

# Non-sterile gloves in minor lacerations and excisions?

Ezekial Steve MD Adrienne J. Lindblad PharmD G. Michael Allan MD CCFP

## Clinical question

Do non-sterile (clean) gloves for minor laceration repair and office-based excisions cause more infections than sterile gloves do?

## Bottom line

Using non-sterile gloves does not increase the number of infections compared with sterile gloves for outpatient minor or uncomplicated skin excisions (not flap excisions) and laceration repair in immune-competent adults. The current standard of care of using sterile gloves for these procedures is likely unnecessary and is more costly. It is unclear if this applies to sebaceous cyst excisions, as these were not studied.

## Evidence

Minor excision procedures:

- An Australian primary care RCT (N=493, mean age 65 years) of mean 2-cm excisions (33% head or neck)<sup>1</sup> found an infection rate of 8.7% for non-sterile gloves versus 9.3% for sterile gloves (not statistically different).
- A small RCT of 60 Mohs patients (mean age 73 years) with mean 2.2-cm excisions (85% head or neck)<sup>2</sup> found an infection rate of 3% for non-sterile gloves versus 7% for sterile gloves (not statistically different).
- A cohort study of 3071 simple excisions<sup>3</sup> found an infection rate of 1.7% for non-sterile gloves versus 1.6% for sterile gloves (not statistically different).  
–Among 420 reconstructive (flap) procedures, infections were statistically significantly more likely with non-sterile than with sterile gloves (14.7% vs 1.6%).
- Two cohort studies of Mohs procedures (1400 and 2025 procedures) found no difference in infection rates.<sup>4,5</sup> In one cohort (20821 procedures)<sup>6</sup> sterile gloves reduced the infection rate by 0.47% compared with non-sterile gloves ( $P=.04$ ).

Lacerations:

- An RCT<sup>7</sup> (N=816 patients, aged  $\geq 1$  year) in Canadian emergency departments compared sterile with non-sterile gloves in suture repair of lacerations and found an infection rate of 4.3% for non-sterile gloves versus 6% for sterile gloves (not statistically different).
- Two older (randomization unclear) studies (N=50, N=408)<sup>8,9</sup> compared no gloves to sterile gloves and infections did not differ. The studies had substantial limitations and suturing without gloves is clearly inappropriate.

## Context

- Exclusion criteria included sebaceous cyst excision<sup>1,3</sup> (possibly owing to existing infection<sup>2</sup>), complex

procedures (such as closure requiring flaps)<sup>1</sup> or increased infection risk,<sup>3</sup> and immunocompromise.<sup>1,2,7</sup>

- Other limitations: inclusion of Mohs excisions, which are often more complex, with potentially multiple glove changes (possibly less primary care relevance),<sup>2,4-6</sup> and cohort studies, which have lower-level evidence.<sup>3-6</sup>

## Implementation

Sterile gloves cost 3.5 to 16 times more than non-sterile gloves do.<sup>1,2,4,5</sup> Non-sterile, clean gloves are appropriate for minor procedures (eg, punch or shave biopsy, ellipse excision, simple laceration repair). Exclusion criteria leave uncertainty around sebaceous cyst excision or procedures in immunocompromised patients. Other research suggests keeping wounds dry beyond 12 hours does not reduce infection rates (patients can shower after 12 hours),<sup>10</sup> punch biopsies 4 mm or smaller do not require suturing for patient satisfaction or appearance,<sup>11</sup> and absorbable sutures can be used (no need for suture removal follow-up).<sup>12</sup>

Dr Steve is a resident at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. Dr Lindblad is Knowledge Translation and Evidence Coordinator with the Alberta College of Family Physicians in Edmonton. Dr Allan is Professor and Director of Evidence-Based Medicine in the Department of Family Medicine at the University of Alberta in Edmonton.

### Competing interests

None declared

The opinions expressed in Tools for Practice articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily mirror the perspective and policy of the Alberta College of Family Physicians.

### References

1. Heal C, Sriharan S, Buttner PG, Kimber D. Comparing non-sterile to sterile gloves for minor surgery: a prospective randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. *Med J Aust* 2015;202(1):27-31.
2. Xia Y, Cho S, Greenway HT, Zelac DE, Kelley B. Infection rates of wound repairs during Mohs micrographic surgery using sterile versus nonsterile gloves: a prospective randomized pilot study. *Dermatol Surg* 2011;37(5):651-6.
3. Rogues AM, Lasheras A, Amici JM, Guillot P, Beylot C, Taieb A, et al. Infection control practices and infectious complications in dermatological surgery. *J Hosp Infect* 2007;65(3):258-63.
4. Rhinehart MB, Murphy MM, Farley MF, Albertini JG. Sterile versus nonsterile gloves during Mohs micrographic surgery: infection rate is not affected. *Dermatol Surg* 2006;32(2):170-6.
5. Mehta D, Chambers N, Adams B, Gloster H. Comparison of the prevalence of surgical site infection with use of sterile versus nonsterile gloves for resection and reconstruction during Mohs surgery. *Dermatol Surg* 2014;40(3):234-9. Epub 2014 Jan 22.
6. Alam M, Ibrahim O, Nodzenski M, Strasswimmer JM, Jiang SI, Cohen JL, et al. Adverse events associated with Mohs micrographic surgery: multicenter prospective cohort study of 20,821 cases at 23 centers. *JAMA Dermatol* 2013;149(12):1378-85.
7. Perelman VS, Francis GJ, Rutledge T, Foote J, Martino F, Dranitsaris G. Sterile versus nonsterile gloves for repair of uncomplicated lacerations in the emergency department: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Emerg Med* 2004;43(3):362-70.
8. Worrall GJ. Repairing skin lacerations: does sterile technique matter? *Can Fam Physician* 1987;33:1185, 1187.
9. Bodiwala GG, George TK. Surgical gloves during wound repair in the accident-and-emergency department. *Lancet* 1982;2(8289):91-2.
10. Heal C, Buettner P, Raasch B, Browning S, Graham D, Bidgood R, et al. Can sutures get wet? Prospective randomized controlled trial of wound management in general practice. *BMJ* 2006;332(7549):1053-6.
11. Christenson LJ, Phillips PK, Weaver AL, Otley CC. Primary closure vs second-intention treatment of skin punch biopsy sites: a randomized trial. *Arch Dermatol* 2005;141(9):1093-9.
12. Xu B, Xu B, Wang L, Chen C, Yilmaz TU, Zheng W, et al. Absorbable versus nonabsorbable sutures for skin closure: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Ann Plast Surg* 2016;76(5):598-606.



Tools for Practice articles in *Canadian Family Physician (CFP)* are adapted from articles published on the Alberta College of Family Physicians (ACFP) website, summarizing medical evidence with a focus on topical issues and practice-modifying information. The ACFP summaries and the series in *CFP* are coordinated by Dr G. Michael Allan, and the summaries are co-authored by at least 1 practising family physician and are peer reviewed. Feedback is welcome and can be sent to [toolsforpractice@cfpc.ca](mailto:toolsforpractice@cfpc.ca). Archived articles are available on the ACFP website: [www.acfp.ca](http://www.acfp.ca).