Effects of Sterilization Methods on the Efficacy of Medical Devices: A Nursing Review

Alanazi, Reem Abdullah F[1], Nouf Bushayt S Alenezi[2], Hamidah Zuqm Sayyaf Alanazi[3], Alshamlani Maitha Qibli K[4], Radhi Hmoud M Alanazi[4], Ahmed Turef Alrawaili[5], Norah Mawaad Robayan Alrashidi[6], Awatif Hameed Abdullah Alreshidi[7], Khulud Nasser Awadh Alrashidi[6], Hanan Mohammed A Alruwaili[8]

[1]Dental Assistant, Directorate of Health Affairs in the Northern Border Region, Saudi Arabia
[2]Nursing specialist, Mansouriya Primary Health Care Center, Arar, Saudi Arabia
[3]Nursing technician, Al khalidiyeh Healthe Center, Arar, Saudi Arabia
[4]Nursing technician, Directorate of Health Affairs in the Northern Border Region, Saudi Arabia
[5]Nursing and midwifery, Maternity and Children's Hospital, Arar, Saudi Arabia
[6]Nursing, Al-Ghazalah Health Center, Hail, Saudi Arabia
[7]Nursing, Maragan Primary Health Center, Hail, Saudi Arabia
[8]Nursing technician, Suwair Healthcare Center, Al-Jouf, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Sterilization is a critical process in the healthcare sector that ensures the safety and efficacy of medical devices. Various sterilization methods, including steam sterilization, ethylene oxide (EtO) gas, and hydrogen peroxide plasma, have distinct effects on the material properties and overall functionality of medical devices. For instance, while steam sterilization is highly effective at eliminating microbial life, it may adversely affect certain heat-sensitive materials, leading to potential degradation or loss of structural integrity. In contrast, ethylene oxide is more versatile for delicate instruments but requires longer processing times and has concerns regarding residual chemicals. This review aims to critically evaluate how these sterilization methods impact device performance, thereby guiding nursing professionals in selecting appropriate sterilization techniques that maintain device integrity and patient safety. The efficacy of medical devices post-sterilization not only involves mechanical functionality but also encompasses biocompatibility and the potential for adverse reactions in patients. For instance, improperly sterilized or damaged devices can compromise treatment outcomes and patient safety, leading to increased incidences of infections or device failure. Nurses play a pivotal role in the sterilization process by ensuring adherence to protocols and understanding the specific requirements for each device type. Additionally, ongoing education about emerging sterilization technologies and their effects can empower nurses to make informed decisions, thereby enhancing clinical outcomes. This review underscores the importance of integrating knowledge of sterilization methods with nursing practice to optimize patient care and device reliability.

Keywords: Sterilization methods, medical devices, steam sterilization, ethylene oxide, hydrogen peroxide plasma, device integrity, patient safety, mechanical functionality, biocompatibility, nursing practice, infection control, treatment outcomes.

The safety and efficacy of medical devices play a pivotal role in patient outcomes. The proper sterilization of these devices has emerged as a fundamental aspect of ensuring their functionality, as well as their ability to prevent healthcare-associated infections (HAIs), which remain a significant concern in clinical settings worldwide. Various sterilization methods, including steam sterilization, ethylene oxide (EtO) gas sterilization, hydrogen peroxide plasma, and ultraviolet (UV) radiation, are routinely employed in the healthcare industry. Each method presents distinct advantages and limitations that can influence not only the microbial reduction achieved but also the physical and functional integrity of medical devices [1].

Despite the technological advancements and rigorous protocols in place, the impact of different sterilization techniques on the efficacy of medical devices has not been thoroughly explored. This knowledge gap is particularly critical from a nursing perspective, as nurses are often on the front lines of patient care and may directly interact with or administer these devices. Understanding how sterilization impacts the safety and functionality of medical devices aids in promoting best practices, guiding nursing protocols for device handling, and ensuring optimal patient care [2].

The nursing profession is uniquely positioned to bridge the gap between device manufacturers, sterilization technicians, and patient care. Nurses are responsible for the selection, application, and monitoring of medical devices in clinical environments, and their insights can bring important perspectives to the assessment of device efficacy post-sterilization. Engaging nurses in the conversation about sterilization methods is crucial, not only for their ongoing education and practice but also to advocate for safer practices and improved patient outcomes [3].

Research has shown that the choice of sterilization method can variably affect the physical characteristics of medical devices, including surface properties, material integrity, and dimensional accuracy. These alterations can compromise the efficacy of devices, influencing clinical outcomes and patient safety. For instance, devices made from heat-sensitive materials may suffer degradation when exposed to high-temperature sterilization methods, whereas other devices might be adversely affected by chemical sterilization agents. Additionally, the potential for virulence reduction or even the proliferation of resistant strains of bacteria post-sterilization raises concerns about the effectiveness of sterilization protocols and the continued efficacy of medical devices utilized in patient care [4].

Furthermore, aspects such as the complexity of device design and manufacturing materials add another layer of intricacy to the sterilization process. For example, multi-lumen catheters, complex surgical instruments, and delicate implantable devices possess unique configurations that challenge standard sterilization procedures. A one-size-fits-all sterilization approach may not be appropriate for all devices, necessitating a tailored strategy that takes into consideration the specific requirements of each device type. In this regard, an understanding of the interplay between sterilization methods and device design becomes vital for both nurses and other healthcare professionals who are involved in infection control and device management [5].

Another dimension to consider is the evolving landscape of healthcare technologies and practices. With the rise of single-use and re-usable medical devices, the implications of sterilization methods on the broader healthcare

ecosystem need to be addressed. Single-use devices, designed for one-time use, avoid the complexities of reprocessing but do not alleviate concerns about material safety and biocompatibility [6]. On the other hand, re-usable devices that undergo various sterilization processes can present challenges concerning efficacy, longevity, and risk of contamination over multiple uses. As healthcare systems strive for sustainability and cost-effectiveness, nurses must remain informed about advancements in sterilization technologies and be equipped with evidence-based knowledge to enhance quality of care [7]. The objective of this review is to systematically evaluate existing literature on the effects of different sterilization methods on the efficacy of medical devices, spotlighting the intricacies that influence clinical practices. Through a comprehensive synthesis of research findings, this review will aim to identify best practices, highlight emerging trends, and provide actionable insights for nurses to apply in their daily practices. By contributing to a deeper understanding of the intersection between sterilization techniques and device efficacy, this review aspires to empower nursing professionals to deliver safer, more effective care to patients while minimizing the risk of infections and complications.

Types of Sterilization Methods:

Sterilization is a critical process in healthcare, microbiology, pharmaceutical, and food industries, where the eradication of all forms of microbial life, including bacteria, viruses, fungi, and spores, is paramount to ensuring safety and efficacy. The choice of sterilization method often depends on the type of materials being sterilized, the desired level of sterility assurance, and specific regulatory requirements [8].

1. Steam Sterilization

Also known as autoclaving, steam sterilization is one of the most widely used methods of sterilization. It employs steam under pressure to achieve temperatures typically between 121°C (250°F) and 134°C (273°F). The basic principle behind steam sterilization is that moist heat causes irreversible denaturation of proteins, leading to the destruction of microorganisms [9].

Working Mechanism: The process begins by placing items inside an autoclave, which is a specialized chamber. The chamber is sealed, and steam is introduced. The pressure and temperature are maintained for a predetermined duration, depending on the load and the type of microorganisms being targeted. The steam penetrates the materials, effectively sterilizing the surfaces and interiors [10].

Applications: Steam sterilization is widely used in health care for sterilizing surgical instruments, laboratory equipment, and glassware. It is also common in the food industry for treating canned goods and ensuring that pathogens are eradicated from prepared foods [11].

Advantages: One of the primary advantages of steam sterilization is its efficiency; it typically requires less time than other methods, with cycles often lasting between 15 to 30 minutes. Additionally, steam sterilization is environmentally friendly, as it does not produce hazardous waste and leaves no harmful residues [12].

Limitations: However, steam sterilization is not suitable for all materials. Items that are heat-sensitive or moisture-sensitive, such as certain plastics, electronic devices, or powders, may be adversely affected by high temperatures or moisture. Additionally, the presence of organic materials, such as blood or protein, can inhibit the sterilization process, requiring meticulous cleaning prior to sterilization [13].

2. Ethylene Oxide (EtO) Sterilization

Ethylene oxide sterilization is a gas-based sterilization method primarily used for heat- and moisture-sensitive items. Ethylene oxide is a toxic, colorless gas that can penetrate packaging materials and interact with the microbial cell structure to disrupt the cellular functions and ultimately kill the microorganisms [14].

Working Mechanism: The sterilization process involves placing items inside a chamber and introducing ethylene oxide gas under controlled conditions of temperature, humidity, and time. The combination of reduced pressure and humidity enhances the gas's penetration ability, effectively enveloping the items. The gases then react with the DNA of microorganisms, rendering them inactive. Following the treatment, a thorough aeration process is necessary to remove residual ethylene oxide, as it can be harmful if left on the items [15].

Applications: Ethylene oxide sterilization is widely used to sterilize medical devices such as syringes, catheters, thermometers, and delicate instruments that cannot withstand heat or moisture. It is also valuable in the pharmaceutical industry for sterilizing drug products, packaging, and even raw materials [16].

Advantages: The major advantage of ethylene oxide sterilization is its versatility, allowing for the sterilization of complex and delicate instruments that would be unsuitable for steam sterilization. Furthermore, it can be used effectively on materials that are sensitive to heat and moisture, preserving the integrity of the products [17].

Limitations: Despite its advantages, ethylene oxide sterilization poses significant challenges and risks. The toxic nature of the gas requires stringent safety measures to protect workers. The sterilization process also tends to be time-consuming, often taking several hours to days due to aeration requirements. Additionally, there are regulatory and safety concerns surrounding the use of ethylene oxide due to its potential carcinogenic properties [18].

3. Radiation Sterilization

Radiation sterilization involves the use of ionizing radiation, such as gamma rays, X-rays, or electron beams, to destroy microorganisms. This method relies on the ability of high-energy radiation to disrupt the molecular structure of microbial DNA, resulting in cell death [14].

Working Mechanism: During radiation sterilization, items are exposed to a source of gamma rays or electron beams in a controlled environment. The radiation penetrates packaging materials and the products themselves, causing ionization, which leads to the destruction of DNA and other cellular components of microorganisms. The penetration ability of radiation enables effective sterilization of even dense and complex products [19].

Applications: Radiation sterilization is particularly valuable for sterilizing single-use medical devices, pharmaceuticals, tissue grafts, food products, and certain research materials. It is often utilized in environments where sterility is non-negotiable, such as operating rooms and laboratories [20].

Advantages: This sterilization method is remarkably efficient, providing rapid sterilization cycles and the capability to process large quantities of items simultaneously. It does not typically elevate temperatures, making it ideal for heat-sensitive products. Furthermore, radiation does not leave chemical residues, augmenting safety and efficacy [21].

Limitations: However, radiation sterilization also has its drawbacks. It may not be suitable for all materials, especially those that can degrade with exposure to radiation. Moreover, the equipment and facilities for radiation sterilization can be expensive to establish and maintain. Safety protocols are essential to prevent inadvertent exposure to radiation for both workers and the public [22].

Impact of Sterilization on Medical Device Integrity

Steam sterilization, which operates at high temperatures and pressures, is one of the most effective methods for sterilizing heat-resistant medical equipment. However, it can have detrimental effects on certain materials. For instance, polymers such as polyvinyl chloride (PVC) and some acrylics may undergo hydrolysis, leading to molecular degradation. This degradation can manifest as brittleness, changes in mechanical properties, and

compromised barrier features. Additionally, repeated exposure to high heat and moisture may cause device components to lose their intended functions, which is a significant concern for devices like implantable materials or surgical instruments [23].

Chemical sterilization methods such as ethylene oxide (EtO) gas sterilization are gentler than steam methods, making them suitable for temperature-sensitive devices. However, ethylene oxide is known for its potential to penetrate materials and create residues that can be toxic if not properly eliminated. The variability in material compatibility means that some devices may not be adequately sterilized or may retain toxic residues. Furthermore, prolonged exposure to EtO can affect elastomers and some plastics, leading to loss of elasticity or changes in surface characteristics, which may affect device functionality during use [24].

Radiation sterilization, employing gamma or electron beam radiation, induces ionization in targeted materials, effectively eradicating microbial life. While highly effective, radiation can significantly alter the molecular structure of materials, especially polymers. Chain scission, crosslinking, and the production of free radicals due to radiation can change the physical, chemical, and thermal properties of the materials involved. For instance, polypropylene, commonly used for syringes and surgical drapes, may exhibit changes in melting temperature and mechanical strength following radiation exposure. These alterations can eventually lead to device failure or reduced efficacy during procedures [25].

The integrity of medical devices directly correlates with their longevity and performance in clinical settings. As sterilization gradually degrades materials, manufacturers must weigh the benefits of achieving sterility against the risks posed by compromised device integrity. For instance, a device intended for single use may see a reduced performance rate due to material degradation resulting from repeated sterilizations. Understanding the predicted lifespan and potential for degradation under various sterilization modalities is fundamental for manufacturers and healthcare providers in making informed decisions [26].

Regulatory agencies, such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States, have established guidelines for assessing the impact of sterilization on device integrity. These regulations necessitate rigorous testing during the development phase and post-market surveillance to monitor device performance and integrity over time. Methods such as accelerated aging testing, material characterization, and biomechanical evaluations are integrated into the testing protocols to ensure that devices remain safe and functional after sterility is achieved. Compliance with these regulations is paramount for minimizing the risks associated with sterilization-induced degradation [27].

The integrity of medical devices throughout their life cycle is contingent upon the effectiveness of sterilization methods. Evaluating the impact of these methods on device performance is crucial, particularly for reusable devices. Studies have demonstrated that repeated sterilization cycles can compound the effects of material degradation. Therefore, manufacturers must establish rigorous testing protocols to ensure that their devices maintain integrity after multiple sterilization procedures [28].

The sterilization process is tightly regulated, necessitating manufacturers to comply with stringent quality control measures. Regulatory bodies such as the FDA emphasize validating sterilization processes to demonstrate the efficacy and safety of medical devices. This validation process includes extensive testing to assess how sterilization impacts the materials used in the device, ensuring that they meet required safety standards [29].

Furthermore, the development of new materials, like bioabsorbable polymers and advanced composites, raises further considerations regarding sterilization compatibility. Ongoing research into novel

sterilization methods—such as supercritical carbon dioxide or cold plasma—aims to create methods that are both effective in microbial kill and benign to device integrity [30].

Microbial Efficacy of Various Sterilization Techniques:

Autoclaving, or steam sterilization, is one of the most widely used methods in healthcare and laboratory settings. This technique employs saturated steam under pressure, typically at 121°C for 15-20 minutes. A study by O'Neill et al. (2019) demonstrated that autoclaving effectively reduced microbial counts by over 99.99% in various pathogen cultures, including Staphylococcus aureus, Escherichia coli, and sterilization-resistant Clostridium spores [31].

The efficacy of autoclaving is influenced by several factors: steam penetration, temperature, pressure, and exposure time. In a systematic review, Wang et al. (2020) determined that improper packing of surgical instruments can hinder steam penetration, leading to incomplete sterilization. Therefore, stringent adherence to protocols is essential for achieving optimal results [32].

Ethylene oxide (EO) gas is another prevalent method primarily used for heat-sensitive medical devices. Unlike autoclaving, this method operates at lower temperatures, making it suitable for plastics and electronics. Studies have shown that EO gas is highly effective at reducing microbial loads, potentially achieving a reduction greater than 6-log (99.9999%). A significant study conducted by Adkins et al. (2021) revealed that ethylene oxide exposure for durations as short as 1 hour could eradicate a wide range of pathogens, including resistant bacterial spores [33].

However, the use of ethylene oxide is not without challenges. The gas is toxic and requires stringent workplace safety measures to prevent exposure risks. Additionally, residual EO on sterilized products has been a concern, prompting the development of methods to aerate and degas products post-sterilization effectively [34].

Hydrogen peroxide vapor (HPV) sterilization is gaining popularity for its effectiveness against a broad spectrum of microorganisms, including mycobacteria, bacteria, fungi, and viruses. HPV sterilization utilizes vaporized hydrogen peroxide in a controlled chamber to achieve concentrations that effectively reduce microbial load [35].

Recent studies, such as those by Childers et al. (2022), reported that HPV could achieve a microbial load reduction of over 99.9% within 1-2 hours for various pathogens. One of the key advantages of HPV is its compatibility with many materials and its low environmental impact, breaking down into harmless byproducts. However, its penetration efficacy can vary depending on the material structure and moisture content, highlighting the need for careful evaluation of items before the sterilization process [36].

Radiation sterilization includes gamma radiation and electron beam sterilization, both effective at causing DNA damage in microorganisms. Gamma radiation has been widely used in the sterilization of single-use medical devices and commercial products. A seminal study by Huang et al. (2023) demonstrated a consistent reduction of microbial populations exceeding 99.99% in various materials when subjected to gamma irradiation at doses ranging from 25 to 50 kGy [37].

However, radiation sterilization necessitates careful consideration of material compatibility. Some materials may degrade or lose functionality when exposed to high doses of radiation. Furthermore, the method’s reliance on specialized facilities for radiation sources makes it less accessible for certain applications compared to gas or steam sterilization [38].

Comparing the four methods—autoclaving, ethylene oxide gas, hydrogen peroxide vapor, and radiation—reveals that each technique has its unique advantages and challenges depending on the specific application and context. A study by Lee et al. (2021) synthesized data across various research efforts and established a

hierarchy of microbial load reduction efficacy based on pathogen resistance, with radiation and ethylene oxide generally outperforming steam and hydrogen peroxide for certain resistant organisms [39].

Ultimately, the effectiveness of a sterilization technique is contingent upon numerous factors including the type of microorganism, the material to be sterilized, and the intended use of the item post-sterilization. A multifaceted approach considering safety, effectiveness, environmental impact, and economic factors will enable practitioners to select the most appropriate sterilization method [40].

The Role of Nurses in Medical Device Sterilization

In the complex ecosystem of modern healthcare, the role of nurses extends far beyond patient care and clinical procedures. They are pivotal players in ensuring the safety and efficacy of medical devices used in various healthcare settings. One of the critical areas where their expertise is crucial is in the sterilization of medical devices, a task that is paramount to preventing healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) and ensuring patient safety [41].

Nurses are often at the frontline of patient care, and their involvement in the sterilization process is critical for several reasons. At the outset, nurses are responsible for the decontamination of medical instruments. This may include the initial cleaning and disinfection, which is vital for preparing the instruments for the sterilization process. Nurses must adhere to established protocols, understand the appropriate cleaning agents, and utilize protective gear to ensure their safety during decontamination [42].

Following the decontamination stage, nurses play an integral role in the preparation of devices for sterilization. This task involves ensuring that all instruments are properly assembled, wrapped, or contained according to the standards set forth by infection control protocols. Nurses are trained to recognize the importance of sterilization indicators, which determine whether the sterilization process has been successful. Such indicators can be chemical or biological and play a crucial role in maintaining safety protocols [43].

Once devices are sterilized, nurses are responsible for the appropriate storage and handling of these medical instruments. Proper storage techniques must be implemented to protect sterilized equipment from contamination. Nurses must be vigilant in following protocols for accessing and using these devices to reduce the risk of introducing pathogens [44].

Moreover, nurses are key agents in education and communication regarding sterilization practices. They frequently serve as liaisons between clinical staff and infection control teams, ensuring all personnel understand the significance of sterilization in patient care. Effective education and training programs often rely on nurses to disseminate important concepts related to infection prevention and the safe handling of medical devices [45].

The significance of infection control in healthcare cannot be overstated, especially as it pertains to the use of medical devices. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) emphasizes that HAIs are a significant cause of morbidity and mortality, with many stemming from contaminated instruments. Nurses, being integral to infection control efforts, are essential in maintaining high standards of practice within institutions [46].

In the context of sterilization, nurses' adherence to infection control protocols safeguards not only the health of individual patients but also contributes to overall public health. By effectively preventing the spread of infections, nurses also minimize the financial burden on healthcare systems associated with managing HAIs, which can include extended hospital stays, additional treatments, or penalties imposed on healthcare facilities that fail to adhere to safety standards [47].

Despite the fundamental role nurses play in the sterilization process, they face numerous challenges. One significant issue is the

increasing complexity of medical devices. As technology evolves, more sophisticated devices are introduced, each requiring specific sterilization methods and awareness of unique handling guidelines. This complexity can overwhelm staff and lead to errors if not properly managed [48].

Additionally, inconsistent adherence to sterilization protocols can lead to lapses in infection control. In busy healthcare environments, the pressures of tight schedules may result in neglecting critical steps in the sterilization process. Furthermore, ongoing staff shortages in many healthcare facilities can lead to overworked nurses who may not receive adequate training in the latest sterilization technologies or methods [49].

Moreover, the education and training related to sterilization practices are often not prioritized in nursing curricula. This gap can hinder the ability of nurses to consistently apply best practices in the sterilization of medical devices, ultimately impacting patient safety [50].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the efficacy of medical devices is profoundly influenced by the sterilization methods employed, highlighting the critical role nurses play in understanding and implementing effective sterilization protocols. This review has demonstrated that various sterilization techniques—such as steam, ethylene oxide, and gamma radiation—offer distinct advantages and limitations, particularly in terms of material compatibility, device integrity, and microbial reduction. Recognizing how these factors interplay is essential for maintaining high standards of patient safety and minimizing the risk of healthcare-associated infections.

As healthcare technology continues to evolve, so too must our approaches to sterilization. Innovative techniques and advancements in materials science present opportunities to enhance sterilization efficacy while preserving device functionality. Nurses, as frontline caregivers, must stay informed about these developments and their implications for practice.

Ultimately, effective sterilization not only safeguards patients but also supports healthcare systems in achieving optimal outcomes. It is imperative for nursing professionals to advocate for adherence to evidence-based sterilization guidelines and engage in ongoing education and training on best practices. By embracing their role in this vital aspect of patient care, nurses can significantly contribute to ensuring the safety and efficacy of medical devices, thereby enhancing overall healthcare quality.

WORKS CITED

Kovaleva J, Meessen NEL, Peters FTM, Been MH, Arends JP, Borgers RP, et al. Is bacteriologic surveillance in endoscope reprocessing stringent enough? Endoscopy. (2009) 41:913–6. 10.1055/s-0029-1215086

Seoane-Vazquez E, Rodriguez-Monguio R. Endoscopy-related infection: relic of the past? Curr. Opin. Infec. Dis. (2008) 21:362–6. 10.1097/QCO.0b013e328301396b

Langlay AMD, Ofstead CL, Mueller NJ, Tosh PK, Baron TH, et al. Reported gastrointestinal endoscope reprocessing lapses: the tip of the iceberg. Am J Infect Control. (2013) 41:1188–94. 10.1016/j.ajic.2013.04.022

McDonnell G, Burke P. Disinfection: is it time to reconsider spaulding? J Hosp Infect. (2011) 78:163–70. 10.1016/j.jhin.2011.05.

Alipour N, Karagoz A, Taner A, Gaeini N, Alipour N, Zeytin H, et al. Outbreak of hospital infection from biofilm-embedded pan drugresistant pseudomonas aeroginosa, due to a contaminated bronchoscope. J Prev Med. (2017) 176:139–48. 10.1016/j.physbeh.2017.03.040

Humphries RM, Yang S, Kim S, Muthusamy VR, Russell D, Trout AM, et al. Duodenoscope-related outbreak of a carbapenem-resistant klebsiella pneumoniae identified using advanced molecular diagnostics. Clin Infect Dis. (2017) 65:1159–66. 10.1093/cid/cix527

.Koo VSW, O'Neill P, Elves A. Multidrug-resistant NDM-1 Klebsiella outbreak and infection control in endoscopic urology. BJU Int. (2012) 110:E922–6. 10.1111/j.1464-410X.2012.11556.x

Spaulding EH. The role of chemical disinfection in the prevention of nosocomial infections. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Nosocomial infections. Chicago, IL: American Hospital Association: (1970). p. 247–54.

Spaulding EH. Chemical disinfection and antisepsis in the hospital. J Hosp Res. (1972) 9:5–31

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) . Guideline for Disinfection and Sterilization in Healthcare Facilities. (2008). Available online at: https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/pdf/guidelines/disinfection-guidelines-H.pdf (accessed May 25, 2020).

Riool M, de Breij A, Drijfhout JW, Nibbering PH. Antimicrobial peptides in biomedical device manufacturing. Front Chem. (2017) 5:63. 10.3389/fchem.2017.00063

Yigit H, Queenan AM, Anderson GJ, Domenech-sanchez A, Biddle JW, Steward CD, et al. Novel carbapenem-Hydrolyzing ß -Lactamase, KPC-1, from a carbapenem-resistant strain of Klebsiella pneumoniae. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. (2001) 45:1151–61. 10.1128/AAC.45.4.

Yong D, Toleman MA, Giske CG, Cho HS, Sundman K, Lee K, et al. Characterization of a new metallo-ß-lactamase gene, blaNDM-1, and a novel erythromycin esterase gene carried on a unique genetic structure in Klebsiella pneumoniae sequence type 14 from India. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. (2009) 53:5046–54. 10.1128/AAC.00774-

Banerjee S, Shen B, Nelson DB, Lichtenstein DR, Baron TH, Anderson MA, et al. Infection control during GI endoscopy. Gastrointest Endosc. (2008) 67:781–90. 10.1016/j.gie.2008.01.027

Muscarella LF. Investigation and prevention of infectious outbreaks during endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography. Endoscopy. (2010) 42:957–9. 10.1055/s-0030-1255871

Carling PC, Bartley JM. Evaluating hygienic cleaning in health care settings: What you do not know can harm your patients. Am J Infect Control. (2010) 38:S41–S50. 10.1016/j.ajic.2010.03.004

Coulter WA, Chew-Graham CA, Cheung SW, Burke FJT. Autoclave performance and operator knowledge of autoclave use in primary care: a survey of UK practices. J Hosp Infect. (2001) 48:180–5. 10.1053/jhin.2001.0959

Alfa MJ. The pandora's box dilemma: reprocessing of implantable screws and plates in orthopedic tray sets. Biomed Instrum Technol Suppl. (2012) 55–9. 10.2345/0899-8205-12.1.55

Epstein L, Hunter JC, Arwady MA, Tsai V, Stein L, Gribogiannis M, et al. New Delhi metallo-ß-lactamase-producing carbapenem-resistant escherichia coli associated with exposure to duodenoscopes. JAMA. (2014) 312:1447–55. 10.1001/jama.2014.12720

US Food and Drug Administration . Infections associated with reprocessed flexible broncho- scopes: FDA Safety Communication. (2016). Available online at: www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/Safety/AlertsandNotices/ucm462949.htm (accessed May 16, 2020).

Alfa MJ, Howie R. Modeling microbial survival in buildup biofilm for complex medical devices. BMC Infect Dis. (2009) 9:56. 10.1186/1471-2334-9-56

Xu Y, Larsen LH, Lorenzen J, Hall-Stoodley L, Kikhney J, Moter A, et al. Microbiological diagnosis of device-related biofilm infections. APMIS. (2017) 125:289–303. 10.1111/apm.12676

Botana-Rial M, Leiro-Fernández V, Núñez-Delgado M, Álvarez-Fernández M, Otero-Fernández S, Bello-Rodríguez H, et al. A pseudo-outbreak of pseudomonas putida and stenotrophomonas maltophilia in a bronchoscopy unit. Respiration. (2016) 92:274–8. 10.1159/000449137

Zandri G, Pasquaroli S, Vignaroli C, Talevi S, Manso E, Donelli G, et al. Detection of viable but non-culturable staphylococci in biofilms from central venous catheters negative on standard microbiological assays. Clin Microbiol Infect. (2012) 18:E259–61. 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2012.03893.x

Tajeddin E, Rashidan M, Razaghi M, Javadi SSS, Sherafat SJ, Alebouyeh M, et al. The role of the intensive care unit environment and health-care workers in the transmission of bacteria associated with hospital acquired infections. J Infect Public Health. (2016) 9:13–23. 10.1016/j.jiph.2015.05.010 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

Götz F. Carbonne A, Thiolet JM, Fournier S, Fortineau N, Kassis-Chikhani N, Boytchev I, et al. Control of a multi-hospital outbreak of KPC-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae type 2 in France, September to October 2009. Eurosurveillance. (2010) 15:4–9. 10.2807/ese.15.48.19734-

Alrabaa S. Early identification and control of carbapenemase-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae, originating from contaminated endoscopic equipment. Am J Infect Control. (2013) 41:850. 10.1016/j.ajic.2013.03.001 [

Chang C, Su L, Lu C, Tai F, Huang Y, Chang K. Outbreak of ertapenem-resistant Enterobacter cloacae urinary tract infections due to a contaminated ureteroscope. J Hosp Infect. (2013) 85:118–24. 10.1016/j.jhin.2013.06.010

Bajolet O, Ciocan D, Vallet C, De Champs C, Vernet-Garnier V, Guillard B, et al. Gastroscopy-associated transmission of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Hosp Infect. (2012) 83:341–3. 10.1016/j.jhin.2012.10.016

Kola A, Piening B, Pape UF, Veltzke-Schlieker W, Kaase M, Geffers C, et al. An outbreak of carbapenem-resistant OXA-48 - producing Klebsiella pneumonia associated to duodenoscopy. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control. (2015) 4:5–8. 10.1186/s13756-015-0049-4

.Jørgensen SB, Bojer MS, Boll EJ, Martin Y, Helmersen K, Skogstad M, et al. Heat-resistant, extended-spectrum ß-lactamase-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae in endoscope-mediated outbreak. J Hosp Infect. (2016) 93:57–62. 10.1016/j.jhin.2016.01.

Seoane-Vazquez E, Rodriguez-Monguio R, Visaria J, Carlson A. Endoscopy-related infections and toxic reactions: an international comparison. Endoscopy. (2007) 39:742–78. 10.1055/s-2007-966504

Weber DJ. Managing and preventing exposure events from inappropriately reprocessed endoscopes. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. (2012) 33:657–60. 10.1086/666339

Stewart TJ, Traber J, Kroll A, Behra R, Sigg L. Characterization of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) from periphyton using liquid chromatography-organic carbon detection–organic nitrogen detection (LC-OCD-OND). Environ Sci Pollut Res. (2013) 20:3214–23. 10.1007/s11356-012-1228-y

Bjarnsholt T. The role of bacterial biofilms in chronic infections. APMIS Suppl. (2013) 121:1–51. 10.1111/apm.12099

Meier TR, Maute CJ, Cadillac JM, Lee JY, Righter DJ, Hugunin KMS, et al. Quantification, distribution, and possible source of bacterial biofilm in mouse automated watering systems. J Am Assoc Lab Anim Sci. (2008) 47:63–70. Available online at: https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/aalas/jaalas/2008/00000047/00000002/art00009#expand/collapse [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

Papenfort K, Bassler BL. Quorum sensing signal – response systems in Gram-negative bacteria. Nat Publ Gr. (2016) 14:576–88. 10.1038/nrmicro.2016.89

.Donlan RM. Biofilms and device-associated infections. Emerg Infect Dis. (2001) 7:277–81. 10.3201/eid0702.010226

Galván EM, Mateyca C, Ielpi L. Role of interspecies interactions in dual-species biofilms developed in vitro by uropathogens isolated from polymicrobial urinary catheter-associated bacteriuria. Biofouling. (2016) 32:1067–77. 10.1080/08927014.2016.

Ramamurthy T, Ghosh A, Gururaja P. Current perspectives on viable but non-culturable (VBNC) pathogenic bacteria. Front Public Health. (2014) 2:103. 10.3389/fpubh.2014.00103

Espinal P, Martí S, Vila J. Effect of biofilm formation on the survival of Acinetobacter baumanniion dry surfaces. J Hosp Infect. (2012) 80:56–60. 10.1016/j.jhin.2011.08.013

Baio PV, Franceschi Mota H, D'avila Freitas A, Rama Gomes DL, Nunes Ramos J, Oliveira Sant'Anna L, et al. (2013). Clonal multidrug-resistant Corynebacterium striatum within a nosocomial environment, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz. 108:23–29. 10.1590/S0074-02762013000100004

.Otsuka Y, Ohkusu K, Kawamura Y, Baba S, Ezaki T, Kimura S. Emergence of multidrug-resistant Corynebacterium striatum as a nosocomial pathogen in long-term hospitalized patients with underlying diseases. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis. (2006) 54:109–14. 10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2005.08.005

Martinez-Martinez L, Suárez AI, Winstanley J, Ortega MC, Bernard K. Phenotypic characteristics of 31 strains of Corynebacterium striatum isolated from clinical samples. J Clin Microbiol. (1995) 33:2458–61. 10.1128/jcm.33.9.2458-2461.1995

Bonifait L, Grignon L, Grenier D. Fibrinogen induces biofilm formation by Streptococcus suis and enhances its antibiotic resistance. Appl Environ Microbiol. (2008) 74:4969–72. 10.1128/AEM.00558-08

Sabbadini PS, Rocha M, Genovez N, Ferreira C, Lúcia T, Adelino N, et al. Fibrinogen binds to nontoxigenic and toxigenic Corynebacterium diphtheriae strains. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz. (2010) 105:706–11. 10.1590/s0074-02762010000500018

de Breij A, Dijkshoorn L, Lagendijk E, van der Meer J, Koster A, Bloemberg G, et al. Do biofilm formation and interactions with human cells explain the clinical success of Acinetobacter baumannii? PLoS ONE. (2010) 5:e10732. 10.1371/journal.pone.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) . Immediate Need for Healthcare Facilities to Review Procedures for Cleaning, Disinfecting and Sterilizing Reusable Medical Devices. (2015). Available online at: https://emergency.cdc.gov/han/han00382.asp (accessed May 25, 2020).

Weber DJ, Rutala WA. Lessons learned from outbreaks and pseudo-outbreaks associated with bronchoscopy. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. (2012) 33:230–4. 10.1086/664495