**Case Report/Case Series** 

# SURGICAL SITE INFECTION CAUSED BY NON-HEMOLYTIC Staphylococcus aureus FOLLOWING A TOTAL KNEE ARTHROPLASTY AT A CLASS C HOSPITAL IN INDONESIA

Satiyo<sup>1</sup>, Elsye Maria Rosa<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Orthopedics, Kertosono Regional Hospital, Nganjuk, Indonesia <sup>2</sup>Postgraduate Program of Hospital Administration, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

This article presents a case report of a knee arthroplasty surgical site infection caused by non-hemolytic *Staphylococcus aureus*. A 56-year-old woman came to the Orthopedic Outpatient Clinic, with the chief complaint of pain in the left knee for the last three years. After being diagnosed with grade IV osteoarthritis, the patient underwent a total knee arthroplasty. The patient had routine post-operative follow-ups at the Orthopedic Outpatient Clinic. However, the patient complained of swelling, pain, and discharge at the surgical site after three months. The patient underwent a second surgery for debridement, implant removal, and interspacer placement. A broad-spectrum antibiotic (gentamicin) was administered while waiting for the culture and antibiotic sensitivity test results. The culture results showed non-hemolytic *Staphylococcus aureus* presence. The antibiotics were then changed and administered for two weeks according to the culture and antibiotic sensitivity test results. As the results were good, the patient was scheduled for revision surgery for her previous total knee arthroplasty.

Keywords: Surgical site infection; non-hemolytic Staphylococcus aureus; total knee arthroplasty; human and health

\***Correspondence:** Elsye Maria Rosa, Postgraduate Program of Hospital Administration, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Email: elsye@umy.ac.id, elsyemariarosa11@gmail.com

## Article history

•Submitted 16 Dec 2022 • Revised 11 Jan 2023 • Accepted 10 Feb 2023 • Published 10 Mar 2023

**How to cite:** Satiyo & Rosa EM (2023). Surgical site infection caused by non-hemolytic *Staphylococcus aureus* following a total knee arthroplasty at a class C hospital in Indonesia. Folia Medica Indonesiana, 59 (1), 57-62. https://doi.org/10.20473/fmi.v59i1.39745



Copyright: © 2023 Folia Medica Indonesiana.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License as stated in https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/deed.id. pISSN: 2355-8393, eISSN: 2599-056x

## **Highlights:**

- 1. A patient with grade IV osteoarthritis underwent an arthroplasty and developed a surgical site infection caused by *Staphylococcus aureus*.
- 2. The treatment for the surgical site infection included antibiotic medications and revision surgery for the previous total knee arthroplasty.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Surgical site infection (SSI) is a microbial infection at the surgical site that occurs within a period of less than 30 days up to one year after surgery (World Health Organization 2019). Surgical site infection is one of the most common types of nosocomial infections, which occur when a patient receives medical care in a hospital or other health care facility. Symptoms that can occur when a patient experiences a surgical site infection include purulent drainage, wound dehiscence, fever, pain or tenderness when pressure is applied, local swelling, and redness. Any of these symptoms can be found during physical examinations or supporting examinations, such as histopathological and radiological examinations (Wenk et al. 2017).

The surgical site infection prevalence among postoperative orthopedic patients is approximately 71%. The incidences of surgical site infection were 1.69% in orthopedic patients who underwent total hip replacement and 2.82% in those who underwent total knee replacement. The surgical site infection prevalence is generally low and closely related to the operating room layout, the surgical technique used by the operator, and the aseptic procedures carried out in a strict and disciplined manner (Ashraf et al. 2018, Saffanah et al. 2020). Total knee arthroplasty is a common surgery performed in the orthopedic field to treat osteoarthritis, arthritis deformans, and rheumatoid arthritis. Recent studies found prevalent cases of knee osteoarthritis among people older than 55 years (Rositaet al. 2021, Gan et al. 2023). Total knee arthroplasty replaces the abnormal knee joint with an artificial material. The end of the femur is replaced with a metal shell, and the end of the tibia with a metal rod, both of which are then connected with plastic to act as a motion cushion.

A previous study found a 0.5%-2.0% probability of surgical site infection among patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty for the first time (Springer & Scuderi 2013). Surgical site infection will increase patient morbidity and mortality due to longer hospitalization, higher treatment costs, and a heavier mental burden on the patient (Purba et al. 2018, 2020). In order to treat surgical site infection, patients must undergo multiple procedures. Prior revealed that methicillin-sensitive studies Staphylococcus aureus (MSSA), methicillinresistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA), and coagulase-negative Staphylococci are the most common causes of infection in total knee arthroplasty (Weiser & Moucha 2015).

## CASE REPORT

A 56-year-old woman with the chief complaint of left knee pain that had persisted for the past three years presented to the Orthopedic Outpatient Clinic, Kertosono Regional Hospital, Nganjuk, Indonesia. The patient was diagnosed with grade IV osteoarthritis through clinical and radiological assessments. Figure 1 shows the x-ray of the patient's left knee.



Figure 1. X-ray of the patient's left knee when first presented to the Orthopedic Outpatient Clinic.

After the diagnosis was confirmed, the patient underwent a total knee arthroplasty. Figure 2 presents the x-ray of the patient's left knee after surgery. The patient presented for the post-operative followup a week after the surgery, and the evaluation results were good. However, three months following the surgery, the patient returned for follow-up with complaints of swelling, pain, and discharge at the surgical site. An x-ray was performed on the patient's left knee, as shown in Figure 3.



Figure 2. X-ray of the patient's left knee after total kneearthroplasty.

The patient was then advised to undergo a second procedure for debridement, removal of the previously inserted implant, and placement of an interspacer. Initially, the patient declined and requested outpatient treatment.



Figure 3. X-ray of the patient's left knee at three months after total knee arthroplasty.

After six months, the patient eventually agreed to undergo surgery. The surgery was therefore performed, as seen in Figure 4.



Figure 4. The patient's left knee before debridement and implant removal (A) and during debridement (B).

While waiting for the results of the culture and antibiotic sensitivity tests, the patient was administered a broad-spectrum antibiotic (gentamicin). Figure 5 depicts the x-ray of the patient's left knee after the second surgery.



Figure 5. X-ray of the patient's left knee after debridement, implant removal, and interspacer placement.

A week following the second surgery, the results of the culture and antibiotic sensitivity tests came out, as shown in Table 1. A non-hemolitic Staphylococcus infection was discovered in the patient. The antibiotic medications were then adjusted according to the results of the culture and antibiotic sensitivity tests and administered for two weeks. The patient attended the postoperative follow-up a month following the second surgery. The evaluation results were satisfactory. She was then scheduled for a revision surgery for her prior total knee arthroplasty.

# Table 1. Results of the culture and antibiotic sensitivity tests.

Obje	erial: Pus ective: AcrB culture = A				
	ure: Biological organisr biotic sensitivity test:	n: Non-	hemoly	tic Staphylococus	
No.	Antibiotics		No.	Antibiotics	
I.0.	Penicillin		V	Aminoglycoside	
-	Ampicillin			Amikacin	R (0)
	Penicillin-G Amoxycillin Oxacillin			Eictuamyca Dibekacin Kanamycis	(-)
Π	β-lactamase inhibitor		VI	Tetracyclin	
	Ampicillin- Sulbactam			Tetracyclin	_
	Amoxycillin- Clavulanic acid	S	VII	Phenicol	I (13)
	Ticancillin- Clavulanic acid			Chloramphenicol	
	Celoperarone- Salbactam		VIII	Macrolide	
	Piperacillin- Tazobactam	S		Erythromycin	
Ш	Cephalosporin			Clindamycin	R (0)
	1 <sup>st</sup> generation		IX	Fluoroquinolone	
	Cepharolin			Ciprofloxacine	R (0)
	Cephalotin Cephradine 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation Cefaroxime			Ofloxacin Gatlonacis Levofloxacin Norfloxacin	
	Cefotiamin			Moxfloxacin	R (14)
	Cefoprozil 3 <sup>rd</sup> generation Cefoperaxone	S	Х	Carbapenem Imipenem Meropenem	S
	Cefotaxime	S		Weropenem	
	Ceftriaxone	5	XI	Glycopeptides	
	Ceftazidime			Vancomycin	
	Cefpododime			Teicoplanin	
	Cefixine		XII	Others	
	4th generation			Fosfomycin	
	Celepime Cefpirom	S		Nalidoic acid Onezolid	S
117	-			C. C. Cond	(33)
IV	Sulfa-Trimetoprime Trimetoprime	R			
	sulfametoksazole	(0)			

S: sensitive; R: resistant

# DISCUSSION

The patient in this study was a 56-year-old woman with no known comorbidity. Several studies on surgical site infection risk factors found that age and female sex are not risk factors for surgical site infection. On the other hand, studies discovered that advanced age was a protective factor, but male sex was a risk factor for surgical site infection (Baier et al. 2019, Resende et al. 2021, Li et al. 2022). The patient in this study developed grade IV osteoarthritis, which necessitated a total knee arthroplasty. Because of its high success rate and low complication rate, total knee arthroplasty is the surgical procedure of choice for patients with endstage knee arthritis. However, there were studies that reported 27% of surgical site infection cases within 30 days and 65% within a year after total knee arthroplasty (Lin et al. 2018, Chung et al. 2021).

The patient in this study experienced pain, swelling, and discharge at the surgical site. These clinical symptoms are considered in the diagnosis of surgical site infection. A study found that pain was the main symptom in >90% of cases (Zahar & Sarungi 2021). Following a clinical examination, supporting tests (such as laboratory and radiological examinations) are required to confirm the diagnosis. Plain radiography and blood tests are among the tests that must be performed. Two-plane radiography is utilized to check for solid implant fixation (radiolucent lines), osteolytic changes in the distal femur or proximal tibia, and periarticular ossification. During a blood test, the leukocyte count, differential, C-reactive protein (CRP) level, and erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) are all checked (Cooper & Valle 2014, Shahi & Parvizi 2015). Despite these various tests, bacterial culture remains the gold standard for surgical site infection diagnosis (Goswami et al. 2018, Mühlhofer et al. 2021).

Previous studies indicated that methicillin-sensitive Staphylococcus aureus (MSSA), methicillinresistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA), and coagulase-negative Staphylococci were the most common bacterial pathogens causing SSI after total knee arthroplasty. In surgical site infection cases, Staphylococcus accounted for 70% to 80% of the bacteria causing infection. Other bacteria commonly found in surgical site infection are Gram-negative bacilli and non-group A Streptococcus bacteria (Weiser & Moucha 2015, Gehrke et al. 2015). Several studies attempting to investigate the process of S. aureus colonization at the surgical site discovered that patients who had S. aureus nasal colonization were more at riskto develop a surgical site infection following total knee arthroplasty. The risk increased up to nine times compared to people who did not have nasal S. aureus colonization. Further molecular typing revealed that the S. aureus isolates from both sites (the surgical site and the nose) were molecularly identical (Skråmm et al. 2014).

Other than the case in this report, there was anothercase of surgical site infection at Kertosono Regional Hospital, Nganjuk, Indonesia. The patient had approschetic joint implanted and developed an infection caused by non-hemolytic Staphylococcus. Initial prosthetic joint infection occurs within three weeks after a procedure, whereas the occurence after those three weeks is considered late infection regardless of the stability of the components. A prosthetic joint infection indicates an infection not only at the prosthetic interface, but also in the surrounding bone and soft tissue (Zmistowski 2014). Early prosthetic joint infections are generally managed by aggressive debridement, exchange of modular parts, and retention of fixed components. Conversely, late prosthetic joint infections usually require the removal of the component (Osmon et al. 2013; Zmistowski 2014). The aforementioned patient at the Kertosono Regional Hospital had a late prosthetic joint infection. Several surgical options to treat PJI include debridement, antibiotics, and implant retention (DAIR), as well as single-stage and two-stage revision surgery (Karachalios et al. 2014, Karachalios & Komnos 2021). If all of the patient's reconstructive treatments fail, salvage surgeries (e.g., arthroplasty resection, fusion, and above-the-knee amputation) can be undertaken (Gehrke et al. 2015).

In addition to surgical care, patients must be administered antibiotics to treat the infection. Antibiotics were administered post-operatively in somecases to prevent surgical site infection (Hadi & Ishardyanto 2021). In general, antimicrobial therapy should be pathogen-directed and guided by the results of antimicrobial susceptibility testing where applicable (Osmon et al. 2013, Tande & Patel 2014). The general principles for antimicrobial treatment are to apply the least toxic, most efficacious, narrowspectrum antimicrobial regimen preferentially. When several agents are deemed equal, the cost and convenience of the administration should also be considered (Chaussade et al. 2017, Bernard et al. 2021).

## Strength and limitations

This case report can contribute to recent studies on surgical site infection by identifying the bacteria causing the infection that occurred to the patient in this study. The findings of this study confirm that *Staphylococcus aureus* is among the bacteria most commonly causing surgical site infections. This study also further confirms that treatments for surgical site infection require a second procedure for debridement, implant removal, and interspacer placement. However, this case study may not be able to generalize and demonstrate a cause-effect correlation of the infection.

#### CONCLUSION

*Staphylococcus aureus* was found to cause surgical site infection investigated in this study. Treatments for surgical site infection as a post-operative complication are important and should be carried out immediately, which may include debridement, antibiotic medications, and revision surgery.

## Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the Department of Orthopedics, Kertosono Regional Hospital, Nganjuk, Indonesia and the Postgraduate Program of Hospital Administration, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

#### **Conflict of interest**

None.

## Funding disclosure

None.

#### Author contribution

STY and EMR participated equally in the design of this study, manuscript preparation and drafting; proposed the main idea; as well as contributed equally to the study design, methodology, supervision, and formal analysis.

## REFERENCES

- Ashraf I, Mohib Y, Hasan O, et al (2018). Surgical site infection surveillance following total knee arthroplasty: Tertiary care hospital experience. Annals of Medical and Surgery 31, 14–16. doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2018.04.006.
- Baier C, Adelmund S, Schwab F, et al (2019). Incidence and risk factors of surgical site infection after total knee arthroplasty: Results of a retrospective cohort study. American Journal of Infection Control 47, 1270–1272. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2019.04.010.
- Bernard L, Arvieux C, Brunschweiler B, et al (2021). Antibiotic therapy for 6 or 12 weeks for prosthetic joint infection. New England Journal of Medicine 384, 1991–2001. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa2020198.
- Chaussade H, Uçkay I, Vuagnat A, et al (2017). Antibiotic therapy duration for prosthetic joint infections treated by Debridement and Implant Retention (DAIR): Similar long-term remission for 6 weeks as compared to 12 weeks. International Journal of Infectious Diseases 63, 37–42. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2017.08.002.

Chung H-K, Wen S-H, Chang W-C, et al (2021).

Acute surgical site infection after total knee arthroplasty in patients with rheumatoid arthritis versus osteoarthritis. Scientific Reports 11, 22704. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-02153-x.

- Cooper HJ, Valle CJ Della (2014). Diagnosis of periprosthetic joint infection: An algorithmic approach to patients. In Periprosthetic Joint Infection of the Hip and Knee, pp. 65–77. Springer New York, New York, NY. 4\_5. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4614-7928-4\_5.
- Gan AK, Rahman S, Indra Nur Alam A, et al (2023). Profile of patients' osteoarthritis at tertiary and teaching in Aceh, Indonesia. Surabaya Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Journal J 5, 25–31. doi: 10.20473/spmrj.v5i1.36881.
- Gehrke T, Alijanipour P, Parvizi J (2015). The management of an infected total knee arthroplasty. The Bone & Joint Journal 97-B, 20–9. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.97B10.36475.
- Goswami K, Parvizi J, Maxwell Courtney P (2018). Current recommendations for the diagnosis of acute and chronic PJI for hip and knee—Cell counts, alpha-defensin, leukocyte esterase, nextgeneration sequencing. Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine 11, 428–438. doi: 10.1007/s12178-018-9513-0.
- Hadi N, Ishardyanto H (2021). The use of oral antibiotics to prevent surgical site infection on postoperative modified radical mastectomy patients in Dr. Soetomo General Hospital, Surabaya. Folia Medica Indonesiana 56, 36. doi: 10.20473/fmi.v56i1.24585.
- Karachalios T, Komnos GA (2021). Management strategies for prosthetic joint infection: Longterm infection control rates, overall survival rates, functional and quality of life outcomes. EFORT Open Reviews 6, 727–734. doi: 10.1302/2058-5241.6.210008.
- Karachalios T, Koutalos A, Komnos G (2014). Management strategies for infected total hip arthroplasty. A critical appreciation of problems and techniques. HIP International 24, 44–7. doi: 10.5301/hipint.5000166.
- Li T, Zhang H, Chan PK, et al (2022). Risk factors associated with surgical site infections following joint replacement surgery: A narrative review. Arthroplasty 4, 11. doi: 10.1186/s42836-022-00113- y.
- Lin F-H, Chen H-C, Lin C, et al (2018). The increase in total knee replacement surgery in Taiwan. Medicine (Baltimore) 97, e11749. doi: 10.1097/MD.000000000011749.
- Mühlhofer H, Renz N, Zahar A, et al (2021). Diagnostik der periprothetischen Infektion. Deer Orthopade 50, 312–25. doi: 10.1007/s00132-020-03940-6.
- Osmon DR, Berbari EF, Berendt AR, et al (2013). Diagnosis and management of prosthetic joint infection: Clinical practice guidelines by the infectious diseases Society of America. Clinical

Infectious Diseases 56, e1–25. doi: 10.1093/cid/cis803.

- Purba AKR, Luz CF, Wulandari RR, et al (2020). The impacts of deep surgical site infections on readmissions, length of stay, and costs: A matched case–control study conducted in an Academic Hospital in the Netherlands. Infection and Drug Resistance 13, 3365–74. doi: 10.2147/IDR.S264068.
- Purba AKR, Setiawan D, Bathoorn E, et al (2018). Prevention of surgical site infections: A systematic review of cost analyses in the use of prophylactic antibiotics. Front in Pharmacology. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2018.00776.
- Resende VAC, Neto AC, Nunes C, et al (2021). Higher age, female gender, osteoarthritis and blood transfusion protect against periprosthetic joint infection in total hip or knee arthroplasties: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy 29, 8–43. doi: 10.1007/s00167-018-5231-9.
- Rosita PE, Kurniawati PM, Utomo DN (2021). Profile of age, gender, and body mass index in patient with knee osteoarthritis in Surabaya. Surabaya Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Journal 3, 23. doi: 10.20473/spmrj.v3i1.22355.
- Saffanah NI, Agustina D, Sutejo IR (2020). Postoperative orthopedic surgical site infection antibiogram of dr. Soebandi Hospital, Jember in 2019. JPSCR Journal of Pharmaceutical Science and Clinical Research 5, 110. doi:10.20961/jpscr.v5i2.41947.
- Shahi A, Parvizi J (2015). Prevention of periprosthetic joint infection. The Archives of Bone and Jointt Surgery 3, 72–81. [Journal]
- Skråmm I, Fossum Moen AE, Årøen A, et al (2014). Surgical site infections in orthopaedic surgery demonstrate clones similar to those in orthopaedic staphylococcus aureus nasal carriers. Journal of

Boneand Joint Surgery 96, 882–8. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.M.00919.

- Springer BD, Scuderi GR (2013). Evaluation and management of the infected total knee arthroplasty. Instructional Course Lectures 62, 349-61. [Journal]
- Tande AJ, Patel R (2014). Prosthetic joint infection. Clinical Microbiology Reviews 27, 302–45. doi: 10.1128/CMR.00111-13.
- Weiser MC, Moucha CS (2015). The current state of screening and decolonization for the prevention of staphylococcus aureus surgical site infection after total hip and knee Arthroplasty. The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery-American 97, 1449–1458. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.N.01114.
- Wenk M, Van Aken H, Zarbock A (2017). The new world health organization recommendations on perioperative administration of oxygen to prevent surgical site infections. Anesthesia & Analgesia 125, 682–687. doi: 10.1213/ ANE. 000000000002256.
- World Health Organization (2019). Implementation manual to prevent and control the spread of carbapenem-resistant organisms at the national and health care facility level: Interim practical manual supporting implementation of the Guidelines for the prevention and control of carbapenem-res. WHO. [Web Page]
- Zahar A, Sarungi M (2021). Diagnosis and management of the infected total knee replacement: Apractical surgical guide. Journal of Experimental Orthopedics 8, 14. doi: 10.1186/s40634-021-00333-2.
- Zmistowski B (2014). Diagnosis of periprosthetic joint infection. Journal of Orthopaedic Research 32, \$98–107. doi: 10.1002/jor.22553.

