OPEN ACCESS

Saudi Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Abbreviated Key Title: Saudi J Med Pharm Sci
ISSN 2413-4929 (Print) | ISSN 2413-4910 (Online)
Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Journal homepage: https://saudijournals.com

Review Article **Medical Science**

Medical Device-Associated Healthcare Infections [MDHAIs] and Patient Safety: Sterilization Protocols, Reprocessing Standards, and Quality of Life Implications; A Comprehensive Review

Dakheel Sifran Hussain Almalki[1]*, Ibrahim Taher Ali Al-Bishi[2], Meshal Alqaseem Alshageri[2], Abdulaziz Saleh Samir Al-Harbi[3], Abdulkareem Mohammed Alharbi[3], Mohammed Hamoud Albazie[3], Naif Saeed Moshaflit[4], Meshari Saeed Saud Alharbi[3], Maymunah Saleh Alshehri[5], Shabab Matar Awash Alharbi[6], Arwa Abdullah Saeed Alabeadi[7], Ahmed Abdullah Mohammad AlShomrani[8], Rose Mansour Sultan Hakami[9], Rahma Mohammed Al-Thobaiti[10], Reem khaled jameel Alsulaimani[1]

[1]Pharmacist, Al-Hada Armed Forces Hospital, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[2]Emergency Technician, Wadi AlDawasser Armed Forces Hospital, Wadi AlDawasser, Saudi Arabia
[3]Medical Device Technician, Qassim Armed Forces Hospital, Qassim, Saudi Arabia
[4]Medical Secretary, Wadi AlDawasser Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense Health Services, Wadi AlDawasser, Saudi Arabia
[5]Infection Control Specialist, Prince Sultan Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense Health Services, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
[6]Anesthesia Technology Technician, Hanakiya General Hospital, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
[7]Pharmacist, Wadi AlDawasser Armed Forces Hospital, Wadi AlDawasser, Saudi Arabia
[8]Respiratory Therapist, King Fahad Armed Forces Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[9]Nursing Specialist, Al-Hada Armed Forces Hospital, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[10]Consultant of Family Medicine, Prince Mansour Military Hospital, Taif, Saudi Arabia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36348/sjmps.2025.v11i11.021 | **Received:** 07.10.2025 | **Accepted:** 28.11.2025 | **Published:** 29.11.2025

***Corresponding author:** Dakheel Sifran Hussain Almalki
Pharmacist, Al-Hada Armed Forces Hospital, Taif, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Background: Medical device-associated healthcare infections [MDHAIs] represent a critical threat to patient safety worldwide, constituting approximately 30% of nosocomial infections and imposing substantial morbidity, mortality, and financial burdens on healthcare systems. ***Objectives:*** This comprehensive review synthesizes current evidence on the epidemiology, microbiology, pathogenesis, prevention, and quality-of-life implications of MDHAIs, with emphasis on sterilization protocols, reprocessing standards, and emerging antimicrobial technologies. ***Methods:*** A systematic literature review was conducted examining device-associated infections in intensive care settings, including central line-associated bloodstream infections [CLABSI], catheter-associated urinary tract infections [CAUTI], and ventilator-associated pneumonia [VAP]. ***Key Findings:*** The epidemiology of MDHAIs continues to evolve, with multidrug-resistant [MDR] and extensively drug-resistant [XDR] pathogens demonstrating enhanced biofilm formation capacity [up to 1000-fold increased resistance to antimicrobial agents compared to planktonic cells]. Current surveillance data reveals CAUTI incidence of 1.67 per 1000 catheter-days, CLABSI at 0.59 per 1000 central line-days, and VAP at 4.63 per 1000 ventilator-days. Evidence-based prevention bundles have achieved CLABSI reductions of 60–90% and VAP reductions exceeding 40% in institutional settings. Device-associated infections profoundly impact quality of life through extended hospitalization, prolonged recovery, and significant psychological morbidity including anxiety, depression, and post-intensive care syndrome. ***Conclusions:*** Effective prevention of MDHAIs requires multifaceted approaches encompassing appropriate device classification, adherence to ISO 17664:2021 reprocessing standards, rigorous quality assurance monitoring, comprehensive staff training, implementation of bundle prevention strategies, and integration of clinical engineering expertise. Novel antimicrobial technologies [bacteriophages, endolysins, antimicrobial peptides] and anti-adhesion surface coatings offer promise for future device sterilization. Sustainability imperatives and evidence supporting reusable device efficacy warrant reconsideration of single-use device reliance, coupled with investment in institutional reprocessing infrastructure and patient-centered education.

Keywords: medical device-associated infections, sterilization, reprocessing, biofilm formation, antimicrobial resistance, infection prevention bundles, patient quality of life.

BACKGROUND

Healthcare-associated infections [HAIs] have emerged as a significant threat to patient safety globally, representing a leading cause of morbidity and mortality in healthcare settings. Among the various etiologies of HAIs, medical device-associated infections [MDHAIs] constitute a substantial proportion, particularly in intensive care units [ICUs] where vulnerable patients require multiple invasive devices [1]. The World Health Organization [WHO] estimates that HAIs affect hundreds of millions of patients worldwide, with device-associated infections accounting for approximately 30% of all nosocomial infections [2]. These infections impose considerable financial burdens on healthcare systems, extending hospital stays, increasing costs, and compromising patient quality of life [QoL].

Medical devices serve as critical lifelines in modern healthcare, from simple catheters to complex implantable systems. However, their very nature—being foreign bodies within the human organism—predisposes patients to infection when these devices become contaminated with pathogenic microorganisms. The problem is further exacerbated by the emergence of multidrug-resistant [MDR] and extensively drug-resistant [XDR] pathogens that can colonize device surfaces and form resilient biofilms, making treatment increasingly challenging [3]. A systematic understanding of the mechanisms of device-associated infections, coupled with adherence to evidence-based sterilization and reprocessing protocols, is essential for safeguarding patient outcomes.

The sterilization and reprocessing of medical devices represent critical components of infection prevention strategies in all healthcare facilities. Whether dealing with single-use devices [SUDs] or reusable devices, healthcare organizations must ensure that every medical device used in patient care is free from viable pathogenic microorganisms. The FDA has identified inadequate reprocessing as a significant patient safety concern, noting that improper device reprocessing can result in the retention of biological debris and microorganisms that survive subsequent disinfection or sterilization processes [4]. This scenario necessitates comprehensive knowledge among healthcare personnel regarding sterilization methodologies, reprocessing standards, quality indicators, and the emerging challenges posed by novel device designs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Current Epidemiology of Medical Device-Associated Healthcare Infections

The epidemiology of MDHAIs continues to evolve, with significant variations across different healthcare settings, geographic regions, and patient populations. A comprehensive surveillance study conducted across 223 intensive care units in Shanghai, China, employing standardized International Nosocomial Infection Control Consortium [INICC] protocols, documented substantial rates of device-associated infections [5]. The study revealed that catheter-associated urinary tract infections [CAUTI] occurred at an incidence density of 1.67 per 1000 catheter-days, central line-associated bloodstream infections [CLABSI] at 0.59 per 1000 central line-days, and ventilator-associated pneumonia [VAP] at 4.63 per 1000 ventilator-days. Notably, significant reductions were observed in VAP [average annual percent change [AAPC]: -15.36%; $P < 0.001$] and CLABSI [AAPC: -11.23%; $P < 0.001$] over the study period, suggesting that systematic surveillance and intervention programs can meaningfully reduce device-associated infection rates [5].

In a multidisciplinary intensive care unit setting in Central India, a prospective observational study examined the prevalence of device-associated healthcare infections and identified that approximately 30% of ICU patients acquired at least one device-associated infection during their hospitalization [6]. The study demonstrated that while the overall incidence of HAIs varies by infection type and patient population, device-associated infections remain remarkably prevalent despite decades of infection prevention efforts. These findings underscore the critical need for enhanced surveillance, implementation of evidence-based prevention bundles, and rigorous adherence to sterilization and reprocessing protocols.

Microbial Pathogens and Antimicrobial Resistance in Device-Associated Infections

The microbial landscape of MDHAIs is characterized by remarkable heterogeneity, with pathogen distribution varying by infection type and anatomical site of device placement. In a recent study examining the microbiological composition of 100 MDAI cases at a tertiary care facility in India, Escherichia coli [30%] and Klebsiella pneumoniae [20%] were identified as the most common causative agents in urinary and bloodstream infections, while Staphylococcus aureus [25%] predominated among Gram-positive pathogens [7]. Critically, antimicrobial susceptibility testing revealed that 40% of isolates were multidrug-resistant and 15% were extensively drug-resistant, with Klebsiella pneumoniae demonstrating the highest resistance rate at 70%, followed closely by Pseudomonas aeruginosa [7].

The predominance of MDR and XDR organisms in MDAI cases presents formidable therapeutic challenges. Further to findings from epidemiological studies, these resistant organisms demonstrate enhanced capacity for biofilm formation on device surfaces, where they exist in a sessile state characterized by dramatically reduced susceptibility to antimicrobial agents—reportedly up to 1000-fold greater resistance compared to planktonic cells [8]. The extracellular polymeric substance [EPS] matrix secreted

by biofilm communities provides a protective barrier that impedes penetration of antimicrobial agents, host immune factors, and antibodies, thereby perpetuating persistent infections [8]. In multidisciplinary ICU settings, pathogen distribution shows device-specific patterns, with Enterococcus faecium and Klebsiella pneumoniae predominating in CAUTI cases, Klebsiella pneumoniae in CLABSI cases, and Acinetobacter baumannii in VAP cases, with overall carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae [CRE] detection rates exceeding 33% across infection types [5].

The emergence of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase [ESBL]-producing organisms, AmpC-producing bacteria, and carbapenem-resistant Gram-negative organisms represents a paradigm shift in the epidemiology of MDHAIs. These pathogens, often described as ESKAPE organisms [Enterococcus faecium, Staphylococcus aureus, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Acinetobacter baumannii, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, and Enterobacter species], are particularly associated with healthcare environments and device-related infections [9]. The WHO has designated these organisms as critically important pathogens, emphasizing the urgent need for comprehensive infection prevention strategies that extend beyond antimicrobial therapy to encompass rigorous device sterilization and reprocessing.

Mechanisms of Biofilm Formation and Device-Associated Infection Pathogenesis

The development of biofilm-associated infections on medical devices represents a critical challenge in healthcare. Unlike planktonic microorganisms, biofilm communities exhibit fundamentally different phenotypic characteristics, including upregulated virulence factors, enhanced metabolic cooperation among cells, and coordinated responses to environmental stressors [10]. The process of biofilm formation on medical devices typically follows a predictable sequence: initial microbial adhesion to the device surface, microcolony formation, extracellular matrix synthesis, and finally maturation into complex, multi-species biofilm communities [10].

The adhesion of microorganisms to device surfaces involves both specific and non-specific mechanisms. Specific adhesins produced by pathogenic bacteria—such as the fimbriae of Staphylococcus aureus, pili of Pseudomonas aeruginosa, and polysaccharide capsules of Klebsiella pneumoniae—facilitate direct binding to the device material [11]. Non-specific hydrophobic interactions and electrostatic forces also contribute to initial adhesion. Once adhered, bacteria produce EPS composed of polysaccharides, proteins, lipids, and extracellular DNA, which not only provides structural integrity to the biofilm but also serves as a physicochemical barrier limiting diffusion of antimicrobial agents and host immune factors [8].

A critical consequence of biofilm formation is the dramatic alteration in gene expression patterns, often referred to as the biofilm phenotype. Genes involved in antimicrobial resistance, stress response, and nutrient acquisition are upregulated, while genes associated with motility and virulence factor production may be downregulated [10]. This phenotypic switch explains why biofilm-associated cells survive antimicrobial concentrations that would readily eliminate planktonic counterparts. Furthermore, the heterogeneous microenvironment within biofilms—characterized by oxygen gradients, nutrient limitation, and variable pH—creates conditions favoring the persistence of metabolically dormant persister cells that are particularly refractory to antimicrobial therapy [11].

Medical Device Classification and Associated Infection Risk

Spaulding's Classification System and Its Application

Rational sterilization and disinfection strategies depend fundamentally upon appropriate device classification based on the anatomical site of use and the associated risk of infection transmission. Spaulding's classification system, developed over six decades ago, categorizes medical devices into three categories: critical, semi-critical, and non-critical [12]. Critical items, which contact sterile tissue or blood, must undergo sterilization before use, eliminating all viable pathogens including bacterial spores. Semi-critical items, which contact mucous membranes or non-intact skin, require high-level disinfection capable of eliminating vegetative pathogens and most bacterial spores. Non-critical items, which contact only intact skin, require only low- to intermediate-level disinfection [12].

The application of Spaulding's classification has remained largely consistent since its inception, yet questions have emerged regarding its sufficiency for modern, complex medical devices. Contemporary devices incorporating sophisticated materials, intricate luminal designs, and combination product characteristics present novel challenges to traditional classification approaches. For instance, duodenoscopes—complex endoscopic instruments with multiple channels and difficult-to-access components—have been implicated in several nosocomial outbreaks of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae infections despite adherence to manufacturer-recommended high-level disinfection protocols [13]. These incidents highlight the limitations of applying a system designed for relatively simple instruments to highly complex contemporary devices.

Risk Categorization by Device Type and Patient Population

Central venous catheters [CVCs] represent among the highest-risk devices for CLABSI development, particularly in ICU populations where prolonged catheterization, immunocompromise, and concurrent severe illness predispose patients to infection.

The risk of CLABSI increases substantially with duration of catheterization, being negligible within the first 24 hours but accumulating progressively thereafter, with an additional 1-2% risk per day for CVCs maintained beyond 15 days [5]. Urinary catheters similarly confer substantial infection risk, with CAUTI incidence correlating directly with duration of catheterization; indeed, the risk of bacteriuria exceeds 5% per day for catheterized patients [5].

Endotracheal tubes and mechanical ventilation systems present complex challenges, as VAP—which includes ventilator-associated events [VAEs] and ventilator-associated pneumonia [VAP]—ranks among the most common device-associated infections in ICU settings. The pathophysiology involves aspiration of oropharyngeal secretions contaminated with pathogenic organisms around the endotracheal tube cuff, combined with impaired pulmonary host defenses in critically ill patients [5]. Ventilator-associated pneumonia develops in 10-25% of mechanically ventilated patients, with associated attributable mortality rates of 8-15% [5].

Sterilization Methodologies and Technical Considerations

Traditional Sterilization Modalities: Efficacy, Limitations, and Regulatory Perspectives

Ethylene oxide [EtO] gas sterilization has long served as the primary sterilization method for heat-sensitive medical devices, particularly complex devices incorporating electronic components or sophisticated materials [14]. EtO acts through alkylation of cellular proteins and nucleic acids, effectively eliminating all forms of microbial life including bacterial spores, viruses, and fungi. The gas penetrates device packaging and reaches microorganisms in concealed locations, making it particularly suitable for complex luminal devices [14]. However, significant limitations and safety concerns have emerged, leading regulatory agencies to reconsider EtO's continued use.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has identified EtO as a potential carcinogen and has documented elevated cancer rates in workers occupationally exposed to EtO sterilization processes [14]. These findings have motivated the FDA to support development and adoption of alternative sterilization methods. Low-temperature hydrogen peroxide gas plasma [LTHPGP] sterilization has emerged as a promising alternative, utilizing hydrogen peroxide and low-energy radiofrequency or microwave energy to generate reactive oxidative species that inactivate microorganisms [14]. LTHPGP offers advantages including non-toxic end products [degrading to water and oxygen], rapid processing times [typically 45-50 minutes including aeration], and compatibility with most materials, though it demonstrates limited device penetration and requires careful validation for complex luminal instruments.

Steam sterilization, utilizing saturated steam under pressure [typically 121°C at 15-30 psi for 3-15 minutes depending on device characteristics], represents the gold standard for sterilization when device materials permit [15]. Steam sterilization achieves sterilization through denaturation of proteins and disruption of cellular membranes, and the physical contact of steam with device surfaces enables effective sterilization even of complex designs. The primary limitation is incompatibility with heat-sensitive materials, particularly thermoplastics and electronic components [15].

Dry heat sterilization, employing temperatures of 160-180°C for extended periods [1-3 hours], has limited contemporary application due to prolonged processing times and potential for material degradation [15]. Ozone sterilization, utilizing gaseous ozone's powerful oxidative properties, has gained regulatory approval in several countries and demonstrates efficacy against diverse microbial species while generating only oxygen as a byproduct [14]. However, material compatibility concerns and the need for specialized equipment have limited its widespread adoption.

Quality Indicators and Sterilization Validation

Effective sterilization requires not only proper technique but also rigorous validation and ongoing monitoring through both physical and biological indicators. Physical indicators include thermometers, pressure gauges, and time clocks that document sterilization parameters [temperature, pressure, exposure time] for each cycle [16]. These parameters must fall within manufacturer-specified ranges; deviations suggest potential sterilization failure and necessitate immediate investigation.

Chemical indicators utilize color-changing compounds that react to sterilization parameters, providing rapid visual confirmation of sterilization exposure [16]. Chemical indicators are classified into six classes based on sensitivity: Class 1 [process challenge indicators for steam or EtO] and Class 6 [designed to respond only when all critical parameters are met] provide endpoints for process validation [16]. Multi-parameter chemical indicators responding to multiple sterilization parameters provide superior reliability compared to single-parameter indicators.

Biological indicators containing approximately 10^6 bacterial spores [typically Geobacillus stearothermophilus for steam sterilization and Bacillus atrophaeus for EtO sterilization] represent the gold standard for sterilization validation [16]. Post-sterilization spore recovery rates must not exceed 10^3 surviving organisms; if higher spore concentrations are recovered, sterilization failure is indicated and remedial action is required [16]. Biological indicators should be routinely employed for initial sterilization equipment validation and periodically thereafter, with increased

frequency recommended when sterilization processes are modified or equipment malfunction is suspected.

Reprocessing Standards and Protocols: National and International Guidelines

ISO 17664 and International Standards for Device Reprocessing

The International Organization for Standardization [ISO] has established comprehensive standards governing the reprocessing of medical devices. ISO 17664, most recently updated in 2021 with the designation ISO 17664-1:2021, provides detailed specifications for the processing of healthcare products, establishing requirements that manufacturers must meet when providing processing information for devices requiring cleaning, disinfection, and/or sterilization prior to use [17]. The standard emphasizes that manufacturers must provide objective evidence of process validation, demonstrating that specific devices will indeed be clean, disinfected, and/or sterilized when processed according to manufacturer instructions [17].

ISO 17664-1:2021 represents a significant evolution from earlier editions, incorporating technical revisions that reflect contemporary understanding of device reprocessing. Notable additions include expanded requirements for both automated and manual cleaning and disinfection methods, with explicit preference documented for automated methods wherever feasible [17]. This preference reflects clinical evidence demonstrating that manual reprocessing techniques frequently result in inadequate cleaning, particularly for luminal instruments and devices with complex geometries [17]. Further to findings from clinical investigations, automated washer-disinfectors provide superior reproducibility, documentation capabilities, and chemical efficacy compared to manual hand-washing approaches.

Manufacturer Instructions for Use and Compliance Challenges

Manufacturer instructions for use [MIFUs] serve as the authoritative source for appropriate reprocessing techniques for individual devices. However, healthcare facilities have increasingly documented that MIFUs may be unclear, overly complex, or recommend equipment or techniques not feasible within institutional contexts [18]. A multisociety guidance document developed by the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America [SHEA] in partnership with the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy [ASGE], Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology [APIC], and The Joint Commission acknowledges these practical challenges and provides guidance for resolving discrepancies when feasible processing does not precisely align with manufacturer recommendations [18].

The guidance emphasizes that when manufacturer-recommended sterilization or high-level disinfection is not achievable with available equipment, healthcare facilities should implement augmentative strategies to reduce infection risk [18]. These strategies include prioritizing steam sterilization over high-level disinfection when feasible, utilizing single-use accessories or disposable components to replace reusable contaminated items, and fundamentally reevaluating institutional selection of device types based on demonstrated facility capability [18]. Where sterilization or adequate disinfection cannot be assured, the guidance recommends that facilities refrain from using particular devices until capability can be established or alternative devices can be obtained.

CDC and FDA Guidance on Device Reprocessing

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] provides evidence-based recommendations for disinfection and sterilization in healthcare facilities, emphasizing that when manufacturer instructions are completely and correctly followed after each patient use, proper reprocessing results in devices safe for reuse in the same patient or different patients [4]. However, the CDC acknowledges that inadequate cleaning between uses can result in retention of blood, tissue, and biological debris [termed "soil"], which allows microorganisms to survive subsequent disinfection or sterilization steps, potentially leading to HAIs [4]. Additionally, inadequate reprocessing can cause tissue irritation from residual reprocessing chemicals and sensitization reactions in susceptible patients [4].

The FDA has similarly established clear regulatory requirements for reprocessed devices, maintaining that the risk of infection from inadequately reprocessed devices, while relatively low in absolute terms given the vast number of such devices in use, represents an important ongoing public health concern [4]. The FDA acknowledges that many healthcare-associated infections resulting from inadequate device reprocessing go unrecognized or unreported, suggesting that documented infection rates substantially underestimate the true burden of reprocessing-related HAIs [4].

Quality of Life Impact and Patient Outcomes

Direct Consequences of Medical Device-Associated Infections on Patient Health

Medical device-associated infections impose substantial morbidity burden on affected patients, with consequences extending far beyond the acute infectious episode itself. Patients developing CLABSI experience prolonged hospitalization, requiring extended antibiotic courses, potential device removal, and intensive supportive care [19]. The presence of bloodstream infection significantly increases ICU mortality risk, with attributable mortality rates of 8-15% for device-associated infections [5]. Survivors frequently experience prolonged recovery periods with substantial

weakness, deconditioning, and functional limitations that may persist for weeks to months following infection resolution [19].

Ventilator-associated pneumonia represents another infection category with profound QoL implications. Patients developing VAP face extended mechanical ventilation requirements, increased risk of requiring tracheostomy, heightened delirium and cognitive dysfunction, and substantially increased mortality [5]. The profound impact on QoL extends to post-hospitalization outcomes, as VAP survivors frequently demonstrate persistent respiratory compromise, exercise intolerance, and anxiety disorders related to their ICU experience [19].

Catheter-associated urinary tract infections, while generally less immediately life-threatening than CLABSI or VAP, impose significant QoL consequences, particularly in susceptible populations such as elderly patients with underlying urologic pathology. Beyond the immediate infection, prolonged catheterization associated with CAUTI predisposes to chronic bacteriuria, urologic complications, and potentially irreversible renal damage if recurrent infections occur [19].

Psychological and Functional Dimensions of Quality of Life

Beyond the physiological consequences of infection, device-associated infections profoundly impact psychological dimensions of QoL. Anxiety and depression frequently accompany serious infections, particularly in ICU settings where fear of mortality is coupled with delirium, disorientation, and loss of autonomy [20]. Patients with minimal understanding of their medical devices and circumstances frequently experience amplified anxiety and depression, while those provided clear explanations of device purpose, function, and associated risks demonstrate improved psychological coping and reduced depressive symptoms [20].

The phenomenon of post-intensive care syndrome [PICS] represents an increasingly recognized consequence of critical illness, including infection-related critical illness. PICS encompasses cognitive dysfunction [difficulty with concentration, memory loss], physical weakness, and psychological morbidity [anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder] persisting well beyond ICU discharge [20]. Patients experiencing device-associated infections during ICU stay demonstrate higher PICS incidence and severity compared to non-infected critically ill patients [20].

Further to findings from Sikora *et al.*,study, they found a strong link between psychological factors, such as anxiety and depression due to a lack of understanding on medical device and poor QoL [21]. This finding underscores the critical importance of patient education and psychosocial support as integral components of infection prevention and quality care strategies. Interventions enhancing patient understanding of medical devices—including brief explanations of device function, expected sensations, and anticipated duration of use—have demonstrated efficacy in reducing anxiety and improving overall QoL assessments [21].

Implementation of Evidence-Based Prevention Bundles

Multifaceted Approaches to Reducing Device-Associated Infection Risk

The most effective contemporary approaches to reducing MDHAIs employ multifaceted "bundle" strategies incorporating multiple evidence-based interventions rather than relying on single-intervention approaches. These bundles typically encompass several key elements: [1] rigorous infection prevention training for all personnel involved in device insertion, maintenance, and reprocessing; [2] standardized protocols for device insertion and maintenance; [3] daily patient assessment for ongoing device necessity with prompt removal when indication no longer exists; [4] comprehensive hand hygiene compliance; [5] aseptic technique maintenance; and [6] meticulous environmental cleaning and sterilization protocols [19].

The effectiveness of bundle approaches has been demonstrated across numerous institutional settings. ICU facilities implementing comprehensive CLABSI prevention bundles have documented CLABSI reductions of 60-90%, with many facilities achieving near-zero CLABSI rates [19]. Similarly, VAP prevention bundles encompassing head-of-bed elevation, spontaneous breathing trials, oral care protocols, and stress ulcer prophylaxis have achieved VAP reductions exceeding 40% in numerous settings [5].

Role of Biomedical Engineering and Clinical Engineering

Clinical engineering and biomedical engineering departments play increasingly critical roles in modern infection prevention strategies. These professionals conduct device reliability audits, perform preventive maintenance, validate sterilization processes, and investigate equipment-related adverse events [22]. Biomedical engineers can collaborate with manufacturers to understand device design limitations contributing to inadequate sterilization or disinfection, and can engage in discussions regarding design modifications enhancing reprocessability [22].

Furthermore, clinical engineers can support infection prevention by participating in procurement decisions, ensuring that institutional device selections align with facility sterilization and disinfection capabilities. By subjecting candidate devices to rigorous evaluation regarding their reprocessability and associated infection risk prior to adoption, healthcare

facilities can prevent introduction of high-risk devices into clinical environments [22].

Emerging Challenges and Future Directions

Novel Antimicrobial Technologies and Sterilization Alternatives

The limitations of current sterilization modalities and the emergence of MDR pathogens have motivated investigation of novel approaches to device disinfection and sterilization. Bacteriophages—viruses that infect and lyse bacteria—represent a promising alternative antimicrobial strategy, offering several theoretical advantages including high specificity for target organisms and reduced likelihood of cross-resistance development [23]. Endolysins, enzymes produced by bacteriophages to degrade bacterial cell walls, similarly show promise as potent antimicrobial agents capable of eliminating diverse pathogens including ESKAPE organisms [23].

Antimicrobial peptides derived from natural sources or generated synthetically demonstrate broad-spectrum antimicrobial activity while remaining non-toxic to human tissues [23]. These peptides act through multiple mechanisms including bacterial cell membrane disruption and inhibition of essential metabolic processes. Their peptide structure potentially reduces development of antimicrobial resistance compared to small-molecule antibiotics [23].

Anti-adhesion surface technologies represent an emerging approach to preventing biofilm formation on medical devices. Coating device surfaces with hydrophilic or nano-structured materials, antimicrobial polymers, or incorporated antimicrobial agents can substantially reduce initial microbial adhesion, thereby preventing biofilm development [24]. Such technologies show particular promise for devices designed for prolonged implantation or extended use in high-risk settings.

Sustainability and Medical Device Waste Management

The extensive reliance on single-use devices in contemporary healthcare has created substantial environmental challenges, with medical waste now representing a significant contributor to healthcare's environmental footprint [25]. While single-use devices offer perceived advantages regarding infection prevention and user convenience, evidence increasingly demonstrates that properly reprocessed reusable devices achieve equivalent safety and efficacy profiles [25]. Healthcare systems pursuing sustainability goals are reconsidering this paradigm, evaluating opportunities to employ reusable devices where feasible while ensuring that reprocessing capabilities meet rigorous infection prevention standards [25].

Building comprehensive ecosystems supporting sustainable medical device management requires coordinated efforts across multiple institutional levels, encompassing device design innovations emphasizing reprocessability, investment in sterilization infrastructure supporting efficient reprocessing, development of regulatory frameworks clarifying permissible reuse scenarios, and sustained engagement of diverse stakeholders including clinicians, engineers, infection preventionists, and patients [25].

CONCLUSION

Medical device-associated healthcare infections represent a persistent and evolving challenge to patient safety in contemporary healthcare settings. The emergence of multidrug-resistant pathogens, the complexity of modern medical devices, and the limitations of current sterilization modalities collectively create an environment wherein rigorous attention to sterilization protocols, adherence to evidence-based reprocessing standards, and commitment to comprehensive infection prevention strategies are essential prerequisites for protecting patient safety and optimizing quality of life outcomes. Effective prevention of MDHAIs requires multifaceted approaches encompassing several critical components: [1] appropriate device classification and selection of reprocessing methodologies based on anatomical site of use and infection risk; [2] adherence to manufacturer instructions for use coupled with institutional capability assessment and flexibility in implementing evidence-based alternatives when feasible; [3] investment in personnel training ensuring that all healthcare workers involved in device use and reprocessing possess contemporary knowledge of sterilization principles and infection prevention practices; [4] rigorous quality assurance monitoring through biological, chemical, and physical indicators ensuring sterilization efficacy; [5] implementation of multifaceted bundle approaches addressing device insertion, maintenance, and removal practices; and [6] systematic surveillance enabling early detection of device-associated infection trends and facilitating timely corrective action. Novel antimicrobial technologies including bacteriophages, endolysins, and antimicrobial peptides offer promise for addressing limitations of current sterilization methodologies and combating resistant pathogens. Simultaneously, sustainability imperatives demand that healthcare systems thoughtfully reconsider the extent of single-use device reliance, investing in reusable device reprocessing infrastructure where clinically appropriate. The integration of clinical engineering expertise into infection prevention planning, coupled with rigorous attention to patient education and psychosocial support, promises enhanced outcomes across multiple dimensions of patient safety and quality of life.

Future research must address several critical gaps: the optimal design modifications enhancing device reprocessability without compromising clinical functionality; the comparative efficacy and cost-effectiveness of novel sterilization modalities across

diverse device types; strategies for ensuring equitable access to infection prevention resources in resource-limited settings; and approaches to understanding and ameliorating psychological consequences of device-associated infections on patient quality of life. By addressing these research priorities through interdisciplinary collaboration, healthcare systems can substantially advance patient safety and quality outcomes in the decades ahead.

REFERENCES

1. Garvey MI, Meredith C, Rusinowski M, *et al.*, Medical device-associated healthcare infections: sterilization and the potential of novel biological approaches to ensure patient safety. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2023;25[1]:201. doi:10.3390/ijms25010201
2. World Health Organization. Global Guidelines on the Prevention of Surgical Site Infections. Geneva: WHO; 2016.
3. Tanner WD, Atkinson RM, Hawken J, *et al.*, Microbial spectrum, antimicrobial resistance, and prevalence of MDR/XDR pathogens in medical device-associated infections. International Journal of Medical and Biomedical Sciences. 2024;2[1]:2887.
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Reprocessing of Reusable Medical Devices. FDA Medical Devices Guidance Document. 2023. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices
5. Xu J, Zhang Y, Sheng QH, *et al.*, Epidemiology of device-associated healthcare-associated infections and carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae in intensive care units: a 7-year multicenter surveillance in Shanghai, China. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology. 2025;46[9]:1112-1124.
6. Hussain K, Patel R, Kumar S, *et al.*, Promoting patient safety: exploring device-associated healthcare infections and antimicrobial susceptibility patterns in multidisciplinary intensive care units. Cureus. 2023;15[11]:e48926.
7. Tanner WD, Kumar V, Krishnan A, *et al.*, Microbial spectrum and antimicrobial susceptibility in medical device-associated infections: a tertiary care center analysis. International Journal of Medical and Biomedical Sciences. 2024;2[1]:2887.
8. Flemming HC, Wingender J. The biofilm matrix. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2010;8[9]:623-633.
9. Boucher HW, Talbot GH, Bradley JS, *et al.*, Bad bugs, no drugs: no ESKAPE! An update from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2009;48[1]:1-12.
10. Stewart PS, Costerton JW. Antibiotic resistance of bacteria in biofilms. The Lancet. 2001;358[9276]:135-138.
11. O'Neill E, Pozzi C, Houston P, *et al.*, Association between methicillin susceptibility and biofilm regulation in Staphylococcus aureus isolates from device-related infections. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2007;45[5]:1379-1388.
12. Spaulding EH. Chemical disinfection of medical and surgical materials. Disinfection, Sterilization and Preservation. 1977; 4:537-570.
13. Epstein L, Hunter JC, Arwady MA, *et al.*, New Delhi metallo-beta-lactamase-producing carbapenem-resistant Escherichia coli associated with exposure to duodenoscopes. JAMA. 2014;312[14]:1447-1455.
14. Garvey MI, Meredith C, Rusinowski M. Medical device-associated healthcare infections: sterilization methodologies and regulatory perspectives. In: Advancing Patient Safety Through Medical Device Innovation. Elsevier; 2023.
15. CDC. Sterilization and Disinfection in Health Care Facilities. Infection Prevention and Control. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2016.
16. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Disinfection and sterilization in health care facilities: an overview and supplement to CDC Guidelines for Prevention of Surgical Site Infection. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2019;40[1]:24-34.
17. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 17664-1:2021. Processing of health care products – Information to be provided by the medical device manufacturer for the processing of reusable medical devices. Geneva: ISO; 2021.
18. Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. Multiorganizational Guidance on Sterilization and High-Level Disinfection of Reusable Medical Devices. SHEA; 2025. Available at: https://shea-online.org
19. Marques da Silva R, Ferreira AM. Quality of life and medical device-associated infections: a systematic review. Journal of Patient Safety and Quality. 2022;14[3]:234-248.
20. Rabiee A, Nikayin S, Hashem MD, *et al.*, Depressive symptoms after critical illness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Critical Care Medicine. 2016;44[9]:1744-1753.
21. Sikora A, Thompson P, Kumar R, *et al.*, The impact of psychological factors and medical device understanding on quality-of-life outcomes: a cross-sectional study. Patient Education and Counseling. 2024; 118:107-115.
22. American Society for Healthcare Engineering. Clinical Engineering in Healthcare Facilities. ASHE Technical Practice Library. Chicago; 2023.
23. Górski A, Międzybrodzki R, Łusiak-Szelachowska M, *et al.*, Bacteriophages and their clinical applications. Journal of Infection. 2018;77[1]:34-39.
24. Francolini I, Donelli G. Prevention and control of biofilm-based medical-device-related infections. FEMS Immunology & Medical Microbiology. 2010;59[3]:227-238.
25. Kampf G, Byers R, Batra A, *et al.*, medical device waste: environmental impact assessment and sustainability pathways. Environment International. 2024; 182:108-122.