Received: 30 June 2021 | Accepted: 5 December 2021
DOI: 10.1002/wjo2.63

REVIEW ARTICLE

WJO HNS World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery

Surgical wound classification in otolaryngology: A state-of-the-art review

Jeffrey D. Bernstein[1] | **David J. Bracken**[1] | **Shira R. Abeles**[2] | **Ryan K. Orosco**[1,3] | **Philip A. Weissbrod**[1]

[1]Department of Otolaryngology, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

[2]Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Disease and Global Public Health, University of California San Diego, San Diego, California, USA

[3]Moores Cancer Center, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

Correspondence
Philip A. Weissbrod, Department of Otolaryngology, University of California San Diego, San Diego Medical Center, 200W Arbor Dr, Mail Code 8895, San Diego, CA 92103, USA.
Email: pweissbrod@health.ucsd.edu

Funding information
None

Abstract

Objective: To describe the issues related to the assignment of surgical wound classification as it pertains to Otolaryngology—Head & Neck surgery, and to present a simple framework by which providers can assign wound classification.

Data Sources: Literature review.

Conclusion: Surgical wound classification in its current state is limited in its utility. It has recently been disregarded by major risk assessment models, likely due to inaccurate and inconsistent reporting by providers and operative staff. However, if data accuracy is improved, this metric may be useful to inform the risk of surgical site infection. In an era of quality-driven care and reimbursement, surgical wound classification may become an equally important indicator of quality.

KEYWORDS
ENT, health care spending, OHNS, otolaryngology, quality improvement, reimbursement, surgical site infection, wound classification

Key points

- In its current state, surgical wound classification has been disregarded as a key metric, likely due to habitual inaccuracies in procedure categorization.
- A new paradigm for surgical wound classification specific to Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery is presented.
- The possibility of surgical wound classification serving as an important indicator of quality of care is discussed and contextualized in current health care trends.

INTRODUCTION

First introduced in 1964, surgical wound classification (SWC) has become a routine component of procedure documentation.[1] Refined over decades, this practice characterizes the cleanliness of the surgical field and is pertinent because of the correlation between wound contamination and the risk of postoperative surgical site infection (SSI).[2–9] In the General Surgery literature, rates of superficial SSI in clean cases have been found to be low, around 1.8%, ranging up to 5.1%–8.5% for dirty cases.[10,11] Within Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery (OHNS), SWC has also been identified as a significant risk factor for SSI, particularly within Head and Neck ablative surgery and endocrine surgery.[12–22] It has also been linked to an increase in the incidence of postoperative complications,[23–25] increased length of hospital stay,[26] and greater rates of hospital readmission.[26,27]

The incidence of SSI within a hospital system is an important indicator of quality of care.[28,29] Studies have shown that a high rate of SSI adds to the hospital cost-burden and places additional stress on health care utilization. In 2005 alone, SSI was associated with over 400,000 additional days of hospital stays, with additional hospital costs totaling nearly $1 billion before accounting for costs of readmission.[30] A 2014 Department of Veterans Affairs study found hospital costs were increased by a factor of 1.43 in cases involving SSI.[31] Measures to reduce the incidence of these infections may be beneficial from a cost and care-utilization standpoint. Investment in quality improvement has been shown to reduce overall Medicare expenditures by up to 38%.[32] In short, the cost of care is lower when patients do well.

Classification of wounds is typically the responsibility of the surgical team or operative nursing staff. Critically, studies have shown that SWC is frequently documented inaccurately.[33] Though a baseline incidence of SSI is anticipated, inaccurate documentation of SWC may lead to a significant deviation from expected rates of infection. Systematic under- or over-reporting could negatively influence hospital performance measures, reduce reimbursement, and may obscure the true risk profile of a procedure. Efforts to improve classification accuracy through nursing- and provider-driven interventions have been shown to be effective.[34–36] Though multiple interventions have been made within the scope of General Surgery procedures, we were unable to identify any specific efforts within OHNS. To date, there are no well-established guidelines for SWC in OHNS. As such, we aim to promote a number of basic tenets to allow for more consistent SWC assignments between providers. We propose a concise framework of SWC specific to Otolaryngology and based upon guidelines established by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC; Table 1).[3,4,37]

DISCUSSION

SSI has multiple risk factors. While SWC may be one,[38,39] there are numerous other factors that influence the rate of infection including diabetes mellitus, smoking status, obesity, immunosuppression, and other medical comorbidities.[4,6] As such, it is suggested that more than half of cases of SSI are preventable with appropriate focus on glycemic control, antiseptic prophylaxis, normothermia, and oxygenation.[40,41] In Otolaryngology, the risk for SSI has been found to be low in nonmajor surgery and endocrine surgery including thyroidectomy.[13] However, this risk is significantly increased with all major surgery involving nearly any anatomical subsite of the head and neck, including the aerodigestive tract, paranasal sinuses, ear, salivary glands, larynx, or facial bones.[13,42]

A number of national organizations have made efforts to measure and report SSI toward the goal of improving surgical quality. The National Safety and Quality Improvement Program (NSQIP) is a hospital-based initiative that allows facilities to track a variety of 30-day risk-adjusted surgical outcomes. For a select set of common surgical procedures, NSQIP tracks more than 130 variables including mortality, complication rates, pneumonia, unplanned intubations, renal failure, urinary tract infection, pulmonary embolism, and SSIs.[10,43] A unique report of expected versus observed outcomes helps a hospital see their performance within a greater regional and national context. For many years, SWC was included in these data extracted from medical records by NSQIP. This recently changed in January 2021, when SWC was removed by NSQIP as a variable of interest because of its low impact on risk-adjusted models.[44]

Similarly, the National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN), managed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, is a widely used infection tracking system.[45] Like NSQIP, NHSN also utilizes a risk-adjusted metric called the standardized infection ratio

TABLE 1 Centers for disease control guidelines for surgical wound classification

Wound class	Definition
Class I: Clean	• Uninfected operative wounds made under ideal conditions • No inflammation • No entry into respiratory, alimentary, genital, or uninfected urinary tracts • No lapse in sterile technique • Primary wound closure • Closed drainage
Class II: Clean-contaminated	• Entrance into mucosalized tissue under controlled conditions (respiratory, alimentary, genital, or urinary tract) • No unusual contamination by foreign body • No evidence of infection or major break in sterile technique
Class III: Contaminated	• Open or fresh accidental wounds • Operations with major breaks in sterile technique • Gross spillage from the gastrointestinal tract • Any acute, nonpurulent inflammation
Class IV: Dirty/infected	• Old traumatic wounds with retained devitalized tissue • Existing clinical infection or purulence • Environmental debris • Perforated viscera

Note: Adapted from Garner.[3]



FIGURE 1 Surgical wound classification guideline for Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery

(SIR) to track central line infections, mucosal barrier injury, catheter-related infections, ventilator-associated events, and SSIs.[46,47] Additionally, NHSN tracks a limited number of Otolaryngology-related operative procedure categories including "neck" and "thyroid and/or parathyroid" surgery. Also, like NSQIP, the NHSN SIR does not include SWC as a variable for most procedure categories. In the NHSN current model for neck cases, "procedure duration" is the only relevant predictor, while for thyroid cases the only predictors are "institution size" and "teaching affiliation."[47]

It is probably not a coincidence that SWC is no longer used in both NHSN and NSQIP's multivariate risk-adjustment models. While it is feasible that the influence of SWC on SSI is overshadowed by patient-mediated factors such as diabetes, smoking, and immunodeficiency, or other surgical factors like anatomic location, depth or size of field, operative time, and hematoma incidence,[4] another likely explanation is data inconsistency. It is reasonable to speculate that user error and systematic misclassification between different providers and institutions create unreliable wound classification data for common procedures, rendering this metric inert and hindering accurate quality improvement.[33,35,48] The value to be gained by accurate and transparent reporting of SWC has been demonstrated in a General Surgery study. Improved accuracy and consistency in SWC documentation led to a substantial change in perceived outcomes and interpretations of performance measures.[49] Though not currently utilized, SWC may be reintroduced into risk adjustment models if found to meet significance after future review.

We identified several areas in OHNS as sources of discrepancy in SWC. For example, in otologic surgery, the middle ear is in communication with the nasopharynx and respiratory tract via the eustachian tube. Surgery involving a healthy middle ear, when characterized properly, should be clean-contaminated (Class II). However, when the remainder of the surgical field is sterile, such as during a translabyrinthine approach to the cerebellopontine angle, these cases may be easily miscategorized as Class I (clean). Another illustrative example is encountered with parotidectomy or similar salivary surgery, where ductal ligation or violation of gland parenchyma places the surgical field in communication with the oral cavity, meeting Class II criteria. Again, many providers may improperly categorize these procedures as clean cases given their lack of a direct intraoral component. Last, in sterile ablative head and neck cancer surgery, providers may vary in their classification of surgical fields with necrosis or postirradiative noninfected inflammation. As a result of poor wound healing and fibrosis, the risk of SSI may be increased in these cases,[12,18,50–55] though other studies have not found this to be true.[13,15,16,56–59] If the risk of SSI is truly greater in these instances, a revision to their SWC may be warranted. These examples highlight the shortcomings of the current state of wound classification assignment in OHNS and underscore the need for an accepted, reliable, and reproducible wound classification algorithm.

Despite the fact that there are known discrepancies in SWC assignment, improvements can be made to this system. Efforts have been successful in other surgical disciplines to educate practitioners and improve consistency in wound classification. Devaney and Rowell[34] introduced an education series within their hospital to improve SWC accuracy, which led to a 26% decrease in misclassification. Chupp and Edhayan,[36] by posting a wound classification algorithm in the operating room, improved concordance between operative and nursing staff by approximately 50%–70% for select procedures. While efforts have been made in General Surgery and other specialties to build consistency and alignment with SWC as defined by CDC, little has been done in the Otolaryngology space to improve inter-rater reliability of assigned SWC. To meet this need, the authors created a generic algorithm to classify commonly encountered surgical wounds in OHNS in an effort to start the conversation around wound classification in our field (Figure 1).

As a matter of quality improvement, greater accuracy in wound classification may have a long-lasting positive impact on patient care both in terms of quality and cost. It is already the case that SWC holds influence over medical decision-making, for example, in determining perioperative antibiotic dosing. While Class I wounds, such as sterile neck dissection or thyroidectomy, usually do not require antibiotics beyond the intraoperative period.[60] Similarly, studies have shown no benefit to antibiotics beyond 24–48 h postoperatively for clean-contaminated wounds, such as in oral cancer resection.[61–63] More accurate SWC will better inform the risk of SSI for specific procedures, helping to better establish expectations, guide prophylactic treatment, and improve antibiotic stewardship.

As medical systems become increasingly quality-driven, care payments and reimbursement may soon also be influenced by the risk or incidence of SSI based on the SWC for a given procedure. Though to our knowledge at the time of writing this manuscript NHSN data does not currently affect care payment for OHNS-specific cases and is not collected by insurance companies, we can foresee an incentive-based system reliant upon both SWC and SSI. Providers who outperform expectations with lower than expected rates of SSI could be reimbursed at a greater rate, thereby reducing costly hospital length of stay while encouraging improved quality of care. Alternatively, procedures with higher expected risk of SSI based on their SWC could be reimbursed at a greater rate to account for the increased expected cost and complexity of treatment. To properly inform these quality-based models, it is paramount that we develop a common language and reliable framework for defining and categorizing the types of surgical wounds encountered in our specialty.

While the authors envision numerous benefits of consistent and accurate SWC assignment, these claims may be overstated. With greater accuracy of documentation, we may find that the use of wound classification is simply irrelevant, or, perhaps more likely, plays only a minor part in a multifactorial system of risk assessment. Until we develop a universally applicable, consistent, and accurate system for SWC in OHSN, it is unlikely that its potential value as a quality metric will be understood.

CONCLUSION

We present an issue at hand in Otolaryngology—Head & Neck surgery stemming from the inconsistency in provider-assigned surgical wound class. The ambiguity of SWC as applied to common OHNS cases, we believe, has created an unreliable system, which cannot be used to derive meaningful conclusions about patient care, risk assessment, or system-wide performance. We present an easily adopted guideline for improved accuracy of SWC in OHNS and offer discussion points for an evolving dialog aimed toward improving consistency in SWC assignment amongst providers and institutions.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Jeffrey D. Bernstein, MD assisted with project design, drafted the manuscript, and revised the manuscript. David J. Bracken, MD assisted with revising of the manuscript. Shira R. Abeles, MD assisted with revising of the manuscript. Ryan K. Orosco, MD assisted with project design and revising of the manuscript. Philip A. Weissbrod, MD conceived the project design and assisted with revising of the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Nick Hilbert, MSN, RN, of the Office of Quality and Patient Safety at UC San Diego Health for his insight into the American College of Surgeons NSQIP; Frank Edward Myers III, MA, CIC, FAPIC, Director of Infection Prevention and Clinical Epidemiology at UC San Diego Health for his insight into the CDC NHSN. This study received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

There was no data collected for this study.

ETHICS STATEMENT

This body of work did not involve live subjects and did not require approval from the Institutional Review Board.

REFERENCES

1. Berard F, Gandon J. Postoperative wound infections: the influence of ultraviolet irradiation of the operating room and of various other factors. *Ann Surg*. 1964;160(suppl 2):1-192.
2. Simmons BP. Guideline for prevention of surgical wound infections. *Am J Infect Control*. 1983;11(4):133-143. doi:10.1016/0196-6553(83)90030-5
3. Garner JS. CDC guideline for prevention of surgical wound infections, 1985. *Infect Control*. 1986;7(3):193-200. doi:10.1017/s0195941700064080
4. Mangram AJ, Horan TC, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR. Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 1999. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. *Am J Infect Control*. 1999;27(2):97-132.
5. World Health Organization. Global guidelines for the prevention of surgical site infection. Geneva, Swtzerland: World Health Organization; 2016.
6. Garner BH, Anderson DJ. Surgical site infections: an update. *Infect Dis Clin North Am*. 2016;30(4):909-929. doi:10.1016/j.idc.2016.07.010
7. Mioton LM, Jordan SW, Hanwright PJ, Bilimoria KY, Kim JY. The relationship between preoperative wound classification and postoperative infection: a multi-institutional analysis of 15,289 patients. *Arch Plast Surg*. 2013;40(5):522-529. doi:10.5999/aps.2013.40.5.522

8. National Healthcare Safety Network. Procedure associated module: surgical site infection event (SSI); 2021.
9. Anderson DJ. Surgical site infections. *Infect Dis Clin North Am*. 2011; 25(1):135-153. doi:10.1016/j.idc.2010.11.004
10. Ortega G, Rhee DS, Papandria DJ, et al. An evaluation of surgical site infections by wound classification system using the ACS-NSQIP. *J Surg Res*. 2012;174(1):33-38. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2011.05.056
11. Ju MH, Cohen ME, Bilimoria KY, et al. Effect of wound classification on risk adjustment in American College of Surgeons NSQIP. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2014;219(3):371-381. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2014.04.009
12. Shi M, Han Z, Qin L, et al. Risk factors for surgical site infection after major oral oncological surgery: the experience of a tertiary referral hospital in China. *J Int Med Res*. 2020;48(8):300060520944072. doi:10.1177/0300060520944072
13. Al-Qurayshi Z, Walsh J, Owen S, Kandil E. Surgical site infection in head and neck surgery: a national perspective. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2019;161(1):52-62. doi:10.1177/0194599819832858
14. Haidar YM, Tripathi PB, Tjoa T, et al. Antibiotic prophylaxis in clean-contaminated head and neck cases with microvascular free flap reconstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Head Neck*. 2018;40(2):417-427. doi:10.1002/hed.24988
15. Goyal N, Emerick KS, Deschler DG, et al. Risk factors for surgical site infection after supraclavicular flap reconstruction in patients undergoing major head and neck surgery. *Head Neck*. 2016;38(11): 1615-1620. doi:10.1002/hed.24480
16. Goyal N, Yarlagadda BB, Deschler DG, et al. Surgical site infections in major head and neck surgeries involving pedicled flap reconstruction. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol*. 2017;126(1):20-28. doi:10.1177/0003489416672871
17. Cannon RB, Houlton JJ, Mendez E, Futran ND. Methods to reduce postoperative surgical site infections after head and neck oncology surgery. *Lancet Oncol*. 2017;18(7):e405-e413. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30375-3
18. Lee DH, Kim SY, Nam SY, Choi SH, Choi JW, Roh JL. Risk factors of surgical site infection in patients undergoing major oncological surgery for head and neck cancer. *Oral Oncol*. 2011;47(6):528-531. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2011.04.002
19. Chaukar DA, Deshmukh AD, Majeed T, Chaturvedi P, Pai P, D'cruz AK. Factors affecting wound complications in head and neck surgery: a prospective study. *Indian J Med Paediatr Oncol*. 2013; 34(4):247-251. doi:10.4103/0971-5851.125236
20. Myssiorek D, Ahmed Y, Parsikia A, Castaldi M, McNelis J. Factors predictive of the development of surgical site infection in thyroidectomy—an analysis of NSQIP database. *Int J Surg*. 2018;60: 273-278. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2018.11.013
21. Elfenbein DM, Schneider DF, Chen H, Sippel RS. Surgical site infection after thyroidectomy: a rare but significant complication. *J Surg Res*. 2014;190(1):170-176. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2014.03.033
22. Li X, Nylander W, Smith T, Han S, Gunnar W. Risk factors and predictive model development of thirty-day post-operative surgical site infection in the veterans administration surgical population. *Surg Infect*. 2018;19(3):278-285. doi:10.1089/sur.2017.283
23. Mascarella MA, Richardson K, Mlynarek A, et al. Evaluation of a preoperative adverse event risk index for patients undergoing head and neck cancer surgery. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2019; 145(4):345-351. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2018.4513
24. Helman SN, Brant JA, Kadakia SK, Newman JG, Cannady SB, Chai RL. Factors associated with complications in total laryngectomy without microvascular reconstruction. *Head Neck*. 2018;40(11): 2409-2415. doi:10.1002/hed.25363
25. Cannady SB, Hatten KM, Bur AM, et al. Use of free tissue transfer in head and neck cancer surgery and risk of overall and serious complication(s): an American College of Surgeons-national surgical quality improvement project analysis of free tissue transfer to the head and neck. *Head Neck*. 2017;39(4):702-707. doi:10.1002/hed.24669
26. Helman SN, Brant JA, Moubayed SP, Newman JG, Cannady SB, Chai RL. Predictors of length of stay, reoperation, and readmission following total laryngectomy. *Laryngoscope*. 2017;127(6): 1339-1344. doi:10.1002/lary.26454
27. Garg RK, Wieland AM, Hartig GK, Poore SO. Risk factors for unplanned readmission following head and neck microvascular reconstruction: results from the national surgical quality improvement program, 2011-2014. *Microsurgery*. 2017;37(6):502-508. doi:10.1002/micr.30116
28. Kao LS, Ghaferi AA, Ko CY, Dimick JB. Reliability of superficial surgical site infections as a hospital quality measure. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2011;213(2):231-235. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2011.04.004
29. Weber RS, Lewis CM, Eastman SD, et al. Quality and performance indicators in an academic department of head and neck surgery. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2010;136(12):1212-1218. doi:10.1001/archoto.2010.215
30. de Lissovoy G, Fraeman K, Hutchins V, Murphy D, Song D, Vaughn BB. Surgical site infection: incidence and impact on hospital utilization and treatment costs. *Am J Infect Control*. 2009;37(5): 387-397. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2008.12.010
31. Schweizer ML, Cullen JJ, Perencevich EN, Vaughan Sarrazin MS. Costs associated with surgical site infections in veterans affairs hospitals. *JAMA Surg*. 2014;149(6):575-581. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2013.4663
32. Scally CP, Thumma JR, Birkmeyer JD, Dimick JB. Impact of surgical quality improvement on payments in medicare patients. *Ann Surg*. 2015;262(2):249-252. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000001069
33. Levy SM, Holzmann-Pazgal G, Lally KP, Davis K, Kao LS, Tsao K. Quality check of a quality measure: surgical wound classification discrepancies impact risk-stratified surgical site infection rates in pediatric appendicitis. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2013;217(6):969-973. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2013.07.398
34. Devaney L, Rowell KS. Improving surgical wound classification—why it matters. *AORN J*. 2004;80(2):208-209. doi:10.1016/s0001-2092(06)60559-0
35. Zens TJ, Rusy DA, Gosain A. Pediatric surgeon-directed wound classification improves accuracy. *J Surg Res*. 2016;201(2):432-439. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2015.11.051
36. Chupp RE, Edhayan E. An effort to improve the accuracy of documented surgical wound classifications. *Am J Surg*. 2018;215(3): 515-517. doi:10.1016/j.amjsurg.2017.11.029
37. Simo R, French G. The use of prophylactic antibiotics in head and neck oncological surgery. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2006;14(2):55-61. doi:10.1097/01.moo.0000193183.30687.d5
38. Schwartzman G, Khachemoune A. Surgical site infection after dermatologic procedures: critical reassessment of risk factors and reappraisal of rates and causes. *Am J Clin Dermatol*. 2021;22(4): 503-510. doi:10.1007/s40257-021-00599-3
39. Storey A, MacDonald B, Rahman MA. The association between preoperative length of hospital stay and deep sternal wound infection: a scoping review. *Aust Crit Care*. 2021;34(6):620-633. doi:10.1016/j.aucc.2020.12.010
40. Umscheid CA, Mitchell MD, Doshi JA, Agarwal R, Williams K, Brennan PJ. Estimating the proportion of healthcare-associated infections that are reasonably preventable and the related mortality and costs. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2011;32(2):101-114. doi:10.1086/657912
41. 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 Surg*. 2017;152(8):784-791. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2017.0904
42. Roof SA, Ferrandino RM, Villavisanis DF, et al. Infection rates after microlaryngeal and open phonosurgery: the role of postoperative

antibiotics. *Laryngoscope*. 2020;130(5):1128-1131. doi:10.1002/lary.28225
43. Khuri SF. The NSQIP: a new frontier in surgery. *Surgery*. 2005;138(5):837-843. doi:10.1016/j.surg.2005.08.016
44. American College of Surgeons. ACS National Surgical Quality Improvement Program. Accessed May 31, 2021. https://www.facs.org/quality-programs/acs-nsqip
45. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National healthcare safety network (NHSN). Accessed April 23, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/datastat/index.html
46. Boev C, Kiss E. Hospital-acquired infections: current trends and prevention. *Crit Care Nurs Clin North Am*. 2017;29(1):51-65. doi:10.1016/j.cnc.2016.09.012
47. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Healthcare Service Network. A guide to the standardized infection ratio (SIR). Accessed May 25, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/pdfs/ps-analysis-resources/nhsn-sir-guide.pdf
48. Putnam LR, Levy SM, Blakely ML, et al. A multicenter, pediatric quality improvement initiative improves surgical wound class assignment, but is it enough? *J Pediatr Surg*. 2016;51(4):639-644. doi:10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2015.10.046
49. Speicher PJ, Nussbaum DP, Scarborough JE, et al. Wound classification reporting in HPB surgery: can a single word change public perception of institutional performance? *HPB*. 2014;16(12):1068-1073. doi:10.1111/hpb.12275
50. Girod DA, McCulloch TM, Tsue TT, Weymuller EA Jr. Risk factors for complications in clean-contaminated head and neck surgical procedures. *Head Neck*. 1995;17(1):7-13. doi:10.1002/hed.2880170103
51. Benatar MJ, Dassonville O, Chamorey E, et al. Impact of preoperative radiotherapy on head and neck free flap reconstruction: a report on 429 cases. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. 2013;66(4):478-482. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2012.12.019
52. Dassonville O, Poissonnet G, Chamorey E, et al. Head and neck reconstruction with free flaps: a report on 213 cases. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2008;265(1):85-95. doi:10.1007/s00405-007-0410-1
53. Baker DG, Krochak RJ. The response of the microvascular system to radiation: a review. *Cancer Invest*. 1989;7(3):287-294. doi:10.3109/07357908909039849
54. Dormand EL, Banwell PE, Goodacre TE. Radiotherapy and wound healing. *Int Wound J*. 2005;2(2):112-127. doi:10.1111/j.1742-4801.2005.00079.x
55. Hunter SE, Scher RL. Clinical implications of radionecrosis to the head and neck surgeon. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2003;11(2):103-106. doi:10.1097/00020840-200304000-00007
56. Penel N, Fournier C, Lefebvre D, Lefebvre JL. Multivariate analysis of risk factors for wound infection in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma surgery with opening of mucosa. Study of 260 surgical procedures. *Oral Oncol*. 2005;41(3):294-303. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2004.08.011
57. Hirakawa H, Hasegawa Y, Hanai N, Ozawa T, Hyodo I, Suzuki M. Surgical site infection in clean-contaminated head and neck cancer surgery: risk factors and prognosis. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2013;270(3):1115-1123. doi:10.1007/s00405-012-2128-y
58. Righi M, Manfredi R, Farneti G, Pasquini E, Cenacchi V. Short-term versus long-term antimicrobial prophylaxis in oncologic head and neck surgery. *Head Neck*. 1996;18(5):399-404. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0347(199609/10)18:5%3C399::AID-HED2%3E3.0.CO;2-0
59. Busch CJ, Knecht R, Münscher A, Matern J, Dalchow C, Lörincz BB. Postoperative antibiotic prophylaxis in clean-contaminated head and neck oncologic surgery: a retrospective cohort study. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2016;273(9):2805-2811. doi:10.1007/s00405-015-3856-6
60. Chiesa-Estomba CM, Lechien JR, Fakhry N, et al. Systematic review of international guidelines for perioperative antibiotic prophylaxis in Head & Neck Surgery. A YO-IFOS Head & Neck Study Group Position Paper. *Head Neck*. 2019;41(9):3434-3456. doi:10.1002/hed.25856
61. Vander Poorten V, Uyttebroek S, Robbins KT, et al. Perioperative antibiotics in clean-contaminated head and neck surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Adv Ther*. 2020;37(4):1360-1380. doi:10.1007/s12325-020-01269-2
62. Patel PN, Jayawardena ADL, Walden RL, Penn EB, Francis DO. Evidence-based use of perioperative antibiotics in otolaryngology. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2018;158(5):783-800. doi:10.1177/0194599817753610
63. Vila PM, Zenga J, Jackson RS. Antibiotic prophylaxis in clean-contaminated head and neck surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2017;157(4):580-588. doi:10.1177/0194599817712215

How to cite this article: Bernstein JD, Bracken DJ, Abeles SR, Orosco RK, Weissbrod PA. Surgical wound classification in otolaryngology: a state-of-the-art review. *World J Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2022;8:139-144. doi:10.1002/wjo2.63