


**Tools for Practice** is proudly sponsored by the Alberta College of Family Physicians (ACFP). ACFP is a provincial, professional voluntary organization, representing more than 3500 family physicians, family medicine residents and medical students in Alberta. Established over fifty years ago, the ACFP strives for excellence in family practice through advocacy, continuing medical education and primary care research. [www.acfp.ca](http://www.acfp.ca)

**Reviewed: July 13, 2016**  
**Evidence Updated: No new evidence**  
**Bottom Line: No change**  
**First Published: June 1, 2009**



## **Lacerations: Sterile Gloves & Water?**

**Clinical Question: In the management of simple lacerations, are sterile gloves and sterile saline required to reduce infection?**

**Bottom-line: The present evidence indicates that simple lacerations can be cleaned with tap water and repaired with clean non-sterile gloves without an increased risk of infection.**

### **Evidence:**

#### Gloves:

- Randomized-controlled trial (RCT)<sup>1</sup> of 816 immunocompetent patients (age  $\geq 1$ ) in Canadian emergency departments compared sterile vs. non-sterile gloves (both latex-free) in suture repair of lacerations.
  - Infection rates by day 23: Sterile gloves 6% vs. non-sterile 4.3% (not statistically different).

#### Irrigation:

- One meta-analysis<sup>2</sup> of three RCTs (1328 patients) comparing tap water to saline for irrigation of lacerations.
  - Infection rates: Tap water 4.4% vs. saline 6.7% (not statistically different,  $p=0.16$ ).
    - Though there is a suggestion that saline increases the risk of infection, this is mainly driven by a small study of non-sterile saline and one study of questionable randomization.
    - If we focus on the best study—a high-quality RCT of 713 patients comparing tap water and sterile saline with no difference in infections—it appears that sterile saline offers no advantage over tap water.<sup>3</sup>

### **Context:**

- The study of non-sterile gloves is the only RCT that we have, but it is of high quality and of reasonable size.

- Two older studies (with 50 and 408 patients)<sup>4,5</sup> with questionable randomization surprisingly compared no gloves at all to sterile gloves, and infections did not differ:
  - These two studies have significant limitations, and suturing without any gloves is clearly not appropriate for a host of reasons including blood-borne infectious diseases.
  - However, these do lend support to the idea that sterile gloves likely offer little advantage in the repair of simple lacerations.

**Original Author:**

G. Michael Allan MD CCFP

**Updated:**

Ricky D Turgeon BSc(Pharm) ACPR PharmD

**Reviewed:**

G. Michael Allan MD CCFP

**References:**

1. Perelman VS, Francis GJ, Rutledge T, *et al.* Ann Emerg Med. 2004; 43:362-70.
2. Fernandez R, Griffiths R. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012; (2):CD003861.
3. Moscati RM, Mayrose J, Reardon RF, *et al.* Acad Emerg Med. 2007; 14:404-9.
4. Worrall GJ. Can Fam Physician. 1987; 33:1185-7.
5. Bodiwala GG, George TK. Lancet. 1982; 91-2.

**Tools for Practice** is a biweekly article summarizing medical evidence with a focus on topical issues and practice modifying information. It is coordinated by G. Michael Allan, MD, CCFP and the content is written by practising family physicians who are joined occasionally by a health professional from another medical specialty or health discipline. If you are not a member of the ACFP and would like to receive the TFP emails, please sign up for the distribution list at <http://bit.ly/signupfortfp> to be added to the distribution list. Archived articles are available on the ACFP website.

This communication reflects the opinion of the authors and does not necessarily mirror the perspective and policy of the Alberta College of Family Physicians.