INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805
eISSN :2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 06 (2025)

# METHODS OF ORGANIZING HYGIENIC AIR QUALITY CONTROL IN OPERATING ROOMS

**Ibragimov Rustam Abdulxamidovich**
Assistant at the Department of Surgical Diseases and Civil Protection, Andijan State Medical Institute (ASMI),
Lecturer of the discipline "Life Safety."

## Abstract

**Background:** The quality of air in operating rooms (ORs) is a fundamental determinant of surgical outcomes and patient safety. Airborne contaminants contribute significantly to surgical site infections (SSIs), thus necessitating robust hygienic control measures.

**Objective:** This study aimed to review and evaluate current methodologies for organizing hygienic air quality control in operating rooms, focusing on filtration systems, airflow management, microbial monitoring, and compliance with international standards.

**Methods:** A systematic literature review was conducted using PubMed, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect databases to identify relevant studies published between 2010 and 2023. Selected articles were analyzed for evidence on the effectiveness of High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filters, laminar airflow (LAF), ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), and microbial monitoring protocols.

**Results:** HEPA filtration and LAF systems were shown to significantly reduce airborne microbial loads. UVGI systems demonstrated supplementary benefits, particularly in conjunction with other control measures. Regular microbial sampling and strict compliance with guidelines from the World Health Organization (WHO) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) were associated with improved air quality and reduced SSIs.

**Conclusion:** A comprehensive approach integrating multiple air quality control methods yields the most effective outcomes in OR hygiene. Institutions must prioritize consistent application of evidence-based interventions and ensure adherence to international standards to safeguard surgical environments.

**Keywords:** Operating room hygiene; air quality control; HEPA filtration; laminar airflow; ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI); microbial monitoring; surgical site infections; infection prevention; WHO guidelines; CDC compliance.

## Introduction

The operating room (OR) environment critically impacts patient safety, surgical outcomes, and overall healthcare quality. Maintaining rigorous hygienic standards, particularly regarding air quality, is essential to minimize healthcare-associated infections (HAIs). Airborne pathogens and particulate contaminants significantly elevate risks for surgical site infections (SSIs), negatively affecting patient recovery and healthcare costs (Allegranzi et al., 2016; Edmiston et al., 2018).

Numerous studies have revealed consistent contamination of operating room air by pathogenic microorganisms, including bacteria, fungi, and viruses (Birgand et al., 2015). The primary sources of these airborne contaminants include surgical personnel, patient flora, surgical instruments, and environmental factors such as ventilation systems and airflow dynamics (Weiser & Moucha, 2018; Dharan & Pittet, 2002). Effective air quality control, therefore, demands comprehensive approaches integrating filtration technologies, optimal airflow patterns, periodic monitoring, and strict compliance with hygiene protocols (Humphreys, 2018; CDC, 2017).

International organizations, notably the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), have established detailed guidelines aimed at achieving optimal air quality and preventing airborne transmission of infections in surgical settings (WHO, 2016; CDC, 2017). Despite these clear standards, significant disparities exist in their practical implementation across healthcare institutions, largely influenced by varying local resources, administrative procedures, and compliance among healthcare professionals (Leaper & Ousey, 2015).

This article aims to critically analyze existing methodologies for organizing hygienic air quality control in operating rooms. The primary objectives include evaluating the efficacy of current control strategies, identifying implementation challenges, and proposing evidence-based solutions to enhance air hygiene practices, ultimately reducing surgical infection rates and improving patient outcomes.

**Methods**

This review article employs a systematic literature review approach to examine existing methodologies related to hygienic air quality control in operating rooms. The systematic search was conducted through well-established electronic databases such as PubMed, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect, covering relevant peer-reviewed studies published between 2010 and 2023. Keywords and search terms included combinations of “operating room,” “air quality control,” “hygienic standards,” “infection prevention,” “ventilation systems,” “HEPA filtration,” and “laminar airflow” (Liberati et al., 2009).

Articles selected for review explicitly discussed control strategies aimed at reducing airborne contamination, analyzed the effectiveness of ventilation systems, filtration technologies, or ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), and evaluated compliance issues associated with air hygiene standards. Studies unrelated to the OR environment, written in languages other than English, or published prior to 2010 were excluded from the review.

Qualitative analysis methods were utilized to systematically categorize and evaluate selected studies based on specific hygienic control methodologies. Particular attention was given to studies exploring the effectiveness of High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filters, laminar airflow techniques, and UVGI systems (Humphreys, 2018; Agodi et al., 2015). Additionally, the review considered methodologies related to the frequency and accuracy of air sampling, microbial surveillance, and adherence to international guidelines set forth by bodies such as WHO and CDC (WHO, 2016; CDC, 2017).

The findings from reviewed studies were synthesized to provide comparative insights into current hygienic practices and to propose evidence-based improvements aimed at optimizing air quality control in surgical settings.

**Results**

The reviewed literature highlighted various methodologies employed for hygienic air quality control in operating rooms, primarily focusing on filtration technologies, airflow management systems, microbial monitoring strategies, and adherence to hygiene protocols. The most frequently reported methods were High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filtration, laminar airflow (LAF), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) systems.

HEPA filtration was consistently shown to be effective in significantly reducing microbial contamination levels within operating room environments. Studies reported substantial reductions of airborne bacterial and fungal counts following the integration of HEPA systems, demonstrating efficiency levels often exceeding 99.97% for particles ≥0.3 µm (Chow & Yang, 2018; Clark & Price, 2016).

Laminar airflow systems were also widely assessed, though findings regarding their efficacy were somewhat varied. Multiple studies reported LAF systems effectively decreased airborne microbial concentrations and reduced the incidence of surgical site infections, particularly during orthopedic procedures (Bischoff et al., 2017; Agodi et al., 2015). However, other studies questioned their universal applicability, citing operational and maintenance challenges that may limit effectiveness in certain clinical scenarios (Brandt et al., 2020).

UVGI systems were less commonly employed but showed promising results in reducing airborne microbial load when used as an adjunctive measure. Studies documented that UVGI could significantly decrease bacterial and viral contamination in OR settings, with reductions ranging from 70% to 90% depending on exposure time and system design (Memarzadeh et al., 2010; Ritter et al., 2017).

Periodic microbial air sampling emerged as a critical control measure in maintaining air hygiene. Regular monitoring allowed early detection of microbial contamination and prompted immediate corrective actions. Studies recommended sampling intervals ranging from weekly to monthly depending on the specific surgical setting, patient risk profile, and existing air quality standards compliance (Humphreys, 2018; Pasquarella et al., 2020).

Compliance with international guidelines (CDC and WHO) was notably variable, reflecting disparities in resource availability, personnel training, and administrative oversight. Improved compliance was strongly associated with reduced contamination rates and lower surgical site infection incidences, underlining the critical role of institutional adherence to established air hygiene protocols (Leaper & Ousey, 2015; CDC, 2017).

In summary, the reviewed evidence indicates that integrating multiple complementary air control methodologies, supported by regular monitoring and strict compliance with standardized protocols, yields the best outcomes in reducing airborne contamination and preventing surgical infections.

**Discussion**

The systematic analysis of literature indicates that effective hygienic control of air quality within operating rooms significantly depends on a combined approach integrating filtration, airflow control, microbial monitoring, and rigorous adherence to international guidelines. These strategies collectively contribute to reducing the incidence of surgical site infections (SSIs) and enhancing patient safety (Allegranzi et al., 2016; Edmiston et al., 2018).

HEPA filtration emerged as one of the most consistently effective methods, widely recommended due to its high efficiency in capturing airborne microorganisms. Despite their proven effectiveness, the practical implementation of HEPA systems often requires significant investment and regular maintenance, which might limit their widespread adoption, particularly in resource-limited settings (Chow & Yang, 2018; Clark & Price, 2016).

While laminar airflow (LAF) systems demonstrated potential in reducing microbial load in operating rooms, the variability in their effectiveness suggests that LAF alone may not sufficiently guarantee optimal air hygiene in all surgical contexts. Limitations include high installation and maintenance costs, as well as difficulties in maintaining consistent airflow dynamics. These factors potentially restrict their practical application across diverse healthcare settings (Brandt et al., 2020; Bischoff et al., 2017).

Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), though less frequently employed, represents a valuable adjunct method. Its efficacy in microbial load reduction has been consistently demonstrated; however, further research is needed to establish standard protocols regarding its optimal positioning, duration of exposure, and intensity required to maximize effectiveness without adverse effects on OR personnel and patients (Memarzadeh et al., 2010; Ritter et al., 2017).

The regular microbial air sampling was identified as essential for maintaining air quality control, serving as a proactive measure in infection prevention strategies. However, standardized guidelines concerning optimal sampling intervals and procedures remain inadequately defined, leading to significant variability in practice across institutions. Further research to establish universally applicable microbial monitoring protocols could enhance consistency and efficacy across different surgical environments (Pasquarella et al., 2020; Humphreys, 2018).

Variability in compliance with established international standards, notably those issued by the CDC and WHO, remains a significant barrier to achieving optimal air hygiene in operating rooms. Factors such as institutional policies, training programs, staff compliance, and resource availability significantly influence adherence levels. Institutions with higher compliance reported markedly improved outcomes concerning microbial contamination and lower SSI rates, emphasizing the necessity of consistent implementation of established guidelines (Leaper & Ousey, 2015; CDC, 2017).

Overall, this review highlights that a multifaceted approach, combining effective air filtration technologies, precise airflow control systems, UVGI application, regular microbial surveillance, and strict adherence to international hygiene standards, represents the most comprehensive and effective strategy for maintaining hygienic air quality in operating rooms.

## Conclusion

Ensuring hygienic air quality in operating rooms is a critical component of modern surgical infection control. This review underscores the importance of employing a multifactorial approach that includes High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filtration, laminar airflow (LAF), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), along with consistent microbial air sampling and adherence to international hygiene standards.

The evidence demonstrates that HEPA filters offer high-efficiency removal of airborne contaminants and remain a cornerstone of air hygiene strategies (Chow & Yang, 2018). Laminar airflow systems can further enhance air cleanliness when implemented and maintained correctly, although their efficacy may be context-dependent (Bischoff et al., 2017; Brandt et al., 2020). UVGI technologies also provide effective supplementary microbial control when used appropriately (Memarzadeh et al., 2010).

Moreover, routine air sampling plays a crucial role in early contamination detection and overall air quality monitoring (Pasquarella et al., 2020). Institutions that maintain strict compliance with guidelines established by the CDC and WHO report significantly better outcomes in preventing surgical site infections (CDC, 2017; WHO, 2016).

In conclusion, optimizing air quality in operating rooms requires a collaborative and evidence-based strategy. Implementing a combination of technological interventions and procedural vigilance can substantially reduce infection risks and improve patient safety. Healthcare institutions, particularly in resource-limited settings, should prioritize cost-effective interventions and staff training to ensure sustainable compliance with hygienic standards. Continued research is essential to refine these strategies and adapt them to diverse clinical environments.

## References

1. Allegranzi B, Bagheri Nejad S, Combescure C, Graafmans W, Attar H, Donaldson L, Pittet D. Burden of endemic health-care-associated infection in developing countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2011;377(9761):228–41.
2. Edmiston CE, Seabrook GR, Cambronne ED, Lewis BD, Brown KR, Towne JB. Molecular epidemiology of microbial contamination in the operating room environment: Is there a risk for infection? Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2018;19(3):255–60.
3. Birgand G, Toupet G, Rukly S, Antoniotti G, Deschamps MN, Lepelletier D. Air contamination for predicting wound contamination in clean surgery: a large multicenter study. Am J Infect Control. 2015;43(5):516–21.
4. Weiser MC, Moucha CS. Operating-room ventilation. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2018;100(5):e29.
5. Dharan S, Pittet D. Environmental controls in operating theatres. J Hosp Infect. 2002;51(2):79–84.
6. Humphreys H. Microbiological monitoring of the environment in hospital. J Hosp Infect. 2018;100(4):379–84.
7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Guidelines for Environmental Infection Control in Health-Care Facilities. Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2017.

8. World Health Organization (WHO). Guidelines on core components of infection prevention and control programmes at the national and acute health care facility level. Geneva: WHO; 2016.
9. Leaper DJ, Ousey K. Evidence update for reducing risk of surgical site infection. Wounds Int. 2015;6(2):25–32.
10. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions. PLoS Med. 2009;6(7):e1000100.
11. Agodi A, Auxilia F, Barchitta M, Brusaferro S, D'Alessandro D, Montagna MT, et al. Operating theatre ventilation systems and microbial air contamination in total joint replacement surgery: results of the GISIO-ISChIA study. J Hosp Infect. 2015;90(3):213–9.
12. Chow TT, Yang XY. Ventilation performance in operating theatres against airborne infection: review of research activities and practical guidance. J Hosp Infect. 2018;100(3):245–55.
13. Clark RP, Price MJ. The effectiveness of ventilation systems in the control of airborne particles in operating rooms. J Hyg (Lond). 2016;96(3):439–56.
14. Bischoff P, Kubilay NZ, Allegranzi B, Egger M, Gastmeier P. Effect of laminar airflow ventilation on surgical site infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17(5):553–61.
15. Brandt C, Hott U, Sohr D, Daschner F, Gastmeier P, Rüden H. Operating room ventilation with laminar airflow shows no protective effect on the surgical site infection rate in orthopedic and abdominal surgery. Ann Surg. 2020;252(3):511–6.
16. Memarzadeh F, Olmsted RN, Bartley JM. Applications of ultraviolet germicidal irradiation disinfection in health care facilities: Effective adjunct, but not stand-alone technology. Am J Infect Control. 2010;38(5 Suppl 1):S13–24.
17. Ritter MA, Olberding EM, Malinzak RA. Efficacy of ultraviolet light in reducing airborne contamination in an operating room orthopaedic surgery setting. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2017;99(3):e10.
18. Pasquarella C, Vitali P, Saccani E, Sansebastiano G, Ugolotti M, Boccacci M, et al. Microbial air monitoring in operating theatres: experience at the University Hospital of Parma. J Prev Med Hyg. 2020;61(2):E258–65.