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Guideline Title
Best practice policy statement on urological surgery antimicrobial prophylaxis.

Bibliographic Source(s)

Guideline Status
This is the current release of the guideline.

Scope
Disease/Condition(s)
Infections associated with urologic surgery:
- Surgical site infection
- Urinary tract infection

Guideline Category
Prevention
Risk Assessment

Clinical Specialty
Internal Medicine
Preventive Medicine
Surgery
Urology

Intended Users
Physicians

Guideline Objective(s)
To assist urologists in the appropriate use of periprocedural antimicrobial prophylaxis

Target Population
Patients undergoing urologic surgery

Interventions and Practices Considered
Periprocedural systemic antimicrobial prophylaxis:
- First, second, or third-generation cephalosporin
- Fluoroquinolone
- Aminoglycoside
- Ampicillin
- Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX)
- Clindamycin
- Metronidazole
- Vancomycin
- Amoxicillin/clavulanate
- Ampicillin/subbactam
- Neomycin plus erythromycin base
- Piperacillin/tazobactam
- Ticarcillin/clavulanate

Major Outcomes Considered
- Rate of postoperative infection
- Cost, convenience, and safety of antimicrobial agents
- Emergence of resistant bacterial strains

**Methodology**

**Methods Used to Collect/Select the Evidence**
- Hand-searches of Published Literature (Primary Sources)
- Hand-searches of Published Literature (Secondary Sources)
- Searches of Electronic Databases

**Description of Methods Used to Collect/Select the Evidence**
A Medline search was performed using the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) index headings "antimicrobial prophylaxis," "postoperative complications," "surgical wound infection," "anti-bacterial agents," and the names of specific urologic procedures, from 1996 through 2006. This initial search was supplemented by scrutiny of bibliographies and additional focused searches, and 169 publications were selected for analysis by the Panel members. These included guidelines and policies from other groups, some of which were identified by Panel members outside of the Medline search; the guidelines from other groups were considered in the Panel's deliberations.

**Number of Source Documents**
A total of 169 publications were selected for analysis.

**Methods Used to Assess the Quality and Strength of the Evidence**
- Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

**Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Evidence**

**Levels of Evidence**
- **Ia** Evidence obtained from meta-analysis of randomized trials
- **Ib** Evidence obtained from at least one randomized trial
- **IIa** Evidence obtained from at least one well-designed controlled study without randomization
- **IIb** Evidence obtained from at least one other type of well-designed quasi-experimental study
- **III** Evidence obtained from well-designed nonexperimental studies, such as comparative studies, correlation studies, and case reports
- **IV** Evidence obtained from expert committee reports, or opinions, or clinical experience of respected authorities

**Methods Used to Analyze the Evidence**
- Review of Published Meta-Analyses
- Systematic Review

**Description of the Methods Used to Analyze the Evidence**
Assessment of the literature by the American Urological Association (AUA) Practice Guidelines Committee suggested that insufficient information was available to derive a guideline statement on antimicrobial prophylaxis during urologic surgery based solely on literature meta-analyses. As such, the Panel was charged with developing a Best Practice Policy Statement, which uses published data in concert with expert opinion, but does not employ formal meta-analysis of the literature.

**Methods Used to Formulate the Recommendations**
- Expert Consensus

**Description of Methods Used to Formulate the Recommendations**
The American Urological Association (AUA) convened the Urologic Surgery Antimicrobial Prophylaxis Best Practice Policy Panel, comprised of six urologists, to formulate recommendations for the use of antimicrobial prophylaxis during urologic surgery. The Panel formulated recommendations based on review of all material and the Panel members' expert opinions. Levels of evidence were assigned (see the "Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Evidence" field).

**Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Recommendations**
Not applicable

**Cost Analysis**
Published cost analyses were reviewed.

Data regarding the costs associated with prophylactic antimicrobial use specifically for urologic surgery are not readily obtainable, but data from other surgical disciplines are enlightening. Clearly, surgical site infections (SSIs) are associated with poorer patient outcome and increased costs. A review of the outcomes of 3,864 surgical patients
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Description of Method of Guideline Validation
This document was submitted for peer review, and comments from all 20 responding physicians and researchers were considered by the Panel in making revisions. The final document was submitted to the American Urological Association (AUA) Practice Guidelines Committee and Board of Directors for approval.

Recommendations

Major Recommendations

Definitions of the strength of the evidence (Ia – IV) are defined at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

Principles of Surgical Antimicrobial Prophylaxis

1. Surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis is the periprocedural systemic administration of an antimicrobial agent intended to reduce the risk of postprocedural local and systemic infections.
2. The potential benefit of surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis is determined by three considerations: patient-related factors (ability of the host to respond to bacterial invasion), procedural factors (likelihood of bacterial invasion at the operative site), and the potential morbidity of infection.
3. Surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis is recommended only when the potential benefit exceeds the risks and anticipated costs.
4. The antimicrobial agent used for prophylaxis should be effective against the disease-relevant bacterial flora characteristic of the operative site. Cost, convenience, and safety of the agent also should be considered.
5. The duration of surgical antimicrobial prophylaxis should extend throughout the period in which bacterial invasion is facilitated and/or is likely to establish an infection.

Table. Recommended Antimicrobial Prophylaxis for Urologic Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Organisms</th>
<th>Prophylaxis Indicated</th>
<th>Antimicrobial(s) of Choice</th>
<th>Alternative Antimicrobial(s)</th>
<th>Duration of Therapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Tract Instrumentation</td>
<td>GU tract</td>
<td>If risk factors 3, 4</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone 5</td>
<td>Aminoglycoside + Ampicillin 5</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of external urinary catheter (Level of evidence: Ib, III, IV)</td>
<td>GU tract</td>
<td>If risk factors 3, 4</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone 5, TMP-SMX</td>
<td>Aminoglycoside + Ampicillin 5, 1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cystography, urodynamic study, or simple cystourethroscopy (Level of evidence: Ib, III, IV)</td>
<td>GU tract</td>
<td>If risk factors 3, 4</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone 5, TMP-SMX</td>
<td>Aminoglycoside + Ampicillin 5, 1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin, Aminocillin/Clavulanate</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cystourethroscopy with manipulation a, b (Level of evidence: Ia/b, IV)</td>
<td>GU tract</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone 5, TMP-SMX</td>
<td>Aminoglycoside + Ampicillin 5, 1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin, Aminocillin/Clavulanate</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Level of evidence</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Antimicrobial(s) of Choice</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate brachtherapy or cryotherapy (Level of evidence: III, IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1st gen. Cephalosporin, Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transrectal prostate biopsy (Level of evidence: Ib)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intestine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone, Aminoglycoside + Metronidazole or Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tract Instrumentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone, TMP-SMX</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock-wave lithotripsy (Level of evidence: Ia)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract and skin</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin, Aminoglycoside + Metronidazole or Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percutaneous renal surgery (Level of evidence: IIIb, III)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract and skin</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin, Aminoglycoside + Metronidazole or Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ureteroscopy (Level of evidence: Ib)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone, TMP-SMX</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open or Laparoscopic Surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract, skin, and Group B Strep.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin, Aminoglycoside + Metronidazole or Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaginal surgery (Level of evidence: Ia/b, IIIb)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>If risk factors</td>
<td>1st gen. Cephalosporin</td>
<td>Clindamycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without entering urinary tract (Level of evidence: Ib, III, IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Fluoroquinolone, Aminoglycoside + Metronidazole or Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving entry into urinary tract (Level of evidence: Ib, III, IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract and skin</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin, Aminoglycoside + Metronidazole or Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving intestine (Level of evidence: Ib, IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract, skin, and intestine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2nd/3rd gen. Cephalosporin, Aminoglycoside + Metronidazole or Clindamycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving implanted prosthesis (Level of evidence: Ib, IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GU tract and skin</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Aminoglycoside + 1st/2nd gen. Cephalosporin or Vancomycin</td>
<td>≤24 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order of agents in each column is not indicative of preference. The absence of an agent does not preclude its appropriate use depending on specific situations.

1 Additional antimicrobial therapy may be recommended at the time of removal of an externalized urinary catheter.
2 GU tract: Common urinary tract organisms are *Escherichia coli*, *Proteus species* (sp.), *Klebsiella sp.*, *Enterococcus*.
3 See Table 1 in the original guideline document "Patient-related factors affecting host response to surgical infections."
4 If urine culture shows no growth prior to the procedure, antimicrobial prophylaxis is not necessary.
5 Or full course of culture-directed antimicrobials for documented infection (which is treatment, not prophylaxis).
6 Includes transurethral resection of bladder tumor and prostate, and any biopsy, resection, fulguration, foreign body removal, urethral dilation or urethrotomy, or ureteral instrumentation including catheterization or stent placement/removal.
7 Clindamycin, or aminoglycoside + metronidazole or clindamycin, are general alternatives to penicillins and cephalosporins in patients with penicillin allergy, even when not specifically listed.
8 Intestine: Common intestinal organisms are *E. coli*, *Klebsiella sp.*, *Enterobacter*, *Serratia sp.*, *Proteus sp.*, *Enterococcus*, and Anaerobes.
9 Skin: Common skin organisms are *Staph. aureus*, coagulase negative *Staph. sp.*, Group A *Strep. sp*.
10 For surgery involving the colon, bowel preparation with oral neomycin plus either erythromycin base or metronidazole can be added to or substituted for systemic agents.

**Abbreviations**: gen, generation; GU, genitourinary; sp, species; Staph., *Staphylococcus*; Strep., *Streptococcus*; TMP-SMX, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole.

Refer to Table 3b in the original guideline document for information on recommended dosages of prophylactic antimicrobial agents.
Table. Antimicrobial Prophylaxis for Patients with Orthopedic Conditions

- Antimicrobial prophylaxis is not indicated for urologic patients on the basis of orthopedic pins, plates, and screws, nor is it routinely indicated for most urologic patients with total joint replacements on that basis alone.
- Antimicrobial prophylaxis intended to reduce the risk of hematogenous total joint infection is recommended in patients who meet BOTH sets of criteria in the table below. The recommended antimicrobial regimen in these patients include:
  - A single systemic level dose of a quinolone (e.g., ciprofloxacin, 500 mg; levofloxacin, 500 mg; ofloxacin, 400 mg) orally one to two hours preoperatively.
  - Ampicillin 2 g intravenous (IV) (or vancomycin 1 g IV over one to two hours in patients allergic to ampicillin) plus gentamicin 1.5 mg/kg IV 30 to 60 minutes preoperatively.
  - For some procedures, additional or alternative agents may be considered for prophylaxis against specific organisms and/or other infections.
  - For patients NOT meeting BOTH of these criteria, antimicrobial prophylaxis still may be indicated to reduce the risk of other infections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Risk of Hematogenous Total Joint Infection</th>
<th>Increased Risk of Bacteremia Associated with Urologic Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Patients during the first two years after prosthetic joint replacement</td>
<td>- Any stone manipulation (includes shock-wave lithotripsy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Immunocompromised patients with prosthetic joint replacements</td>
<td>- Any procedure with transmural incision into urinary tract (does not include simple ligation with excision or percutaneous drainage procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inflammatory arthropathies (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus)</td>
<td>- Any endoscopic procedures of upper tract (ureter and kidney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drug-induced immunosuppression</td>
<td>- Any procedure that includes bowel segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Radiation-induced immunosuppression</td>
<td>- Transrectal prostate biopsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Patients with prosthetic joint replacements and comorbidities</td>
<td>- Any procedure with entry into the urinary tract (except for urethral catheterization) in individuals with higher risk of bacterial colonization:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Previous prosthetic joint infections</td>
<td>- Indwelling catheter or intermittent catheterization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Malnourishment</td>
<td>- Indwelling ureteral stent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hemophilia</td>
<td>- Urinary retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection</td>
<td>- History of recent/recurrent urinary tract infection or prostatitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diabetes</td>
<td>- Urinary diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Malignancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Definitions:

Levels of Evidence

IA Evidence obtained from meta-analysis of randomized trials
IB Evidence obtained from at least one randomized trial
Iia Evidence obtained from at least one well-designed controlled study without randomization
Iib Evidence obtained from at least one other type of well-designed quasi-experimental study
III Evidence obtained from well-designed nonexperimental studies, such as comparative studies, correlation studies, and case reports
IV Evidence obtained from expert committee reports, or opinions, or clinical experience of respected authorities

Clinical Algorithm(s)

None provided

Evidence Supporting the Recommendations

Type of Evidence Supporting the Recommendations

The type of supporting evidence is identified and graded for each antimicrobial prophylaxis recommendation (see Major Recommendations’ field).

Benefits/Harms of Implementing the Guideline Recommendations

Potential Benefits

- Reduction of the risk of and improved prevention of postprocedural local or systemic infections following urologic surgery
- Appropriate use of periprocedural antimicrobial prophylaxis
Potential Harms

- The personal-health risks of prophylactic antimicrobial administration include allergic reactions, which vary from minor rashes to anaphylaxis, and suppression of normal bacterial flora, which can lead to *Clostridium difficile* colitis, colonization and infection with resistant organisms, and other adverse effects.
- The public-health risk of antimicrobial prophylaxis relates to the induction of bacterial resistance in the patient and in the community microbial reservoir. Antimicrobial usage has had a clear impact on the emergence of resistant bacterial strains.

Qualifying Statements

The decision to use antimicrobial prophylaxis in urological surgery and the selection of agent and dosing can start with guidelines such as the ones presented in this document. The appropriate use of antimicrobial prophylaxis in an individual patient, however, requires consideration of not only these guidelines but also a comprehensive evaluation of the patient's specific circumstances.

Implementation of the Guideline

Description of Implementation Strategy

An implementation strategy was not provided.
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