69%	2	1%
Simple Mastectomy	1	1.21%	0	0%	1	0.5%
Sac eversion of Hydrocele	1	1.21%	1	0.84%	2	1%

Table 3: Shows Duration of Hospital Stay after Surgery In Study Population

Duration of Hospital stay	Group I (n=82)	Group II (n=118)
≤5 days	0 (0%)	1 (0.84%)
5-10 days	65 (79.26%)	117 (99.16%)
>10 days	17 (20.73%)	0 (0%)

Table 4: Prepainting microbiological report

Microbiological Report	Group-I (n=82) Povidone iodine		Group-II (n=118) Chlorhexidine	
	No. of subjects	Percentage	No. of subjects	Percentage
No Growth	15	18.29%	1	0.84%
Coagulase negative Staphylococcus	47	57.31%	15	12.71%
Coagulase positive Staphylococcus	20	24.39%	99	83.89%
Gram positive bacilli	0	0%	3	2.54%

Table 5: Postpainting microbiological report

Microbiological Report	Group-I (n=82) Povidone iodine		Group-II (n=118) Chlorhexidine	
	No. of subjects	Percentage	No. of subjects	Percentage
No Growth	78	95.12%	116	98.30%
Coagulase negative Staphylococcus	2	2.4%	0	0%
Coagulase positive Staphylococcus	2	2.4%	2	1.7%
Gram positive bacilli	0	0%	0	0%

Table 6: Shows the objective symptoms of surgical site infections

Objective Symptoms	Group-I Povidone iodine		Group-II Chlorhexidine	
	No. of subjects	Percentage	No. of subjects	Percentage
Fever	3	1.5%	2	1%
Pain	3	1.5%	1	0.5%
Tender	3	1.5%	1	0.5%
Discharge	3	1.5%	1	0.5%

Discussion

The pre operative skin preparation is done with povidone iodine IP 5% w/v marketed as Betadine in group-I & chlorhexidine gluconate 5% v/v in aqueous base in group II. In both the groups sterile saline swab culture were taken from the incision site pre-painting as well as post-painting. In cases where culture is positive antibiotic sensitivity is done along with morphological characteristics and differences in colonization rates were determined as a measure of efficacy of antiseptic regimen. It was noticed from this study that the Mean of age in Group I and Group II was 40.68 years and 41.25 years respectively whereas the respective values of Patrick JC, Kari K, Miles M and Blackwell L et al¹² study was 53.4 years, which is higher than the present study but in both the studies, age was not the factor to have any implications on results of the study as all patients had good immune status, had no co-morbid

conditions and were planned for clean elective surgery.

There are numerous risk factors contributing to the development of SSIs related to patient, environment and the treatment being provided. Nutrition of the patient play important role in wound healing and recovery of the patient. Most important source of developing SSIs is patient's own microbial flora. Strict antisepsis of surgical site and optimization of pre-operative antisepsis may decrease the incidence of SSIs. The prevention of an SSI is easier, more economical and more feasible than treating an established SSI. In present study most common surgery was cholecystectomy (31.70%) followed by inguinal hernia (21.95%) in group I and in group II, mostly surgery was cholecystectomy (37.28%) followed by inguinal hernioplasty (16.10%) and appendectomy (15.25%). There is now increasing evidence that a higher proportion of surgical site

infections may be caused by bacteria introduced into deeper skin structures at the time of incision. Proper skin disinfection might be one of the most important factor to reduce the colonization of site of incision and thus, preventing the development of subsequent infection. Several randomized, controlled trials investigating different regimens for skin disinfection prior to surgery found chlorhexidine in aqueous solution more effective in reducing incision site colonization and subsequent wound infection when compared to povidone iodine.¹³ Most SSIs are superficial, but even so they contribute greatly to the morbidity and mortality associated with surgery^{14,15}. Estimating the cost of SSIs has proved to be difficult but many studies agree that additional bed occupancy is the most significant factor.

In this study maximum number of patients 182 (91%) stayed 5-10 days after surgery in both group followed by 17 (20.73%) patients stayed more than 10 days in group I and only 1 (0.84%) patient stayed less than 5 days after surgery in group II. Similar result (8±2 day post operatively) was found in a study by Matin ASMR (1981).¹⁶ Haddad V and Macon WLN (1980)¹⁷ showed in their studies that the occurrence of wound infection was on an average of 6.8 post-operative days which was also similar to that of ours (5.33-6.33).The time of appearance of wound infection in majority of the cases (6 to10 days) indicates that the source of infection was not from the operation theatre, rather from patients' surroundings like, patients' ward, attendance etc.

Our result showing bacterial growth in preoperative period in povidone iodine group 81.70% while in chlorhexidine group 99.15% which is statistically insignificant P-0.461. Surgical site infection in recent times is a significant cause in the morbidity of the patient leading to delay in the hospital stay. Proper skin disinfection however plays a vital role in reduction of surgical site infections. The microbiological report during the time of postoperative period, showing bacterial growth in

PI group 4.8% while in CHG group 1.7% which is statistically significant (P-0.043).

Connell et al in 1964¹⁸ demonstrated povidone-iodine as a highly effective degerming agent which had a rapid lethal effect and was noninjurious to both normal skin and/or open wounds. Hugo and Longworth (1964)¹⁹ observed that chlorhexidine is rapidly absorbed by bacterial cell.

A study by Ranjeet et al (2013)²⁰ showed that surgical site infection in chlorhexidine group was 9.96% & that of povidone-iodine was 15.95%. Darouiche et al (2010)²¹ found chlorhexidine group 9.5% is better than povidone-iodine group 16.1%.

Ingli et al (2010)²² done a meta-analysis of various RCT's comparing chlorhexidine with iodine for preoperative skin antisepsis revealed that chlorhexidine was associated with significant fewer surgical site infections along with reduction in the cost of antisepsis.

Grabsch EA et al (2004)²³, suggested excellent bactericidal efficacy of chlorhexidine over povidone iodine. T.R. Brown et al (1984)²⁴ concluded that wound infection rates were less with chlorhexidine spray technique (6%) as compared to povidone iodine scrub or liquid (8.1%).

Paocharoen V et al (2009)²⁵ concluded that bacterial colonization and postoperative surgical wound infection were significantly reduced in the chlorhexidine group than in povidone iodine group.

In this study showed the objective symptoms maximum occur in group I (3.6%) as compare to group II (1.6%). These rates were calculated after excluding ward acquired infections.

The study done by Brown et al. (1984)²⁴ compared post-operative wound infection rates after using either povidone iodine or aqueous solution of chlorhexidine and it showed that post-operative wound infection rates were less in chlorhexidine group (Group I) (6.0%) than in povidone iodine group (Group II) (8.1%).

Chlorhexidine can also be used in most parts of body but needs careful application near eyes and ears as it can be toxic to middle ear on repeated exposures and irritating to eyes when comes in direct contact with the eye.

The results of the present study shows chlorhexidine gluconate 5% v/v in aqueous solution is nearly an ideal antiseptic due to:

- Broader antimicrobial spectrum than povidone iodine.
- It leaves a protective film where as povidone-iodine leaves no film.
- Rate of post-operative wound infections are much lower than povidone-iodine.
- Bacterial colonization is also significantly less than povidone-iodine.
- It has more rapid onset of action than PI and persistent activity in the presence of body fluids.

Conclusion

Surgical site infections determine the final outcome of an operation apart from the morbidity and mortality they cause. Though surgical care is very important to prevent wound infection, but some pre and post operative steps can reduce post operative wound infections also. Hence it can be safely concluded that chlorhexidine aquaous should be followed in preoperative skin preparation in clean & clean contaminated elective surgeries. Since the efficacy of this regimen was proved in reduction in incision site colonization and postoperative wound infection, it is prudent to use this regimen in contaminated and emergency surgeries.

chlorhexidine aquaous was associated with reduced risk of postoperative SSI in clean and clean-contaminated surgery when compared to Povidone Iodine. Further studies should evaluate the effectiveness of CHG versus PI in reducing SSI across contaminated surgery.

References

1. Smyth ET, McIlvenny G, Enstone JE, et al. Four Country Healthcare Associated

- Infection Prevalence Survey 2006: overview of the results. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2008;69:230–48.
2. Department of Health CMO. *Winning Ways: Working Together to Reduce Healthcare Associated Infection in England*. London: Department of Health; 2003.
3. Cruse PJ, Foord R. The epidemiology of wound infection. A 10-year prospective study of 62,939 wounds. *Surgical Clinics of North America*. 1980;60:27–40.
4. Mannien J, Wille JC, Snoeren RL, et al. Impact of postdischarge surveillance on surgical site infection rates for several surgical procedures: results from the nosocomial surveillance network in The Netherlands. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology*. 2006;27:809–16.
5. Whitby M, McLaws ML, Collopy B, et al. Post-discharge surveillance: can patients reliably diagnose surgical wound infections? *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2002;52:155–60.
6. Astagneau P, Rioux C, Golliot F, et al. Morbidity and mortality associated with surgical site infections: results from the 1997–1999 INCISO surveillance. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2001;48:267–74.
7. Bayat A, McGrouther DA, Ferguson MW. Skin scarring. *British Medical Journal* 2003;326:88–92.
8. National Collaborating Centre for Women's and Children's Health. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence: guidance. *Surgical site infection: prevention and treatment of surgical site infection*. RCOG Press, London (2008).
9. Reichman DE, Greenberg JA. Reducing Surgical Site Infections: A Review. *Reviews in Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2009;2(4):212-221.
10. Digison MB. A review of antiseptic agents for pre-operative skin preparation. *Plast Surg Nurs*.2007;27:185–189.

11. Hibbard JS. Analyses comparing the antimicrobial activity and safety of current antiseptic agents: a review. *J Infus Nurs.* 2005;28:194–207.
12. Patrick JC, Kari K, Miles M, Blackwell L, James S. A randomized trial that compared povidone iodine and chlorhexidine antiseptics for vaginal hysterectomy. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2012 Feb; 192(2):422-5.
13. Anjanappa T. H, Arjun A. Preparative Skin Preparation And Surgical Wound Infection. *Journal of Evidence based Medicine and Healthcare*; Volume 2, Issue 2, January 12, 2015; Page: 131-154.
14. Leaper DJ, van Goor H, Reilly J, Petrosillo N, Geiss HK, Torres AJ, et al. Surgical site infection - a European perspective of incidence and economical burden. *Int Wound Journal* 2004; 1(4): 247-273.
15. DiPiro JT, Martindale RG, Bakst A, Vacani PF, Watson P, Miller MT. Infection in surgical patients: effects on mortality, hospitalization, and postdischarge care. *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 1998; 55(8): 777-81.
16. Matin ASMR. Wound Infection in Planned Abdominal Surgery. (Dissertation), Bangladesh College of Physicians and Surgeons, 1981. 10.
17. Haddad V, Macon WLN. Abdominal Wound Dehiscence and Evisceration: Contributing factors and improved mortality, *Br J Surg.* 1980;16:508-13.
18. James F. Connell and Louis M. Rousselot. 1964, Dec. "Povidone-Iodine: Extensive surgical evaluation of a new antiseptic agent." *American Journal of Surgery.* 108: 849-855.
19. Hugo W.B. and Longworth A.R. 1964. "Some aspects of the mode of action of chlorhexidine." *Brit. J. Pharm. Pharmacop.* 16: 658.
20. Ranjeet A. Patil "A Comparative Study Of Chlorhexidine-Alcohol Versus Povidone-Iodine For Surgical Site Antisepsis In Clean & Clean Contaminated Cases" *Journal of Medical Thesis* 2013 July-Sep; 1(1) : 33.
21. Darouiche RO, et al. Chlorhexidine-alcohol versus povidone-iodine for surgical-site antisepsis. *N Engl J Med* 2010 362: 18–26.
22. Ingi Lee, Rajender K. Agarwal, Bruce Y. Lee Neil O. Fishman, Craig A. Umscheid. Systematic Review and Cost Analysis Comparing Use of chlorhexidine with Use of Iodine for Preoperative Skin Antisepsis to Prevent Surgical Site Infection. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology.* Dec.,2010, Vol 31(12):1219-1229.
23. Grabsch E.A., Mitchell D.J., Hooper J.and Turnidge J.D. "In use efficacy of a chlorhexidine in alcohol surgical sub: a comparative study." *ANZ J Surg.*2004; 74(9): 769-72.
24. Brown T.R., Clarence E. Ehrlich, Frederick B. Stehman, Alan M. Golichowski, James A. Madura and Harold E.E. 1984. "Clinical evaluations of chlorhexidine gluconate spray as compared with iodophor scrub for preoperative skin preparation." *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics*; 158(4):363.
25. V. Paocharoen, C. Mingmalairak, A. Apisarnthanarak: Comparison of surgical wound infection after preoperative skin preparation with 4% chlorhexidine [correction of chlohexidine] and povidone iodine: a prospective randomized trial; *J Med Assoc Thai*, 92 (7) (2009), pp. 898–902.