Management of postoperative spinal infections
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Abstract

Postoperative surgical site infection (SSI) is a common complication after posterior lumbar spine surgery. This review details an approach to the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of SSIs. Factors contributing to the development of a SSI can be split into three categories: (1) microbiological factors; (2) factors related to the patient and their spinal pathology; and (3) factors relating to the surgical procedure.SSI is most commonly caused by Staphylococcus aureus. The virulence of the organism causing the SSI can affect its presentation. SSI can be prevented by careful adherence to aseptic technique, prophylactic antibiotics, avoiding myonecrosis by frequently releasing retractors and preoperatively optimizing modifiable patient factors. Increasing pain is commonly the only symptom of a SSI and can lead to a delay in diagnosis. C-reactive protein and magnetic resonance imaging can help establish the diagnosis. Treatment requires acquiring intra-operative cultures to guide future antibiotic therapy and surgical debridement of all necrotic tissue. A SSI can usually be adequately treated without removing spinal instrumentation. A multidisciplinary approach to SSIs is important. It is useful to involve an infectious disease specialist and use minimum serial bactericidal titers to enhance the effectiveness of antibiotic therapy. A plastic surgeon should also be involved in those cases of severe infection that require repeat debridement and delayed closure.
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INTRODUCTION

Postoperative surgical site infection (SSI) in the lumbar spine is a relatively frequent complication of invasive spine procedures. The management of a SSI can be costly due to its potentially devastating consequences, including lost productivity during prolonged treatment and recovery, increased morbidity, the need for subsequent reoperation and even death. With the rise in prevalence of antibiotic-resistant organisms such as methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA), the prevention and treatment of SSIs has become even more difficult, particularly in those patients with spinal instrumentation.
This review describes the factors that contribute to the development of a SSI and strategies for their prevention, the range of presentations of SSIs, and the challenges that arise during diagnosis and treatment.

PATHOGENESIS AND PREVENTION

Although multifactorial, the various risk factors that contribute to the development of a SSI can be broadly divided into three categories: (1) microbiological; (2) patient/host; and (3) procedure-related. Understanding the contribution of these risk factors to SSIs enhances measures aimed at the prevention of this common yet dreadful complication.

Microbiological factors

The most common organism causing a SSI is *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*), although other reported causative organisms include *Staphylococcus epidermidis* (*S. epidermidis*), *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Pseudomonas* spp., *Enterobacter cloacae*, and *Proteus mirabilis* [1,2]. Trauma patients are more likely to present with infections due to gram-negative bacteria, which may result from hematogenous spread in the setting of urosepsis, frequently in patients with neurological injury related to their trauma [3]. Recently, a consecutive series of 3218 patients undergoing posterior lumbar-instrumented arthrodesis was reviewed by Koutsoumbelis et al [4]. In this series, 34% of SSIs demonstrated positive cultures for MRSA, indicating an increasing prevalence of this organism.

When addressing microbiological factors that contribute to SSIs, it is important to emphasize that meticulous adherence to aseptic technique is the key component of SSI prevention [5]. One intervention that the bulk of available evidence has suggested may decrease the rate of SSI after spinal surgery is the use of prophylactic antibiotics [6]. Antibiotic prophylaxis has brought the incidence of SSI following lumbar discectomy down to <1% [7,12]. In fact, one report by Transfeldt et al [8] showed a decrease in the SSI rate from 7% to 3.6% following elective spinal arthrodesis with the use of routine antibiotic prophylaxis. When choosing an antibiotic, one with good efficacy against common strains of *S. aureus* and *S. epidermidis* should be used due to the higher frequency of infection with these bacteria. A first-generation cephalosporin such as cefazolin is popular, as it also quickly reaches peak serum concentrations and has a more benign side effect profile than other antibiotics. If a patient is at high risk for colonization with MRSA, we recommend combining vancomycin with cefazolin, as vancomycin alone has relatively low efficacy against non-methicillin resistant strains of *Staphylococcus* spp. Yet for those patients with allergies to penicillin or cephalosporins, vancomycin alone can be used. Risk factors for colonization with MRSA include antibiotic use within 3 mo before admission, hospitalization during the past 12 mo, diagnosis of skin or soft-tissue infection at admission, and human immunodeficiency virus infection [9,10]. Bacterial antibiotic resistance continues to be an evolving problem and these recommendations may need to be modified based on regional bacterial susceptibilities or if common pathogens in SSIs develop widespread resistance to these antibiotics in the future.

Patient/host factors

Several patient-related risk factors have been reported for SSIs including: diabetes mellitus, obesity, alcohol abuse, smoking, advanced age, corticosteroid use, malnutrition and hospitalization greater than one week [11-40]. Koutsoumbelis et al [41] also identified coronary artery disease, osteoporosis and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease as independent risk factors for SSIs. Although the exact mechanism by which these factors increase the likelihood of a SSI is not definitively known, it is clear that an inability of the host to heal the surgical wound and mount an inflammatory response sufficient to eradicate the infectious organisms leads to their growth. Obese patients have a large layer of adipose tissue with poor vascular perfusion that may become necrotic following wound closure, creating a nidus for infection [21,22,24-41,43]. Smoking and diabetes both predispose patients to infection through microvascular damage and subsequent induction of tissue ischemia [23,24,41-43]. Advancing age increases the likelihood of the presence of other comorbidities and is associated with immunosenescence, a phenomenon by which the immune response gradually wanes and becomes ineffective.

The pathlogy that patients present with also influences susceptibility to infection. Patients with traumatic spine injury, especially those with a concomitant neurological injury, have infection rates of up to 10% [2,16,40-47]. Such patients may have additional injuries to the viscera or appendicular skeleton and usually have a greater degree of soft-tissue injury than patients undergoing elective surgery, which contributes to tissue hypoxia. Trauma patients are in a catabolic state and are more likely to have protein-calorie malnutrition. Prolonged stays in intensive care units lead to increased exposure to antibiotic resistant bacteria, which may increase the severity of a SSI and make treatment more difficult. Those factors that cause trauma patients to have a higher risk of developing SSIs also apply to patients with spinal neoplasms. In addition, these patients may also undergo systemic chemotherapy or radiation to the surgical site, leading to immunosuppression and delayed healing, and consequently increasing their susceptibility to infection.

Modifiable risk factors should be mitigated preoperatively to minimize the risk of postoperative infection. A nutrition consult should be obtained in patients after significant polytrauma, with catabolic processes due to neoplasms, or otherwise at significant risk for malnutrition. Blood sugar should be closely controlled in diabetic patients.

Procedure-related factors

The length and complexity of the index surgical procedure has a significant impact on the incidence of SSIs.
Although the risk of a SSI is < 1% for lumbar discectomy, the risk is higher following spinal arthrodesis, particularly with posterior instrumentation. This is likely due to increased dead space, longer duration of surgery and the potential for adherence of biofilm to metal implants. Following elective thoracic or lumbar spinal arthrodesis, reported rates of SSI from individual surgeons or institutions ranges from 1.9% to 4.4% in the last ten years [41,42,48-50]. The most recent National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance report in 2004 cited the infection rate following spinal arthrodesis as 2.1% [51]. The risk of SSI is less common after anterior spinal arthrodesis and is not greater for a combined anterior/posterior arthrodesis than for a posterior arthrodesis alone [46], except for when it is a staged procedure done under separate anesthesia [46]. Devices such as an operating microscope or headlamp and loupe magnification can create a source of bacterial shedding onto the surgical field, although increased contamination from these devices has not been shown to directly increase infection risk [40,42,52-54]. There is also some limited evidence that minimally invasive surgery may decrease the risk of a SSI. A recent systematic review of single cohort studies comparing minimally invasive transforaminal interbody fusion (TLIF) to open TLIF showed a significant decrease in SSI rates from 4% to 0.6% [45-57]. In addition, it has recently been shown that the risk of returning to the operating room (OR) to treat a SSI increases along with the surgical invasiveness index of the primary spine surgery [48].

The study by Koutsoumbelis et al [40] reported an overall incidence of SSIs of 2.6%. Their study identified four procedure related risk factors: (1) longer duration of surgery; (2) intra-operative blood loss/need for transfusion; (3) incidental durotomy; and (4) greater than ten people in the OR, specifically cautioning against extraneous nurses. Previous studies have also identified increased operative time, multilevel surgery, revision surgery, and an increased number of people in the OR as important predisposing factors for a SSI [1,2,16,41,42,47,48,49]. However, this is the first time incidental durotomy has been identified as a risk factor for SSI [47]. It is unclear how and to what extent incidental durotomy and an increased number of people in the OR increase the likelihood of a SSI. Both may increase the risk of contamination of the surgical field directly, or be indicative of a longer and/or more complex surgical procedure.

Modifications to procedural technique can assist in the prevention of a SSI. It is important to frequently release retractors to prevent myonecrosis, avoid excessive use of electrocautery during subperiosteal dissection of muscle, and debride necrotic appearing muscle at the conclusion of the case. This will prevent the retention of devitalized necrotic tissue, which is a potential nidus for infection. Although the use of this technique in the lumbar spine has not yet been investigated, the addition of vancomycin powder to posterior cervical incisions prior to closure has been shown to decrease SSI [49,50]. At our institution, patients undergoing multi-level decompression and/or posterior spinal arthrodesis routinely receive antibiotic irrigation and closed suction drains postoperatively. Existing investigations have not shown that these interventions provide a significant benefit, although they have been underpowered to detect a change in infection rate, a rare event [61-63]. Evidence for the use of vertical laminar flow systems to decrease the risk of SSI in the OR is limited [64].

Recently, DiPaola et al [65] created a predictive model to stratify patients with spinal SSIs into those needing single vs multiple irrigation and debridements. To develop the model, risk factors from all three categories (microbiological, patient/host and procedure related), were analyzed. It was found that positive MRSA cultures and concomitant infections at sites other than the spine or bacteremia were strong predictors of the need for multiple irrigation and debridements. In addition, diabetes, location of surgery in the posterior lumbar spine, presence of instrumentation and the use of bone graft material other than autogenous bone graft were also more likely to result in multiple irrigation and debridements. In the future, this predictive model may help stratify patients with SSIs, enabling surgeons to adapt their index surgery and SSI treatment strategies accordingly.

**CLINICAL PRESENTATION AND DIAGNOSIS**

The diagnosis of a SSI requires the synthesis of all available data, as there is no one pathognomonic sign or symptom to indicate its presence. The most common symptom of a SSI in the early postoperative period is increasing pain at the surgical site. Signs on exam include tenderness to palpation, peri-incisional erythema, induration and drainage. A particular concern is a patient with constitutional symptoms such as fever and chills, and in the case of a severe infection: hypotension, lethargy and confusion from sepsis. Such an infection is an absolute indication for emergent irrigation and debridement, but presents rarely. In the setting of a revision surgery, latent infection from organisms such as *Propionibacterium acnes* must always be considered and routine cultures sent, as the presentation may be limited to vague complaints of pain with evidence of hardware loosening or pseudoarthrosis.

**Imaging**

Except in the setting of latent infections or discitis, plain radiographs of the spine are not particularly useful to diagnose an early SSI. Patients with latent infections may have lucency around instrumentation, while those with discitis may show loss of disk height and end plate erosion. Along those lines, computed tomography (CT) can be used in these patients to assess bony destruction and implant loosening three-dimensionally. Bone scan is not useful in these patients, as it will commonly show increased uptake due to the reactive bone at the surgical
site post-operatively.\textsuperscript{[66]} Gadolinium enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is the best radiologic modality to use when a SSI is suspected. Progressive marrow signal changes, rim enhancing fluid collections, ascending or descending epidural collections and bony destruction are all indicative of infection on MRI.

When interpreting MRI results, confounding factors such as time from index procedure should be taken into account, as tissue edema from a non-infectious cause can be confused with an infectious process. Infection typically occurs between three days and three months postoperatively and takes several days to become established. In the immediate post-operative period (\(< 6 \) wk), it has been shown that diffuse, spotty, linear intervertebral disk enhancement, with two thin bands paralleling the endplates, as well as annular enhancement at the surgical curet site are common findings and do not indicate that an infection is developing. Type 1 changes of adjacent endplates, such as decreased signal intensity on T1 imaging and edema of the vertebral marrow adjacent to the disc, are also common post-operatively. Vertebral osteomyelitis is typically recognized by endplate changes similar to these Type 1 changes, and is described as a diffuse, irregular area of non-anatomic high signal intensity in the disc. Contrast is valuable in differentiating between the two entities, as osteomyelitis shows circumferential enhancement of the disc, while the postoperative state will only produce subtle linear areas of enhancement.\textsuperscript{[67,68]}

Laboratory tests
Measurement of acute phase reactants is very useful when diagnosing an infection. C-reactive protein (CRP) has been shown to be more sensitive than erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) for detecting a SSI, as CRP levels only stay elevated for two weeks postoperatively before decreasing, while it may take up to six weeks for ESR levels to normalize. For this reason, time since index surgery is important when interpreting levels of acute phase reactants. Persistent elevation of CRP is an early indicator of an infection. In addition, preoperative measurement of CRP levels in high-risk patients with associated medical co-morbidities that may confound a postoperative CRP measurement can be useful as a baseline for detection of early infection postoperatively.\textsuperscript{[69]} White blood cell count, although routinely obtained, is an unreliable indicator of a SSI. It may remain normal despite a SSI or may be normally elevated in the postoperative period. When attempting to identify the causative organism in a SSI, intra-operative tissue cultures are the gold standard. Superficial cultures, from either the skin or drainage, are not reliable due to the likelihood of contamination by skin flora. Alternatively, some authors have proposed wound aspiration as a method for detecting early infections.\textsuperscript{[70]}

TREATMENT OF SSI
The timing and location of the infection dictates treatment. The timing of a SSI can be classified as early, late or latent, and location is either limited to the disc, or superficial or deep to the fascia.

Posterior spinal infections
Superficial extraspinal SSIs, such as cellulitis or subcutaneous abscesses, are usually managed with IV antibiotics and/or surgical incision and drainage, which can often be performed at the bedside. Subfascial wound infections rarely respond to antibiotic treatment alone and require surgical debridement and removal of all necrotic tissue with closure over drains. Epidural abscesses can be managed medically when small. However, surgical drainage is typically required for large collections, small collections that progress despite antibiotic therapy, and decompression of the dural sac in the event of a neurologic deficit. Paraspinal epidural abscesses, such as a psoas abscess, may respond to medical treatment when small. However, CT-guided aspiration and drainage is often required for large collections.\textsuperscript{[71]} A SSI in an immunocompromised host or with a particularly virulent organism may require multiple irrigation and debridements.

Patients with a SSI and spinal instrumentation present similarly to those without instrumentation, but pose unique challenges. The use of MRI in patients with instrumentation requires specialized protocols for suppression of metal artifact, such as the metal artifact reduction sequence described by Chang et al.\textsuperscript{[72]} Without which the MRI is of limited value.\textsuperscript{[73,74]} Thorough surgical debridement of all necrotic tissue and irrigation with large amounts of normal saline is crucial.\textsuperscript{[75]} Loose bone graft material should be removed if unincorporated, as dead bone will only serve as a nidus for continued infection. Loose pedicle screws and other non-essential spinal instrumentation should be removed, but essential instrumentation should be maintained if possible to avoid the creation of instability or the loss of deformity correction. Interbody and posterior segmental instrumentation can usually be left in place early on, as several authors have reported high success rates using this hardware-preservation strategy in the management of early SSIs.\textsuperscript{[73,75,76]} Patients with a late infection and solid fusion can have their instrumentation removed during surgical debridement to help clear the infection.\textsuperscript{[77]} Unfortunately, these patients are at an increased risk of developing a pseudoarthrosis and must be monitored with serial imaging studies.\textsuperscript{[78]} As multiple debridements are often necessary when treating a SSI, involving a plastic surgeon early on can facilitate optimal wound management.\textsuperscript{[75,76]} The debridement of soft tissue required to treat a SSI may result in a significant soft tissue defect. Such defects may be definitively closed with a muscle flap, or heal by secondary intention using a vacuum-dressing. We recommend that patients who require multiple surgical debridements have antibiotic impregnated polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) beads placed into the wound during early debridements, permitting high local antibiotic concentrations despite...
poor tissue vascularity. PMMA beads have been shown to decrease the development of infection after wound contamination, and have been documented to decrease both acute infection rates and osteomyelitis after compound limb fractures.

Postprocedure discitis
With a reported incidence ranging from 0.2% to 2.75%, postprocedure discitis is an infrequent complication of spine surgery. A vague complaint of low back pain is commonly the only indication that a patient may be suffering from postprocedure discitis, which can lead to a delay in diagnosis. Especially concerning are those patients with a history of increasing low back pain following surgery. For these patients, bracing can be used for comfort. Image guided percutaneous aspiration of the disc to identify the causative organism and guide antibiotic treatment is very effective. Most of these cases can be treated with six weeks of IV antibiotics, usually resulting in spontaneous fusion of the disk space.

Surgery is indicated in those patients whose infection has progressed on MRI despite appropriate antibiotic therapy, with deformity due to progressive destruction of the vertebral bodies, or with severe pain or neurological deficits due to progression of the infection into the spinal canal. For early postoperative discitis with minimal involvement of the vertebral bodies, percutaneous transforminal endoscopic debridement is an effective and minimally invasive option that has been shown to bring immediate pain reduction and good clinical results. Otherwise, anterior only or posterior only approaches for debridement and fusion may be sufficient, depending on the location of the infection and the extent of debridement and resulting instability. Many surgeons prefer to use autologous bone graft as an interbody spacer to minimize the risk of recurrent infection. If performed, harvesting of the bone graft should be performed prior to opening the spinal wound to minimize the risk of graft donor site SSI. When performing a surgical discectomy, as much of the disk as possible should be removed to prevent recurrent infection, as the adult intervertebral disk is avascular.

Postoperative antibiotic therapy
Infectious disease specialists are routinely involved in the selection and monitoring of antibiotic therapy at our institution. For implanted spinal instrumentation, the protocol our institution uses is based on previous experience with SSIs following total joint replacement. Intravenous antibiotics are chosen based on the type of causative organism and its sensitivity profile. Dosage is monitored by the trough serum bactericidal titer (SBT), which indicates the amount of bactericidal activity in the patient’s serum at the trough level between antibiotic doses. The trough SBT should be maintained at a minimum of 1:2. This ensures that at a trough level, there is at least twice the minimum concentration of antibiotic in the serum that is required for bactericidal activity. Using the SBT to monitor antibiotic therapy improves its efficacy, even in cases with resistant organisms. Antibiotics are continued for six weeks postoperatively, although recent recommendations advise eight weeks of total IV antibiotic therapy for patients with resistant organisms such as MRSA. Patients are subsequently maintained on oral suppressive antibiotics. The patient’s health status, success in achieving spinal fusion and causative organism influence the choice between lifetime oral antibiotic suppression to prevent recurrent infection and removal of instrumentation.

CONCLUSION
SSI is a common but challenging complication, particularly after instrumented spinal arthrodesis. Using meticulous aseptic technique, intra-operative irrigation, prophylactic antibiotics and optimizing patient factors preoperatively are key to preventing a SSI. In patients who still develop an infection despite efforts at prevention, timely diagnosis and treatment is critical. Instrumentation can be retained while still successfully clearing an early infection, although following fusion, instrumentation can be removed if lifetime oral antibiotic suppression is either not indicated or undesirable. Involving a plastic surgeon early on in the process is useful for closure of complex soft tissue defects.

REFERENCES
1. Weinstein MA, McCabe JP, Cammisa FP. Postoperative spinal wound infection: a review of 2,391 consecutive index procedures. J Spinal Disord 2006; 13: 422-426
2. Massie JB, Heller JG, Abitbol JJ, McPherson D, Garfin SR. Postoperative posterior spinal wound infections. Clin Orthop Relat Res 1992; (284): 99-108
3. Rechtine GR, Bono PL, Cahill D, Bolesta MJ, Chrin AM. Postoperative wound infection after instrumentation of thoracic and lumbar fractures. J Orthop Trauma 2001; 15: 566-569
4. Koutroubelis S, Hughes AP, Girardi FP, Cammisa FP, Finkert EA, Nguyen JT, Gausden E, Sama AA. Risk factors for postoperative infection following posterior lumbar instrumented arthrodesis. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2011; 93: 1627-1633
5. Lister J. Antiseptic Principle in the practice of surgery. Brit Med J 1867; 2: 246-248
6. Barker FG. Efficacy of prophylactic antibiotic therapy in spinal surgery: a meta-analysis. Neurosurgery 2002; 51: 391-400; discussion 400-401
7. Bassewitz HL, Fischgrund JS, Herkowitz HN. Postoperative spine infections. Semin Spine Surg 2000; 12: 203-211
8. Wilson DH, Harbaugh R. Microsurgical and standard removal of the protruded lumbar disc: a comparative study. Neurosurgery 1981; 8: 422-427
9. Stolke D, Sollmann WP, Seiffert V. Intra- and postoperative complications in lumbar disc surgery. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 1989; 14: 56-59
10. A Methodological Systematic Review on Surgical Site Infections Following Spinal Surgery: Part 2: Prophylactic Treatments. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2012; 37: 2034-2045
11. Kanayama M, Hashimoto T, Shigenobu K, Oha F, Togawa D. Effective prevention of surgical site infection using a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guideline-based antimicrobial prophylaxis in lumbar spine surgery. J Neurosurg 1989; 71: 229-234
12 Khan IU, Janjua MB, Hasan S, Shah S. Surgical site infection in lumbar surgeries, pre and postoperative antibiotics and length of stay: a case study. *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad* 2009; 27(4): 135-138

13 Transfeldt EE, Lonstein JE. Wound infections in elective reconstructive spinal surgery. *Orthopaedic Transactions* 1985; 9: 128-129

14 Hidron AI, Kourbatova EV, Halvosa JS, Terrell BJ, McDougal LK, Tenover FC, Blumberg HM, King MD. Risk factors for colonization with methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) in patients admitted to an urban hospital: emergence of community-associated MRSA nasal carriage. *Clin Infect Dis* 2005; 41: 159-166

15 Slover J, Haas JP, Quirino M, Phillips MS, Bosco JA. Cost-effectiveness of a Staphylococcus aureus screening and decolonization program for high-risk orthopedic patients. *J Arthroplasty* 2011; 26: 360-365

16 Wimmer C, Gluch H, Franzreb M, Ogon M. Predisposing factors for infection in spine surgery: a survey of 850 spinal procedures. *J Spinal Disord* 1998; 11: 124-128

17 Klein JD, Hey LA, Yu CS, Klein BB, Coufal FJ, Young EP, Marshall LF, Garfin SR. Perioperative nutrition and postoperative complications in patients undergoing spinal surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 1996; 21: 2676-2682

18 Carreon LY, Puno RM, Dimar JR, Glassman SD, Johnson JR. Perioperative complications of posterior lumbar decompression and arthrodesis in older adults. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2003; 85-A: 2089-2092

19 Cassinelli EH, Eubanks J, Vogt M, Furey C, Yoo J, Bohlan HH. Risk factors for the development of perioperative complications in elderly patients on lumbar decompression and arthrodesis for spinal stenosis: an analysis of 166 patients. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2007; 32: 230-235

20 Patel N, Bagan V, Vadera S, Maltenfort MG, Deutsch H, Vaccaro AR, Harrop J, Sharan A, Ratliff JK. Obesity and spine surgery: relation to perioperative complications. *J Neurosurg* 2007; 6: 291-297

21 Peng CW, Bendo JA, Goldstein JA, Nallbandian MM. Perioperative outcomes of anterior lumbar surgery in obese versus non-obese patients. *Spine* J 2009; 9: 715-720

22 Simpson JM, Silveri CP, Balderston RA, Simeone FA, An HS. The results of operations on the lumbar spine in patients who have diabetes mellitus. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1993; 75(5): 1923-1929

23 Friedman ND, Sexton DJ, Connelly SM, Kaye KS. Risk factors for surgical site infection complicating laminectomy. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2007; 28: 1060-1065

24 Capen DA, Calderone RR, Green A. Perioperative risk factors for wound infections after lower back fusions. *Orthop Clin North Am* 1996; 27: 83-86

25 Thalgott JS, Cotler HB, Sasso RC, LaRocca H, Gardner V. Postoperative infections in spinal implants. Classification and analysis—a multicenter study. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 1991; 16: 981-984

26 Schuster JM, Rechtine G, Norvell DC, Dettori JR. The influence of perioperative risk factors and therapeutic interventions on infection rates after spine surgery: a systematic review. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2010; 35: S125-S137

27 A Methodological Systematic Review on Surgical Site Infections Following Spinal Surgery: Part 1: Risk Factors. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2012; 37: 2017-2035

28 Abdul-Jabbar A, Takemoto S, Weber MH, Hu SS, Mumanen PV, Deviren V, Ames CP, Chou D, Weinstein PR, Burch S, Berven SH. Surgical site infection in spinal surgery: description of surgical and patient-based risk factors for postoperative infection using administrative claims data. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2012; 37: 1340-1345

29 Gelalis ID, Arnaoutoglou CM, Politis AN, Batzalekis NA, Katonis PG, Xenakis TA. Bacterial wound contamination during simple and complex spinal procedures. A prospective clinical study. *Spine* J 2011; 11: 1042-1048

30 Lazennec YJ, Fourniols E, Lenoir T, Aubry A, Pissonnier ML, Issartel B, Rousseau MA. Infections in the operated spine: update on risk management and therapeutic strategies. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2011; 97: S107-S116

31 Rao SB, Vasques G, Harrop J, Maltenfort M, Stein N, Kaliyadan G, Klibert F, Epstein R, Sharan A, Vaccaro A, Flomenberg P. Risk factors for surgical site infections following spinal fusion procedures: a case-control study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2011; 53: 686-692

32 Pull ter Gunne AF, Mohamed AS, Skolasky RL, van Laarhoven CJ, Cohen DB. The presentation, incidence, etiology, and treatment of surgical site infections after spinal surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2010; 35: 1323-1328

33 Chen S, Anderson MV, Cheng WK, Wongworawat MD. Diabetes associated with increased surgical site infections in spinal arthrodosis. *Clin Orthol Relat Res* 2009; 467: 1670-1673

34 Stambough JL, Beringer D. Postoperative wound infections complicating adult spine surgery. *J Spinal Cord Med* 1992; 5: 277-285

35 Calderone RR, Larsen JM. Overview and classification of surgical infections. *Orthop Clin North Am* 1996; 27: 1-8

36 Lim MR, Lee JY, Vaccaro AR. Surgical infections in the traumatized spine. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2006; 444: 114-119

37 Pull ter Gunne AF, van Laarhoven CJ, Cohen DB. Incidence of surgical site infection following adult spinal deformity surgery: an analysis of patient risk. *Eur Spine J* 2010; 19: 982-988

38 Schwarzkopf R, Chung C, Park JJ, Walsh M, Spivak JM, Steiger D. Effects of perioperative blood product use on surgical site infection following thoracic and lumbar spinal surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2010; 35: 340-346

39 Kanafani ZA, Dabdouki GK, El-Dbouni O, Bawwab T, Kanj SS. Surgical site infections following spinal surgery at a tertiary care center in Lebanon: incidence, microbiology, and risk factors. *Spinal J* 2012; 467: 589-592

40 Malone DL, Genuit T, Tracy JK, Gannon C, Napolitano LM. Surgical site infections: reanalysis of risk factors. *J Surg Res* 2002; 103: 89-95

41 Olsen MA, Nepple JJ, Riew KD, Lenke LG, Bridwell KH, Mayfield J, Fraser VJ. Risk factors for surgical site infections following thoracic and lumbar spinal arthrodesis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2008; 90: 62-69

42 Pull ter Gunne AF, Cohen DB. Incidence, prevalence, and analysis of risk factors for surgical site infection following adult spinal surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2009; 34: 1422-1428

43 Goodson WH, Hung TK. Studies of wound healing in experimental diabetes mellitus. *J Surg Res* 1977; 22: 221-227

44 Blam OG, Vaccaro AR, Vanichkachorn JS, Albert TJ, Hili-brand AS, Minnich JM, Murphy SA. Risk factors for surgical site infection in the patient with spinal injury. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2003; 28: 1475-1480

45 Levi AD, Dickman CA, Sonntag VK. Management of postoperative infections after spinal instrumentation. *J Neurosurg* 1997; 86: 975-980

46 Maragakis LL, Coogrove SE, Martinez EA, Tucker MG, Cohen DB, Perl TM. Intraoperative fraction of inspired oxygen is a modifiable risk factor for surgical site infection after spinal surgery. *Anesthesiology* 2009; 110: 556-562

47 Cammissa FP, Girardi FP, Sangani PK, Parvataneni HK, Cadag S, Sandhu HS. Incidental diuoride in spine surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2000; 25: 2653-2657

48 Fang A, Hu SS, Endres N, Bradford DS. Risk factors for infection after spinal surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2005; 30: 1460-1465

49 Olsen MA, Mayfield J, Laurysen C, Polish LB, Jones M, Vest J, Fraser VJ. Risk factors for surgical site infection in spinal surgery. *J Neurosurg* 2003; 98: 149-155
Hegde V et al. Management of postoperative spinal infections

Glassman SD, Dimar JR, Puno RM, Johnson JR. Salvage of instrumental lumbar fusions complicated by surgical wound infection. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 1996; 21: 2163-2169

National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System Report, data summary from January 1992 through June 2004, issued October 2004. *Am J Infect Control* 2004; 32: 470-485

Weiner BK, Kilgore WB. Bacterial shedding in common spine surgical procedures: headlamp/luopes and the operative microscope. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2007; 32: 918-920

Bible JE, O'Neill KR, Crosby CG, Schoenecker MG, McGirt MJ, Devin CJ. Microscope sterility during spine surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2012; 37: 623-627

Shiono Y, Watanabe K, Hosogane N, Tsuchi T, Ishii K, Nakamura M, Toyama Y, Chiba K, Matsumoto M. Sterility of posterior elements of the spine in posterior correction surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2012; 37: 523-526

Ahn DK, Park HS, Choi DJ, Kim TW, Chun TH, Yang JH, Kim DG. The difference of surgical site infection according to the methods of lumbar fusion surgery. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2012; 25: E230-E234

O'Toole JE, Eichholz KM, Fessler RG. Surgical site infection rates after minimally invasive spinal surgery. *J Neurosurg Spine* 2009; 11: 471-476

Parker SL, Adogwa O, Witham TF, Aaronson OS, Cheng J, McGirt MJ. Post-operative infection after minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (TLIF): literature review and cost analysis. *Minim Invasive Neurosurg* 2011; 54: 53-57

Cizik AM, Lee MJ, Martin BL, Bransford RJ, Bellabarba C, Chapman JR, Mirza SK. Using the spine surgical invasive artefact to identify risk of surgical site infection: a multi-variate analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2012; 94: 335-342

O'Neill KR, Smith JG, Abtahi AM, Archer KR, Spengler DM, McGirt MJ, Devin CJ. Reduced surgical site infections in patients undergoing posterior spinal stabilization of traumatic injuries using vancomycin powder. *Spine* 2011; 11: 641-646

Sweet FA, Roh M, Sliva C. Intrawound application of vancomycin for prophylaxis in instrumented thoracolumbar fusions: efficacy, drug levels, and patient outcomes. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2011; 36: 2084-2088

Kanayama M, Oha F, Togawa D, Shigenobu K, Hashimoto T. Is closed-suction drainage necessary for single-level lumbar decompression?: review of 560 cases. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2010; 468: 2693-2694

Payne DH, Fischgrund JS, Herkowitz HN, Barry RL, Kurz LT, Montgomery DM. Efficacy of closed wound suction drainage after single-level lumbar laminectomy. *J Spinal Disord* 1996; 9: 401-403

Brown MD, Brookfield KF. A randomized study of closed wound suction drainage for extensive lumbar spine surgery. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2004; 29: 1066-1068

Gruenberg MF, Campaner CL, Sola CA, Orlotan EG. Ultra-clean air for prevention of postoperative infection after posterior spinal fusion with instrumentation: a comparison between surgeries performed with and without a vertical exponential filtered air-flow system. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2004; 29: 2330-2334

Dipaola CP, Saravanja DD, Boriani L, Zhang H, Boyd MC, Kwon BK, Paquette SJ, Dvorak MF, Fisher CG, Street JT. Postoperative infection treatment score for the spine (PITSS): construction and validation of a predictive model to define need for single versus multiple irrigation and debridement for spinal surgical site infection. *Spine* 2012; 12: 218-230

Thakkar RS, Malloy JP, Thakkar SC, Carrino JA, Khanna AJ. Imaging the postoperative spine. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2012; 50: 731-747

Yu SJ, Terriere LC. Metabolism of [14C]hydropropene (ethyl 3,7,11-trimethyl-1,2,4-dodecadienoate) by microsomal oxidases and esterases from three species of diptera. *J Agric Food Chem* 1977; 25: 1076-1080

Van Goethem JW, Farizel PM, Jinkins JR. Review article: MRI of the postoperative lumbar spine. *Neuroradiology* 2002; 44: 723-739

Kang BU, Lee SH, Ahn Y, Choi WC, Choi YG. Surgical site infection in spinal surgery: detection and management based on serial C-reactive protein measurements. *J Neurosurg Spine* 2010; 13: 158-164

Sponseller PD, LaPorte DM, Hungerford MW, Eck K, Bridwell HK, Lenke LG. Deep wound infections after neuromuscular scoliosis surgery: a multicenter study of risk factors and treatment outcomes. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2000; 25: 2461-2466

Chang SD, Lee MJ, Munk PL, Janzen DL, MacKay A, Xiang QS. MRI of spinal hardware: comparison of conventional TI-weighted sequence with a new metal artifact reduction sequence. *Skeletal Radiol* 2001; 30: 213-218

Olsen RV, Munk PL, Lee MJ, Janzen DL, MacKay AL, Xiang QS, Masi B. Metal artifact reduction sequence: early clinical applications. *Radiographics* 2000; 20: 699-712

Eustace S, Goldberg R, Williamson D, Melhem ER, Oladipo O, Yucel EK, Jara H. MR imaging of soft tissues adjacent to orthopaedic hardware: techniques to minimize susceptibility artefact. *Clin Radiol* 1997; 52: 589-594

Watanabe M, Sakai D, Matsuyma Y, Yamamoto Y, Sato M, Moehida J. Risk factors for surgical site infection following spine surgery: efficacy of intraoperative saline irrigation. *J Neurosurg Spine* 2010; 12: 540-546

Sierra-Hoffman M, Jinadatha C, Carpenter JL, Rahm M. Postoperative instrumented spine infections: a retrospective review. *South Med J* 2010; 103: 25-30

Pappou IP, Papadopoulos EC, Sama AA, Girardi FP, Cammis FA. Postoperative infections in interbody fusion for degenerative spinal disease. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2006; 444: 120-128

Gerometta A, Rodriguez Olaverrri JC, Bitan F. Infections in spinal instrumentation. *Int Orthop* 2012; 36: 457-464

Ahmed R, Greenlee JD, Traynelis VC. Preservation of spinal instrumentation after development of postoperative bacterial infections in patients undergoing spinal arthrodesis. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2012; 25: 299-302

Viola RW, King HA, Adler SM, Wilson CB. Delayed infection after elective spinal instrumentation and fusion. A retrospective analysis of eight cases. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 1997; 22: 2444-250; discussion 2444-2450

Weiss LE, Vaccaro AR, Scuderri C, McGuire M, Garfin SR. Pseudarthrosis after postoperative wound infection in the lumbar spine. *J Spinal Disord* 1997; 10: 482-487

Mitra A, Mitra A, Harlin S. Treatment of massive thoracolumbar wounds and vertebral osteomyelitis following scoliosis surgery. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2004; 113: 206-213

Dumanian GA, Ondra SL, Liu J, Schafer MF, Chao JD. Muscle flap salvage of spine wounds with soft tissue defects or infection. *Spine* (Phila Pa 2003) 2005; 28: 1203-1211

Stall AC, Becker E, Ludwig SC, Gelb D, Poelstra KA. Reduction of postoperative spinal implant infection using gentamicin microspheres. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 2009; 34: 479-483

Seligson D, Mehta S, Voos K, Henry SL, Johnson JR. The use of antibiotic-impregnated polymethylmethacrylate beads to prevent the evolution of localized infection. *J Orthop Trauma* 1992; 6: 401-406

Ostermann PA, Seligson D, Henry SL. Local antibiotic therapy for severe open fractures. A review of 1085 consecutive cases. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1995; 77: 93-97

Silber JS, Anderson DG, Vaccaro AR, Anderson PA, McCormick P. Management of postprocedural discitis. *Spine* 2002; 2: 279-287

Lindholm TS, Pyllkknen P. Discitis following removal of intervertebral disc. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976) 1982; 7: 618-622
88 Tyler KL. Acute pyogenic diskitis (spondylodiskitis) in adults. Rev Neurol Dis 2008; 5: 8-13
89 Trennier V, Schneider R, Kunz U, Albert F, Oldenkott P. Postoperative spondylodiscitis: results of a prospective study about the aetiology of spondylodiscitis after operation for lumbar disc herniation. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 1992; 117: 149-152
90 Chew FS, Kline MJ. Diagnostic yield of CT-guided percutaneous aspiration procedures in suspected spontaneous infectious diskitis. Radiology 2001; 218: 211-214
91 Ozuna RM, Delamarter RB. Pyogenic vertebral osteomyelitis and postsurgical disc space infections. Orthop Clin North Am 1996; 27: 87-94
92 Carragee EJ. Pyogenic vertebral osteomyelitis. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1997; 79: 874-880
93 Visuri T, Pihlajamäki H, Eskelin M. Long-term vertebral changes attributable to postoperative lumbar discitis: a retrospective study of six cases. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2005; (433): 97-105
94 Ito M, Abumi K, Kotani Y, Kadoya K, Minami A. Clinical outcome of posterolateral endoscopic surgery for pyogenic spondylodiscitis: results of 15 patients with serious comorbid conditions. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2007; 32: 200-206
95 Przybylski GJ, Sharan AD. Single-stage autogenous bone grafting and internal fixation in the surgical management of pyogenic discitis and vertebral osteomyelitis. J Neurosurg 2001; 94: 1-7
96 Pee YH, Park JD, Choi YG, Lee SH. Anterior debridement and fusion followed by posterior pedicle screw fixation in pyogenic spondylodiscitis: autologous iliac bone strut versus cage. J Neurosurg Spine 2008; 8: 405-412
97 Kuklo TR, Potter BK, Bell RS, Moquin RR, Rosner MK. Single-stage treatment of pyogenic spinal infection with titanium mesh cages. J Spinal Disord Tech 2006; 19: 376-382
98 Toulson C, Walcott-Sapp S, Hur J, Salvati E, Bostrum M, Brause B, Westrich GH. Treatment of infected total hip arthroplasty with a 2-stage reimplantation protocol: update on “our institution’s” experience from 1989 to 2003. J Arthroplasty 2009; 24: 1051-1060
99 Westrich GH, Walcott-Sapp S, Bornstein LJ, Bostrum MP, Windsor RE, Brause MD. Modern treatment of infected total knee arthroplasty with a 2-stage reimplantation protocol. J Arthroplasty 2010; 25: 1015-1021, 1015-1021
100 Vinol SJ, Hinrichs SH, Garvin KL. Two-stage reimplantation of total joint infections: a comparison of resistant and non-resistant organisms. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2004; : 94-100
101 Weinstein MP, Stratton CW, Hawley HB, Ackley A, Reller LB. Multicenter collaborative evaluation of a standardized serum bactericidal test as a predictor of therapeutic efficacy in acute and chronic osteomyelitis. Am J Med 1987; 83: 218-222
102 Liu C, Bayer A, Cosgrove SE, Daum RS, Fridkin SK, Gorwitz RJ, Kaplan SL, Karchmer AW, Levine DP, Murray BE, J Rybak M, Talan DA, Chambers HF. Clinical practice guidelines by the infectious diseases society of america for the treatment of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections in adults and children: executive summary. Clin Infect Dis 2011; 52: 285-292

S- Editor Huang XZ  L- Editor A  E- Editor Xiong L