

SH73: During protracted revision arthroplasty surgery, should a second dose of prophylactic antibiotics be given during the course of surgery and if so, when? If applicable, should the administration of a second dose be based on the duration of the surgery, blood loss, magnitude of revision (size of implant) or other factors?

Liaison: Benjamin Zmistowski

Lead Delegates: Kerem Bilsel, Michael Kazzam

Supportive Delegates: Tyler Brolin, Robert Hudek

Supportive Authors: Koray Sahin, Mehmet Kapicioglu

Recommendation: Even though the available literature lacks evidence specific to the shoulder; decision for a second dose of prophylactic antibiotics may be given based on duration of the surgery, especially if the surgery duration exceeds two half-life times of the administered antibiotics. Other factors such as blood loss, patient weight, or magnitude of revision do not seem to have significant impact on this concern.

Strength of recommendation: Limited

Rationale: A comprehensive literature review was performed on January 2025 to identify all the available data regarding association between second dose intraoperative prophylactic antibiotics and shoulder revision arthroplasty surgery. Selected terms included “shoulder arthroplasty”, “revision arthroplasty”, “prophylactic antibiotics”, “antibiotics prophylaxis”, “second dose”, “re-dose” and “readministration” which were searched through PubMed, Scopus and Cochrane databases. Exclusion criteria were articles on non-English languages, non-human studies, case reports, editorial comments and opinion pieces. Following title and abstract assessment, retracted results specifically for “shoulder arthroplasty” were highly scarce; thus, 7 previous studies and other related studies which had been cited in these reports were included into this review.

No previous reports confined to “shoulder arthroplasty” was found; however, most of the studies had general population consisting various surgical interventions (including orthopedic and arthroplasty procedures). Pharmacokinetic properties of the administered antibiotics are strongly recommended to be considered by the NICE guidelines (1); and also by some other previous studies (2,3). Antibiotic selection and dose must consider probable microorganisms, local pathogen susceptibility, and, crucially, the penetration of the target tissue for the desired duration. Nonetheless, the most neglected and inadequately comprehended aspects of antibiotic selection are pharmacokinetic concerns. The justification for administering antibiotic prophylaxis before surgery to prevent potential infection is founded on the principle of establishing a protective antibiotic concentration at the surgical site prior to incision. The preventive antimicrobial agent must be administered at a dosage sufficient to achieve an antibacterial action, namely exceeding the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of the possible pathogen for the length of the procedure (4). Cefazolin, which is the mainstay of surgical infection prophylaxis, exhibits time-dependent pharmacokinetics rather than concentration-dependent pharmacokinetics, with no dose-dependent enhancement of antibacterial efficacy at elevated doses. Cefazolin is a hydrophilic antibiotic that fails to penetrate adipose tissue, irrespective of the intravenous dosage administered. Increased dosages lead to correspondingly elevated blood and non-adipose tissue concentrations, whereas adipose tissue concentrations remain unchanged. Thus; an increased dosage or redosage of antibiotic prophylaxis may not be effective in obese patients (2).

In 2017, the CDC did not find adequate high-quality evidence to assess the benefits of intraoperative redosing of antibiotics for infection prophylaxis; however, from a pharmacokinetic perspective, supplementary intraoperative doses should be administered for procedures lasting longer than two antibiotic half-lives or for those involving substantial blood loss (exceeding 1.5 L). This ensures an antibiotic concentration exceeding the minimal inhibitory concentration at the surgical site for the entire procedure (5). A recently published meta-analysis validated the significance of antibiotic redosing. Despite the variability in the antibiotics used, intraoperative redosing of prophylactic antibiotics lowered infection rates compared to a single preoperative dose across all surgical procedures. In a cefazolin case with a half-life of roughly 2 hours, an extra intraoperative dose should be administered after approximately 4 hours (6). Another study has demonstrated that inadequate re-dosing of preventive antibiotics during prolonged surgeries may elevate the risk of infections (7). A comprehensive multicenter collaborative investigation demonstrated a correlation between the timing of antibiotics and infection risk, confirming that intraoperative re-dosing seems to diminish infection risk in procedures beyond 4 hours, contingent upon the accurate administration of the preoperative dose (8).

The intraoperative re-administration of prophylactic antibiotics may serve as an independent preventive factor against infection in diabetic patients. A targeted perioperative antibiotic administration protocol should be advocated for diabetic patients undergoing extended procedures to reduce the risk of infection (9).

Available data in the literature concerning the influence of blood loss during surgery on serum antibiotics concentration is highly confined. For orthopedic procedures, a previous study examining vancomycin showed modest negative correlation between amount of blood loss and intraoperative serum vancomycin levels, without significance (10). Consequently, blood loss during orthopedic surgeries is likely to have negligible effects on the intraoperative kinetics of vancomycin. Redosing is rarely warranted.

References:

1. 2019 exceptional surveillance of surgical site infections: prevention and treatment (NICE guideline NG125) [Internet]. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE); 2019 [cited 2025 Jan 28]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK552252/>
2. Blum S, Cunha CB, Cunha BA. Lack of Pharmacokinetic Basis of Weight-Based Dosing and Intra-Operative Re-Dosing with Cefazolin Surgical Prophylaxis in Obese Patients: Implications for Antibiotic Stewardship. *Surg Infect (Larchmt)*. 2019 Sep;20(6):439–43.
3. Sartelli M, Coccolini F, Labricciosa FM, Al Omari AH, Bains L, Baraket O, et al. Surgical Antibiotic Prophylaxis: A Proposal for a Global Evidence-Based Bundle. *Antibiotics (Basel)*. 2024 Jan 19;13(1):100.
4. Bratzler DW, Dellinger EP, Olsen KM, Perl TM, Auwaerter PG, Bolon MK, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for antimicrobial prophylaxis in surgery. *Am J Health Syst Pharm*. 2013 Feb 1;70(3):195–283.
5. Berríos-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, Leas B, Stone EC, Kelz RR, et al. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Guideline for the Prevention of Surgical Site Infection, 2017. *JAMA Surg*. 2017 Aug 1;152(8):784–91.
6. Wolfhagen N, Boldingh QJJ, de Lange M, Boormeester MA, de Jonge SW. Intraoperative Redosing of Surgical Antibiotic Prophylaxis in Addition to Preoperative Prophylaxis Versus

Single-dose Prophylaxis for the Prevention of Surgical Site Infection: A Meta-analysis and GRADE Recommendation. *Ann Surg.* 2022 Jun 1;275(6):1050–7.

7. Kasatpibal N, Whitney JD, Dellinger EP, Nair BG, Pike KC. Failure to Redose Antibiotic Prophylaxis in Long Surgery Increases Risk of Surgical Site Infection. *Surg Infect (Larchmt)*. 2017;18(4):474–84.
8. Steinberg JP, Braun BI, Hellinger WC, Kusek L, Bozikis MR, Bush AJ, et al. Timing of antimicrobial prophylaxis and the risk of surgical site infections: results from the Trial to Reduce Antimicrobial Prophylaxis Errors. *Ann Surg.* 2009 Jul;250(1):10–6.
9. Zhang X, Li T, Li Y, He M, Liu YQ, Wang MY, et al. Protective effect of intraoperative re-dose of prophylactic antibiotics on surgical site infection in diabetic patients: a retrospective cohort study. *Ann Transl Med.* 2019 Mar;7(5):96.
10. Klekamp JW, DiPersio D, Haas DW. No influence of large volume blood loss on serum vancomycin concentrations during orthopedic procedures. *Acta Orthop Scand.* 1999 Feb;70(1):47–50.