

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Comparison of olanexidine versus povidone-iodine for preventing surgical site infection in gastrointestinal surgery: study protocol for a multicenter, single-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028269
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Takeuchi, Masashi; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Obara, Hideaki; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery, Kawakubo, Hirofumi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Shinoda, Masahiro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Okabayashi, Koji ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Mayanagi, Shuhei ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Irinno, Tomoyuki; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Fukuda, Kazumasa; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Nakamura, Rieko; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Wada, Norihito ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Kitago, Minoru ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Yagi, Hiroshi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Abe, Yuta; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Oshima, Go ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Hori, Shutaro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Tsuruta, Masashi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Ishida, Takashi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Yokose, Takahiro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Hirukawa, Kazuya ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	<p>Isobe, Yoh; Department of Surgery, National Tokyo Medical Center Sekimoto, Yasuhito ; Department of Surgery, National Tokyo Medical Center Harada, Hirohisa ; Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital Maeda, Yusuke ; Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital Shito, Masaya ; Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital Kondo, Takayuki ; Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital Sato, Yasunori ; Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Keio University School of Medicine Kitagawa, Yuko ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery</p>
<p>Keywords:</p>	<p>WOUND MANAGEMENT, SURGERY, Gastrointestinal infections < GASTROENTEROLOGY</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Comparison of olanexidine versus povidone-iodine for preventing surgical site infection**
5
6
7 **in gastrointestinal surgery: study protocol for a multicenter, single-blind, randomized**
8
9 **controlled clinical trial**
10
11
12

13
14 Masashi Takeuchi, M.D.¹; Hideaki Obara, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Hirofumi Kawakubo, M.D., Ph.D.¹;

15
16
17 Masahiro Shinoda, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Koji Okabayashi, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Shuhei Mayanagi, M.D.,

18
19
20 Ph.D.¹; Tomoyuki Irino, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Kazumasa Fukuda, Ph.D.¹; Rieko Nakamura, M.D.,

21
22
23 Ph.D.¹; Norihito Wada, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Minoru Kitago, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Hiroshi Yagi, M.D.,

24
25
26 Ph.D.¹; Yuta Abe, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Go Oshima, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Shutaro Hori, M.D., Ph.D.¹;

27
28
29 Masashi Tsuruta, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Takashi Ishida, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Takahiro Yokose, M.D.¹;

30
31
32 Kazuya Hirukawa, M.D.¹; Yoh Isobe, M.D., Ph.D.²; Yasuhito Sekimoto, M.D.²; Hirohisa

33
34
35 Harada, M.D., Ph.D.³; Yusuke Maeda, M.D.³; Masaya Shito, M.D., Ph.D.⁴; Takayuki Kondo,

36
37
38 M.D.⁴; Yasunori Sato, Ph.D.⁵; and Yuko Kitagawa, M.D., Ph.D.¹

39
40
41 ¹Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku,

42
43
44
45
46
47 Tokyo 160-8582, Japan

48
49
50 ²Department of Surgery, National Tokyo Medical Center, 2-5-1 Higashigaoka, Meguro-ku,

51
52
53
54
55 Tokyo 152-8902, Japan

56
57
58 ³Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital, 1-4-17 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo

1
2
3
4 108-0073, Japan
5
6

7
8 ⁴Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital, 12-1 Shinkawadori, Kawasaki-ku,
9
10
11 Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa 210-0013, Japan
12
13

14 ⁵Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Keio University School of Medicine,
15
16
17 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan
18
19

20
21 **Corresponding author:** Hideaki Obara, M.D., Ph.D.
22

23
24 Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku,
25
26
27 Tokyo 160-8582, Japan
28

29
30
31 E-mail: obara.z3@keio.jp
32

33
34 Tel: +81-3-3353-1211; Fax: +81-3-3755-4707
35
36

37
38 **Word count:** 2536
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Although several guidelines have indicated the efficacy of chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine for reducing the surgical site infection (SSI) rate, the optimal recommendation has still not been established, and the prevalence of SSI remains high in gastrointestinal surgery. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the more effective antiseptic for surgical site preparation. Olanexidine (1.5% Olanedine[®], Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc., Tokushima, Japan), which is a new antiseptic in Japan, has antimicrobial activity against a wide range of bacteria, including gram-positive bacteria and gram-negative bacteria.

Methods and analysis: We propose a multicenter, single-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial for comparing two treatments, that is, 1.5% olanexidine or 10% povidone-iodine, for surgical skin preparation to prevent SSI in gastrointestinal surgeries with class II surgical wounds. Patients aged ≥ 20 years at the time of consent will be included. The primary outcome measure is the 30-day postoperative SSI rate. Pearson's chi-square test or Fisher's exact test and Student's t-test will be used in the statistical analyses.

Ethics and dissemination: Participant recruitment began in June 2018. The final results will be published in international peer-reviewed medical journals.

Trial registration number: UMIN 000031560 (<https://upload.umin.ac.jp/cgi-open->

bin/ctr_e/ctr_view.cgi?recptno=R000036031)

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Article Summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first study to evaluate the effect of olanexidine, which has been commercially available since 2015 in Japan.
- To evaluate whether olanexidine or povidone-iodine, the conventional skin antiseptic used in Japan, is useful for preventing surgical site infection (SSI) in gastrointestinal surgery.
- The study design is a multicenter, single-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial.
- The primary outcome measure is the 30-day postoperative SSI rate.

INTRODUCTION

Surgical site infection (SSI) is one of the most common nosocomial infections in surgical patients.¹ Especially, the rate of SSI is higher in gastrointestinal surgery than in other surgeries, such as cardiothoracic surgery, gynecologic surgery, and neurosurgery,²⁻⁴ and it has been reported that 10% to 30% of patients suffer from SSI after gastrointestinal surgery.⁵ SSI not only causes prolonged hospitalization and delay of postoperative therapy, but it also causes increased medical costs—\$1300-5000 per person for inpatient treatment including antibiotic therapy.^{6,7} Therefore, prevention of SSI is extremely important to both the patient and all medical practitioners involved in the surgery.

Many perioperative measures for decreasing SSI have been reported, including enhanced nutritional support, perioperative oxygenation, surgical technique, wound dressing, and use of an antimicrobial agent.^{1,8} Surgical site preparation is one of the useful procedures for preventing SSI because microorganisms are removed from the skin. Thus far, two types of preparations, povidone-iodine and chlorhexidine,⁹⁻¹² have been commonly used as preoperative antiseptic procedures worldwide. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guideline just recommends skin preparation with an alcohol-containing agent if there are no contraindications to its use, and other guidelines do not favor one antiseptic agent over another

1
2
3
4 for skin preparation.^{1,13,14} Both preparations have broad-spectrum antibacterial effectiveness;
5
6
7 however, chlorhexidine is not effective against some pathogens, such as methicillin-resistant
8
9
10 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA)¹⁵ and vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE),¹⁶ of which
11
12
13 infection should be avoided. On the other hand, povidone-iodine is known to decrease its
14
15
16 activity under the presence of organic materials included blood or pus.¹⁷ Therefore, it is
17
18
19 necessary to determine the more effective antiseptic for surgical site preparation.
20
21
22

23
24 Olanexidine (1.5% Olanedine®; Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc., Tokushima, Japan),
25
26
27 which is a new antiseptic, is one of the biguanide bactericidal disinfectants that contains
28
29
30 olanexidine gluconate as its active ingredient.^{18,19} It has been commercially available since
31
32
33 2015 in Japan. It can disrupt membrane integrity by binding to the cell membrane; this results
34
35
36 in irreversible leakage of intracellular components, and its bacteriostatic and fungicidal
37
38
39 activities are exerted.¹⁸ Olanexidine has antimicrobial activity against a wide range of bacteria,
40
41
42 including gram-positive bacteria and gram-negative bacteria. Moreover, Inoue et al. reported
43
44
45 that compared to chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine, olanexidine showed more potent
46
47
48 bactericidal activity against MRSA and VRE both in vitro and in vivo.¹⁸ Therefore, the use of
49
50
51 olanexidine is highly expected to lead to decreases in the SSI rate. However, to date, no study
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 has evaluated the effectiveness and safety of olanexidine compared to conventional antiseptics
5
6
7
8 in large-scale clinical trials.
9

10
11 In this multicenter, single-blinded, randomized controlled clinical trial, we aim to evaluate
12
13
14 whether olanexidine or povidone-iodine, which is the conventional skin antiseptic used in
15
16
17 Japan, is useful for preventing SSI in gastrointestinal surgery. We hypothesize that olanexidine
18
19
20 will be more useful for preventing SSI than povidone-iodine without increasing toxicity.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

METHODS

Trial design

This trial is a multi-center, prospective, randomized, open-label, blinded-endpoint trial (PROBE) designed to assess the efficacy of 1.5% olanexidine for surgical skin preparation for preventing SSIs in gastrointestinal surgery. The trial was designed and will independently be conducted by Keio University with approval from the ethics committee of Keio University School of Medicine in accordance with the principals of the Declaration of Helsinki. All analyses will be conducted by Keio University, independent of the sponsor, according to the prespecified statistical analysis plan (SAP). As a prospective randomized controlled trial, the study strategy will be constructed and presented in accordance with the recommendations of the CONSORT statement.

Eligibility criteria

Eligible patients are those who meet all of the following inclusion criteria and who do not have any listed exclusion criteria.

- Inclusion criteria
 - 1) Scheduled to undergo elective gastrointestinal surgery involving the esophagus, stomach,

1
2
3
4 duodenum, small intestine, colorectal, liver, biliary tract, and pancreas that has a class II
5
6
7 surgical wound (Figure 1).
8

9
10 2) Age ≥ 20 years at the time of consent by nonblinded investigators
11
12

13
14 3) Provision of written informed consent by the patient.
15
16

17 • Exclusion criteria
18

19
20
21 1) Allergy to olanexidine gluconate or povidone-iodine.
22
23

24 2) Unable to undergo follow-up 30 days postoperatively.
25
26

27 3) Active bacterial infection at the time of informed consent (except for viral hepatitis).
28
29

30 4) Receipt of antimicrobial therapy on the day before surgery.
31
32

33 5) Undergoing non-elective surgery or surgery requiring antisepsis of the mucosal surfaces or
34
35 surgical wound sites.
36
37

38 6) Unsuitable conditions for safe conduct of this trial according to the nonblinded investigators.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Intervention**

49
50
51 Study arm A (experimental group): Surgical skin antisepsis with 1.5% olanexidine is
52
53 administered just before gastrointestinal surgery.
54
55

56
57 Study arm B (control group): Surgical skin antisepsis with 10% povidone-iodine is
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 administered just before gastrointestinal surgery.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Recruitment of study participants**

11
12
13
14 The trial protocol (October/ 24/2018, ver1.3) was approved by each participating
15
16
17 institution's institutional review board and registered in the University Hospital Medical
18
19
20 Information Network Clinical Trials Registry (number UMIN 000031560). Recruitment into
21
22
23 the trial started in May 2018 and will continue until 600 participants are registered. All
24
25
26 participants who meet inclusion criteria will be provided with a participant information sheet
27
28
29 by investigators before giving written informed consent. This study is being conducted in 4
30
31
32 general centers: Keio University Hospital (Tokyo, Japan), National Tokyo Medical Center
33
34
35 (Tokyo, Japan), Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital (Tokyo, Japan), and Kawasaki Municipal
36
37
38 Hospital (Kanagawa, Japan).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Randomization**

50
51 Registration and allocation of participants is generated by nonblinded investigators using the
52
53
54 CapTool® Lite (Mebix, Inc., Tokyo, Japan). Eligible patients will be randomized to either
55
56
57 surgical skin antisepsis with olanexidine (study arm A) or surgical skin antisepsis with
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 povidone-iodine (study arm B) in a 1:1 replacement ratio. The random sequence will be
5
6
7 generated from computer-generated block randomization. We designated the factor of surgical
8
9 approach (laparoscopy versus laparotomy) as the allocation adjustment factor because of
10
11 evidence that there is a significantly higher SSI rate in laparotomy than in laparoscopy.²⁰
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Blinding**

22
23
24 Both patients and blinded investigators will be masked to the assigned group. Although there
25
26 is a difference in color between povidone-iodine and olanexidine, it is feasible for patients to
27
28 be masked because we wipe the stain of the antiseptic off their skin postoperatively.
29
30
31 Nonblinded investigators cannot be masked because he/she will be in the operating room when
32
33 the antiseptic is used.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 A diagnosis of SSI, which is reported by nonblinded investigators, will be verified by chart
42
43 review, and blinded investigators will verify the diagnosis without knowledge of the group to
44
45 which the patients were assigned.
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Outcome measures**

52
53
54 The duration of observation will be 30 days postoperatively. The nonblinded investigators
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 will observe the surgical wound site daily during admission. After discharge, participants will
5
6
7
8 undergo outpatient observation at least once if it is within 30 days postoperatively. Nonblinded
9
10
11 investigators will observe the surgical wound in the same manner as during the hospital stay.

12
13
14 We also recommend that patients visit outpatient clinic or an emergency department if there
15
16
17 are any symptoms suggestive of SSI such as pain or redness. If SSI is suspected based on the
18
19
20 clinical findings, a microbiological culture would be collected using a cotton swab. The
21
22
23 diagnosis of SSI will be determined by blinded investigators who will be unaware of the
24
25
26 patients' group assignment. The investigator will verify the SSI via chart review by using the
27
28
29 questionnaire for SSI provided by the nonblinded investigators in accordance with the CDC
30
31
32 guideline. Moreover, blinded investigators will assess the seriousness of all adverse events and
33
34
35 determine whether they are related to the study.
36
37
38
39
40

41 (1) Primary outcome measure

42
43
44 Postoperative 30-day SSI rate.
45
46

47 (2) Secondary outcome measures

48
49
50 Postoperative 30-day superficial incisional SSI rate, deep incisional SSI rate, organ/space SSI
51
52
53 rate, rate of positive bacterial wound culture, bacterial strains, and rates of toxicity and allergy
54
55
56 events (e.g., erythema and symptoms of allergy).
57
58
59
60

Definitions

SSIs are classified as superficial incisional SSIs, deep incisional SSIs, and organ/space SSIs based on criteria in the CDC guidelines.¹

(i) Superficial incisional SSI

Superficial incisional SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).

A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.

B) The infection affects only the incision in the skin and the subcutaneous tissue.

C) At least one of the following is applicable:

a. purulent drainage is observed from the superficial incision,

b. organisms are identified from the superficial incision or subcutaneous tissue by a culture or non-culture based microbiologic testing method, and/or

c. the superficial incision is deliberately opened by a nonblinded investigator, and culture or non-culture based testing is not performed.

In addition, at least one of the following symptoms for infection must be applicable: pain, pressure pain, localized swelling, erythema, or fever.

(ii) Deep incisional SSI

1
2
3
4 Deep incisional SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).
5
6

7 A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.
8
9

10 B) The infection reaches the deep soft tissues of the incision (fascia or muscle layer).
11
12

13 C) At least one of the following is applicable:
14
15

16 a. purulent drainage is observed from the deep incision,
17
18

19 b. the deep incision spontaneously dehisces, or is deliberately opened or aspirated by a
20
21 nonblinded investigators, and/or
22
23

24 c. an abscess or other evidence of infection is present and involves the deep incision.
25
26
27

28
29
30 In addition, the organism is identified by a culture or non-culture based microbiologic testing
31
32 method that is performed for purposes of clinical diagnosis or treatment, and symptoms for
33
34 infection must be applicable: fever, localized pain, or tenderness. Negative finding of a culture
35
36 does not meet this criterion.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 (iii) Organ/space SSI
45
46

47 Organ/space SSI involves any part of the body other than the skin incision, fascia, or muscle
48
49 layer that has been opened or manipulated during surgery. The specific site is classified as
50
51 organ/space for the purpose of further identification of the infection site. Organ/space SSI must
52
53
54 meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.
5
6

7
8 B) The infection involves any part of the body that is opened or manipulated during the
9
10
11 operative procedure (except for the facial/muscle layers).
12
13

14 C) At least one of the following is applicable:
15

16
17 a. purulent drainage is observed from a drain that is placed into the organ/space,
18

19
20
21 b. organisms are identified from fluid or tissue in the organ/space by a culture or non-culture
22
23
24 based microbiologic testing method, and/or
25

26
27
28 c. an abscess or other evidence of infection is present and involves the organ/space.
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Data collection**

35
36
37 All data will be collected and recorded into the web-based electronic CRF (CapTool® Lite) by
38
39
40 the trial or nonblinded investigators. From the electronic CRF, the trial database will be
41
42
43 established. Patients' characteristics, such as sex, age, smoking status, comorbidities, such as
44
45
46 diabetes mellitus, and steroid use, will be collected.
47
48

49
50
51 Data will also be collected regarding the surgical procedures such as the type of surgery, use
52
53
54 of laparoscopy, method of wound closure, type of prophylactic antiseptic agent, repeat
55
56
57 application of an antiseptic agent, use of sterilized sutures for wound closure, amount of
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 intraperitoneal irrigation, amounts of wound irrigation and blood loss, and status of excision
5
6
7 site into the electric CRF. We will confirm that personal identifying information such as name,
8
9
10 medical record ID are deleted from data. Thereafter, a linkable anonymization number is set
11
12
13
14 and stored by a personal information manager for at least 5 years after study completion.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Sample size calculation**

22
23
24 In our institution, the estimated proportions of SSI in gastrointestinal surgery with wound
25
26
27 class II are 12% after povidone-iodine use and 6% after olanexidine use. Assuming a group
28
29
30 difference of 6% during the study period, 281 patients per group would provide a power over
31
32
33
34 80%, which is sufficient for detecting a difference in the proportion of SSI between olanexidine
35
36
37 and povidone-iodine using a one-sided, chi-square test at a 5% level of significance. A dropout
38
39
40 rate of about 5% is allowed; thus, with 300 patients required per group, a total sample size of
41
42
43
44 600 patients is required for the trial.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Statistical analysis**

52
53 Analyses of the primary and secondary efficacy outcomes will be performed using the full
54
55 analysis set, which includes all patients who took at least one dose of treatment during the study,
56
57 did not have any serious violation of the study protocol, and had data collected after treatment
58
59 commencement. Safety analysis will be conducted in the safety analysis population. For the
60

1
2
3 baseline variables, summary statistics will be performed using frequencies and proportions for
4
5 categorical data, and means and standard deviations for continuous variables. Patient
6
7 characteristics will be compared using Pearson's chi-square test or Fisher's exact test for
8
9 categorical outcomes and Student's t-test for continuous variables, as appropriate. For the
10
11 primary analysis, which is aimed at comparing the treatment effects, the adjusted risk ratio and
12
13 its 95% confidence interval will be estimated using the Mantel-Haenszel method. To test for a
14
15 significant association of the primary outcome, the Mantel-Haenszel test will be applied after
16
17 adjusting for allocation factors. All comparisons are planned, and all *p*-values will be two sided.
18
19 *P*-values <0.05 will be considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses will be
20
21 performed using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). The SAP will be
22
23 developed by the principal investigator and the biostatistician before completion of patient
24
25 recruitment and data fixation.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Participant recruitment began in June 2018. The final results will be published in international peer-reviewed medical journals.

For peer review only

DISCUSSION

Although some guidelines have indicated the efficacy of chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine for reducing the SSI rate, the optimal recommendation has still not been established, and the prevalence of SSI remains high in gastrointestinal surgery. Therefore, a comparative trial between conventional antiseptics including chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine, and newly antiseptics that considers their effectiveness, toxicity, and costs is needed.⁸

We have been conducting a randomized controlled clinical trial to compare olanexidine and povidone-iodine, which is the most popular antiseptic in Japan in terms of prevalence of SSI and toxicity. The strength in this trial is that we adopted a single-blind system for diagnosing SSI in multiple centers. To maintain the quality of practices, only 4 centers, all of which are high-volume centers performing greater than 500 gastrointestinal surgeries per year, are participating in this trial. Furthermore, since the staff in each center belongs to the SSI control committee for providing unified and evidence-based counter measures against SSI in Keio University Hospital, the management of SSI in each center can be performed in almost the same manner.

This study has several limitations. First, this trial is recruiting patients with various types of gastrointestinal surgery, such as esophagectomy, gastrectomy, and cholecystectomy, and there

1
2
3
4 are differences in the prevalence of SSI according to the type of surgery. However, there is no
5
6
7
8 major bias in allocation because it is randomized. Furthermore, since this is the first report
9
10
11 using olanexidine, it is more important to include various types of surgery than limiting the
12
13
14 study to a particular type of surgery. Second, this study is limited to a Japanese population,
15
16
17 which could introduce an element of selection bias, because olanexidine is only commercially
18
19
20 available in Japan.
21
22

23
24 In conclusion, the present study is assessing the efficacy of olanexidine compared to
25
26
27 povidone-iodine for preventing SSI in gastrointestinal surgery. We expect olanexidine to be
28
29
30 more useful for preventing SSI than povidone-iodine without increasing toxicity. Even if this
31
32
33 expectation is not the predicted result, this trial can provide new knowledge in the aspect of
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

TRIAL STATUS

As of 25 October 2018, this trial is actively recruiting patients in 3 centers with additional centers planned. Two hundred of the planned 600 participants have been enrolled.

For peer review only

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Masashi Takeuchi and Hideaki Obara contributed equally to this study. All authors made significant contribution to the conception and design of the study protocol. MT designed the study and wrote the protocol and manuscript. The protocol was reviewed by HO, HK, MS, KO, and YK. YS wrote the statistical analysis plan. All authors gave final approval of the manuscript and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

FUNDING

This work was supported by donations from the Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine and Ohyama Health Foundation, Inc.

DISCLAIMER

Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc. was not involved in the planning of the protocol or in the conduct of the trial.

COMPETING INTERESTS

YK received grant support from Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc.

ETHICS APPROVAL

The protocol was firstly approved by the Institutional Review Board of Keio University School of Medicine, and then approved by the institutional review board of each participating site.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Asako Inoue and Kumiko Motooka, staff members of the Department of Surgery in Keio University School of Medicine, for their help in the preparation of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Berríos-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, et al: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Guideline for the Prevention of Surgical Site Infection, 2017. *JAMA Surgery* 152:784-791, 2017
2. Steiner HL, Strand EA: Surgical-site infection in gynecologic surgery: pathophysiology and prevention. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 217:121-128, 2017
3. López Pereira P, Díaz-Agero Pérez C, López Fresneña N, et al: 'Epidemiology of surgical site infection in a neurosurgery department'. *Br J Neurosurg* 31:10-15, 2016
4. Figuerola-Tejerina A, Rodríguez-Caravaca G, Bustamante-Munguira J, et al: Epidemiological Surveillance of Surgical Site Infection and its Risk Factors in Cardiac Surgery: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)* 69:842-848, 2016
5. Maehara Y, Shirabe K, Kohnoe S, et al: Impact of intra-abdominal absorbable sutures on surgical site infection in gastrointestinal and hepato-biliary-pancreatic surgery: results of a multicenter, randomized, prospective, phase II clinical trial. *Surg Today* 47:1060-1071, 2017
6. Kirkland KB, Briggs, JP, Trivette, S, et al: The Impact of Surgical-Site Infections in the 1990s: Attributable Mortality, Excess Length of Hospitalization, And Extra Costs. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 20: 725-730. 1999
7. de Lissovoy G, Fraeman K, Hutchins V, et al: Surgical site infection: incidence and impact on hospital utilization and treatment costs. *Am J Infect Control* 37:387-397, 2009
8. Allegranzi B, Bischoff P, de Jonge S, et al: New WHO recommendations on preoperative measures for surgical site infection prevention: an evidence-based global perspective. *Lancet Infect Dis* 16:e276-e287, 2016
9. Srinivas A, Kaman L, Raj P, et al: Comparison of the efficacy of chlorhexidine gluconate versus povidone iodine as preoperative skin preparation for the prevention of surgical site infections in clean-contaminated upper abdominal surgeries. *Surg Today* 45:1378-1384, 2015
10. Springel EH, Wang XY, Sarfoh VM, et al: A randomized open-label controlled trial of chlorhexidine-alcohol vs povidone-iodine for cesarean antisepsis: the CAPICA trial. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 217:463 e1-463 e8, 2017
11. Darouiche RO, Wall MJ Jr., Itani KM, et al: Chlorhexidine-Alcohol versus Povidone-Iodine for Surgical-Site Antisepsis. *N Engl J Med* 362:18-26, 2010
12. Park HM, Han SS, Lee EC, et al: Randomized clinical trial of preoperative skin antisepsis with chlorhexidine gluconate or povidone-iodine. *Br J Surg* 104:e145-e150, 2017

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
13. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Surgical Site Infection: Prevention and Treatment of Surgical Site Infection (NICE Clinical Guideline 74). 2008
14. Burlingame B DB, Link T, et al: Guideline for Preoperative Patient Skin Antisepsis. In: Connor R, ed. AORN Guidelines for Perioperative Practice. Denver, CO: Association of periOperative Registered, Nurses; 2016.
15. Kobayashi H, Tsuzuki M, Hosobuchi K. Bactericidal effects of antiseptics and disinfectants against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 10:562-564, 1989.
16. Kampf G, Hofer M, Wendt C. Efficacy of hand disinfectants against vancomycin-resistant enterococci in vitro. *J Hosp Infect* 42:143–150, 1999.
17. Zamora JL Price MF, Chuang P, et al: Inhibition of povidone-iodine's bactericidal activity by common organic substances: an experimental study. *Surgery* 98:25–29,1985.
18. Inoue Y, Hagi A, Nii T, et al: Novel antiseptic compound OPB-2045G shows potent bactericidal activity against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* both in vitro and in vivo: a pilot study in animals. *J Med Microbiol* 64:32-36, 2015
19. Hagi A, Iwata K, Nii T, et al: Bactericidal Effects and Mechanism of Action of Olanexidine Gluconate, a New Antiseptic. *Antimicrob Agents and Chemother* 59:4551-4559, 2015
20. Howard DP, Datta G, Cunnick G, et al: Surgical site infection rate is lower in laparoscopic than open colorectal surgery. *Colorectal Dis* 12:423-7, 2010.

1
2
3
4 **FIGURE LEGEND**
5

6
7 Figure 1
8

9
10
11 The definition of wound classes.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Figure 1

Wound Class	Definition
Class I (Clean)	An uninfected operative wound in which no inflammation is encountered and the respiratory, alimentary, genital, or uninfected urinary tracts are not entered.
Class II (Clean-contaminated)	Operative wounds in which the respiratory, alimentary, genital, or urinary tracts are entered under controlled conditions and without unusual contamination.
Class III (Contaminated)	Includes open, fresh, accidental wounds.
Class IV (Dirty-contaminated)	Includes old traumatic wounds with retained devitalized tissue and those that involve existing clinical infection or perforated viscera.

Figure 1
The definition of wound classes.

338x190mm (200 x 200 DPI)

BMJ Open

Comparison of olanexidine versus povidone-iodine for preventing surgical site infection in gastrointestinal surgery: study protocol for a multicenter, single-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028269.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Jan-2019
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Takeuchi, Masashi; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Obara, Hideaki; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery, Kawakubo, Hirofumi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Shinoda, Masahiro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Okabayashi, Koji ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Mayanagi, Shuhei ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Irinno, Tomoyuki; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Fukuda, Kazumasa; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Nakamura, Rieko; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Wada, Norihito ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Kitago, Minoru ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Yagi, Hiroshi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Abe, Yuta; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Oshima, Go ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Hori, Shutaro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Tsuruta, Masashi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Ishida, Takashi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Yokose, Takahiro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Hirukawa, Kazuya ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery</p>

	Isobe, Yoh; Department of surgery, National Hospital Organization Tokyo Medical Center Sekimoto, Yasuhito ; Department of surgery, National Hospital Organization Tokyo Medical Center Harada, Hirohisa ; Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital Maeda, Yusuke ; Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital Shito, Masaya ; Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital Kondo, Takayuki ; Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital Sato, Yasunori ; Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Keio University School of Medicine Kitagawa, Yuko ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery
Primary Subject Heading:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology
Keywords:	WOUND MANAGEMENT, SURGERY, Gastrointestinal infections < GASTROENTEROLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **1 Comparison of olanexidine versus povidone-iodine for preventing surgical site infection**
5
6
7 **2 in gastrointestinal surgery: study protocol for a multicenter, single-blind, randomized**
8
9
10 **3 controlled clinical trial**

14 Masashi Takeuchi, M.D.¹; Hideaki Obara, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Hirofumi Kawakubo, M.D., Ph.D.¹;
15
16
17 Masahiro Shinoda, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Koji Okabayashi, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Shuhei Mayanagi, M.D.,
18
19
20 Ph.D.¹; Tomoyuki Irino, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Kazumasa Fukuda, Ph.D.¹; Rieko Nakamura, M.D.,
21
22
23 Ph.D.¹; Norihito Wada, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Minoru Kitago, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Hiroshi Yagi, M.D.,
24
25
26 Ph.D.¹; Yuta Abe, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Go Oshima, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Shutaro Hori, M.D., Ph.D.¹;
27
28
29 Masashi Tsuruta, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Takashi Ishida, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Takahiro Yokose, M.D.¹;
30
31
32 Kazuya Hirukawa, M.D.¹; Yoh Isobe, M.D., Ph.D.²; Yasuhito Sekimoto, M.D.²; Hirohisa
33
34
35 Harada, M.D., Ph.D.³; Yusuke Maeda, M.D.³; Masaya Shito, M.D., Ph.D.⁴; Takayuki Kondo,
36
37
38 M.D.⁴; Yasunori Sato, Ph.D.⁵; and Yuko Kitagawa, M.D., Ph.D.¹

39
40
41
42
43
44 ¹Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, 35 Shinanomachi,
45
46
47 Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan
48
49

50
51 ²Department of Surgery, National Hospital Organization Tokyo Medical Center, 2-5-1
52
53
54 Higashigaoka, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8902, Japan
55

56
57
58 ³Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital, 1-4-17 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 108-0073, Japan
5
6

7
8 2 ⁴Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital, 12-1 Shinkawadori, Kawasaki-ku,
9

10
11 3 Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa 210-0013, Japan
12
13

14 4 ⁵Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Keio University School of Medicine,
15

16
17 5 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan
18
19

20
21 6 **Corresponding author:** Hideaki Obara, M.D., Ph.D.
22

23
24 7 Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku,
25

26
27 8 Tokyo 160-8582, Japan
28
29

30
31 9 E-mail: obara.z3@keio.jp
32

33
34 10 Tel: +81-3-3353-1211; Fax: +81-3-3755-4707
35
36

37
38 11 **Word count:** 2778
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **ABSTRACT**

3 **Introduction:** The prevalence of surgical site infection (SSI) remains higher in
4 gastrointestinal surgery than in other surgeries. Although several guidelines have indicated
5 the efficacy of chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine in reducing the SSI rate, the optimal
6 recommendation has still not been established. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the
7 more effective antiseptic for surgical site preparation. Olanexidine (1.5% Olanedine[®], Otsuka
8 Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc., Tokushima, Japan), which is a new antiseptic in Japan, has
9 antimicrobial activity against a wide range of bacteria, including gram-positive bacteria and
10 gram-negative bacteria. Our study will contribute to determining a new antiseptic for use in
11 gastrointestinal and other surgeries.

12 **Methods and analysis:** We propose a multicenter, randomized controlled clinical trial for
13 comparing two treatments, i.e., 1.5% olanexidine or 10% povidone-iodine, for surgical skin
14 preparation to prevent SSI in clean-contaminated gastrointestinal surgeries with surgical
15 wounds. Patients aged ≥ 20 years at the time of consent will be included. The primary
16 outcome measure is the 30-day postoperative SSI rate. For the primary analysis, which is

1
2
3
4 1 aimed at comparing the treatment effects, the adjusted risk ratio and its 95% confidence
5
6
7
8 2 interval will be estimated using the Mantel-Haenszel method.
9

10
11 3 **Ethics and dissemination:** The protocol was first approved by the Institutional Review
12
13
14 4 Board of Keio University School of Medicine, followed by the institutional review board of
15
16
17
18 5 each participating site. Participant recruitment began in June 2018. The final results will be
19
20
21 6 published in international peer-reviewed medical journals.
22

23
24 7 **Trial registration number:** UMIN 000031560
25
26
27
28 8 (https://upload.umin.ac.jp/cgi-open-bin/ctr_e/ctr_view.cgi?recptno=R000036031)
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **Article Summary**3 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

4 • This is the first study to evaluate the effect of olanexidine, which has been
5 commercially available since 2015 in Japan.

6 • The study design is a multicenter, single-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial.

7 • The primary outcome measure is the 30-day postoperative SSI rate.

8 • This study is limited to a Japanese population, which could introduce an element of
9 selection bias, because olanexidine is only commercially available in Japan.

1
2
3
4 1
5
6
78 **2 INTRODUCTION**
9

10 3 Surgical site infection (SSI) is one of the most common nosocomial infections in surgical
11
12
13
14 4 patients.¹ Especially, the rate of SSI is higher in gastrointestinal surgery than in other
15
16
17 5 surgeries, such as cardiothoracic surgery, gynecologic surgery, and neurosurgery,²⁻⁴ and it has
18
19
20
21 6 been reported that 10% to 30% of patients suffer from SSI after gastrointestinal surgery.⁵ SSI
22
23
24 7 not only causes prolonged hospitalization and delay of postoperative therapy, but it also
25
26
27 8 causes increased medical costs—\$1300-5000 per person for inpatient treatment including
28
29
30
31 9 antibiotic therapy.^{6,7} Therefore, prevention of SSI is extremely important to both the patient
32
33
34 10 and all medical practitioners involved in the surgery.

35
36
37 11 Many perioperative measures for decreasing SSI have been reported, including enhanced
38
39
40
41 12 nutritional support, perioperative oxygenation, surgical technique, wound dressing, and use
42
43
44 13 of an antimicrobial agent.^{1,8} Surgical site preparation is one of the useful procedures for
45
46
47 14 preventing SSI because microorganisms are removed from the skin. Thus far, two types of
48
49
50
51 15 preparations, povidone-iodine and chlorhexidine-alcohol,⁹⁻¹² have been commonly used as
52
53
54 16 preoperative antiseptic procedures worldwide. The Centers for Disease Control and
55
56
57 17 Prevention (CDC) guideline just recommends skin preparation with an alcohol-containing
58
59
60

1 agent if there are no contraindications to its use, and other guidelines do not favor one
2 antiseptic agent over another for skin preparation.^{1,13,14} Both preparations have
3 broad-spectrum antibacterial effectiveness; however, povidone-iodine is known to decrease
4 its activity under the presence of organic materials including blood or pus.¹⁵ On the other
5 hand, chlorhexidine-alcohol has high antibacterial activity against some pathogens, such as
6 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA)¹⁵ and vancomycin-resistant enterococci
7 (VRE); nevertheless, it is associated with inflammability, more expensive than
8 povidone-iodine, and has been linked to allergic reactions.^{16,17} Therefore, it is necessary to
9 determine the more effective antiseptic for surgical site preparation.

10 Olanexidine (1.5% Olanedine®; Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc., Tokushima, Japan),
11 which is a new antiseptic, is one of the biguanide bactericidal disinfectants that contains
12 olanexidine gluconate as its active ingredient.^{18,19} It has been commercially available since
13 2015 in Japan. It can disrupt membrane integrity by binding to the cell membrane; this results
14 in irreversible leakage of intracellular components, and its bactericidal and fungicidal
15 activities are exerted.¹⁸ Olanexidine has antimicrobial activity against a wide range of
16 bacteria, including gram-positive bacteria and gram-negative bacteria. Moreover, Inoue et al.
17 reported that compared to chlorhexidine-alcohol and povidone-iodine, olanexidine showed

1 more potent bactericidal activity against MRSA and VRE both in vitro and in vivo.¹⁸

2 Therefore, the use of olanexidine is highly expected to lead to decreases in the SSI rate.

3 However, to date, no study has evaluated the effectiveness and safety of olanexidine

4 compared to conventional antiseptics in large-scale clinical trials.

5 In this multicenter, randomized controlled clinical trial, we aim to evaluate whether

6 olanexidine or povidone-iodine, which is the conventional skin antiseptic used in Japan, is

7 useful for preventing SSI in gastrointestinal surgery. We hypothesize that olanexidine will be

8 more useful for preventing SSI than povidone-iodine without increasing toxicity.

1
2
3
4 15
6
7
8 **2 METHODS**9
10
11 **3 Trial design**

12
13
14 4 This trial is a multi-center, prospective, randomized, blinded-endpoint trial (PROBE)
15
16
17 5 designed to assess the efficacy of 1.5% olanexidine for surgical skin preparation for
18
19
20
21 6 preventing SSIs in gastrointestinal surgery. The trial was designed and will independently be
22
23
24 7 conducted by Keio University with approval from the ethics committee of Keio University
25
26
27 8 School of Medicine in accordance with the principals of the Declaration of Helsinki. All
28
29
30 9 analyses will be conducted by Keio University, independent of the sponsor, according to the
31
32
33
34 10 prespecified statistical analysis plan (SAP). As a prospective randomized controlled trial, the
35
36
37 11 study strategy will be constructed and presented in accordance with the recommendations of
38
39
40
41 12 the SPIRIT statement.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

14 **Eligibility criteria**

15 Eligible patients are those who meet all of the following inclusion criteria and who do not
16 have any listed exclusion criteria.

- 17 • Inclusion criteria

1
2
3
4 1 1) Scheduled to undergo elective gastrointestinal surgery involving the esophagus, stomach,
5
6
7
8 2 duodenum, small intestine, colorectal, liver, biliary tract, and pancreas that has a class II
9
10
11 3 surgical wound (Table 1).

12
13
14 4 2) Age ≥ 20 years at the time of consent by non-blinded investigators.

15
16
17 5 3) Provision of written informed consent by the patient.

18
19
20
21 6 • Exclusion criteria

22
23
24 7 1) Allergy to olanexidine gluconate or povidone-iodine.

25
26
27 8 2) Unable to undergo follow-up 30 days postoperatively.

28
29
30 9 3) Active bacterial infection at the time of informed consent (except for viral hepatitis).

31
32
33 10 4) Antimicrobial therapy on the day before surgery.

34
35
36
37 11 5) Undergoing non-elective surgery or surgery requiring antisepsis of the mucosal surfaces or
38
39
40
41 12 surgical wound sites.

42
43
44 13 6) Unsuitable conditions for safe conduct of this trial according to the non-blinded
45
46
47
48 14 investigators.

49
50
51 15

52
53
54 16 **Intervention**

55
56
57 17 Study arm A (experimental group): Surgical skin antisepsis with an aqueous formulation of
58
59
60

1 1.5% olanexidine is administered just before gastrointestinal surgery.

2 Study arm B (control group): Surgical skin antiseptics with an aqueous formulation of 10%
3 povidone-iodine is administered just before gastrointestinal surgery.

4

5 **Treatment protocol**

6 The antiseptics should be applied widely in consideration of the drain site and length of the
7 skin incision. We apply agents from the papilla (in cases of esophageal surgery; the neck)
8 with a cranial limit and to the upper thigh with a caudal limit. After waiting 3 minutes to
9 allow the antiseptics to dry, the operation is started. In study arm A, one olanexidine
10 applicator will be used in surgery; however, if surgeons determine that disinfection is
11 inadequate, an additional applicator can be added.

12 We used other measures to prevent SSI in our protocol as follows:

13 (1) Administer standard antibiotic prophylaxis before making the surgical incision,

14 (2) use absorbable sutures for wound closure and recommend the use of
15 antimicrobial-coated sutures,

16 (3) recommend the use of a wound protector,

17 (4) recommend wound irrigation,

- 1 (5) use any type of immunosuppressive agent,
- 2 (6) change or retain the same gloves during the operation, and
- 3 (7) change or retain the surgical instruments.

4 Furthermore, we always maintain a normal body temperature by using warming devices
5 during surgery, and do not perform hair removal before surgery.

6 **Recruitment of study participants**

7 The trial protocol (October 24, 2018, version 1.3) was approved by each participating
8 institution's institutional review board and registered in the University Hospital Medical
9 Information Network Clinical Trials Registry (number UMIN 000031560). Recruitment into
10 the trial started in June 2018 and will continue until 600 participants are registered. All
11 participants who meet the inclusion criteria will receive a participant information sheet from
12 investigators before giving written informed consent. This study is being conducted in 4
13 general centers: Keio University Hospital (Tokyo, Japan), National Hospital Organization
14 Tokyo Medical Center (Tokyo, Japan), Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital (Tokyo, Japan), and
15 Kawasaki Municipal Hospital (Kanagawa, Japan).

17 **Randomization**

1
2
3
4 1 Registration and allocation of participants are generated by non-blinded investigators using
5
6
7
8 2 the CapTool® Lite (Mebix, Inc., Tokyo, Japan). Eligible patients will be randomized to either
9
10
11 3 surgical skin antiseptics with olanexidine (study arm A) or surgical skin antiseptics with
12
13
14 4 povidone-iodine (study arm B) in a 1:1 replacement ratio. The random sequence will be
15
16
17
18 5 generated from computer-generated block randomization. We designated the factor of
19
20
21 6 surgical approach (laparoscopy versus laparotomy) as the allocation adjustment factor
22
23
24 7 because of evidence that there is a significantly higher SSI rate in laparotomy than in
25
26
27
28 8 laparoscopy.²⁰
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Blinding**

35
36
37 11 Both patients and investigators will be blinded to the assigned group. Although there is a
38
39
40
41 12 difference in color between povidone-iodine and olanexidine, it is feasible for patients to be
42
43
44 13 masked because we wipe the stain of the antiseptic off their skin postoperatively.
45
46
47
48 14 Non-blinded investigators cannot be masked because they will be in the operating room when
49
50
51 15 the antiseptic is used.
52
53
54 16 Non-blinded investigators will answer the questionnaire about the wound condition; however,
55
56
57
58 17 they do not diagnose the presence or absence of SSI. SSIs are diagnosed by investigators who
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 are blinded to the group allocation with reference to the questionnaire. Blinded investigators
5
6
7
8 2 perform data entry for diagnosis of SSI, and the data analyst is blinded.
9

10
11 3
12

13 14 4 **Trial visits**

15
16
17 5 Generally, patients are hospitalized 1 to 4 days before surgery. We obtain informed consent
18
19
20
21 6 and patients' background characteristics after admission. Informed consent for the operation
22
23
24 7 and clinical trial is routinely obtained on the day before surgery. Thus, randomization is
25
26
27 8 mainly performed on the day before surgery. The duration of observation will be 30 days
28
29
30
31 9 postoperatively. The schedule for the trial visits and data collection is summarized in Table 2.
32

33
34 10
35
36

37 11 **Outcome measures**

38
39
40
41 12 The non-blinded investigators will observe the surgical wound site daily during admission.
42
43
44 13 After discharge, participants will undergo outpatient observation at least once if it is within
45
46
47
48 14 30 days postoperatively. Non-blinded investigators will observe the surgical wound in the
49
50
51 15 same manner as during the hospital stay. We also recommend that patients visit the outpatient
52
53
54 16 clinic or an emergency department if there are any symptoms suggestive of SSI such as pain
55
56
57 17 or redness. If SSI is suspected based on the clinical findings, a microbiological culture would
58
59
60

1 be collected using a cotton swab. The diagnosis of SSI will be determined by blinded
2 investigators who will be unaware of the patients' group assignment. The investigator will
3 verify the SSI via chart review by using the questionnaire for SSI provided by the
4 non-blinded investigators in accordance with the CDC guideline. Moreover, blinded
5 investigators will assess the seriousness of all adverse events and determine whether they are
6 related to the study.

7 (1) Primary outcome measure

8 Postoperative 30-day SSI rate.

9 (2) Secondary outcome measures

10 Postoperative 30-day superficial incisional SSI rate, deep incisional SSI rate, organ/space SSI
11 rate, rate of positive bacterial wound culture, bacterial strains, and rates of
12 intervention-related toxicity and allergy events (e.g., erythema, pruritus, dermatitis, and other
13 symptoms of allergy around the region disinfected by the antiseptic during surgery).

14
15 **Definitions**

16 SSIs are classified as superficial incisional SSIs, deep incisional SSIs, and organ/space
17 SSIs based on criteria in the CDC guidelines (Supplemental Table 1).¹

1
2
3
4 15
6
7
8 **2 Data collection**

9
10 3 All data will be collected and recorded into the web-based electric CRF (CapTool® Lite) by
11
12
13
14 4 the trial or non-blinded investigators. From the electric CRF, the trial database will be
15
16
17
18 5 established. Patients' characteristics, such as sex, age, smoking status, body mass index, the
19
20
21 6 use of prophylactic antibiotics, mode of skin closure, comorbidities, such as diabetes
22
23
24 7 mellitus, and steroid use, will be collected.

25
26
27 8 Data will also be collected regarding the surgical procedures such as the type of surgery, use
28
29
30
31 9 of laparoscopy, method of wound closure, type of prophylactic antiseptic agent, repeat
32
33
34 10 application of an antiseptic agent, use of sterilized sutures for wound closure, amount of
35
36
37
38 11 intraperitoneal irrigation, amounts of wound irrigation and blood loss, and status of excision
39
40
41 12 site into the electric CRF. We will confirm that personal identifying information such as
42
43
44 13 patients' name and medical record identification are deleted from the data. Thereafter, a
45
46
47
48 14 linkable anonymized number is set and stored by a personal information manager for at least
49
50
51 15 5 years after study completion.

52
53
54 1655
56
57 **17 Data monitoring**
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 Central monitoring will be conducted with the aim of ensuring that the trials are conducted
5
6
7
8 2 safely and in accordance with the implementation plan, and that the data collection is correct.
9
10
11 3 It is conducted once a year, with 10% of registration completed in each institution. The
12
13
14 4 number of consents acquired, number of patients registered, number of patients who
15
16
17 5 withdraw or are loss to follow-up and their reasons, safety, compliance with eligibility
18
19
20 6 criteria and exclusion criteria, accuracy of the allocation procedure, and compliance with
21
22
23
24 7 various regulations and research plan are all evaluated by test secretariat.
25
26
27
28 8
29
30

31 **9 Sample size calculation**

32
33
34 10 In our institution, the estimated proportions of SSI in gastrointestinal surgery with wound
35
36
37 11 class II are 12% (this rate was only included in a non-published Japanese report) after
38
39
40 12 povidone-iodine use and 6% after olanexidine use. Assuming a group difference of 6%
41
42
43
44 13 during the study period, 281 patients per group would provide a power over 80%, which is
45
46
47
48 14 sufficient for detecting a difference in the proportion of SSI between olanexidine and
49
50
51 15 povidone-iodine using a one-sided, chi-square test at a 5% level of significance. A dropout
52
53
54 16 rate of about 5% is allowed; thus, with 300 patients required per group, a total sample size of
55
56
57
58 17 600 patients is required for the trial.
59
60

1
2
3
4 15
6
7
8 2 **Patient and Public Involvement**9
10
11 3 Patients and the public were not involved in the design of this study.
12
13
14 415
16
17 5 **Statistical analysis**

18
19
20 6 We will perform the primary analyses using the full analysis set, from which patients who
21
22 7 do not undergo surgery or who withdraw consent before assessment of the primary endpoint
23
24 8 are excluded. In addition, we will repeat the analyses in the per-protocol set, further
25
26 9 excluding patients with major protocol deviations. The safety analysis set will include all
27
28 10 patients who were randomly assigned to a study group and received treatment during the
29
30 11 study. For the baseline variables, summary statistics will be performed using frequencies and
31
32 12 proportions for categorical data, and means and standard deviations for continuous variables.
33
34 13 Patient characteristics will be compared using Pearson's chi-square test or Fisher's exact test
35
36 14 for categorical outcomes and Student's t-test for continuous variables, as appropriate. For the
37
38 15 primary analysis, which is aimed at comparing the treatment effects, the adjusted risk ratio
39
40 16 and its 95% confidence interval will be estimated using the Mantel-Haenszel method. To test
41
42 17 for a significant association of the primary outcome, the Mantel-Haenszel test will be applied
43
44 18 after adjusting for allocation factors. All comparisons are planned, and all *p*-values will be
45
46 19 two sided. *P*-values <0.05 will be considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses
47
48 20 will be performed using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). The SAP
49
50 21 will be developed by the principal investigator and the biostatistician before completion of
51
52 22 patient recruitment and data fixation.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1
5
6
7

8 **2 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**
9

10
11 3 Participant recruitment began in June 2018. The final results will be published in
12
13
14 4 international peer-reviewed medical journals.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **DISCUSSION**

3 Although some guidelines have indicated the efficacy of chlorhexidine-alcohol and
4 povidone-iodine for reducing the SSI rate, the optimal recommendation has still not been
5 established, and the prevalence of SSI remains high in gastrointestinal surgery. Therefore, a
6 comparative trial between conventional antiseptics, including chlorhexidine-alcohol and
7 povidone-iodine, and newly antiseptics that considers their effectiveness, toxicity, and costs
8 is needed.⁸

9 We have been conducting a randomized controlled clinical trial to compare olanexidine and
10 povidone-iodine, which is the most popular antiseptic in Japan in terms of prevalence of SSI
11 and toxicity. The strength in this trial is that we adopted blinding for diagnosing SSI in
12 multiple centers. To maintain the quality of practices, only 4 centers, all of which are
13 high-volume centers performing greater than 500 gastrointestinal surgeries per year, are
14 participating in this trial. Furthermore, since the staff in each center belongs to the SSI
15 control committee for providing unified and evidence-based counter measures against SSI in
16 Keio University Hospital, the management of SSI in each center can be performed in almost
17 the same manner.

1 In this study, we adopted povidone-iodine instead of chlorhexidine-alcohol as a control.
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 2 Since inflammability is associated with chlorhexidine-alcohol, povidone-iodine is
9
10
11 3 recommended and typically used for gastrointestinal surgery in Japan. In addition,
12
13
14 4 chlorhexidine-alcohol with concentrations greater than 1% are not commercially available in
15
16
17
18 5 Japan, although a concentration greater than 2% is recognized as having a bactericidal effect
19
20
21 6 in international guidelines.²¹⁻²³ Moreover, considering the influence of ethnic differences
22
23
24 7 including intrinsic and extrinsic ethnic factors, this comparison is a meaningful examination
25
26
27
28 8 of SSI treatment at least in Japan. Therefore, we think that the selection of a control group is
29
30
31 9 reasonable.
32
33

34 10 Although antiseptics would influence only superficial and deep SSIs, we included
35
36
37
38 11 organ-space SSI in the endpoint. As described earlier, this is the first study to use
39
40
41 12 olanexidine; therefore, it is more important to establish evidence for all types of SSI than
42
43
44 13 limiting the study to superficial and deep wound infections. Some studies have investigated
45
46
47
48 14 skin antiseptics in gastrointestinal surgery and included organ SSI as an outcome.^{11,12}
49

50
51 15 This study has several limitations. First, this trial is recruiting patients with various types of
52
53
54 16 gastrointestinal surgery, such as esophagectomy, gastrectomy, and cholecystectomy, and
55
56
57
58 17 there are differences in the prevalence of SSI according to the type of surgery. However,
59
60

1 there is no major bias in allocation because it is randomized. Furthermore, since this is the
2 first report using olanexidine, it is more important to include various types of surgery than
3 limiting the study to a particular type of surgery. Second, this study is limited to a Japanese
4 population, which could introduce an element of selection bias, because olanexidine is only
5 commercially available in Japan.

6 In conclusion, the present study is assessing the efficacy of olanexidine compared to
7 povidone-iodine for preventing SSI in gastrointestinal surgery. We expect olanexidine to be
8 more effective for preventing SSI than povidone-iodine without increasing toxicity. In the
9 future, we should also consider conducting another trial that compares olanexidine to an
10 alcohol-based antiseptic agent, if superiority of olanexidine compared to povidone-iodine is
11 proven in this trial. Even if this expectation is not the predicted result, this trial can provide
12 new knowledge in the aspect of antisepsis for preventing SSI. The result will also contribute
13 to the development of new antisepsis treatment for gastrointestinal surgery.

1
2
3
4 1
5
6
7

8 **2 TRIAL STATUS**
9

10
11 3 As of 25 October 2018, this trial is actively recruiting patients in 3 centers with additional
12
13
14 4 centers planned. Two hundred of the planned 600 participants have been enrolled.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

3 Masashi Takeuchi and Hideaki Obara contributed equally to this study. All authors made
4 significant contribution to the conception and design of the study protocol. MT designed the
5 study and wrote the protocol and manuscript. SM, TI, KF, RN, NW, MK, HY, YA, GO, SH,
6 MT, TI, TY, KH, YI, YS, HH, YM, MS, and TK assisted with the development of the study
7 design and protocol. The protocol was reviewed by HO, HK, MS, KO, and YK. YS wrote the
8 statistical analysis plan. All authors gave final approval of the manuscript and agree to be
9 accountable for all aspects of the work.

10

11 **FUNDING**

12 This work was supported by donations from the Department of Surgery, Keio University
13 School of Medicine and Ohyama Health Foundation, Inc.

14

15 **DISCLAIMER**

16 Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc. was not involved in the planning of the protocol or in
17 the conduct of the trial.

1

2 2 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

3 3 YK received grant support from Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc.

4

5 5 **ETHICS APPROVAL**

6 6 The protocol was firstly approved by the Institutional Review Board of Keio University

7 7 School of Medicine, and then approved by the institutional review board of each participating

8 8 site.

9

10 10 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

11 11 The authors thank Asako Inoue and Kumiko Motooka, staff members of the Department of

12 12 Surgery in Keio University School of Medicine, for their help in the preparation of this

13 13 manuscript.

1
2
3
4 15
6
7
8 2 **REFERENCES**

- 9
10
11 3 1. Berríos-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, et al: Centers for Disease Control
12
13
14 4 and Prevention Guideline for the Prevention of Surgical Site Infection, 2017. *JAMA Surgery*
15
16
17 5 152:784-791, 2017
- 18
19
20
21 6 2. Steiner HL, Strand EA: Surgical-site infection in gynecologic surgery:
22
23
24 7 pathophysiology and prevention. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 217:121-128, 2017
- 25
26
27
28 8 3. López Pereira P, Díaz-Agero Pérez C, López Fresneña N, et al: ‘Epidemiology of
29
30
31 9 surgical site infection in a neurosurgery department’. *Br J Neurosurg* 31:10-15, 2016
- 32
33
34
35 10 4. Figuerola-Tejerina A, Rodríguez-Caravaca G, Bustamante-Munguira J, et al:
36
37
38 11 Epidemiological Surveillance of Surgical Site Infection and its Risk Factors in Cardiac
39
40
41 12 Surgery: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)* 69:842-848, 2016
- 42
43
44
45 13 5. Maehara Y, Shirabe K, Kohnoe S, et al: Impact of intra-abdominal absorbable
46
47
48 14 sutures on surgical site infection in gastrointestinal and hepato-biliary-pancreatic surgery:
49
50
51 15 results of a multicenter, randomized, prospective, phase II clinical trial. *Surg Today*
52
53
54 16 47:1060-1071, 2017
- 55
56
57
58 17 6. Kirkland KB, Briggs, JP, Trivette, S, et al: The Impact of Surgical-Site Infections
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 1 in the 1990s: Attributable Mortality, Excess Length of Hospitalization, And Extra Costs.
5
6
7 2 *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 20: 725-730. 1999
- 8
9
10 3 7. de Lissovoy G, Fraeman K, Hutchins V, et al: Surgical site infection: incidence
11
12
13
14 4 and impact on hospital utilization and treatment costs. *Am J Infect Control* 37:387-397, 2009
- 15
16
17 5 8. Allegranzi B, Bischoff P, de Jonge S, et al: New WHO recommendations on
18
19
20
21 6 preoperative measures for surgical site infection prevention: an evidence-based global
22
23
24 7 perspective. *Lancet Infect Dis* 16:e276-e287, 2016
- 25
26
27 8 9. Srinivas A, Kaman L, Raj P, et al: Comparison of the efficacy of chlorhexidine
28
29
30
31 9 gluconate versus povidone iodine as preoperative skin preparation for the prevention of
32
33
34 10 surgical site infections in clean-contaminated upper abdominal surgeries. *Surg Today*
35
36
37 11 45:1378-1384, 2015
- 38
39
40
41 12 10. Springel EH, Wang XY, Sarfoh VM, et al: A randomized open-label controlled
42
43
44 13 trial of chlorhexidine-alcohol vs povidone-iodine for cesarean antisepsis: the CAPICA trial.
45
46
47 14 *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 217:463 e1-463 e8, 2017
- 48
49
50
51 15 11. Darouiche RO, Wall MJ Jr., Itani KM, et al: Chlorhexidine-Alcohol versus
52
53
54 16 Povidone-Iodine for Surgical-Site Antisepsis. *N Engl J Med* 362:18-26, 2010
- 55
56
57 17 12. Park HM, Han SS, Lee EC, et al: Randomized clinical trial of preoperative skin
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 1 antiseptics with chlorhexidine gluconate or povidone-iodine. *Br J Surg* 104:e145-e150, 2017
5
6
7
8 2 13. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Surgical Site
9
10
11 3 Infection: Prevention and Treatment of Surgical Site Infection (NICE Clinical Guideline 74).
12
13
14 4 2008
15
16
17 5 14. Burlingame B DB, Link T, et al: Guideline for Preoperative Patient Skin
18
19
20
21 6 Antisepsis. In: Connor R, ed. AORN Guidelines for Perioperative Practice. Denver, CO:
22
23
24 7 Association of periOperative Registered, Nurses; 2016
25
26
27 8 15. Zamora JL Price MF, Chuang P, et al: Inhibition of povidone-iodine's
28
29
30
31 9 bactericidal activity by common organic substances: an experimental study. *Surgery*
32
33
34 10 98:25-29, 1985
35
36
37 11 16. Lee I, Agarwal RK, Lee BY, Fishman NO, Umscheid CA. Systematic review and
38
39
40
41 12 cost analysis comparing use of chlorhexidine with use of iodine for preoperative skin
42
43
44 13 antiseptics to prevent surgical site infection. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 31:1219-1229,
45
46
47 14 2010
48
49
50
51 15 17. Lim KS, Kam PC. Chlorhexidine — pharmacology and clinical applications.
52
53
54 16 *Anaesth Intensive Care* 36:502-512, 2008
55
56
57 17 18. Inoue Y, Hagi A, Nii T, et al: Novel antiseptic compound OPB-2045G shows
58
59
60

1 potent bactericidal activity against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and
2 vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* both in vitro and in vivo: a pilot study in animals. *J Med*
3 *Microbiol* 64:32-36, 2015

4 19. Hagi A, Iwata K, Nii T, et al: Bactericidal Effects and Mechanism of Action of
5 Olanexidine Gluconate, a New Antiseptic. *Antimicrob Agents and Chemother* 59:4551-4559,
6 2015

7 20. Howard DP, Datta G, Cunnick G, et al: Surgical site infection rate is lower in
8 laparoscopic than open colorectal surgery. *Colorectal Dis* 12:423-7, 2010

9 21. Preventing surgical site infections. Key recommendations for practice. Dublin:
10 Joint Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland/Royal Colleges of Physicians of Ireland Working
11 Group on Prevention of Surgical Site Infection; 2012

12 22. Targeted literature review: What are the key infection prevention and control
13 recommendations to inform a surgical site infection (SSI) prevention quality improvement
14 tool? Version 3.0. February 2015. Edinburgh: Health Protection Scotland; 2015

15 23. High impact intervention: care bundle to prevent surgical site infection. London:
16 Department of Health; 2011

17

1
2
3
4 15
6
7
8 29
10
11 3 **Table 1** The definition of wound classes
12

Wound Class	Definition
Class I (Clean)	An uninfected operative wound in which no inflammation is encountered and the respiratory, alimentary, genital, or uninfected urinary tracts are not entered.
Class II (Clean-contaminated)	Operative wounds in which the respiratory, alimentary, genital, or urinary tracts are entered under controlled conditions and without unusual contamination.
Class III (Contaminated)	Includes open, fresh, and accidental wounds.
Class IV (Dirty-contaminated)	Includes old traumatic wounds with retained devitalized tissue and those that involve existing clinical infection or perforated viscera.

1

2 **Table 2** Flow chart of the trial

Time point	After admission	Before surgery	Surgery	After surgery
Informed consent	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Patients' background characteristics	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Physical examination	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Randomization		<input type="checkbox"/>		
Intervention			<input type="checkbox"/>	
Observation of the surgical site				<input type="checkbox"/> a

3 a: From postoperative day 1 to postoperative day 30 (outpatient observation is performed at

4 least once if the discharge is within 30 days postoperatively)

Supplemental Table1 Definitions of SSI

Type of SSI	Definition
Superficial incisional SSI	<p>Superficial incisional SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).</p> <p>A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.</p> <p>B) The infection affects only the incision in the skin and the subcutaneous tissue.</p> <p>C) At least one of the following is applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. purulent drainage is observed from the superficial incision, b. organisms are identified from the superficial incision or subcutaneous tissue by a culture or non-culture based microbiologic testing method, and/or c. the superficial incision is deliberately opened by a nonblinded investigators, and culture or non-culture based testing is not performed. <p>In addition, at least one of the following symptoms for infection must be applicable: pain, tenderness, localized swelling, erythema, or heat.</p>
Deep incisional SSI	<p>Deep incisional SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).</p> <p>A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.</p> <p>B) The infection reaches the deep soft tissues of the incision (fascia or muscle layer).</p> <p>C) At least one of the following is applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. purulent drainage is observed from the deep incision, b. the deep incision spontaneously dehisces, or is deliberately opened or aspirated by a nonblinded investigators, and/or

1
2
3
4
5 c. an abscess or other evidence of infection is present and involves the deep incision.

6 In addition, the organism is identified by a culture or non-culture based microbiologic
7 testing method that is performed for purposes of clinical diagnosis or treatment, and
8 symptoms for infection must be applicable: fever, localized pain, or tenderness. Negative
9 finding of a culture does not meet this criterion.
10
11

12
13 Organ/space SSI

14 Organ/space SSI involves any part of the body other than the skin incision, fascia, or
15 muscle layer that has been opened or manipulated during surgery. The specific site is
16 classified as organ/space for the purpose of further identification of the infection site.
17 Organ/space SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).

18 A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.

19 B) The infection involves any part of the body that is opened or manipulated during the
20 operative procedure (except for the facial/muscle layers).

21 C) At least one of the following is applicable:

22 a. purulent drainage is observed from a drain that is placed into the organ/space,

23 b. organisms are identified from fluid or tissue in the organ/space by a culture or non-
24 culture based microbiologic testing method, and/or

25 c. an abscess or other evidence of infection is present and involves the organ/space.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 *Erythema; the skin redness of the skin that spreads away from the incision site, localized swelling; a bulge limited to the incision site,
33
34
35 tenderness; pressured pain beyond normal for the operation.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46



STANDARD PROTOCOL ITEMS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERVENTIONAL TRIALS

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	ItemN o (Page No)	Description
Administrative information		
Title	1(p1)	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym
Trial registration	2a (p4)	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry
	2b (n/a)	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set
	3 (p12)	Date and version identifier
Funding	4 (p24)	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support
Roles and responsibilities	5a (p24)	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors
	5b (p2)	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor
	5c (n/a)	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities
	5d (n/a)	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)
Introduction		
Background and rationale	6a (p6-8)	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention
	6b (p6-8)	Explanation for choice of comparators

1			
2	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses
3		(p6-8)	
4			
5	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group,
6		(p6-8)	crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework
7			(eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)
8			
9			
10			
11	Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes		
12			
13	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic
14		(p12)	hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected.
15			Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained
16			
17	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable,
18		(p9)	eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform
19			the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)
20			
21			
22	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication,
23		(p10)	including how and when they will be administered
24			
25		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a
26		(p10)	given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms,
27			participant request, or improving/worsening disease)
28			
29		11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any
30		(n/a)	procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return,
31			laboratory tests)
32			
33			
34		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or
35		(p10)	prohibited during the trial
36			
37	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific
38		(p14)	measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric
39			(eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of
40			aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each
41			outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy
42			and harm outcomes is strongly recommended
43			
44			
45	Participant	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and
46	timeline	(p14)	washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic
47			diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)
48			
49			
50	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study
51		(p17)	objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and
52			statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations
53			
54	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach
55		(p12)	target sample size
56			
57			
58	Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)		
59			
60	Allocation:		

1			
2	Sequence	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-
3	generation	(p12)	generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification.
4			To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any
5			planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate
6			document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or
7			assign interventions
8			
9			
10	Allocation	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central
11	concealment	(p14)	telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes),
12	mechanism		describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are
13			assigned
14			
15	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol
16		(p12)	participants, and who will assign participants to interventions
17			
18	Blinding	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial
19	(masking)	(p13)	participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and
20			how
21			
22			
23		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and
24		(n/a)	procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during
25			the trial
26			
27			

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

28			
29			
30	Data collection	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other
31	methods	(p16)	trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality
32			(eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a
33			description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory
34			tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to
35			where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol
36			
37			
38		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up,
39		(p16)	including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants
40			who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols
41			
42	Data	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any
43	management	(p16)	related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry;
44			range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data
45			management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol
46			
47			
48	Statistical	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes.
49	methods	(p17)	Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can
50			be found, if not in the protocol
51			
52			
53		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted
54		(p17)	analyses)
55			
56		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence
57		(p17)	(eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle
58			missing data (eg, multiple imputation)
59			
60			

Methods: Monitoring

Data monitoring	21a (p16)	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed
	21b (p16)	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial
Harms	22 (n/a)	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct
Auditing	23 (n/a)	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor

Ethics and dissemination

Research ethics approval	24 (p19)	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval
Protocol amendments	25 (n/a)	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)
Consent or assent	26a (p12)	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)
	26b (n/a)	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable
Confidentiality	27 (p15)	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial
Declaration of interests	28 (p24)	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site
Access to data	29 (n/a)	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators
Ancillary and post-trial care	30 (n/a)	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation

1			
2	Dissemination	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to
3	policy	(n/a)	participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant
4			groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other
5			data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions
6			
7		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional
8		(p24)	writers
9			
10		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol,
11		(n/a)	participant-level dataset, and statistical code
12			
13			

Appendices

14			
15			
16	Informed consent	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to
17	materials	(n/a)	participants and authorised surrogates
18			
19	Biological	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological
20	specimens	(n/a)	specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and
21			for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable
22			

*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "[Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)" license.

BMJ Open

Comparison of olanexidine versus povidone-iodine for preventing surgical site infection in gastrointestinal surgery: study protocol for a multicenter, single-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028269.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Mar-2019
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Takeuchi, Masashi; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Obara, Hideaki; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery, Kawakubo, Hirofumi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Shinoda, Masahiro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Okabayashi, Koji ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Mayanagi, Shuhei ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Irinno, Tomoyuki; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Fukuda, Kazumasa; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Nakamura, Rieko; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Wada, Norihito ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Kitago, Minoru ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Yagi, Hiroshi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Abe, Yuta; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Oshima, Go ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Hori, Shutaro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Tsuruta, Masashi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Ishida, Takashi ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Yokose, Takahiro ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery Hirukawa, Kazuya ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery</p>

	Isobe, Yoh; Department of surgery, National Hospital Organization Tokyo Medical Center Sekimoto, Yasuhito ; Department of surgery, National Hospital Organization Tokyo Medical Center Harada, Hirohisa ; Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital Maeda, Yusuke ; Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital Shito, Masaya ; Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital Kondo, Takayuki ; Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital Sato, Yasunori ; Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Keio University School of Medicine Kitagawa, Yuko ; Keio University School of Medicine Graduate School of Medicine Department of Surgery
Primary Subject Heading:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology
Keywords:	WOUND MANAGEMENT, SURGERY, Gastrointestinal infections < GASTROENTEROLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **1 Comparison of olanexidine versus povidone-iodine for preventing surgical site infection**
5
6
7 **2 in gastrointestinal surgery: study protocol for a multicenter, single-blind, randomized**
8
9
10 **3 controlled clinical trial**

11
12
13
14 4 Masashi Takeuchi, M.D.¹; Hideaki Obara, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Hirofumi Kawakubo, M.D., Ph.D.¹;
15
16
17 5 Masahiro Shinoda, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Koji Okabayashi, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Shuhei Mayanagi, M.D.,
18
19
20 6 Ph.D.¹; Tomoyuki Irino, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Kazumasa Fukuda, Ph.D.¹; Rieko Nakamura, M.D.,
21
22
23 7 Ph.D.¹; Norihito Wada, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Minoru Kitago, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Hiroshi Yagi, M.D.,
24
25
26 8 Ph.D.¹; Yuta Abe, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Go Oshima, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Shutaro Hori, M.D., Ph.D.¹;
27
28
29 9 Masashi Tsuruta, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Takashi Ishida, M.D., Ph.D.¹; Takahiro Yokose, M.D.¹;
30
31
32 10 Kazuya Hirukawa, M.D.¹; Yoh Isobe, M.D., Ph.D.²; Yasuhito Sekimoto, M.D.²; Hirohisa
33
34
35 11 Harada, M.D., Ph.D.³; Yusuke Maeda, M.D.³; Masaya Shito, M.D., Ph.D.⁴; Takayuki Kondo,
36
37
38 12 M.D.⁴; Yasunori Sato, Ph.D.⁵; and Yuko Kitagawa, M.D., Ph.D.¹

39
40
41 13 ¹Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, 35 Shinanomachi,
42
43
44 14 Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan

45
46
47 15 ²Department of Surgery, National Hospital Organization Tokyo Medical Center, 2-5-1
48
49
50 16 Higashigaoka, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8902, Japan

51
52
53 17 ³Department of Surgery, Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital, 1-4-17 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo

1
2
3
4 1 108-0073, Japan
5
6

7
8 2 ⁴Department of Surgery, Kawasaki Municipal Hospital, 12-1 Shinkawadori, Kawasaki-ku,
9

10
11 3 Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa 210-0013, Japan
12
13

14 4 ⁵Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Keio University School of Medicine,
15

16
17 5 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan
18
19

20
21 6 **Corresponding author:** Hideaki Obara, M.D., Ph.D.
22

23
24 7 Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku,
25

26
27 8 Tokyo 160-8582, Japan
28
29

30
31 9 E-mail: obara.z3@keio.jp
32
33

34 10 Tel: +81-3-3353-1211; Fax: +81-3-3755-4707
35
36

37 11 **Word count:** 2791
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **ABSTRACT**

3 **Introduction:** The prevalence of surgical site infection (SSI) remains higher in
4 gastrointestinal surgery than in other surgeries. Although several guidelines have indicated
5 the efficacy of chlorhexidine and povidone-iodine in reducing the SSI rate, the optimal
6 recommendation has still not been established. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the
7 more effective antiseptic for surgical site preparation. Olanexidine (1.5% Olanedine[®], Otsuka
8 Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc., Tokushima, Japan), which is a new antiseptic in Japan, has
9 antimicrobial activity against a wide range of bacteria, including gram-positive and
10 gram-negative bacteria. Our study will contribute to determining a new antiseptic for use in
11 gastrointestinal and other surgeries.

12 **Methods and analysis:** We propose a multicenter, randomized controlled clinical trial for
13 comparing two treatments, i.e., 1.5% olanexidine or 10% povidone-iodine, for surgical skin
14 preparation to prevent SSI in clean-contaminated gastrointestinal surgeries with surgical
15 wounds. Patients aged ≥ 20 years at the time of consent will be included. The primary
16 outcome measure is the 30-day postoperative SSI rate. For the primary analysis, which is

1
2
3
4 1 aimed at comparing the treatment effects, the adjusted risk ratio and its 95% confidence
5
6
7
8 2 interval will be estimated using the Mantel-Haenszel method.
9

10
11 3 **Ethics and dissemination:** The protocol was first approved by the Institutional Review
12
13
14 4 Board of Keio University School of Medicine, followed by the institutional review board of
15
16
17
18 5 each participating site. Participant recruitment began in June 2018. The final results will be
19
20
21 6 published in international peer-reviewed medical journals.
22

23
24 7 **Trial registration number:** UMIN 000031560
25
26
27
28 8 (https://upload.umin.ac.jp/cgi-open-bin/ctr_e/ctr_view.cgi?recptno=R000036031)
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **Article Summary**

3 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

4 • This is the first study to evaluate the effect of olanexidine, which has been
5 commercially available in Japan since 2015.

6 • The study design is a multicenter, single-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial.

7 • The primary outcome measure is the 30-day postoperative SSI rate.

8 • This study is limited to a Japanese population, which could introduce an element of
9 selection bias, because olanexidine is only commercially available in Japan.

1
2
3
4 15
6
7 2 **INTRODUCTION**

8
9
10 3 Surgical site infection (SSI) is one of the most common nosocomial infections in surgical
11
12
13
14 4 patients.¹ The rate of SSI in gastrointestinal surgery in particular is higher than in other
15
16
17 5 surgeries, such as cardiothoracic surgery, gynecologic surgery, and neurosurgery,²⁻⁴ and it has
18
19
20 6 been reported that 10% to 30% of patients suffer from SSI after gastrointestinal surgery.⁵ SSI
21
22
23
24 7 not only causes prolonged hospitalization and delay of postoperative therapy, but increased
25
26
27 8 medical costs of \$1300-5000 per person for inpatient treatment, including antibiotic
28
29
30 9 therapy.^{6,7} Therefore, prevention of SSI is extremely important for both the patient and all
31
32
33
34 10 medical practitioners involved in the surgery.

35
36
37 11 Many perioperative measures for decreasing SSI have been reported, including enhanced
38
39
40 12 nutritional support, perioperative oxygenation, surgical technique, wound dressing, and use
41
42
43
44 13 of an antimicrobial agent.^{1,8} Surgical site preparation is useful for preventing SSI because it
45
46
47 14 can remove microorganisms from the skin. Thus far, two types of preparations,
48
49
50
51 15 povidone-iodine and chlorhexidine-alcohol,⁹⁻¹² have been commonly used as preoperative
52
53
54 16 antiseptic procedures worldwide. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
55
56
57 17 guideline only recommends skin preparation with an alcohol-containing agent if there are no
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 contraindications to its use, and other guidelines do not favor one antiseptic agent over
5
6
7
8 2 another for skin preparation.^{1,13,14} Both preparations have broad-spectrum antibacterial
9
10
11 3 effectiveness; however, povidone-iodine's activity is known to decrease in the presence of
12
13
14 4 organic materials including blood or pus.¹⁵ In contrast, chlorhexidine-alcohol has high
15
16
17 5 antibacterial activity against some pathogens, such as methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
18
19
20 6 *aureus* (MRSA)¹⁵ and vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE); nevertheless, it is associated
21
22
23
24 7 with inflammability, is more expensive than povidone-iodine, and has been linked to allergic
25
26
27 8 reactions.^{16,17} Therefore, it is necessary to determine the more effective antiseptic for surgical
28
29
30
31 9 site preparation.
32
33

34 10 Olanexidine (1.5% Olanedine®; Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory, Inc., Tokushima, Japan),
35
36
37 11 which is a new antiseptic, is one of the biguanide bactericidal disinfectants that contains
38
39
40
41 12 olanexidine gluconate as its active ingredient.^{18,19} It has been commercially available in Japan
42
43
44 13 since 2015. It can disrupt membrane integrity by binding to the cell membrane resulting in
45
46
47 14 irreversible leakage of intracellular components, which is the mechanism underlying its
48
49
50
51 15 bactericidal and fungicidal activities.¹⁸ Olanexidine has antimicrobial activity against a wide
52
53
54 16 range of bacteria, including gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria. Moreover, Inoue et al.
55
56
57 17 reported that compared to chlorhexidine-alcohol and povidone-iodine, olanexidine showed
58
59
60

1 more potent bactericidal activity against MRSA and VRE both in vitro and in vivo.¹⁸

2 Therefore, the use of olanexidine is highly expected to lead to decreases in the SSI rate.

3 However, to date, no study has evaluated the effectiveness and safety of olanexidine

4 compared to conventional antiseptics in large-scale clinical trials.

5 In this multicenter, randomized controlled clinical trial, we aim to evaluate whether

6 olanexidine or povidone-iodine, which is the conventional skin antiseptic used in Japan, is

7 useful for preventing SSI in gastrointestinal surgery. We hypothesize that olanexidine will be

8 more useful for preventing SSI than povidone-iodine without increasing toxicity.

1

2 **METHODS**

3 **Trial design**

4 This is a multi-center, prospective, randomized, blinded-endpoint trial (PROBE) designed
5 to assess the efficacy of 1.5% olanexidine for surgical skin preparation for preventing SSIs in
6 gastrointestinal surgery. The trial was designed and will be independently conducted by Keio
7 University with approval from the ethics committee of Keio University School of Medicine
8 in accordance with the principals of the Declaration of Helsinki. All analyses will be
9 conducted by Keio University, independent of the sponsor, according to the prespecified
10 statistical analysis plan (SAP). As a prospective randomized controlled trial, the study
11 strategy will be constructed and presented in accordance with the recommendations of the
12 SPIRIT statement.

13

14 **Eligibility criteria**

15 Eligible patients are those who meet all of the following inclusion criteria and who do not
16 have any listed exclusion criteria.

- 17 • Inclusion criteria

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 1) Scheduled to undergo elective gastrointestinal surgery involving the esophagus, stomach,
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8 2) duodenum, small intestine, colorectal, liver, biliary tract, and pancreas that has a class II
- 9
- 10
- 11 3) surgical wound (Table 1).
- 12
- 13
- 14 2) Age ≥ 20 years at the time of consent by non-blinded investigators.
- 15
- 16
- 17 3) Provision of written informed consent by the patient.
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 • Exclusion criteria
- 22
- 23
- 24 1) Allergy to olanexidine gluconate or povidone-iodine.
- 25
- 26
- 27 2) Unable to undergo follow-up 30 days postoperatively.
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31 3) Active bacterial infection at the time of informed consent (except for viral hepatitis).
- 32
- 33
- 34 4) Antimicrobial therapy on the day before surgery.
- 35
- 36
- 37 5) Undergoing non-elective surgery or surgery requiring antisepsis of the mucosal surfaces or
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41 12) surgical wound sites.
- 42
- 43
- 44 6) Unsuitable conditions for safe conduct of this trial according to the non-blinded
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48 investigators.
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

16 **Intervention**

17 Study arm A (experimental group): Surgical skin antisepsis with an aqueous formulation of

1 1.5% olanexidine is administered immediately before gastrointestinal surgery.

2 Study arm B (control group): Surgical skin antiseptics with an aqueous formulation of 10%

3 povidone-iodine is administered immediately before gastrointestinal surgery.

4

5 **Treatment protocol**

6 The antiseptics should be applied widely in consideration of the drain site and length of the
7 skin incision. We apply agents from the papilla (in cases of esophageal surgery; the neck)
8 with a cranial limit and to the upper thigh with a caudal limit. The duration of application of
9 both antiseptics is at least 1 minute. After waiting 3 minutes to allow the antiseptics to dry,
10 the operation is started. Olanexidine is administered by ready-to-use applicators. One
11 olanexidine applicator will be used in surgery; however, if surgeons determine that
12 disinfection is inadequate, an additional applicator can be added. Povidone-iodine is
13 administered by a brush or by compression using pliers.

14 We used other measures to prevent SSI in our protocol as follows:

15 (1) Administering standard antibiotic prophylaxis before making the surgical incision

16 (2) Using absorbable sutures for wound closure and recommending the use of
17 antimicrobial-coated sutures

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 1 (3) Recommending the use of a wound protector [The types used are the Alexis® wound
- 5
- 6
- 7 2 protector (Medical Leaders Co. Ltd, Japan) or the lap protector (HAKKO Co. Ltd, Japan),
- 8
- 9
- 10 3 which are used without anti-infective agents]
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14 4 (4) Recommending wound irrigation with sterile normal saline
- 15
- 16
- 17 5 (5) Not restricting the type of immunosuppressive agent that can be used
- 18
- 19
- 20 6 (6) Changing or maintaining the same gloves during the operation
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24 7 (7) Changing or maintaining the surgical instruments
- 25
- 26

27 8 Furthermore, we always maintain a normal body temperature by using warming devices
28
29 9 during surgery, and do not perform preoperative hair removal.
30
31
32
33
34 10

35 36 37 11 **Recruitment of study participants**

38
39
40 12 The trial protocol (October 24, 2018, version 1.3) was approved by each participating
41
42
43 13 institution's institutional review board and registered in the University Hospital Medical
44
45
46 14 Information Network Clinical Trials Registry (number UMIN 000031560). Recruitment into
47
48
49
50 15 the trial started in June 2018 and will continue until 600 participants are registered. All
51
52
53 16 participants who meet the inclusion criteria will receive a participant information sheet from
54
55
56
57 17 investigators before giving written informed consent. This study is being conducted at 4
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 general centers: Keio University Hospital (Tokyo, Japan), National Hospital Organization
5
6
7 2 Tokyo Medical Center (Tokyo, Japan), Tokyo Saiseikai Central Hospital (Tokyo, Japan), and
8
9
10
11 3 Kawasaki Municipal Hospital (Kanagawa, Japan).
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 5 **Randomization**

19
20
21 6 Registration and allocation of participants is performed by non-blinded investigators using
22
23
24 7 the CapTool® Lite (Mebix Inc., Tokyo, Japan). Eligible patients will be randomized to either
25
26
27 8 surgical skin antisepsis with olanexidine (study arm A) or surgical skin antisepsis with
28
29
30 9 povidone-iodine (study arm B) in a 1:1 replacement ratio. The random sequence will be
31
32
33
34 10 generated from computer-generated block randomization. We designated the factor of
35
36
37 11 surgical approach (laparoscopy versus laparotomy) as the allocation adjustment factor
38
39
40 12 because of evidence that there is a significantly higher SSI rate in laparotomy than in
41
42
43
44 13 laparoscopy.²⁰
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 15 **Blinding**

52
53
54 16 Both patients and investigators will be blinded to the assigned group. Although there is a
55
56
57 17 difference in color between povidone-iodine and olanexidine, it is feasible for patients to be
58
59
60

1 masked because we wipe the stain of the antiseptic off their skin postoperatively.

2 Non-blinded investigators cannot be masked because they will be in the operating room when
3 the antiseptic is used.

4 Non-blinded investigators will answer the questionnaire about the wound condition; however,
5 they do not diagnose the presence or absence of SSI. SSIs are diagnosed by investigators who
6 are blinded to the group allocation with reference to the questionnaire. Blinded investigators
7 perform data entry for diagnosis of SSI, and the data analyst is blinded.

9 **Trial visits**

10 Generally, patients are hospitalized 1 to 4 days before surgery. We obtain informed consent
11 and record the patients' background characteristics after admission. Informed consent for the
12 operation and clinical trial is routinely obtained on the day before surgery. Thus,
13 randomization is mainly performed on the day before surgery. The duration of observation
14 will be 30 days postoperatively. The schedule for the trial visits and data collection is
15 summarized in Table 2.

17 **Outcome measures**

1.

1 The non-blinded investigators will observe the surgical wound site daily during admission.
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 2 After discharge, participants will undergo outpatient observation at least once if it is within
9
10
11 3 30 days postoperatively. Non-blinded investigators will observe the surgical wound in the
12
13
14 4 same manner as during the hospital stay. We also recommend that patients visit the outpatient
15
16
17 5 clinic or an emergency department if there are any symptoms suggestive of SSI such as pain
18
19
20
21 6 or redness. If SSI is suspected based on the clinical findings, a microbiological culture would
22
23
24 7 be collected using a cotton swab. The diagnosis of SSI will be determined by blinded
25
26
27 8 investigators who will be unaware of the patients' group assignment. The investigator will
28
29
30
31 9 verify the SSI via chart review by using the questionnaire for SSI provided by the
32
33
34 10 non-blinded investigators in accordance with the CDC guideline. Moreover, blinded
35
36
37 11 investigators will assess the seriousness of all adverse events and determine whether they are
38
39
40
41 12 related to the study.

44 13 (1) Primary outcome measure

47 14 Postoperative 30-day SSI rate

50 15 (2) Secondary outcome measures

53 16 Postoperative 30-day superficial incisional SSI rate, deep incisional SSI rate, organ/space SSI
54
55
56
57 17 rate, positive bacterial wound culture rate, bacterial strains, and rates of intervention-related
58
59
60

1 toxicity and allergic events (e.g., erythema, pruritus, dermatitis, and other symptoms of
2 allergy around the region disinfected by the antiseptic during surgery).

3

4 **Definitions**

5 SSIs are classified as superficial incisional, deep incisional, and organ/space based on
6 criteria in the CDC guidelines (Supplemental Table 1).¹

7

8 **Data collection**

9 All data will be collected and recorded into the web-based electronic case report form (CRF;
10 CapTool® Lite) by the trial or non-blinded investigators. From the electronic CRF, the trial
11 database will be established. Patients' characteristics, such as sex, age, smoking status, body
12 mass index, the use of prophylactic antibiotics, mode of skin closure, comorbidities, such as
13 diabetes mellitus, and steroid use, will be collected.

14 Data will also be collected regarding the surgical procedures such as the type of surgery, use
15 of laparoscopy, method of wound closure, type of prophylactic antiseptic agent, repeat
16 application of an antiseptic agent, use of sterilized sutures for wound closure, amount of
17 intraperitoneal irrigation, amounts of wound irrigation and blood loss, and status of excision

1 site, and recorded in the electric CRF. We will confirm that personal identifying information
2 such as patient names and medical record identification are deleted from the data. Thereafter,
3 a linkable anonymized number is set and stored by a personal information manager for at
4 least 5 years after study completion.

5 6 **Data monitoring**

7 Central monitoring will be conducted with the aim of ensuring that the trials are conducted
8 safely and in accordance with the implementation plan, and that the data collection is
9 performed correctly. It is conducted once a year, with 10% of registration completed in each
10 institution. The number of consents acquired, number of patients registered, number of
11 patients who withdraw or are lost to follow-up and their reasons, safety, compliance with
12 eligibility criteria and exclusion criteria, accuracy of the allocation procedure, and
13 compliance with various regulations and research plan are all evaluated by the test secretariat.

14 15 **Sample size calculation**

16 At our institution, the estimated rate of SSI after gastrointestinal surgery with wound class II
17 is 12% (this rate was only included in a non-published Japanese report) after povidone-iodine

1
2
3
4 1 use and 6% after olanexidine use. Assuming a group difference of 6% during the study
5
6
7
8 2 period, 281 patients per group would provide a power of over 80%, which is sufficient for
9
10
11 3 detecting a difference in the proportion of SSI between olanexidine and povidone-iodine
12
13
14 4 using a one-sided chi-square test at a 5% level of significance. A dropout rate of about 5% is
15
16
17
18 5 allowed; thus, with 300 patients required per group, a total sample size of 600 patients is
19
20
21 6 required for the trial.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

8 **Patient and Public Involvement**

9 The patients and the public were not involved in the design of this study.
10

11 **Statistical analysis**

12 We will perform the primary analyses using the full analysis set, from which patients who
13 do not undergo surgery or who withdraw consent before assessment of the primary endpoint
14 are excluded. In addition, we will repeat the analyses in the per-protocol set, further
15 excluding patients with major protocol deviations. The safety analysis set will include all
16 patients who were randomly assigned to a study group and received treatment during the
17 study period. For the baseline variables, summary statistics will be performed using
18 frequencies and proportions for categorical data and means and standard deviations for
19 continuous variables. Patient characteristics will be compared using Pearson's chi-square test
20 or Fisher's exact test for categorical outcomes, and Student's t-test for continuous variables,

1 as appropriate. For the primary analysis, which is aimed at comparing the treatment effects,
2 the adjusted risk ratio and its 95% confidence interval will be estimated using the
3 Mantel-Haenszel method. To test for a significant association of the primary outcome, the
4 Mantel-Haenszel test will be applied after adjusting for allocation factors. All comparisons
5 are planned, and all *p*-values will be two sided. *P*-values <0.05 will be considered statistically
6 significant. All statistical analyses will be performed using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS
7 Institute, Cary, NC, USA). The SAP will be developed by the principal investigator and the
8 biostatistician before completion of patient recruitment and data fixation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

3 Participant recruitment began in June 2018. The final results will be published in
4 international peer-reviewed medical journals.

For peer review only

1

2 DISCUSSION

3 Although some guidelines have indicated the efficacy of chlorhexidine-alcohol and
4 povidone-iodine for reducing the SSI rate, the optimal recommendation has still not been
5 established, and the prevalence of SSI remains high in gastrointestinal surgery. Therefore, a
6 comparative trial between conventional antiseptics, including chlorhexidine-alcohol and
7 povidone-iodine, and newly developed antiseptics that considers their effectiveness, toxicity,
8 and costs is needed.⁸

9 We have been conducting a randomized controlled clinical trial to compare olanexidine and
10 povidone-iodine, which is the most popular antiseptic in Japan in terms of prevalence of SSI
11 and its low toxicity. The strength of this trial is that we adopted blinding for diagnosing SSI
12 at the multiple centers. To maintain the quality of practices, only 4 centers, all of which are
13 high-volume centers performing greater than 500 gastrointestinal surgeries per year, are
14 participating in this trial. Furthermore, since the staff in each center belongs to the SSI
15 control committee, which provides unified and evidence-based counter measures against SSI
16 at Keio University Hospital, the management of SSI at each center can be performed in
17 almost the same manner.

1
2
3
4 1 In this study, we have used povidone-iodine instead of chlorhexidine-alcohol as a control.
5
6
7 2 Since chlorhexidine-alcohol is associated with inflammation, povidone-iodine is
8
9
10 3 recommended and typically used for gastrointestinal surgery in Japan. In addition,
11
12
13 4 chlorhexidine-alcohol at concentrations greater than 1% is not commercially available in
14
15
16 5 Japan, although a concentration greater than 2% is recognized as having a bactericidal effect
17
18
19 6 in international guidelines.²¹⁻²³ Moreover, considering the influence of ethnic differences,
20
21
22 7 including intrinsic and extrinsic ethnic factors, this comparison is a meaningful examination
23
24
25 8 of SSI treatment, at least in Japan. Therefore, we think that the selection of the control group
26
27
28 9 is reasonable.
29
30
31
32
33

34 10 Although antisepsis would influence only superficial and deep SSIs, we included
35
36
37 11 organ-space SSI in the endpoint. As described earlier, this is the first study to use
38
39
40 12 olanexidine; therefore, it is more important to establish evidence for all types of SSI than to
41
42
43 13 limit the study to superficial and deep wound infections. Some studies have investigated skin
44
45
46 14 antisepsis in gastrointestinal surgery and included organ SSI as an outcome.^{11,12}
47
48
49

50
51 15 This study has several limitations. First, this trial is recruiting patients undergoing various
52
53
54 16 types of gastrointestinal surgery, such as esophagectomy, gastrectomy, and cholecystectomy,
55
56
57 17 which have different rates of SSI. However, there is no major bias in allocation because it is
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 randomized. Furthermore, since this is the first report using olanexidine, it is more important
5
6
7
8 2 to include various operations than to limit the study to a particular procedure. Second, this
9
10
11 3 study is limited to the Japanese population because olanexidine is only commercially
12
13
14 4 available in Japan, which could introduce an element of selection bias,
15
16

17
18 5 In conclusion, the present study is assessing the efficacy of olanexidine compared to
19
20
21 6 povidone-iodine for preventing SSI in gastrointestinal surgery. We expect olanexidine to be
22
23
24 7 more effective for preventing SSI than povidone-iodine without increasing toxicity. In the
25
26
27
28 8 future, if superiority of olanexidine compared to povidone-iodine is proven in this trial, we
29
30
31 9 should also consider conducting another trial that compares olanexidine to an alcohol-based
32
33
34 10 antiseptic agent. Even if this prediction is not the final result, this trial can provide new
35
36
37
38 11 knowledge in terms of antiseptics for preventing SSI. The result will also contribute to the
39
40
41 12 development of new antiseptics treatments for gastrointestinal surgery.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **TRIAL STATUS**

3 As of 25 October 2018, this trial is actively recruiting patients at 3 centers with additional
4 centers planned. Two hundred of the planned 600 participants have been enrolled.

For peer review only

1

2 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

3 MK and HO contributed equally to this study. All authors made significant contribution to
4 the conception and design of the study protocol. MT designed the study and wrote the
5 protocol and manuscript. SM, TI, KF, RN, NW, MK, HY, YA, GO, SH, MT, TI, TY, KH,
6 YI, YS, HH, YM, MS, and TK assisted with the development of the study design and
7 protocol. The protocol was reviewed by HO, HK, MS, KO, and YK. YS wrote the statistical
8 analysis plan. All authors gave final approval of the manuscript and agree to be accountable
9 for all aspects of the work.

10

11 **FUNDING**

12 This work was supported by donations from the Department of Surgery, Keio University
13 School of Medicine and Ohyama Health Foundation Inc.

14

15 **DISCLAIMER**

16 Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory Inc. was not involved in the planning of the protocol or in the
17 conduct of the trial.

1
2
3
4 15
6
7
8 2 **COMPETING INTERESTS**9
10
11 3 Yuko Kitagawa received grant support from Otsuka Pharmaceutical Factory Inc.
12
13
14 415
16
17
18 5 **ETHICS APPROVAL**19
20
21 6 The protocol was first approved by the Institutional Review Board of Keio University School
22
23
24 7 of Medicine, and then approved by the institutional review board of each participating site.
25
26
27 828
29
30
31 9 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**32
33
34 10 The authors thank Asako Inoue and Kumiko Motooka, staff members of the Department of
35
36
37 11 Surgery in Keio University School of Medicine, for their help in the preparation of this
38
39
40
41 12 manuscript.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2 **REFERENCES**

- 3 1. Berríos-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, et al: Centers for Disease Control
4 and Prevention Guideline for the Prevention of Surgical Site Infection, 2017. *JAMA Surgery*
5 152:784-791, 2017
- 6 2. Steiner HL, Strand EA: Surgical-site infection in gynecologic surgery:
7 pathophysiology and prevention. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 217:121-128, 2017
- 8 3. López Pereira P, Díaz-Agero Pérez C, López Fresneña N, et al: 'Epidemiology of
9 surgical site infection in a neurosurgery department'. *Br J Neurosurg* 31:10-15, 2016
- 10 4. Figuerola-Tejerina A, Rodríguez-Caravaca G, Bustamante-Munguira J, et al:
11 Epidemiological Surveillance of Surgical Site Infection and its Risk Factors in Cardiac
12 Surgery: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)* 69:842-848, 2016
- 13 5. Maehara Y, Shirabe K, Kohnoe S, et al: Impact of intra-abdominal absorbable
14 sutures on surgical site infection in gastrointestinal and hepato-biliary-pancreatic surgery:
15 results of a multicenter, randomized, prospective, phase II clinical trial. *Surg Today*
16 47:1060-1071, 2017
- 17 6. Kirkland KB, Briggs, JP, Trivette, S, et al: The Impact of Surgical-Site Infections

- 1
2
3
4 1 in the 1990s: Attributable Mortality, Excess Length of Hospitalization, And Extra Costs.
5
6
7 2 *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 20: 725-730. 1999
8
9
10
11 3 7. de Lissovoy G, Fraeman K, Hutchins V, et al: Surgical site infection: incidence
12
13
14 4 and impact on hospital utilization and treatment costs. *Am J Infect Control* 37:387-397, 2009
15
16
17 5 8. Allegranzi B, Bischoff P, de Jonge S, et al: New WHO recommendations on
18
19
20 6 preoperative measures for surgical site infection prevention: an evidence-based global
21
22
23 7 perspective. *Lancet Infect Dis* 16:e276-e287, 2016
24
25
26
27 8 9. Srinivas A, Kaman L, Raj P, et al: Comparison of the efficacy of chlorhexidine
28
29
30 9 gluconate versus povidone iodine as preoperative skin preparation for the prevention of
31
32
33 10 surgical site infections in clean-contaminated upper abdominal surgeries. *Surg Today*
34
35
36 11 45:1378-1384, 2015
37
38
39
40
41 12 10. Springel EH, Wang XY, Sarfoh VM, et al: A randomized open-label controlled
42
43
44 13 trial of chlorhexidine-alcohol vs povidone-iodine for cesarean antisepsis: the CAPICA trial.
45
46
47 14 *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 217:463 e1-463 e8, 2017
48
49
50
51 15 11. Darouiche RO, Wall MJ Jr., Itani KM, et al: Chlorhexidine-Alcohol versus
52
53
54 16 Povidone-Iodine for Surgical-Site Antisepsis. *N Engl J Med* 362:18-26, 2010
55
56
57 17 12. Park HM, Han SS, Lee EC, et al: Randomized clinical trial of preoperative skin
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 1 antiseptics with chlorhexidine gluconate or povidone-iodine. *Br J Surg* 104:e145-e150, 2017
5
6
7
8 2 13. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Surgical Site
9
10
11 3 Infection: Prevention and Treatment of Surgical Site Infection (NICE Clinical Guideline 74).
12
13
14 4 2008
15
16
17 5 14. Burlingame B DB, Link T, et al: Guideline for Preoperative Patient Skin
18
19
20
21 6 Antisepsis. In: Connor R, ed. AORN Guidelines for Perioperative Practice. Denver, CO:
22
23
24 7 Association of periOperative Registered Nurses; 2016
25
26
27 8 15. Zamora JL Price MF, Chuang P, et al: Inhibition of povidone-iodine's
28
29
30
31 9 bactericidal activity by common organic substances: an experimental study. *Surgery*
32
33
34 10 98:25-29, 1985
35
36
37
38 11 16. Lee I, Agarwal RK, Lee BY, Fishman NO, Umscheid CA. Systematic review and
39
40
41 12 cost analysis comparing use of chlorhexidine with use of iodine for preoperative skin
42
43
44 13 antiseptics to prevent surgical site infection. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 31:1219-1229,
45
46
47 14 2010
48
49
50
51 15 17. Lim KS, Kam PC. Chlorhexidine — pharmacology and clinical applications.
52
53
54 16 *Anaesth Intensive Care* 36:502-512, 2008
55
56
57 17 18. Inoue Y, Hagi A, Nii T, et al: Novel antiseptic compound OPB-2045G shows
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 potent bactericidal activity against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and
5
6
7
8 2 vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* both in vitro and in vivo: a pilot study in animals. *J Med*
9
10
11 3 *Microbiol* 64:32-36, 2015
12
13

14 4 19. Hagi A, Iwata K, Nii T, et al: Bactericidal Effects and Mechanism of Action of
15
16
17 5 Olanexidine Gluconate, a New Antiseptic. *Antimicrob Agents and Chemother* 59:4551-4559,
18
19
20
21 6 2015
22
23

24 7 20. Howard DP, Datta G, Cunnick G, et al: Surgical site infection rate is lower in
25
26
27 8 laparoscopic than open colorectal surgery. *Colorectal Dis* 12:423-7, 2010
28
29

30
31 9 21. Preventing surgical site infections. Key recommendations for practice. Dublin:
32
33
34 10 Joint Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland/Royal Colleges of Physicians of Ireland Working
35
36
37 11 Group on Prevention of Surgical Site Infection; 2012
38
39

40
41 12 22. Targeted literature review: What are the key infection prevention and control
42
43
44 13 recommendations to inform a surgical site infection (SSI) prevention quality improvement
45
46
47 14 tool? Version 3.0. February 2015. Edinburgh: Health Protection Scotland; 2015
48
49

50
51 15 23. High impact intervention: care bundle to prevent surgical site infection. London:
52
53
54 16 Department of Health; 2011
55
56

57
58 17
59
60

1
2
3
4 15
6
7
8 29
10
11 3 **Table 1** Definition of the wound classes
12

Wound Class	Definition
Class I (Clean)	An uninfected operative wound in which no inflammation is encountered and the respiratory, alimentary, genital, or uninfected urinary tracts are not entered.
Class II (Clean-contaminated)	Operative wounds in which the respiratory, alimentary, genital, or urinary tracts are entered under controlled conditions and without unusual contamination.
Class III (Contaminated)	Includes open, fresh, and accidental wounds.
Class IV (Dirty-contaminated)	Includes old traumatic wounds with retained devitalized tissue and those that involve existing clinical infection or perforated viscera.

1

2 **Table 2** Flow chart of the trial

Time point	After admission	Before surgery	Surgery	After surgery
Informed consent	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Patients' background characteristics	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Physical examination	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Randomization		<input type="checkbox"/>		
Intervention			<input type="checkbox"/>	
Observation of the surgical site				<input type="checkbox"/> a

3 a: From postoperative day 1 to postoperative day 30 (outpatient observation is performed at

4 least once if the discharge is within 30 days postoperatively)

Supplemental Table 1 Definitions of SSI

Type of SSI	Definition
Superficial incisional SSI	<p>Superficial incisional SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).</p> <p>A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.</p> <p>B) The infection affects only the incision in the skin and the subcutaneous tissue.</p> <p>C) At least one of the following is applicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">purulent drainage is observed from the superficial incision,organisms are identified from the superficial incision or subcutaneous tissue by a culture or non-culture based microbiologic testing method, and/orthe superficial incision is deliberately opened by a nonblinded investigators, and culture or non-culture based testing is not performed. <p>In addition, at least one of the following symptoms for infection must be applicable: pain, tenderness, localized swelling, erythema, or heat.</p>
Deep incisional SSI	<p>Deep incisional SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).</p> <p>A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.</p> <p>B) The infection reaches the deep soft tissues of the incision (fascia or muscle layer).</p> <p>C) At least one of the following is applicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">purulent drainage is observed from the deep incision,the deep incision spontaneously dehisces, or is deliberately opened or aspirated by a nonblinded investigators, and/or

1
2
3
4
5 c. an abscess or other evidence of infection is present and involves the deep incision.

6 In addition, the organism is identified by a culture or non-culture based microbiologic
7 testing method that is performed for purposes of clinical diagnosis or treatment, and
8 symptoms for infection must be applicable: fever, localized pain, or tenderness. Negative
9 finding of a culture does not meet this criterion.
10
11

12
13 Organ/space SSI

14 Organ/space SSI involves any part of the body other than the skin incision, fascia, or
15 muscle layer that has been opened or manipulated during surgery. The specific site is
16 classified as organ/space for the purpose of further identification of the infection site.
17 Organ/space SSI must meet the following three criteria (A, B, and C).

18 A) Infection occurred within 30 days postoperatively.

19 B) The infection involves any part of the body that is opened or manipulated during the
20 operative procedure (except for the facial/muscle layers).

21 C) At least one of the following is applicable:

22 a. purulent drainage is observed from a drain that is placed into the organ/space,

23 b. organisms are identified from fluid or tissue in the organ/space by a culture or non-
24 culture based microbiologic testing method, and/or

25 c. an abscess or other evidence of infection is present and involves the organ/space.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 *Erythema; the skin redness of the skin that spreads away from the incision site, localized swelling; a bulge limited to the incision site,

33
34
35 tenderness; pressured pain beyond normal for the operation.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46



SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	ItemN o (Page No)	Description
Administrative information		
Title	1(p1)	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym
Trial registration	2a (p4)	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry
	2b (n/a)	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set
	3 (p12)	Date and version identifier
Funding	4 (p24)	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support
Roles and responsibilities	5a (p24)	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors
	5b (p2)	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor
	5c (n/a)	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities
	5d (n/a)	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)
Introduction		
Background and rationale	6a (p6-8)	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention
	6b (p6-8)	Explanation for choice of comparators

1			
2	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses
3		(p6-8)	
4			
5	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group,
6		(p6-8)	crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework
7			(eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)
8			
9			
10			
11	Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes		
12			
13	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic
14		(p12)	hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected.
15			Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained
16			
17	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable,
18		(p9)	eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform
19			the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)
20			
21			
22	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication,
23		(p10)	including how and when they will be administered
24			
25		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a
26		(p10)	given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms,
27			participant request, or improving/worsening disease)
28			
29		11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any
30		(n/a)	procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return,
31			laboratory tests)
32			
33			
34		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or
35		(p10)	prohibited during the trial
36			
37	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific
38		(p14)	measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric
39			(eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of
40			aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each
41			outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy
42			and harm outcomes is strongly recommended
43			
44			
45	Participant	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and
46	timeline	(p14)	washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic
47			diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)
48			
49			
50	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study
51		(p17)	objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and
52			statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations
53			
54	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach
55		(p12)	target sample size
56			
57			
58	Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)		
59			
60	Allocation:		

1			
2	Sequence	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-
3	generation	(p12)	generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification.
4			To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any
5			planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate
6			document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or
7			assign interventions
8			
9			
10	Allocation	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central
11	concealment	(p14)	telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes),
12	mechanism		describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are
13			assigned
14			
15	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol
16		(p12)	participants, and who will assign participants to interventions
17			
18	Blinding	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial
19	(masking)	(p13)	participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and
20			how
21			
22			
23		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and
24		(n/a)	procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during
25			the trial
26			
27			

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

28			
29			
30	Data collection	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other
31	methods	(p16)	trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality
32			(eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a
33			description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory
34			tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to
35			where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol
36			
37			
38		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up,
39		(p16)	including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants
40			who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols
41			
42	Data	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any
43	management	(p16)	related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry;
44			range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data
45			management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol
46			
47			
48	Statistical	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes.
49	methods	(p17)	Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can
50			be found, if not in the protocol
51			
52			
53		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted
54		(p17)	analyses)
55			
56		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence
57		(p17)	(eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle
58			missing data (eg, multiple imputation)
59			
60			

Methods: Monitoring

Data monitoring	21a (p16)	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed
	21b (p16)	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial
Harms	22 (n/a)	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct
Auditing	23 (n/a)	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor

Ethics and dissemination

Research ethics approval	24 (p19)	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval
Protocol amendments	25 (n/a)	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)
Consent or assent	26a (p12)	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)
	26b (n/a)	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable
Confidentiality	27 (p15)	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial
Declaration of interests	28 (p24)	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site
Access to data	29 (n/a)	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators
Ancillary and post-trial care	30 (n/a)	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation

1			
2	Dissemination	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to
3	policy	(n/a)	participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant
4			groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other
5			data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions
6			
7		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional
8		(p24)	writers
9			
10		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol,
11		(n/a)	participant-level dataset, and statistical code
12			
13			

Appendices

14			
15			
16	Informed consent	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to
17	materials	(n/a)	participants and authorised surrogates
18			
19	Biological	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological
20	specimens	(n/a)	specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and
21			for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable
22			

*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "[Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)" license.