Review: Perspective on ocular toxicity of presurgical skin preparations utilizing Chlorhexidine Gluconate/Hibiclens/Chloraprep
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ABSTRACT

**Background:** Chlorhexidine Gluconate (CHG), Hibiclens (4% CHG with 4% Isopropyl Alcohol Detergent), and Chloraprep (i.e. labeled CHG-based solutions), utilized as preoperative surgical preparatory solutions may all cause severe oculotoxicity and ototoxicity. Alternatively, 10% Povidone-Iodine (PI) solutions without detergent demonstrate minimal toxic effects on the eyes and ears.

**Methods:** Based on studies from 1984 to 2021, we compared the safety/efficacy of CHG-based versus PI-based solutions utilized for presurgical skin preparation near the cornea/eyes and ears (i.e., predominantly for cranial or cervical spine surgery).

**Results:** Some studies documented that even minimal exposure (i.e., "splash risk") during face/neck skin preparation with CHG-based solutions could result in irreversible corneal injury and ototoxicity. Within minutes to hours, CHG-based non-detergent solutions posed the risks of; corneal epithelial edema, anterior stromal edema, conjunctival chemosis, bullous keratopathy, and de-epithelialization. Notably, even occlusive dressings like Tegaderm could not protect against CHG penetration. Alternatively, PI-based solutions posed no to minimal ocular and/or ototoxicity, while often demonstrating comparable protection against surgical site infections (SSI).

**Conclusion:** Chlorhexidine Gluconate (CHG), Hibiclens, and Chloraprep (i.e. CHG-based solutions) are often used as skin preparations near the face/eyes/spine (i.e., particularly anterior/posterior cervical procedures). However, if these solutions come in contact with the eyes, corneal irritation, abrasions, and even blindness may result. Alternatively, PI non-detergent solutions demonstrate safety/minimal ocular toxicity/ototoxicity, while frequently showing comparable efficacy against SSI.
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INTRODUCTION

Chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG), Hibiclens (4% CHG and 4% Isopropyl Alcohol), and Chloraprep (i.e. CHG-based solutions) presurgical skin preparations have well-documented oculotoxicity and ototoxicity. Therefore, great care must be utilized to avoid eye and ear contact when utilizing these presurgical preparation solutions when performing cranial and/or anterior or posterior cervical spine surgery, and occasionally, other procedures near the eyes/ears. Alternatively, Povidone-Iodine (PI) non-detergent solutions have demonstrated...
minimal eye/ear toxicity, while often showing comparable prophylaxis against surgical site infection (SSI). Here we reviewed the relative risks/benefits, and alternatives to CHG-based preoperative skin preparation solutions versus PI non-detergent solutions for patients undergoing procedures near the eyes/ears (i.e. cranial surgery, spinal surgery, and occasionally other procedures).

**1984 RABBIT STUDY DOCUMENTED CORNEAL TOXICITY OF CHG/HIBICLENS**

In 1984, Mac Rae et al. evaluated the corneal toxicity in rabbits of multiple skin preparations [Table 1]. These included: tincture of iodine (2% iodine, 2.35% sodium iodine, 46% ethanol), Hibiclens (4% chlorhexidine; 4% isopropyl alcohol with detergent), PhisoHex (3% hexachlorophene/detergent), Lavacol (70% ethanol), 7.5% povidone iodine scrub (PIS plus detergent), and 10% PI solutions (PI without detergent). At 3 h, all skin preparations resulted in marked de-epithelialization, conjunctival chemosis, and/or anterior stromal edema except the 10% PI solution without detergent and 0.9% Normal Saline. They concluded that only the 10% PI solution without detergent and NS showed no significant toxicity, while all other skin preparations were ototoxic or oculotoxic (i.e., to the cornea).

**DOCUMENTATION OF CORNEAL TOXICITY FOR CHG-BASED SOLUTIONS**

Multiple studies demonstrated significant corneal toxicity when using CHG-based preoperative skin preparation solutions for cranial, cataract, or spinal surgery [Table 1]. Van Rij (1995) noted that mistakenly using CHG, Cetrimide

| Author Ref# Year Journal | Study design | Data | Data | Data | Conclusion |
|--------------------------|-------------|------|------|------|------------|
| Mac Rae et al.[5] 1984 Am J Ophthalmol | Corneal Tox Preop SP Rabbits Used BioM, Corneal Pachymetry Healing Studies EM | Groups NS TincI (2% I, 2.35% NAI/46%) Ethanol Hibiclens 4% CHG+4% Isopropyl Alcohol Det | Study Groups PhisoHex Lavachol (70% Ethanol) 7.5% PI Scrub/Det 10% PIS No Det | Findings 5 Min AA Moderate CEE Not Saline 3 Hrs Marked DE, CC, ASE All Not 10% PIS and 0.9% NS | 1 Week; all Corneas Normal Conclude 10% PIS without Det Min Tox Other Preps Tox to Cornea |
| Van Rij et al.1995 Doc Ophthalmol | Tox Keratopathy Due to Accidental Use CHG, Cetrimide and Cialit Cataract Surgery | Use of Irrigation Solutions by OPH (Some Bottles Identical) | 3 Years Chose Wrong Bottle 5x CHG, Cetrimide CHG/Cetrimide and Cialit 8 wk Drops Near Total Loss Corneal Epithelium Prog UK Required Pen Keratoplasty SSI Significantly Lower CHG versus PI <SSI Superficial and Deep | Result Acute CEE, BK 4 Pts Pen 1 Pt Cornea Covered Conjunctival Flap Pathology Ulceration Loss of Bowman’s Membrane LK Apoptosis LEC DATA 300-500,000 SSI/Yr/USA CDC REC 2% CHG Inserted Catheters | Light EM CEE, LK Disrupted/ Loss ECL Hobiclens=CHG 4% with +Det Culture No Organisms But Result Progressive UK CDC No REC Which to Use CHG versus PI to Avoid SSI in 27 Million Operations/yr/ USA If use CHGHC Add Protect AEP+ Tight OC |
| Murthy et al.2002 Cornea | Prog UK Due to Topical CHG (0.02%) | Case 45 yo F Rx for UK with topical CHG 0.02% (+Propamidine 0.1%) Eye Drops | | | |
| Darouiche et al.[3] 2010 NEJM | CHG (409) versus PI (440) for Prep Surgical Site | Hypothesis CHG Better Than PI Prep to Avoid SSI In 30 Days Postop | | | |
| Bever et al.2016 World Neurosurg | CHG SP High Risks Eye Tox | 2 Cases Corneal Damage -4% CHG SP Despite Tight OC Eye Dressing | Highly Tox CHG to Eye Recommend: 10% PIS SP Near Eyes | CHG Use Avoid Contact with Eyes | |

*(Contd...)*
Table 1: (Continued).

| Author Ref# | Study design | Data | Data | Data | Conclusion |
|-------------|--------------|------|------|------|------------|
| Steinsapir and Woodward[8] 2017 Dermatol Surg | CHG for Ker Facial PS 11 Sentinel Cases Late1980’s | Toxic to Cornea Splash Risk Irreversible Damage Minimal Exposure CHG Excellent Antisepsis Standard Concentrate 2–4% Result Ocular Injury Even with BO Dressing- Tegaderm to Closed Eye | Research PubMed Embase LexisNexis Databases 1st Arm in vitro: CHG Pen Edge Tegaderm At 5 min Water No Pen Tegaderm 2nd Arm Central Perm Tegaderm Imperméable to both CHG and Water at 90 min | CHG should NOT be Used on Face and Scalp Risk ME | PIS Safe Effective Choice |
| Brodie et al.[2] 2018 Curr Eye Res | BO Dressing Protect From PreSurg CHG SP 3 Arms to Experiment | Compare Efficacy SP Chloraprep CHGHCG versus PI to Reduce SSI | 2011–2015 SSI 2 (0.1%) MIS/885 Cases 1.1% Open 67 of 6074 Cases | | |
| Ghobrial et al.[4] 2018 J Neurosurg Spine | Preop SP CHG versus PI 6959 Consecutive Spinal Surgery Pt | Review PubMed Web of Science | | SSI Pts DD 48/69 IF in 51/69 Index 1st Surgery 38 RS | No Significant Differences in SSI PI 33 versus CHGHCG Chloraprep 36 |
| Shive et al.[7] 2021 Dermatol Surg | Use of CHG SP Head/Neck | | | 38 Cases Eye Tox- 8 Direct Install 17 Periocular Surgical Prep (remaining prep less defined) | 38 Cases Eye Tox- 7 Prep of Face 1 Scalp 2 Drips Distant Sites 3 Not specified |

STUDIES DOCUMENTING COMPAREABLE OR SUPERIOR PREVENTION OF SSI UTILIZING CHG-BASED SOLUTIONS VERSUS PI SOLUTIONS FOR SURGICAL SKIN PREPARATIONS

Several studies documented that CHG-based versus PI-based skin preparation solutions provided comparable or superior prevention of SSI [Table 1].[3,4] In 2010, Darouiche et al., in a study specifically designed to address the insertion of percutaneous catheters, found that CHG (409 patients) significantly reduced or Cialit solutions for irrigation during cataract surgery resulted in acute corneal changes that included; epithelial edema, bullous keratopathy, loss of keratocytes, and loss of the endothelial cell layer.[1] In Murthy et al. (2002) study, eye drops containing Topical CHG (0.0.2%) were utilized in a 45-year-old patient (2002).[6] Within 8 weeks, they encountered near complete loss of the corneal endothelium/epithelial cells resulting in ulcerative keratitis (i.e., later warranting a penetrating keratoplasty), and ulceration involving Bowman's membrane.
the risk of postoperative superficial and deep SSI at 30 postoperative days versus those receiving PI (440 patients).\(^1\)
Note, however, that the Centers for Disease Control did not issue a specific recommendation favoring CHG-based solutions over PI solutions to address other surgical procedures including spine operations (i.e., also approximately 27 million total operations performed/year in the US). In 2018, Ghobrial et al. compared the efficacy of the preoperative skin preparation with CHG versus PI solutions in 6959 consecutive patients undergoing a variety of spinal procedures (2011–2015); the infection rates were comparable for both types of skin preparations (i.e., 2 (0.1%) infections for minimally invasive surgical cases (total 885) and 1.1% for open procedures (67 of 6074 cases)) 6074 [Table 1].\(^4\)

**CORNEAL DAMAGE DESPITE UTILIZATION OF TIGHT AND/OR BIO OCCLUSIVE OCULAR DRESSINGS**

Even tight or bio occlusive dressings (i.e. Tegaderm) did not adequately protect the eyes from dripping skin CHG-based preparations or “splashes” [Table 1].\(^1,2,8\) In 2016, Bever et al. noted that CHG (4%) skin preparations resulted in 2 cases of significant ocular toxicity even when a tight protective Tegaderm dressing was placed to protect the eyes during surgery.\(^10\) They recommended using PI solutions as a safe/effective alternative. If CHG-based solutions had to be used, “tightly occlusive dressings” including “eye pads should be added to avoid eye exposure, but would/could not guarantee adequate eye protection”. Brodie et al., (2018) similarly found that although CHG-based solutions provided excellent protection against infection (2-4%), using Tegaderm as a bio occlusive dressing did not adequately protect the closed eyes from injury.\(^8\) In their 3 pronged study, the first in vitro prong involved a 5 min application of CHG versus water; the CHG-based solution penetrated the edges of the Tegaderm d while simple water; CHG penetrated the edges of the Tegaderm dressing, but simple water did not. In the second arm, central penetration of a Tegaderm dressing at 90 min was tested with a CHG-based solution versus water; the Tegaderm was impermeable to both. However, in the third in vivo arm, CHG-based solutions penetrated the Tegaderm edges within 10 min while water did not. They concluded that Tegaderm did not provide a sufficient bio occlusive dressing against CHG-based solutions, and that PI solutions should be used instead. In 2017, Steinsapir and Woodward noted 11 sentinel cases of corneal toxicity due to CHG for presurgical skin preparation on the face.\(^8\) CHG-based solutions, even including minimal “splashes”, were toxic to the cornea. PI-based solutions, therefore, provided a safer and more effective alternative. In Shive et al. (2021), CHG-based solutions were used in head and neck surgery.\(^7\) They resulted in 14 cases of ototoxicity and 38 cases of ocular toxicity; 8 from direct contact, 17 from periocular skin preparation, 7 preparations to the face and 1 to the scalp, 2 drips/distant sites, and 3 that were not specified.\(^7\)

**CONCLUSION**

Multiple studies have documented the safety/efficacy of PI-based solution skin preparations when used near the eyes, ears, face, and neck (i.e., cranial, cervical spine, cataract/ surgery, other). Alternatively, CHG-based solutions (i.e., including Hibiclens and Chloraprep) have proven both oculotoxic and ototoxic. As both products have shown nearly comparable SSI prevention, careful attention must be given when using CHG over PI solutions near the eyes or ears.
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