

## Comparison of Single-Dose vs Multi-Dose Antibiotic Prophylaxis in Clean and Clean-Contaminated Surgeries

Sukhpal Singh Brar

Assistant Professor, Dept of General Surgery, Government Medical College, Sriganganagar

Received: 01-05-2025 Revised: 15-06-2025 / Accepted: 21-07-2025

Corresponding author: Dr. Sukhpal Singh Brar

Conflict of interest: Nil

### Abstract

**Background:** Antibiotic prophylaxis is critical in preventing surgical site infections (SSIs). However, there is ongoing debate regarding the need for multi-dose regimens over single-dose prophylaxis in clean and clean-contaminated surgeries.

**Objective:** To compare the efficacy of single-dose versus multi-dose antibiotic prophylaxis in preventing SSIs in clean and clean-contaminated surgeries.

**Methods:** This prospective study was conducted at a tertiary care center in Sriganganagar from January 2024 to May 2025. Patients undergoing clean or clean-contaminated surgeries were randomized into two groups: Group A received a single-dose antibiotic preoperatively, while Group B received a multi-dose regimen comprising a preoperative dose followed by postoperative doses for 48 hours. Patients were followed for 30 days to assess the incidence of SSIs.

**Results:** Out of 400 patients (200 per group), SSI rates were 4.5% in the single-dose group vs 5.5% in the multi-dose group ( $p = 0.62$ ). No significant difference was observed in SSI rates between the two groups for both clean (2.3% vs 3.1%) and clean-contaminated (6.8% vs 7.9%) procedures ( $p = 0.62$ ). Hospital stay and antibiotic-related adverse events were significantly higher in the multi-dose group ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Conclusion:** Single-dose antibiotic prophylaxis is as effective as multi-dose in preventing SSIs in clean and clean-contaminated surgeries and is associated with fewer adverse events and lower costs.

**Keywords:** Antibiotic Prophylaxis, Surgical Wound Infection, Clean Surgical Procedures, Clean-Contaminated Procedures, Anti-Bacterial Agents, Single-Dose Therapy.

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

### Introduction

Surgical site infections (SSIs) continue to be a significant burden on global healthcare systems, accounting for a substantial proportion of healthcare-associated infections [1]. These infections contribute not only to increased postoperative morbidity and mortality but also to prolonged hospital stays, higher treatment costs, and greater use of healthcare resources. In clean and clean-contaminated surgeries, appropriate antibiotic prophylaxis has been shown to play a pivotal role in minimizing the risk of postoperative infections [1-3].

Despite the widespread consensus on the need for prophylactic antibiotics, there remains considerable debate regarding the optimal timing and duration of administration. While prolonged multi-dose regimens have historically been used with the aim of ensuring continued antimicrobial coverage, emerging evidence suggests that prolonged antibiotic use may not offer added benefit and may contribute to resistance and toxicity [3-4]. Recent

clinical guidelines by global health authorities have emphasized that a single preoperative dose administered at the appropriate time is often sufficient for infection prophylaxis in most clean and clean-contaminated surgical procedures. However, a subset of studies has reported marginally better outcomes with extended regimens, particularly in surgeries involving gastrointestinal organs or patients at higher risk of infection. In the Indian context, where overuse of antibiotics is prevalent [14] and antimicrobial resistance is a growing concern, defining a safe and effective minimum effective duration of prophylaxis becomes even more crucial [5].

This study was therefore designed to investigate whether single-dose antibiotic prophylaxis is as effective as multi-dose regimens in preventing surgical site infections among patients undergoing elective clean and clean-contaminated surgeries at a tertiary care center in Sriganganagar. By generating local evidence, the study also aims to inform

rational antibiotic use policies and support national antimicrobial stewardship efforts.

### Materials and Methods

This was a prospective study conducted at a tertiary care teaching hospital in Sriganganagar, Rajasthan. The study was carried out over a period of 17 months, from January 2024 to May 2025. It aimed to compare the efficacy of single-dose versus multi-dose antibiotic prophylaxis in preventing surgical site infections (SSIs) in patients undergoing clean and clean-contaminated surgical procedures.

Patients aged between 18 and 70 years who were scheduled to undergo elective clean or clean-contaminated surgeries under general or regional anesthesia were considered eligible for inclusion in the study. Patients were excluded if they were immunocompromised (e.g., HIV-positive individuals, those on immunosuppressants), undergoing emergency surgical procedures, or already receiving antibiotics preoperatively for any concurrent infection.

A sample size calculation was performed based on an assumed 5% difference in SSI rates between the two groups, with a confidence level of 95% and a power of 80%. This yielded a minimum requirement of 196 patients per group. To account for potential dropouts and ensure adequate power, the sample size was rounded to 200 participants in each group, resulting in a total of 400 patients. Patients were randomized using a computer-

generated block randomization (block size of 4, not stratified) into two groups. Group A consisted of 200 patients who received a single dose of antibiotic prophylaxis preoperatively. Group B also comprised 200 patients and received a multi-dose regimen consisting of the same preoperative antibiotic followed by postoperative doses for 48 hours. The antibiotics used in both groups were either intravenous ceftriaxone 1 gram or cefuroxime 1.5 gram, administered 30 to 60 minutes before the surgical incision. In Group B, the same antibiotic was continued every 12 hours postoperatively for a total of 48 hours.

All surgeries were performed under sterile operating room conditions by qualified surgeons. The type of surgical procedure, duration, intraoperative complications (if any), and wound classification (clean or clean-contaminated) were recorded. Postoperative wound care was standardized across both groups. Patients were followed up daily during their hospital stay and subsequently reviewed on postoperative days 7, 14, and 30. Any signs or symptoms of SSI were recorded and confirmed based on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) criteria for surgical site infection. Data were entered into a structured pro forma and analyzed statistically using Chi-square tests for categorical variables and t-tests for continuous variables to assess differences in infection rates and other secondary outcomes between the two groups.

### Results

**Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of Study Participants**

| Characteristic            | Group A (Single-Dose) | Group B (Multi-Dose) | p-value |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Number of patients (n)    | 200                   | 200                  | —       |
| Mean Age (years $\pm$ SD) | 42.6 $\pm$ 13.2       | 43.1 $\pm$ 12.8      | 0.68    |
| Age Group (years)         |                       |                      |         |
| 18–30                     | 48 (24%)              | 51 (25.5%)           | 0.75    |
| 31–50                     | 97 (48.5%)            | 93 (46.5%)           |         |
| >50                       | 55 (27.5%)            | 56 (28%)             |         |
| Sex                       |                       |                      | 0.81    |
| Male                      | 108 (54%)             | 110 (55%)            |         |
| Female                    | 92 (46%)              | 90 (45%)             |         |
| Type of Surgery           |                       |                      | 0.80    |
| Clean                     | 90 (45%)              | 92 (46%)             |         |
| Clean-contaminated        | 110 (55%)             | 108 (54%)            |         |
| Comorbidities             |                       |                      | 0.79    |
| Hypertension              | 26 (13%)              | 28 (14%)             |         |
| Diabetes Mellitus         | 22 (11%)              | 20 (10%)             |         |
| None                      | 152 (76%)             | 152 (76%)            |         |
| ASA Physical Status       |                       |                      | 0.67    |
| ASA I                     | 116 (58%)             | 119 (59.5%)          |         |
| ASA II                    | 70 (35%)              | 68 (34%)             |         |
| ASA III                   | 14 (7%)               | 13 (6.5%)            |         |

The baseline characteristics of the patients in both groups were statistically comparable, indicating

successful randomization and group matching. The mean age was similar in both groups ( $42.6 \pm 13.2$

in Group A vs  $43.1 \pm 12.8$  in Group B,  $p = 0.68$ ), with the majority of participants falling in the 31–50 year age range. Gender distribution was also well balanced, with males comprising slightly more than half of each group ( $p = 0.81$ ). The proportions of patients undergoing clean and clean-contaminated surgeries were nearly identical across groups ( $p = 0.80$ ), eliminating procedural bias. The prevalence of comorbidities such as hypertension and diabetes was also evenly distributed, with

around 76% of patients in each group being free from chronic medical conditions. ASA physical status grading, an important predictor of perioperative risk, was likewise comparable between groups ( $p = 0.67$ ), with most patients classified as ASA I or II. These comparable baseline features across groups strengthen the internal validity of the study and support a fair comparison of outcomes between the single-dose and multi-dose antibiotic prophylaxis protocols.

**Table 2: Demographics and Surgery Type Distribution**

| Parameter                | Group A (Single-Dose) | Group B (Multi-Dose) | p-value |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Mean Age (years)         | $42.6 \pm 13.2$       | $43.1 \pm 12.8$      | 0.68    |
| Male : Female Ratio      | 108 : 92              | 110 : 90             | 0.81    |
| Number of Clean Cases    | 90                    | 92                   | 0.78    |
| Clean-Contaminated Cases | 110                   | 108                  | 0.84    |

The demographic characteristics and surgical type distribution were comparable between the two groups, with no statistically significant difference in mean age ( $p = 0.68$ ) or gender distribution ( $p = 0.81$ ). The proportion of clean (45% in Group A vs

46% in Group B) and clean-contaminated surgeries (55% in Group A vs 54% in Group B) was also well balanced ( $p > 0.05$ ). This homogeneity in baseline parameters ensures the internal validity of the outcome comparisons between the groups.

**Table 3: Primary Outcome – Surgical Site Infection (SSI) Rates**

| Type of Surgery    | Group A SSI Rate (%) | Group B SSI Rate (%) | p-value |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Clean              | 2.3% (2/90)          | 3.1% (3/92)          | 0.65    |
| Clean-Contaminated | 6.8% (7/110)         | 7.9% (9/108)         | 0.71    |
| Overall            | 4.5% (9/200)         | 5.5% (11/200)        | 0.62    |

The overall surgical site infection (SSI) rate in the single-dose group (Group A) was 4.5%, compared to 5.5% in the multi-dose group (Group B), a difference that was not statistically significant ( $p = 0.62$ ).

When analysed based on surgery type, the SSI rate in clean surgeries was marginally lower in the single-dose group (2.3%) than the multi-dose group

(3.1%), while for clean-contaminated procedures, the SSI rate was 6.8% in Group A and 7.9% in Group B. Neither comparison reached statistical significance ( $p = 0.65$  and  $0.71$ , respectively).

These findings suggest that a single preoperative antibiotic dose is as effective as a multi-dose regimen in preventing SSIs in both clean and clean-contaminated surgeries.

**Table 4: Secondary Outcomes among the Study Participants**

| Outcome                           | Group A       | Group B         | p-value  |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------|
| Mean Hospital Stay (days)         | $4.2 \pm 1.1$ | $5.3 \pm 1.4$   | $<0.01$  |
| Antibiotic-related Adverse Events | 2% (4 cases)  | 7.5% (15 cases) | $<0.01$  |
| Cost of Antibiotic Therapy (INR)  | $145 \pm 12$  | $430 \pm 27$    | $<0.001$ |

Significant differences were observed in secondary outcomes favouring the single-dose group. The mean hospital stay was shorter in Group A ( $4.2 \pm 1.1$  days) compared to Group B ( $5.3 \pm 1.4$  days), which was statistically significant ( $p < 0.01$ ). This reduction in length of stay may be attributed to decreased need for postoperative monitoring and fewer antibiotic-related side effects.

Adverse drug reactions such as gastrointestinal discomfort and rash were more frequent in the multi-dose group (7.5%) compared to the single-dose group (2%), again reaching statistical significance ( $p < 0.01$ ). This underscores the

importance of minimizing antibiotic exposure to reduce iatrogenic complications.

The cost of antibiotic therapy was substantially lower in Group A (mean INR 145) than in Group B (mean INR 430), which was highly significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). This cost difference becomes more relevant in resource-constrained settings and public health institutions.

## Discussion

The findings of the present study demonstrate that there is no statistically significant difference in surgical site infection (SSI) rates between patients

receiving single-dose antibiotic prophylaxis and those administered a multi-dose regimen, in both clean and clean-contaminated surgical procedures. These results are consistent with a growing body of international and Indian literature suggesting that extended courses of prophylactic antibiotics do not confer additional benefit in reducing SSI rates when compared to a single appropriately timed preoperative dose.

Classen et al. (1992), in one of the landmark studies on surgical antibiotic prophylaxis, concluded that there was no added advantage to extending antibiotic coverage beyond the initial dose, provided it was administered within the optimal window before incision [6]. Similarly, DiPiro et al. (1986) emphasized that a single preoperative dose was sufficient in general surgical cases and that extending antibiotics postoperatively did not reduce infection rates further [7]. Bratzler et al. (2013), in their comprehensive clinical practice guidelines, reiterated that the timing of antibiotic administration is more crucial than its duration, reinforcing the importance of delivering the dose within 60 minutes prior to incision [8].

In the Indian context, clinical evidence supports the effectiveness of single-dose prophylaxis in clean and clean-contaminated surgeries. A study from Kolkata involving 60 patients undergoing elective clean procedures found no significant difference in SSI rates between single-dose and multi-dose groups; however, the single-dose regimen was more cost-effective [9]. Similarly, a prospective investigation, which included 264 general surgery patients, reported an overall SSI rate of just 3.8% with single-dose cefazolin, demonstrating its adequacy in clean and clean-contaminated cases without the need for extended postoperative dosing [10].

Some studies have reported slightly different outcomes. For instance, a multicenter randomized trial published in *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics* (Wiley, 2016) compared single-dose versus multi-dose cefazolin regimens in cesarean sections.

While the difference in post-operative infection rates was not statistically significant, the multi-dose group had a marginally lower incidence of febrile morbidity (2.1% vs 3.5%) [11]. Similarly, a propensity-score matched analysis involving 902 elective minimally invasive colorectal cancer surgeries from Korea found that SSI rates were 2.0% in the single-dose group and 2.1% in the multi-dose group pre-matching—and 0.9% vs 1.9% post-matching—although neither difference reached statistical significance [12].

These findings suggest that extended antibiotic coverage offers minimal additional benefit and

should be reserved for high-risk cases. Conversely, a systematic review and meta-analysis focusing on closed orthopaedic fracture surgeries reported no superiority of multi-dose prophylaxis compared to a single preoperative dose (risk ratio 1.24, 95% CI 0.60–2.60) [13].

Antibiotic stewardship is particularly essential in India, where antimicrobial overuse is a major driver of resistance. The 2019 Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) guidelines specifically recommend single-dose preoperative antibiotic prophylaxis for most clean and clean-contaminated surgeries, reserving extended courses only for those with specific risk factors. These guidelines align with global recommendations from both the WHO and CDC, which endorse single-dose regimens in the majority of procedures unless patient comorbidities, implant use, or high contamination risks are present [14].

### Conclusion

Single-dose antibiotic prophylaxis is as effective as multi-dose in preventing SSIs in clean and clean-contaminated surgeries, with added benefits of reduced cost, adverse events, and antimicrobial resistance risk. It should be adopted as standard practice in eligible patients.

### References

1. Mangram AJ, Horan TC, Pearson ML, Silver LC, Jarvis WR. Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 1999. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 1999 Apr; 20(4):250–78.
2. Allegranzi B, Bischoff P, de Jonge S, Kubilay NZ, Zayed B, Gomes SM, et al. New WHO recommendations on preoperative measures for surgical site infection prevention: an evidence-based global perspective. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2016 Dec; 16(12):e276–87.
3. Al-Momany NH, Al-Bakri AG, Makahleh ZM, Wazaify M. Adherence to international antimicrobial prophylaxis guidelines in cardiac surgery: a Jordanian study demonstrating need for quality improvement. *J Manag Care Pharm.* 2009 Sep; 15(7):590–5.
4. Harbarth S, Samore MH, Lichtenberg D, Carmeli Y. Prolonged antibiotic prophylaxis after cardiovascular surgery and its effect on surgical site infections and antimicrobial resistance. *Circulation.* 2000 Jan 25; 101(3):291–6.
5. McDonald M, Grabsch E, Marshall C, Forbes A. Single- versus multiple-dose antimicrobial prophylaxis for major surgery: a systematic review. *Aust N Z J Surg.* 1998 Jul; 68(7):388–96.
6. Classen DC, Evans RS, Pestotnik SL, Horn SD, Menlove RL, Burke JP. The timing of prophylactic administration of antibiotics and

- the risk of surgical-wound infection. *N Engl J Med*. 1992 Jan 30; 326(5):281–6.
7. DiPiro JT, Cheung RP, Bowden TA Jr, Mansberger JA. Single-dose systemic antibiotic prophylaxis of surgical wound infections. *Am J Surg*. 1986 Sep; 152(3):552–9.
  8. 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.
  9. Das S, Kundu R, Chattopadhyay BP. Comparison of single dose versus multiple doses of antibiotic prophylaxis for prevention of surgical site infection. *International Surgery Journal* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 28; 9(1):129. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.18203/2349-2902.isj20215144>
  10. Pravin Salunkhe, Satish C. Shitole & Darade D. M.: Single Dose Antibiotic Prophylaxis in Control of surgical Site Infection in Clean and Clean-Contaminated Surgeries. *International Journal of current Medical and Applied sciences*; 2017, 15(2), 115-120.
  11. Pinto-Lopes R, Sousa-Pinto B, Azevedo L. Single dose versus multiple dose of antibiotic prophylaxis in caesarean section: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJOG an International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 2016 Nov 24; 124(4):595–605.
  12. Ku GY, Kim BJ, Park JW, Kim MJ, Ryoo SB, Jeong SY, Park KJ. Single-Dose Versus Multiple-Dose Prophylactic Antibiotics in Minimally Invasive Colorectal Surgery: A Propensity Score Matched Analysis. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2024 Oct; 39(47):e305.
  13. Slobogean GP, Kennedy SA, Davidson D, O'Brien PJ. Single- versus multiple-dose antibiotic prophylaxis in the surgical treatment of closed fractures: a meta-analysis. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2008 Apr; 22(4):264-9.
  14. ICMR, Bhargava B, ICMR, Gopalkrishnan R, Ohri VC, Walia K. Treatment guidelines for antimicrobial use in common syndromes [Internet]. Indian Council of Medical Research; 2019. Available from: [https://main.icmr.nic.in/sites/default/files/guidelines/Treatment\\_Guidelines\\_2019\\_Final.pdf](https://main.icmr.nic.in/sites/default/files/guidelines/Treatment_Guidelines_2019_Final.pdf)