

Original Research Article

Epidemiology of the postoperative bacteriuria and urinary tract infections following transurethral resection of the prostate.

Abstract

Background: Despite guidelines and recommendations, a pragmatic approach, i.e., that treatment will improve patient-centered outcomes when performed by typical clinicians in typical patients, is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of antibiotic prophylaxis in urological surgery. **Methods:** In this prospective, double-blinded trial, 130 patients were randomly assigned to receive a single dose of 2 g IV ceftriaxone (66 subjects) or 2 g IV cefazolin (64 subjects) thirty minutes before surgery. We evaluated their physical status, preoperative urinary catheter use, urological risk factors, prostate size, and the duration of surgery. **Results:** Ceftriaxone showed a non-significant trend towards superiority to cefazolin (OR = 0.567, 95% CI [0.234-1.414], $p = 0.228$) for the prevention of infections among TURP patients. **Conclusion:** No significant difference in the effectiveness of a single dose of ceftriaxone compared with cefazolin for the prevention of postoperative infections was found in patients undergoing TURP following the early postoperative removal of an indwelling catheter. Due to the pragmatic assumptions of this trial, this result might not represent a negative finding; instead, it may indicate the importance of risk factors influencing the patients' susceptibility to infection.

Keywords: Transurethral Resection of Prostate, Surgical Site Infection, Urinary Tract Infections, Bacteriuria, Antibiotic Prophylaxis, Cefazolin, Ceftriaxone

Introduction

Surgical site infections (SSIs) are an important cause of postoperative morbidity. In endoscopic urologic procedures, complicated urinary tract infections (UTIs), pyelonephritis, and

septicemia are the most feared complications [1]. Great efforts have been made to diagnose these health care-associated infections (HAIs) and to decrease their incidence using standardized preventive, epidemiological, and educational measures [2].

Transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) is still the most commonly performed surgical procedure for benign prostate hypertrophy (BPH), despite the development of new medications and less invasive surgical techniques [3]. Infection following TURP is a concern because it may present as asymptomatic bacteriuria, UTI, epididymitis, prostatitis or even septicemia [4]. Antibiotic prophylaxis is one of several methods for preventing SSIs [5], and while the Best Practice Policy Statement of the American Society of Urology (AUA) recommends prophylaxis with first- or second-generation cephalosporins [6] for all patients undergoing TURP, the European Association of Urology (EAU) guidelines suggest that patients receive trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole or cephalosporins (second or third generation) as prophylaxis, except for individuals at low risk or with a small prostate [7]. First-generation cephalosporins, such as cefazolin, show excellent activity against Gram-positive organisms and mild activity against Gram-negative species. Nevertheless, cefazolin shows good activity against *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella* species, *Haemophilus influenzae*, and *Proteus mirabilis* as well as some *Enterobacter* species. Ceftriaxone exhibits good activity against Gram-negative microorganisms but is associated with a high risk of developing bacterial resistance [8].

There is a low rate of compliance with recommendations regarding prophylaxis, and the prescribing patterns for different antibiotics vary significantly [9]. A pragmatic approach is necessary to implement guidelines while considering patient comorbidities and urological risk factors related to endoscopic urologic surgeries [10,11].

The presence of preoperative bacteriuria, indwelling catheters, urinary tract stones, urinary tract abnormalities, and recurrent UTIs can complicate patient management, and these conditions are common exclusion criteria in studies of the efficacy of antimicrobial prophylaxis in urologic procedures [12,13]. The standard antimicrobial susceptibilities of pathogens should also be considered because the widespread use of antibiotics, especially fluoroquinolones, has led to the emergence of bacterial resistance, which is currently a major concern [14].

The aim of this study was to determine whether a single dose of ceftriaxone is superior to a single dose of cefazolin for the prevention of postoperative infectious complications in patients undergoing TURP following the short-term removal of urinary catheters. We also sought to identify predictors of infectious complications in these patients.

Methods

We performed this prospective, randomized, double-blinded, pragmatic study at a tertiary hospital. All patients who had been scheduled to undergo TURP who were 45 years of age or older and clinically stable were considered for inclusion in the study. The exclusion criteria included a known history of allergy to the study antibiotics, a history of recurrent UTIs, treatment with antibiotics within 10 days prior to surgery, the administration of antibiotic therapy for any other reason, severe renal or hepatic failure, the presence of a distant focus of concurrent infection, and immunosuppression.

The study protocol was approved by the Committee on Human Research of the Federal University of Uberlandia, Brazil, with the record number CEP/UFU 169/1. Data were prospectively collected by the principal investigator during hospitalization and in an ambulatory

69 setting after discharge. Each patient received information on the study protocol and provided
70 written informed consent before participating.

71 A total of 135 patients were randomized into two different groups. Block randomization
72 (2:2) was performed in a blinded fashion by the anesthesiologist one day prior to surgery for all
73 study participants. On the day of surgery, the patients received either 2 g cefazolin (Group 0) or
74 2 g ceftriaxone (Group 1) intravenously 30 minutes before surgery. The patients and surgeons
75 were blinded to the drug administered.

76 A complete blood count (CBC), chemistry panel, electrocardiogram, urinalysis (to detect
77 pyuria), and ultrasonography of the pelvic and abdominal portions of the urogenital tract were
78 performed preoperatively. In the operating room, the researcher recorded the age, body mass
79 index (BMI), comorbidities and medication intake of the patients to grade their physical status
80 according to the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) criteria. Data regarding the
81 preoperative presence of an indwelling urinary catheter, ultrasonographic abnormalities, prostate
82 volume and operative duration were also recorded.

83 Urinary symptoms such as urgency, frequency, dysuria, and suprapubic tenderness were
84 recorded as well. A physical examination was performed preoperatively and included
85 measurements of blood pressure, pulse and axillary temperature ($> 38^{\circ}\text{C}$). Urinalysis and urine
86 cultures were collected at baseline. Following resection, prostate fragments were cultured.

87 Thirty minutes before the beginning of surgery, the patients received the previously
88 allocated study drug. No additional doses were administered to any of the patients except for
89 those with known colonization at baseline, who were treated during their hospital stay or for a
90 longer period based on an antibiogram or empirical findings when these data were not available.
91 During surgery, standard antiseptic measures were followed. Surgery was performed by a

urologist, with a 3-way Foley catheter with a closed drainage system that was continuously irrigated with saline solution being placed at the end of surgery. The catheter remained in place until discharge, when it was removed, except in patients who exhibited complicating urological factors (such as urethral stricture) that required prolonged catheter placement. An assessment of clinical symptoms, CBC, urinalysis and urine cultures were performed after catheter removal at the time of discharge and in an ambulatory setting at one week and at one month after surgery.

The primary outcome was postoperative infection, which was diagnosed according to the European Association of Urology guidelines and CDC definitions and included the following signs and symptoms: asymptomatic bacteriuria (positive urine culture of $\geq 10^5$ CFU/ml with no more than 2 species), UTI (at least one sign or symptom, including fever above 38 °C, urgent or frequent urination, dysuria, suprapubic tenderness or a positive urine culture of $\geq 10^4$ CFU/ml with no more than 2 species), clinical epididymitis, prostatitis, and septicemia [7,15].

The general risk factors of the patients were assessed according to the ASA physical status classification. Specific urological risk factors included anatomic anomalies of the urinary tract, urinary obstructions, urinary stones, and an indwelling or externalized catheter [16].

To calculate the sample size, we considered previous systematic reviews, which have shown that antibiotic prophylaxis decreases the frequency of postoperative bacteriuria in men receiving antibiotic prophylaxis versus placebo or no treatment (from 26% to 9%). Therefore, the difference in risk was -0.17, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -0.20 to -0.15 [11,12]. Based on these findings, the following parameters were employed for our calculations with the G*power program [17] using the two-tailed z-test: an alpha error probability of 0.05, a power (1-beta error probability) of 0.80, and an allocation ratio of 1. A large proportion of the differences between the two evaluated antibiotic groups (as observed in the above-cited systematic reviews

of placebo versus antibiotic prophylaxis showing significant differences in risk, both statistically and clinically) were expected to provide evidence supporting the use of one antibiotic over the other. The proportion of infections (0.09 for group A and 0.29 for group B) was considered post-intervention. Hence, a risk difference of 0.20 was expected. These parameters necessitated a minimum sample size of 132 patients (66 in the cefazolin group and 66 in the ceftriaxone group) to identify a difference in risk of 0.20.

Logistic regression was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the antibiotic treatment (ceftriaxone versus cefazolin) in decreasing infection rates at 30 days after surgery, applying an intention-to-treat analysis. Due to the pragmatic assumptions of this trial (i.e., that treatment will improve patient-centered outcomes when performed by typical clinicians in typical patients) [17], the patients were permitted to exhibit bacteriuria or prostate colonization at the baseline assessment.

To evaluate other variables associated with infection in patients following the intervention, a sequence of bivariate analyses was performed that included age, BMI, ASA status, the duration of surgery, preoperative catheter use, prostate size, and infection. Variables with p-values < 0.20 at this stage of the analysis were then selected for inclusion in an initial multiple logistic regression model [18]. The covariates were also inspected based on multicollinearity, considering (a) whether two or more independent covariates were correlated (correlation matrix); (b) whether significant changes in the coefficient estimates occurred when variables were added or excluded; and (c) whether the sign or coefficient order of a magnitude estimate was different from what was expected [19]. The final model retained variables that were clinically important and were not candidates for causation of multicollinearity.

Finally, two subgroup analyses of treatment effectiveness were carried out for patients whose urine was sterile to evaluate the prophylactic effectiveness of the drugs as well as for those who did not exhibit any urologic risk factors. Mplus software (Los Angeles, CA, EUA) was used for the analysis [20].

Results

Eligible participants attended ambulatory visits. Among the 142 patients with indications for elective TURP, 7 were excluded, and 135 were randomized on the day before surgery. All patients in Group 0 (except for one patient in whom the surgical technique had to be changed due to a complication during surgery) were randomized to the originally allocated group (intention-to-treat analysis). No patients were lost to follow-up. Of the 134 patients, 67 were allocated to each group, and four were not included in the analysis (three in Group 0 and one in Group 1) because they did not meet the criteria for complete cases.

This prospective study was carried out from January 2012 to March 2014. There was no reason to stop the study early. Table 1 shows the patient characteristics for each group. Of the 33 patients showing preoperative bacteriuria and/or colonization of the prostate (25.38%), most had a preoperative indwelling catheter (63.64%), and all 21 exhibited asymptomatic bacteriuria. For the 109 patients without a preoperative catheter, the incidence of bacteriuria and/or colonization of the prostate was 11.01%. Moreover, 4 patients out of the 12 without a catheter presented a negative urine culture, and the colonization status at baseline was due to positive prostate fragment cultures (33.33%). Sepsis was not observed in any patient.

Table 1. Patient characteristics for each arm

		Group	Group
		0 - Cefazolin	1 - Ceftriaxone
		(n = 64)	(n = 66)
Categorical	With bacteriuria and/or prostatic		
measurements:	colonization at baseline	n = 16	n = 17
absolute values	PS1 ASA – normal/healthy	n = 20	n = 18
	PS2 ASA - mild systemic disease	n = 32	n = 34
	PS3 ASA - severe systemic disease	n = 12	n = 14
	Urological risk factors	n = 12	n = 12
	Catheter use before surgery	n = 10	n = 11
Continuous	Age (years)	66.01 (8.94)	66.40 (9.13)
measurements:	BMI (m2/kg)	25.59 (4.19)	25.14 (3.87)
mean (SD)	Surgery duration	39.74 (14.71)	38.67 (14.15)
	Prostate size	56.55 (14.28)	51.91 (15.14)

160 PS ASA = Physical Status, American Society of Anesthesiology; and BMI = body mass index

161 Twenty patients in Group 0 and 16 in Group 1 developed a postoperative infection. Table

162 2 shows the results of univariate regression for each covariate individually. Although the

163 randomized allocation variable ceftriaxone was not significant, it was maintained in subsequent
 164 analyses because it demonstrated the effectiveness of the randomized clinical trial.

165

166 Table 2. Univariate regression of all case covariates

					95% CI for Exp (beta)	
Outcome: infection status	Beta	SE	Odds Ratio	P-value	Lower	Upper
post-surgery						
With bacteriuria and/or prostatic colonization at baseline	1.297	0.436	3.657	0.003	1.555	8.603
Ceftriaxone	-0.404	0.405	0.667	0.318	0.302	1.475
Age	0.020	0.022	1.020	0.383	0.976	1.065
BMI	0.043	0.049	1.044	0.378	0.949	1.149
PS2 ASA*	-0.650	0.494	0.522	0.188	0.198	1.373
PS3 ASA*	0.875	0.539	2.4	0.104	0.835	6.902
Duration of surgery	0.001	0.014	1.001	0.929	0.974	1.029
Catheter use before surgery	1.023	0.497	2.781	0.040	1.049	7.372
Prostate size	0.006	0.013	1.006	0.661	0.98	1.033

Urological risk factors 1.903 0.485 6.705 < 0.001 2.593 17.342

* PS1 ASA (Physical Status, American Society of Anesthesiology) was used as a reference.

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; and SE = standard error

Table 3 shows that the covariates presenting p-values of less than 0.20, as determined through univariate regression analysis, were used to build a multivariate regression model. We failed to reject the null hypothesis regarding differences in the effectiveness of the two drugs. An ASA status of PS3 was strongly correlated with the incidence of postoperative infection, increasing the chance of infection by 5.3 times compared with an ASA status of PS2.

Table 3. Multivariate regression of covariates showing $p < 0.20$, except for ceftriaxone

					95% CI for Exp (beta)	
Outcome: infection status post-surgery	Beta	SE	Adjusted Odds Ratio	P-value	Lower	Upper
With bacteriuria and/or						
prostatic colonization at baseline	1.368	0.708	3.926	0.053	0.980	15.733
Ceftriaxone	-0.637	0.470	0.529	0.175	0.211	1.329
PS2 ASA*	-0.342	0.582	0.710	0.557	0.227	2.222

PS3 ASA*	1.327	0.705	3.771	0.060	0.947	15.012
Catheter use before surgery	-0.071	0.818	0.932	0.931	0.187	4.632
Urological risk factors	2.388	0.581	10.890	< 0.001	3.488	34

* PS1 ASA (Physical Status, American Society of Anesthesiology) was used as a reference.

Abbreviations: CI= confidence interval; and SE = standard error

A strong correlation between preoperative catheter usage and the baseline bacteriuria/colonization status of 0.965 (p=0.026) was found. The reduction in the odds ratio of preoperative catheter usage between the univariate and the multivariate regression analyses may suggest multicollinearity. The final model (Table 4) included the baseline drug allocation data and urological risk factors. The adjusted multivariate analysis again demonstrated a statistically non-significant effect of ceftriaxone.

Table 4. Multivariate regression: final model

				95% CI for Exp (beta)		
Outcome: infection status		Adjusted				
post-surgery	Beta	SE	Odds Ratio	P-value	Lower	Upper
With bacteriuria and/or	1.564	0.492	4.777	0.001	1.820	12.540

prostatic colonization at						
baseline						
Ceftriaxone	-0.552	0.459	0.576	0.228	0.234	1.414
Urologic risk factors	2.102	0.534	8.182	< 0.001	2.875	12.282

188 PS ASA = Physical Status, American Society of Anesthesiology

189

190 Two sub-analyses were conducted. The first considered only patients without
 191 preoperative bacteriuria and/or colonization of the prostate (n = 97) and indicated likely
 192 prophylactic efficacy of ceftriaxone over cefazolin, but no statistically significant difference was
 193 found. For the second subgroup analysis, which considered patients with no urological risk
 194 factors (n = 110), we again failed to reject the null hypothesis regarding the effectiveness of
 195 ceftriaxone over cefazolin. Regarding the covariates included in the model, ASA III, the pre-
 196 surgery infection status and catheter use pre-surgery are noted as predictors of a higher
 197 probability of post-surgery infection.

198

199 Discussion

200 In the present era, humans are faced with an increased life expectancy. Elderly surgical
 201 patients therefore require special consideration due to the high prevalence rates of comorbidities
 202 among individuals in this age group who require surgery [21]. Benign prostatic hypertrophy is
 203 prevalent in the elderly. Each patient's ability to tolerate the intravascular volume changes
 204 associated with the apparently non-invasive surgical technique of TURP should be evaluated.
 205 Moreover, TURP is occasionally associated with significant morbidity and even mortality [22].

A great deal of evidence supports the use of antibiotic prophylaxis in TURP patients, but three large meta-analyses suggesting that prophylactic antimicrobials may be effective in all patients undergoing TURP included only low-risk patients and those with preoperatively sterile urine [12,13,23]. However, the presence of preoperative bacteriuria/prostate colonization and an indwelling urinary catheter are not independent factors, and the presence of infection must be properly assessed, for example, by performing urine cultures before and after surgery [24].

A reduction in the proportion of infections after surgery was observed among the patients treated with ceftriaxone; however, this difference was statistically non-significant. Such a result might not represent a negative finding. Instead, it may indicate an absence of evidence regarding the differences in the treatments. Thus, the use of tertiary cephalosporins for antimicrobial prophylaxis in TURP patients may be unnecessary. Ceftriaxone was expected to be more protective than cefazolin due to its broader spectrum, but statistical analysis showed no significant difference in this regard. Consistent with this finding, a report by the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists (ASHP) recommends that broad-spectrum antimicrobials, such as third-generation cephalosporins and carbapenems, should be reserved for patients with active infections or for those who require additional coverage for intestinal organisms. Routine use of third-generation cephalosporins is not recommended due to their high cost and the potential to promote resistance to HAI Gram-negative bacilli. Cefazolin may therefore be an appropriate drug for UTI prophylaxis in TURP patients due to its good coverage of most microorganisms that cause infections in TURP patients and its low probability of causing resistance [25].

Many urological conditions are associated with an increased risk of UTIs and urosepsis, primarily obstruction of the urinary tract, the presence of contaminated stones, and postoperative

placement of indwelling catheters. In the present study, urological factors were found to be directly related to risk of postoperative infection, and it was challenging to determine how each of these factors influenced the patients' susceptibility to infection. Further studies are necessary to answer these questions.

No significant difference in the effectiveness of a single dose of ceftriaxone compared with cefazolin for the prevention of postoperative infections was found in patients undergoing TURP following the early postoperative removal of an indwelling catheter. Due to the pragmatic assumptions of this trial, this result might not represent a negative finding; instead, it may indicate the importance of risk factors influencing the patients' susceptibility to infection and an evaluation over 30 days is very important to detect postoperative infections in TURP patients.

References

- 1 Grabe M: Antibiotic prophylaxis in urological surgery, a European viewpoint. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2011;38 Suppl:58-63.
- 2 Magill SS, Edwards JR, Bamberg W, Beldavs ZG, Dumyati G, Kainer MA, Lynfield R, Maloney M, McAllister-Hollod L, Nadle J, Ray SM, Thompson DL, Wilson LE, Fridkin SK: Multistate point-prevalence survey of health care-associated infections. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:1198-1208.
- 3 Miller NL: Benign prostatic hyperplasia and lower urinary tract symptoms--when to pull the trigger on surgery? *J Urol* 2013;190:1976-1977.
- 4 Reich O, Gratzke C, Bachmann A, Seitz M, Schlenker B, Hermanek P, Lack N, Stief CG, Urology Section of the Bavarian Working Group for Quality A: Morbidity, mortality and early

- 251 outcome of transurethral resection of the prostate: a prospective multicenter evaluation of 10,654
252 patients. J Urol 2008;180:246-249.
- 253 5 Alexander JW, Solomkin JS, Edwards MJ: Updated recommendations for control of
254 surgical site infections. Ann Surg 2011;253:1082-1093.
- 255 6 Wolf JS, Jr., Bennett CJ, Dmochowski RR, Hollenbeck BK, Pearle MS, Schaeffer AJ:
256 Best practice policy statement on urologic surgery antimicrobial prophylaxis. J Urol
257 2008;179:1379-1390.
- 258 7 Grabe M, Bjerklund Johansen TE, Botto H, Çek M, Naber KG, Pickard RS, Tenke P,
259 Wagenlehner F, Wullt B: Guidelines on urological infections. 2010. Available at:
260 <http://www.uroweb.org/guidelines/online-guidelines/> (accessed Feb 10 2014).
- 261 8 MacDougall C, Guglielmo BJ, Wiener-Kronish J: Antimicrobial therapy; in Evers AS,
262 Maze M, Kharasch ED (eds): Anesthetic Pharmacology. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University
263 Press, 2011, pp 936-986.
- 264 9 Lawson KA, Rudzinski JK, Vicas I, Carlson KV: Assessment of antibiotic prophylaxis
265 prescribing patterns for TURP: a need for Canadian guidelines? Can Urol Assoc J 2013;7:E530-
266 536.
- 267 10 Ng J, Le-Abuyen S, Mosley J, Gardam M: A pragmatic approach to infection prevention
268 and control guidelines in an ambulatory care setting. Am J Infect Control 2014;42:671-673.
- 269 11 Grabe M, Botto H, Cek M, Tenke P, Wagenlehner FM, Naber KG, Bjerklund Johansen
270 TE: Preoperative assessment of the patient and risk factors for infectious complications and
271 tentative classification of surgical field contamination of urological procedures. World J Urol
272 2012;30:39-50.

- 273 12 Qiang W, Jianchen W, MacDonald R, Monga M, Wilt TJ: Antibiotic prophylaxis for
274 transurethral prostatic resection in men with preoperative urine containing less than 100,000
275 bacteria per ml: a systematic review. J Urol 2005;173:1175-1181.
- 276 13 Berry A, Barratt A: Prophylactic antibiotic use in transurethral prostatic resection: a
277 meta-analysis. J Urol 2002;167:571-577.
- 278 14 Zaytoun OM, Vargo EH, Rajan R, Berglund R, Gordon S, Jones JS: Emergence of
279 fluoroquinolone-resistant Escherichia coli as cause of postprostate biopsy infection: implications
280 for prophylaxis and treatment. Urology 2011;77:1035-1041.
- 281 15 CDC/NHSN: Surveillance definition of healthcare-associated infection and criteria for
282 specific types of infections in the acute care setting. 2013. Available at:
283 www.cdc.gov/nhsn/pdfs/psemanual/4psc_clabscurrent.pdf (accessed June 11 2014). 2013.
- 284 16 Bratzler DW, Dellinger EP, Olsen KM, Perl TM, Auwaerter PG, Bolon MK, Fish DN,
285 Napolitano LM, Sawyer RG, Slain D, Steinberg JP, Weinstein RA: Clinical practice guidelines
286 for antimicrobial prophylaxis in surgery. Am J Health Syst Pharm 2013;70:195-283.
- 287 17 Sackett DL: Explanatory and pragmatic clinical trials: a primer and application to a
288 recent asthma trial. Pol Arch Med Wewn 2011;121:259-263.
- 289 18 Mickey RM, Greenland S: The impact of confounder selection criteria on effect
290 estimation. Am J Epidemiol 1989;129:125-137.
- 291 19 Kunter M, Nachtsheim C, Neter J, Li W: Applied Linear Statistical Models, ed 5. New
292 York, NY, McGraw-Hill, 2005.
- 293 20 Muthén LK, Muthén BO: Mplus User's Guide: Statistical Analysis with Latent Variables,
294 ed 6. Los Angeles, CA, Muthén & Muthén, 2010.

- 295 21 Etzioni DA, Liu JH, Maggard MA, Ko CY: The aging population and its impact on the
296 surgery workforce. *Ann Surg* 2003;238:170-177.
- 297 22 McVary KT, Roehrborn CG, Avins AL, Barry MJ, Bruskewitz RC, Donnell RF, Foster
298 HE, Jr., Gonzalez CM, Kaplan SA, Penson DF, Ulchaker JC, Wei JT: Update on AUA guideline
299 on the management of benign prostatic hyperplasia. *J Urol* 2011;185:1793-1803.
- 300 23 Alsaywid BS, Smith GH: Antibiotic prophylaxis for transurethral urological surgeries:
301 systematic review. *Urol Ann* 2013;5:61-74.
- 302 24 Banez LL, Freedland SJ: Impact of host factors and comorbid conditions; in Taneja SS
303 (ed): *Complications of Urologic Surgery*. Philadelphia, PA, Saunders Elsevier, 2010, pp 3-12.
- 304 25 Bratzler DW, Dellinger EP, Olsen KM, Perl TM, Auwaerter PG, Bolon MK, Fish DN,
305 Napolitano LM, Sawyer RG, Slain D, Steinberg JP, Weinstein RA: Clinical practice guidelines
306 for antimicrobial prophylaxis in surgery. *Surg Infect (Larchmt)* 2013;14:73-156.