



Risk of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* prosthetic joint infection in elective total hip and knee arthroplasty following eradication therapy

Jayaweera Arachchige Asela Sampath Jayaweera

Specialty type: Infectious diseases

Provenance and peer review:

Invited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

Peer-review report's scientific quality classification

Grade A (Excellent): 0
Grade B (Very good): 0
Grade C (Good): C, C
Grade D (Fair): D
Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: BEHERA B, India; Liu P, China

Received: March 18, 2022

Peer-review started: March 18, 2022

First decision: June 16, 2022

Revised: June 21, 2022

Accepted: July 11, 2022

Article in press: July 11, 2022

Published online: July 18, 2022



Jayaweera Arachchige Asela Sampath Jayaweera, Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine and Allied Sciences, Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Saliyapura 50008, Sri Lanka

Corresponding author: Jayaweera Arachchige Asela Sampath Jayaweera, MBBS, MD, MPhil, MSc, Senior Lecturer, Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine and Allied Sciences, Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Saliyapura 50008, Sri Lanka. jaas071@gmail.com

Abstract

Re-screening following methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) decolonization will be helpful to minimize the development of prosthetic joint infection among MRSA colonizers.

Key Words: Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* colonization; MRSA decolonization; Prosthetic joint implantation; Prosthetic joint infections

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: Patients with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) colonization have a high risk of contracting prosthetic joint infections, and MRSA screening and decolonization are essential to minimize the development of prosthetic joint infection. However, studies showed that re-screening following MRSA decolonization is important before planned prosthetic joint surgery to minimize infections.

Citation: Sampath Jayaweera JAA. Risk of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* prosthetic joint infection in elective total hip and knee arthroplasty following eradication therapy. *World J Orthop* 2022; 13(7): 676-678

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/2218-5836/full/v13/i7/676.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.5312/wjo.v13.i7.676>

TO THE EDITOR

I read the important retrospective study by Kapur *et al*[1] on the risk of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) prosthetic joint infection in elective total hip and knee arthroplasty following eradication therapy. MRSA is a virulent pathogen that causes infections among healthy and immunocompromised individuals. The spectrum of MRSA infection varies from cellulitis, necrotizing fasciitis, bone and joint infections, bacteremia, and infective endocarditis to pneumonia[2].

That article provides a crucial insight into the importance of screening and re-screening following eradication of MRSA prior to prosthetic joint implant in orthopedic surgery. The authors have compared the incidence of prosthetic joint infection (PJI) among MRSA colonizers and non-colonizers, and following follow-up, found that PJI risk is high among MRSA colonizers. As we know, the associated financial burden following PJI is substantial.

The authors have mentioned the method of MRSA decolonization and some practice instead of prontosol nasal spray and octenisan for 4% chlorhexidine and mupirocin ointment. The IDSA guidelines explain the importance of the latter regime, but different formulae have similar decolonization ability and differ in cost as the latter is cheaper[3]. Use of povidone-iodine and rifampin has shown efficient and low cost MRSA decolonization. Simor *et al*[4] showed that the use of topical germicide and antibiotic plus oral agents and rifampin achieved a 92% eradication rate for MRSA. Moreover, the duration of decolonization was given as 5-10 d of mupirocin and 5-14 d of 4% chlorhexidine body wash. Here the authors have discussed the mupirocin use.

The authors mentioned the use of teicoplanin prophylaxis among MRSA positive patients. In emergency surgery, the advice is to provide vancomycin or teicoplanin prophylactically while replacing cefuroxime. However, routine use of anti-MRSA antibiotic prophylaxis for MRSA positives following decolonization is questionable. The expectation would be to minimize the occurrence of MRSA bacteremia. Most studies have discussed the failure of the MRSA decolonization procedure. Almost all prosthetic joint implantation is done as a planned procedure; this would signify the importance of employing the re-screening strategy following decolonization prior to the surgery[5].

A study conducted by Garvey *et al*[6] showed the possibility of having MRSA colonization following decolonization. Following repeated decolonization, the MRSA colonization has been reduced from 7.2% to 4.7%. Several methods were employed by different research groups for MRSA screening. In addition to molecular methods, the use of chromogenic agar is also costly, but the use of mannitol salt agar and swabs into 7.5% NaCl in brain-heart infusion broth and phenotypic detection including tube and slide coagulase testing is cost effective to isolate MRSA[2]. Over the period, I have seen many patients with repeated MRSA colonization following MRSA decolonization. However, almost all isolates were mupirocin susceptible. Therefore, it may be associated with a lack of compliance and a lack of highlighting the importance of decolonization to the patient or the family. Since most patients are morbid and probably have mobility problems, adherence to a 5-d regular body wash and nasal spraying is questionable[7].

The authors have highlighted the importance of re-screening while relating the financial and social burden following PJI. Another thing is that, if possible, re-screening following MRSA eradication would minimize the prophylactic use of teicoplanin.

Re-screening following MRSA decolonization will be helpful to minimize the development of PJI among MRSA colonizers.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Sampath Jayaweera JAA designed the study, analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript.

Conflict-of-interest statement: All the authors declare that they have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Country/Territory of origin: Sri Lanka

ORCID number: Jayaweera Arachchige Asela Sampath Jayaweera 0000-0001-5051-530X.

S-Editor: Liu JH

L-Editor: Wang TQ

P-Editor: Liu JH

REFERENCES

- 1 **Kapur BP**, Tonge X, Kumar G. Risk of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus prosthetic joint infection in elective total hip and knee arthroplasty following eradication therapy. *World J Orthop* 2021; **12**: 842-849 [PMID: [34888144](#) DOI: [10.5312/wjo.v12.i11.842](#)]
- 2 **Sampath Jayaweera JAA**, Karunaratne M, Kumbukgolla WW. The importance of the timely introduction of vancomycin therapy against methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) bacteremia and severity of MRSA bacteremia at Teaching Hospital, Anuradhapura, Sri Lanka. *Int J One Health* 2017; **3**: 7 [DOI: [10.14202/ijoh.2017.7-11](#)]
- 3 Lambert H. IDSA Guidelines on the Treatment of MRSA Infections in Adults and Children. *Am Fam Physician* 2011; **84**: 455-463
- 4 **Simor AE**, Phillips E, McGeer A, Konvalinka A, Loeb M, Devlin HR, Kiss A. Randomized controlled trial of chlorhexidine gluconate for washing, intranasal mupirocin, and rifampin and doxycycline versus no treatment for the eradication of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus colonization. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007; **44**: 178-185 [PMID: [17173213](#) DOI: [10.1086/510392](#)]
- 5 **Sai N**, Laurent C, Strale H, Denis O, Byl B. Efficacy of the decolonization of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus carriers in clinical practice. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2015; **4**: 56 [PMID: [26688720](#) DOI: [10.1186/s13756-015-0096-x](#)]
- 6 **Garvey MI**, Winfield J, Wiley C, Reid M, Cooper M. Reduction in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* colonisation: impact of a screening and decolonisation programme. *J Infect Prev* 2016; **17**: 294-297 [PMID: [28989493](#) DOI: [10.1177/1757177416661406](#)]
- 7 **Zhu X**, Sun X, Zeng Y, Feng W, Li J, Zeng J. Can nasal Staphylococcus aureus screening and decolonization prior to elective total joint arthroplasty reduce surgical site and prosthesis-related infections? *J Orthop Surg Res* 2020; **15**: 60 [PMID: [32075670](#) DOI: [10.1186/s13018-020-01601-0](#)]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-3991568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

Help Desk: <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

