Review of surgical procedures for wound dehiscence

Rayan Darwish Habib, Abdulaziz Fahad Altowairqi, Rayan Mohammed Alofi, Fahd Hamoud ali Altowairgi, Raad hameed altowairqi

Abstract:

The aim of this review was to define the outcomes of numerous studies that have identified considerable factors associated with surgical wound dehiscence (SWD) and provide information about management of wound dehiscence, highlighting the surgical debridement. We conducted a comprehensive search for articles published in English up to 2017. Search was performed through following databases; MEDLINE, Current Contents, Web of Science, and PubMed with the terms “wound dehiscence”, “risk factors”, “surgical treatment”. Wound dehiscence is the surgical complication with the high danger of death. Following surgical treatment most surgical wounds recover naturally without any complications. Nevertheless, complications such as infection and wound dehiscence (opening) can take place which could cause postponed healing or wound failure. Infected surgical wounds could contain dead (devitalised) tissue. Elimination of this dead tissue (debridement) from surgical wounds is

thought to enable wound recovery. The option of debriding agent and technique is generally made on the basis of the clinician's expertise and knowledge, the accessible sources and cost.Since wound management choices, nevertheless, remain to increase, as do the cost of products, the option of debridement technique or agent should be directed by great proof. An up-todate evaluation of debridement for surgical wounds is for that reason required, to enable evidence-based clinical decision-making.

Introduction:

Wound dehiscence is the procedure of splitting or bursting open of a partially recovered wound generally after surgery, and it takes place 3-11 days postoperatively [1], [2].When dehiscence happen, wound healing, and patients' healing are delayed and this usually lead to raised expense of treatment, long term hospital stay, and missing out on extra days or weeks of productive working period [3], [4].It presents at any type of age, in both gender, and its occurrence is affected by the existence of inclining elements, which might be either presurgical, peri-surgical or postsurgical in origin [4].

Timely and continual postoperative wound healing plays a considerable duty in optimizing a patient's postoperative recovery and recovery. It has been developed that surgical injury dehiscence (SWD) adds to raised morbidity and mortality rates, and implicit and explicit expenses for individuals and health care providers [5], [6]. Explicit costs result from extended hospitalisation, the need for community nursing and assistance solutions and using wound management consumables [7], [8].Social costs consist of delay in return to employment,

decreased capability to self-care and constraints on returning to previous social duties in the neighborhood including family assistance. SWD is defined as the rupture or splitting open of a previously closed surgical cut site. Inning accordance with the Centre for Disease Control (CDC), a SWD can be categorized as either shallow or deep [9].

An evaluation of the literary works for variables connected with SWD was performed in response to a determined increase in SWD referrals to an area nursing service in Western Australia, following either a cardiothoracic, orthopaedic, vascular or abdominal procedure.

Wound dehiscence is a possible difficulty complying with any type of surgical procedure; nonetheless, most authors [5], [6] report the occurrence complying with orthopaedic, abdominal, cardiothoracic and vascular surgical treatment. The literary works details some organizations in between SWD and patient comorbidities and the type of surgical wound closure [7].However, the recognition of these organizations as reliable analysis predictors for SWD risk has been badly studied across the majority of surgical domain names.

Wound dehiscence is a possible complication following any kind of surgical procedure which is life threating. The aim of this review was to define the outcomes of numerous studies that have identified considerable factors associated with surgical wound dehiscence (SWD) and provide information about management of wound dehiscence, highlighting the surgical debridement.

Methodology:

We conducted a comprehensive search for articles published in English up to 2017. Search was performed through following databases; MEDLINE, Current Contents, Web of Science,

and PubMed with the terms “wound dehiscence”, “risk factors”, “surgical treatment”. Furthermore, we searched the reference lists of articles identified by this search. We restricted our search to articles with human subjects only.

Discussion:

- **Background**

Surgical wounds, necessarily, are originally acute and most heal normally without delay or complications [10] Nevertheless, complications such as infection and injury dehiscence (opening) might happen, and might cause either delayed injury recovery or wound malfunction, or both. Injuries with medical site infections could have devitalised (dead) tissue. The look, colour and appearance of this tissue may vary from hard, black tissue (necrotic or eschar) to a soft fibrous yellow or eco-friendly tissue (slough) [11].This may be accompanied by boosted manufacturing of liquid (exudate) and the existence of a smell [12].There is a commonly held idea that injury recovery is restrained by the existence of devitalised, necrotic tissue and wounds containing such material do not heal effectively [13].Non-viable tissue not just prevents the development of epithelial tissue, however additionally enhances the production of exudate, harms evaluation of the wound bed, and makes it more difficult to attain wound closure, hence having a damaging effect on lifestyle [13].Although Baharestani 1999 details a variety of reasons for the elimination of the dead tissue (as detailed over), these reasons do not appear to be sustained by durable, clinical evidence. Debridement is the process whereby foreign material and dead or broken tissue

and debris are eliminated from an injury [14].Debridement of injuries includes any approach that removes infected or polluted tissue, cell particles or dead, devitalised, fibrous material (regularly categorized as eschar or slough) to produce a tidy wound bed [14]. Debridement is believed to provide a structure for the subsequent healing of injuries [15].Debridement may be accomplished by a range of methods consisting of: surgical treatment; biosurgical (larvae) debridement; autolytic debridement; mechanical debridement; chemical debridement and chemical debridement.

- **Prevalence and incidence of SWD**

The occurrence of SWD complying with various surgeries has been reported as varying in between 1 -3 and 9 -3% (Table 1). Among these studies, incidence information have been reported according to the CDC SSI classification standards. The researches within the scope of the evaluation were categorised in to stomach wound dehiscence, cardiothoracic, orthopaedic and vascular. For the purposes of this review, SWD is specified as the bursting or splitting apart of the margins of a wound closure [16]. Wound dehiscence can be a superficial or deep tissue injury and inning accordance with the CDC [17] wound dehiscence can be associated with SSI.

Table 1. Incidence of surgical wound dehiscence

Procedure	**Study**
Abdominal surgery—superficial dehiscence 2% and deep dehiscence 0·3%	Hadar et al. [19]
Abdominal 1·3–4·7%	Wounds West prevalence data (2007–2011)
Caesarean section 3%	De Vivo et al. [20]
Sternal wound 3%	John [22]
Hip prosthesis 3%	Smith et al. [18]
Saphenous vein graft 9·3% (10/108 patients)	Biancari and Tiozzo [21]

- **Comorbidities associated with SWD**

Numerous authors [5], [23] have identified numerous elements related to SWD, such as age, sex, ascites, jaundice, heart disease, pneumonia and infection, and have looked for to determine organizations between patient comorbidities and SWD across certain medical domain names. van Ramshorst et al. [5] and Webster et al. [6] identified a suite of comorbidities related to abdominal SWD. Webster et al. rated the degree of identified predisposing factors and established a prognostic threat design for surgical patients. van Ramshorst et al. [5] checked out a number of variables in a small population of patients who were to undergo stomach surgery and also designed a risk rating for SWD. Variables that they verified to be substantial were age, gender, an emergency surgical procedure, kind of operation, the visibility of ascites, chronic pulmonary illness, coughing and wound infection. In the field of cardiothoracic research, employees have determined possible reasons and threat factors for SWD, which include age, sex, weight problems, chronic obstructive pulmonary illness (COPD) and procedure-related variables such as duration of surgical treatment, use of reciprocal mammary graft and reoperation for control of bleeding [26].Nevertheless, the straight correlation and relevance to SWD stays to be shown as these risk factors were recorded in association with an undefined classification of SSI; as a result, it is difficult to identify whether the factors are associated with SWD or SSI. Baskett et al. [24] located that COPD was the only variable that was recognized as a danger variable for deep sternal wound infection (DSWI) and they mentioned that strict adherence to perioperative aseptic strategy, attention to haemostasis and specific sternal closure can lead to a reduced occurrence of mediastinitis. Floros et al. reported that diabetes and high body mass index (BMI) were related to an enhanced risk of DSWI [25] Likewise, other workers [27] reported that a high BMI and diabetes mellitus was among several associated threat factors for SWD complying with a cardiothoracic procedure. Smoking is well recorded to impact injury healing, specifically the event of wound complications and delayed recovery are greater in cigarette smokers than non-

smokers. Reduced tissue oxygenation has a harmful result on the reparative process during healing and neutrophil support in the visibility of pathogens.

- **Surgical or sharp debridement**

Surgical debridement may be attained by the hostile excision of all devitalised tissue making use of surgical techniques [11].Drawbacks connected with this approach are the requirement for medical facility admission, the administration of an anaesthetic with connected complications, and time in the operating theatre. It is additionally related to discomfort, blood loss and excision of healthy and balanced tissue and, because of this, is not ideal or desirable for all patients [13].On the other hand, sharp debridement includes the excision of small quantities of dead tissue by a clinician utilizing scissors or a scalpel [15].This procedure might be performed in an area or hospital setting [28].Nonetheless, for both medical and sharp procedures, problems of patient authorization, training and skill of the medical professional should be considered.

- **Biosurgical/biological debridement**

In biosurgical or biological debridement, sterilized larvae (maggots) of the Lucilia sericata varieties of greenbottle fly are applied to a sloughy wound. There, the larvae are capable of creating effective proteolytic enzymes that destroy the dead tissue by liquefying and consuming it. Healthy tissue in the wound bed is not damaged and, although there are visual factors to consider, larvae are significantly being used for wound debridement [13].

- **Autolytic debridement**

In time, normally happening enzymes will ultimately break down and dissolve dead or sloughy tissue in wounds. This natural process is advertised by the maintenance of a wet environment through cautious use of dressings and topical representatives (e.g. hydrogels, semiocclusive and

occlusive wound dressings). Many of these dressings moisturize and get rid of black, necrotic tissue and slough [13].Dextranomer is an instance of a hydroscopic clothing which has a high absorptive ability and is capable of getting rid of microorganisms, debris and absorbing wound exudate, therefore helping with autolytic debridement. However globally production of dextranomer grains and paste was terminated in 2007, with the exception of the paste which is still available in South Africa.

- **Mechanical debridement**

Mechanical methods of debridement are non-selective and may cause damage to healthy tissue [13].These approaches include: damp to completely dry debridement, wound cleaning debridement and whirlpool debridement [29].Wet to completely dry debridement.The wet to dry method of debridement involves the application of a saline-soaked gauze clothing to a wound. The wet clothing induces splitting up of the devitalised tissue and, as soon as completely dry, the clothing is eliminated, along with the slough and lethal tissue. This procedure is proceeded until all the devitalised tissue is eliminated. This is reported to be an agonizing procedure and could damage healthy tissue; fibers could be left in the injury and the clothing does not supply a barrier to microbial contamination [13].

- **Wound cleansing debridement**

Wound cleansing debridement includes watering a wound with a continuous or recurring circulation of fluid supplied under high pressure. The force of the liquid is in between 8 and 12 pounds per square inch (psi), and suffices to remove devitalised tissue and wound bacteria [13].Newer wound cleaning systems use pressurised saline provided by means of a nozzle at between 12,800 and 15,000 psi [30].Whirlpool debridement Whirlpool debridement is made use

of for large wounds on the trunk or extremities. The affected individual is immersed in a whirlpool bath, where the strenuous activity of the water and its hydrating result loosen up the surface microorganisms and devitalised tissue, and allow them to be washed away [13].

- **Chemical debridement**

A series of chemical agents, consisting of hypochlorites such as EUSOL (Edinburgh University Solution of Lime) and Dakin's Solution (salt hypochlorite), hydrogen peroxide and iodine, have been used to advertise debridement of wounds. The use of chemical agents stays a controversial location, where any type of benefits have to be judged against any kind of damaging impacts on the procedure of healing [31].

- **Enzymatic debridement**

Topical enzymatic prep work are related to moist (or moistened) devitalised tissue. Such prep work consist of: streptokinase/streptodornase (Lewis 2000; O'Brien 2003a), collagenase [32], papain/urea, and a combination of fibrinolysin and deoxyribonuclease [32]. This technique has a variety of downsides, including a need for frequent clothing adjustments and a slow-moving rate of debridement. Worldwide manufacturing of the enzymatic preparation of streptokinase/streptodornase has now been discontinued.

- **Prevention**

Wound dehiscence can be prevented by taking the following measures:

Complying with the doctor's post-operative instructions and prescribed medication
Good wound care and hygiene (with appropriate dressing and cleaning as instructed by your doctor)
Maintaining good hydration and a healthy diet (to help the wound heal faster and to prevent constipation)

Avoid unnecessary stress or strain to wound area (like heavy lifting, exercise, vomiting, coughing, constipation)
Bracing body with a hand or a pillow at the wound site may help relieve stress to wound when doing an activity

Conclusion:

Wound dehiscence is the surgical complication with the high danger of death. Following surgical treatment most surgical wounds recover naturally without any complications. Nevertheless, complications such as infection and wound dehiscence (opening) can take place which could cause postponed healing or wound failure. Infected surgical wounds could contain dead (devitalised) tissue. Elimination of this dead tissue (debridement) from surgical wounds is thought to enable wound recovery. Many methods are available to medical professionals to debride surgical wounds. There is significant discussion about the suitability and efficiency of debridement techniques. A methodical review released in 1999 indicated that there were no research studies contrasting non debridement with debridement and for that reason the benefits of debridement on wound recovery were unclear. A guidance document on the use of debriding agents for difficultto-heal surgical wounds highlighted the lack of sufficient proof to sustain any particular method of debridement. However a Cochrane Review on the debridement of diabetic foot ulcers found proof recommending that the rate of recovery enhanced when a hydrogel dressing was utilized in comparison to a gauze dressing. The option of debriding agent and technique is generally made on the basis of the clinician's expertise and knowledge, the accessible sources and cost.Since wound management choices, nevertheless, remain to increase, as do the cost of products, the option of debridement technique or agent should be directed by

great proof. An up-todate evaluation of debridement for surgical wounds is for that reason required, to enable evidence-based clinical decision-making.

Reference:

1. Roper N. Churchill Livingstone Pocket Medical Dictionary. 14 th ed. Edinburgh: Harcourt Brace; 1998. p. 77.
2. Posnett J, Gottrup F, Lundgren H, Saal G. The resource impact of wounds on health-care providers in Europe. J Wound Care 2009; 18:154-61.
3. Drew P, Posnett J, Rusling L, Wound Care Audit Team. The cost of wound care for a local population in England. Int Wound J 2007; 4:149-55.
4. Peterson LJ. Postoperative patient management. In: Peterson LJ, Ellis E 3 rd , Hupp JR, Tucker MR, editors. Contemporary Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. St. Louis: Mosby, 1993. p. 261-88.
5. van Ramshorst GH, Nieuwenhuizen J, Hop WC, Arends P, Boom J, Jeekel J, Lange JF. Abdominal wound dehiscence in adults: development and validation of a risk model. World J Surg 2010;34:20–7.
6. Webster C, Neumayer L, Smout R, Horn S, Daley J, Henderson W, Khuri S, Qua NVAS. Prognostic models of abdominal wound dehiscence after laparotomy. J Surg Res 2003;109:130–7.
7. Ridderstolpe L, Gill H, Granfeldt H, Ahlfeldt H, Rutberg H. Superficial and deep sternal wound complications: incidence, risk factors and mortality. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2001;20:1168–75.
8. Urban JA. Cost analysis of surgical site infections. Surg Infect (Larchmt) 2006;7(Suppl 1):S19–22.
9. Mangram AJ, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR. Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 1999. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1999;20:247–78.
10. Bale S, Jones V. Wound care nursing: a patient centred approach. London: Bailliere Tindall, 1997.
11. Thomas AML, Moore K. The structure and composition of chronic wound eschar. Journal of Wound Care 1999;8(6): 285–90.
12. Dealey C. The care of wounds. The care of wounds. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1994.
13. Baharestani M. The clinical relevance of debridement. In: Baharestani M, Gottrup F, Holstein P, Vanscheidt W editor (s). The clinical relevance of debridement. Berlin: SpringerVerlag, 1999:1–15.
14. Vowden K, Vowden P. Wound debridement, part 2: sharp techniques. Journal of Wound Care 1999;8(6):291–6.
15. O'Brien M. Methods of debridement and patient focused care. Journal of Community Nursing 2003;17(11):17–25.
16. Mosby Inc., Mosbys Medical Dictionary, 8th edn. St Louis, MO: Mosby, 2009.

17. Horan TC, Andrus M, Dudeck MA. CDC/NHSN surveillance definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of infections in the acute care setting. 2013. URL http:// www.cdc.gov/nhsn/PDFs/pscManual/17pscNosInfDef_current.pdf [accessed on 3 April 2012].
18. Smith TO, Sexton D, Mann C, Donell S. Sutures versus staples for skin closure in orthopaedic surgery: meta-analysis. BMJ 2010;340:c1199.
19. Hadar E, Melamed N, Tzadikevitch-Geffen K, Yogev Y. Timing and risk factors of maternal complications of cesarean section. Arch Gynecol Obstet 2011;283:735–41.
20. De Vivo A, Mancuso A, Giacobbe A, Priolo AM, De Dominici R, Savasta LM. Wound length and corticosteroid administration as risk factors for surgical-site complications following cesarean section. Acta Obstet Gynecol 2010;89:355–9.
21. Biancari F, Tiozzo V. Staples versus sutures for closing leg wounds after vein graft harvesting for coronary artery bypass surgery. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010:CD008057.
22. John LCH. Modified closure technique for reducing sternal dehiscence; a clinical and in vitro assessment. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2008;33:769–73.
23. Khan MN, Naqvi AH, Irshad K, Chaudhary AR. Frequency and risk factor of abdominal wound dehiscence. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak 2004;14:355–7.
24. Baskett RJ, MacDougall CE, Ross DB. Is mediastinitis a preventable complication? A 10-year review. Ann Thorac Surg 1999;67:462–5.
25. Floros P, Sawhney R, Vrtik M, Hinton-Bayre A, Weimers P, Senewiratne S, Mundy J, Shah P. Risk factors and management approach for deep sternal wound infection after cardiac surgery at a tertiary medical centre. Heart Lung Circ 2011;20:712–7.
26. Careaga Reyna G, Aguirre Baca GG, Medina Concebida LE, Borrayo Sanchez G, Prado Villegas G, Arguero Sanchez R. Risk factors for mediastinitis and sternal dehiscence after cardiac surgery. Rev Esp Cardiol 2006;59:130–5.
27. Salehi Omran A, Karimi A, Ahmadi SH, Davoodi S, Marzban M, Movahedi N, Abbasi K, Boroumand MA, Moshtaghi N. Superficial and deep sternal wound infection after more than 9000 coronary artery bypass graft (CABG): incidence, risk factors and mortality. BMC Infect Dis 2007;7:112.
28. Poston J. Surgical nurse: sharp debridement of devitalised tissue: the nurse's role. British Journal of Nursing 1996;5 (11):655-6, 658-62.
29. Vowden K, Vowden P. Wound debridement, part 1: nonsharp techniques. Journal of Wound Care 1999;8(5):237–40.
30. Granick MS, Posnett J, Jacoby M, Noruthun S, Ganchi PA, Datiashvili RO. Efficacy and cost-effectiveness of a highpowered parallel waterjet for wound debridement. Wound Repair and Regeneration 2006;14(4):394–7.
31. Brennan SS, Leaper DJ. The effect of antiseptics on the healing wound: a study using the rabbit ear chamber. British Journal of Surgery 1985;72(October):780–2.
32. Ramundo J, Wells J. Wound debridement. In: Bryant RA editor(s). Acute and chronic wounds: nursing management. 2nd Edition. St Louis: Mosby, 2000:157–78.