Surgical Smoke and the Orthopedic Implications

R S Parsa, N J Dirig, I N Eck, W K Payne III

Citation

R S Parsa, N J Dirig, I N Eck, W K Payne III. *Surgical Smoke and the Orthopedic Implications*. The Internet Journal of Orthopedic Surgery. 2016 Volume 24 Number 1.

DOI: 10.5580/IJOS.31497

Abstract

Introduction: Orthopedic surgeons encounter potential occupational hazards during every procedure. Recent studies highlight that numerous harmful chemical and biological compounds are present in electrocautery surgical smoke (ESS).

Methods: A systematic review was performed using data from MEDLINE and PubMed. The search resulted in over fifty articles that materially discussed one or more of the following topics: (1) the constituents detected in surgical smoke, (2) the methods used to analyze the smoke, (3) the health consequences of exposure, and (4) prospective risk reduction measures. We summarized the risks.

Results: Exposure to compounds isolated in ESS are associated with an increased risk for carcinogenesis as well as pulmonary and bone marrow damage. Transmission of infectious particles can occur even when standard precautions are taken. Of all the publications reviewed, only one article in the orthopedic literature referenced occupational hazards with a minor section devoted to ESS.

Discussion: Orthopedic surgeons need to be better informed of the hazards that result from ESS. Occupational exposure to ESS has real risks, which have been extrapolated from the literature and are remiss within the orthopedic literature. Further investigation is warranted regarding exposure and long-term sequelae of ESS. Practical solutions are needed to minimize risk to all operating room personnel.

INTRODUCTION

Orthopedic surgeons face numerous occupational hazards during every surgical case. Some of these risks are obvious, like communicable disease transfer through contact or needle sticks and radiation exposure. However, others are more obscure, like neck or low back pain and the focus of this paper, surgical smoke. Electrocautery is regarded by most surgical specialties as an essential intraoperative tool that can efficiently maintain hemostasis and aid in tissue dissection. Many orthopedic surgeries employ prolonged use of electrocautery, including complex spine and reconstructive procedures. As advancements are made in the field of orthopedic surgery, the number of surgical interventions performed, and therefore, the use of electrocautery will also continue to increase.

Numerous chemical and biologic compounds that have been independently demonstrated to be harmful are now being identified in this surgical smoke. Although various smoke filtration systems have been utilized in the operating room, surgeons, who are typically in the closest proximity of the surgical site, are still being directly exposed to hours of aerosolized toxicity with minimal protection. These findings implicate an increased potential for carcinogenesis, pulmonary damage and infection transmission.

METHODS

A systematic review of the literature utilizing MEDLINE and PubMed was performed. The search resulted in over 50 (fifty) articles that materially discussed one or more of the following topics: (1) the constituents detected in surgical smoke, (2) the methods used to analyze the smoke, (3) the health consequences of exposure, and (4) prospective risk reduction measures. Of all the publications reviewed, only one article in the orthopedic literature referenced occupational hazards with a minor section devoted to ESS.1 Additionally, a search of four well respected orthopedic journals (JBJS Am, JBJS Br, JAAOS, and CORR) with the queries of "surgical smoke" and "diathermy" resulted no relevant articles related to surgical smoke safety.

RESULTS

The hazards of ESS are well recognized by most surgical specialties, including general surgery and dermatology. Electrocautery has been shown to produce sub-micron sized particles that can be easily deposited in the pulmonary alveoli of those nearby.2-7 This smoke has been analyzed by many authors and has been shown to contain hundreds of constituents that range from mere mucous membrane irritants to infectious bacterial and viral particles, and even carcinogens.2, 6-38 Tables 1 and 2 summarize the most significant and abundant ESS components and the potential exposure risks they pose.

Table 1

Compounds Detected in Electrocautery Surgical Smoke

Table 1: Compounds Detected in Electrocautery Surgical Smoke	
Name	Hazard
Chemical	
1,2-	
dichloroethane*	Carcinogen
Benzene*	Carcinogen
Ethanol	Carcinogen
Ethylbenzene	Carcinogen
Styrene	Carcinogen
Benzo[a]pyrene	Carcinogen
Acryl-nitrile	Carcinogen (Class 2a)
Acetone	Health Risk
Hexane	Health Risk
Toluene	Health Risk
p-xylene	Health Risk
o-xylene	Health Risk
Hydrogen cyanide	Health Risk
Carbon monoxide	Health Risk
Naphthalene	Health Risk
Aldehydes	Health Risk
Phenol	Health Risk
Chloroform	Health Risk
Biologic	
HIV	Infection Risk
HPV	Infection Risk
HBV	Infection Risk
HCV	Infection Risk
Pseudomonas aeurginosa	Infection Risk
S. aureus	Infection Risk
Corvnebacterium	Infection Risk
Neisseria	Infection Risk
Fungi	Infection Risk
i ungi	meetion hisk
*Unacceptable risk according to EPA guidelines	
Health risk: acute and/or delayed toxicity identified	
Bold denotes chemicals frequently found in cigarette smoke	

Table 2

Health Risks

Carcinogenesis	
Malignant DNA Transformation	
Hematopoietic System Disorders	
Anemia	
Bone Marrow Failure	
Lymphoproliferative Disorders	
Lymphoma	
Leukemia	
Cardiovascular System	
Blood Vessel Hypertrophy	
Myocardial Infarction	
Pulmonary System Disorders	
Interstitial Pneumonia	
Alveolar Congestion	
Bronchiolitis	
Emphysema	
Lung Cancer	
Infection Transmission	
HIV	
HBV/HCV	
HPV (Nasopharyngeal papillomatosis)	
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	
Staphylococcus aureus	
Corynebacterium spp.	
Neisseria spp.	
Hyphae and arthrospores	
(Dermatophytic mycosis)	
Adverse Reactions	
Nausea	
Emesis	
Mucous membrane irritation	

Table 2: Health Risks

Transmission of infectious particles can occur even when standard precautions are taken. Hill et al. showed that five (5) minutes of electrocautery vaporized between 1 and 2 grams of human tissue into the smoke plume.39 Combining their data with that of Tomita et al., they determined that during an average day in a plastic surgery operating room, the mutagenic equivalent of passively smoking 27 to 30 unfiltered cigarettes was produced.36

DISCUSSION

It is universally accepted that excessive exposure to air pollution and cigarette smoke may have lethal consequences. As noted in Table 1, ESS contains many of these same compounds.38, 40-43 This has not gone unnoticed by governmental agencies. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has issued a Hazard Alert, which is their strongest recommendation.

In 1996, healthcare employees were first cautioned of the potential harm of surgical smoke and recommendations were implemented to reduce exposure through adequate ventilation and suction evacuation. Although the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) does not have standards of ESS exposure, they do recommend personal protective equipment (PPE) be used at all times. They also support the use of smoke evacuation systems.

In addition, many laws protect workers from dangerous workplaces. Workman's compensation laws were enacted to protect workers from environments that may cause illness or injury.44 With substantial evidence available in the literature and in response to many healthcare workers' concerns, federal recommendations regarding PPE and surgical devices have begun to improve.

Surgical respirators that meet or exceed current EN-14683 guidelines are available, including N95 respirators. The caveat is that these respirators must be worn snugly and the wearer be appropriately fit tested. In reality, surgical respirators are rarely, if ever, worn by surgeons or OR staff. The vast majority of the time, simple surgical masks are worn that are only designed to protect against splash and droplets. These masks allow for significant air leakage, and therefore, are not effective at filtering even the largest of particles.45-47 It has been shown that even togas and hoods in combination with the appropriate helmet do not effectively filter particles that can easily reach the gas exchanging portion of the lung. In fact, these companies recommend the concurrent use of respirators when respiratory pathogens might be present.48

In response to this growing concern, many electrosurgical companies now offer electrocautery devices with integrated smoke evacuation systems.49-50 Pillinger et al. have shown that appropriate use of suction near the source of production can decrease the amount of smoke reaching the surgeon's lungs by over 11 fold compared with no suction use.51 Although there is no proven solution for reducing the exposure and risk of ESS, the consensus among the majority is to combat this issue with a multi-layered approach consisting of adequate ventilation, excellent evacuation with suction and filtration systems, appropriate use of PPE, and most importantly education and awareness.2, 4, 7, 12, 39, 51

CONCLUSION

Orthopedic surgeons need to be better informed of the hazards that result from ESS. Occupational exposure to ESS has real risks, which have been extrapolated from the published data and are remiss within the orthopedic literature. Exposure to compounds isolated in ESS are associated with an increased risk for carcinogenesis, as well as pulmonary and bone marrow damage. Further investigation is warranted regarding exposure and long-term sequelae of ESS. Practical solutions are needed to minimize risk to all operating room personnel.

References

1) Lester JD, Hsu S, Ahmad CS. Occupational hazards facing orthopedic surgeons. Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ). 2012 Mar;41(3):132-9. Review. PubMed PMID: 22530210. 2) Alp E, Bijl D, Bleichrodt RP, Hansson B, Voss A. Surgical smoke and infection control. J Hosp Infect. 2006 Jan;62(1):1-5. Epub 2005 Jul 5. PubMed PMID: 16002179. 3) Karsai S, Daschlein G. "Smoking guns": Hazards Generated by Laser and Electrocautery Smoke. JDDG; 2012;10:633-636. doi:10.1111/j.1610-0387.2012.07978.x 4) Lewin JM, Brauer JA, Ostad A. Surgical Smoke and the Dermatologist. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2011 May;65(3):636-41. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2010.11.017 5) Nicola JH, Nicola EM, Vieira R, Braile DM, Tanabe MM, Baldin DH. Speed of particles ejected from animal skin by CO2 laser pulses, measured by laser Doppler velocimetry. Phys Med Biol. 2002 Mar 7;47(5):847-56. PubMed PMID: 11931475. 6) Tseng HS et al. Cancer Risk of Incremental Exposure to

b) Iseng HS et al. Cancer Risk of Incremental Exposure to Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Electrocautery Smoke for Mastectomy Personnel. World J Surg Onc. 2014 Feb;12(31). doi:10.1186/1477-7819-12-31.
c) Ulmer BC. The hazards of surgical smoke. AORN J. 2008 App:87(4):721-24; auig 725-28. Payrious, PubMed PMID;

Apr;87(4):721-34; quiz 735-8. Review. PubMed PMID: 18461735.
8) Andreasson SN, Mahteme H, Sahlberg B, Anundi H. Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Electrocautery Smoke

during Peritonectomy Procedures. J Env Public Health. 2012 Mar 23. doi:10.1155/2012/92905

9) Baggish MS, Elbakry M. The effects of laser smoke on the lungs of rats. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1987

May;156(5):1260-5. PubMed PMID: 3107392.

10) Baggish MS, Baltoyannis P, Sze E. Protection of the rat lung from the harmful effects of laser smoke. Lasers Surg Med. 1988;8(3):248-53. PubMed PMID: 3393053 11) Baggish MS, Poiesz BJ, Joret D, Williamson P, Refai A.

Presence of human immunodeficiency virus DNA in laser smoke. Lasers Surg Med. 1991;11(3):197-203. PubMed PMID: 1907345

12) Barrett WL, Garber SM. Surgical smoke: a review of the literature. Is this just a lot of hot air? Surg Endosc. 2003 Jun;17(6):979-87. Epub 2003 Mar 19. Review. PubMed PMID: 12640543.

13) Biggins J, Renfree S. The hazards of surgical smoke. Not to be sniffed at! Br J Perioper Nurs. 2002

Apr;12(4):136-8, 141-3. PubMed PMID: 11993297. 14) Bigony L. Risks associated with exposure to surgical smoke plume: a review of the literature. AORN J. 2007 Dec;86(6):1013-20; quiz 1021-4. Review. PubMed PMID: 18068405.

15) Capizzi PJ, Clay RP, Battey MJ. Microbiologic activity in laser resurfacing plume and debris. Lasers Surg Med. 1998;23(3):172-4. PubMed PMID: 9779652.

16) Fletcher JN, Mew D, DesCôteaux JG. Dissemination of melanoma cells within electrocautery plume. Am J Surg. 1999 Jul;178(1):57-9. PubMed PMID: 10456705.

17) Freitag L, Chapman GA, Sielczak M, Ahmed A, Russin D. Laser smoke effect on the bronchial system. Lasers Surg Med. 1987;7(3):283-8. PubMed PMID: 3626753

18) Gatti JE, Bryant CJ, Noone RB, Murphy JB. The mutagenicity of electrocautery smoke. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1992 May;89(5):781-4; discussion 785-6. PubMed PMID: 1561248.

19) Gianella M, Hahnloser D, Rey JM, Sigrist MW. Quantitative Chemical Analysis of Surgical Smoke Generated During Laproscopis Surgery With a Vessel-Sealing Device. Surg Innov. 2013 Jan;1(10). doi:10.1177/1553350613492025

20) Hallmo P, Naess O. Laryngeal papillomatosis with human papillomavirus DNA contracted by a laser surgeon. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 1991;248(7):425-7. PubMed PMID: 1660719

21) Heinsohn P, Jewett DL. Exposure to blood-containing aerosols in the operating room: a preliminary study. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J. 1993 Aug;54(8):446-53. PubMed PMID: 8213488.

22) Hensman C, Newman EL, Shimi SM, Cuschieri A. Cytotoxicity of electro-surgical smoke produced in an anoxic environment. Am J Surg. 1998 Mar;175(3):240-1. PubMed PMID: 9560129

23) Hensman C, Baty D, Willis RG, Cuschieri A. Chemical composition of smoke produced by high-frequency electrosurgery in a closed gaseous environment. An in vitro study. Surg Endosc. 1998 Aug;12(8):1017-9. PubMed PMID: 9685533.

24) Jewett DL, Heinsohn P, Bennett C, Rosen A, Neuilly C. Blood-containing aerosols generated by surgical techniques: a possible infectious hazard. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J. 1992 Apr;53(4):228-31. PubMed PMID: 1529914.

25) Karoo RO, Whitaker IS, Offer G, Sharpe DT. Surgical smoke without fire: the risks to the plastic surgeon. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2004 Nov;114(6):1658-60. PubMed PMID: 15509975.

26) Kunachak S, Sobhon P. The potential alveolar hazard of carbon dioxide laser-induced smoke. J Med Assoc Thai. 1998 Apr;81(4):278-82. PubMed PMID: 9623022

27) Mellor G, Hutchinson M. Is it time for a more systematic approach to the hazards of surgical smoke?: reconsidering the evidence. Workplace Health Saf. 2013 Jun;61(6):265-70.

doi: 10.3928/21650799-20130516-12. Epub 2013 May 23. PubMed PMID: 23701005.

28) Mihashi S. [The carbon dioxide laser surgery (author's transl)]. Nihon Jibiinkoka Gakkai Kaiho. 1975 Dec 20;78(12):1244-8. Japanese. PubMed PMID: 1240918. 29) Nezhat C, Winer WK, Nezhat F, Nezhat C, Forrest D, Reeves WG. Smoke from laser surgery: is there a health hazard? Lasers Surg Med. 1987;7(4):376-82. PubMed PMID: 3683071.

30) Ott D. Smoke production and smoke reduction in endoscopic surgery: preliminary report. Endosc Surg Allied Technol. 1993 Aug;1(4):230-2. PubMed PMID: 8050026. 31) Ott DE, Moss E, Martinez K. Aerosol exposure from an ultrasonically activated (Harmonic) device. J Am Assoc Gynecol Laparosc. 1998 Feb;5(1):29-32. PubMed PMID: 9454873.

32) Plappert UG, Stocker B, Helbig R, Fliedner TM, Seidel HJ. Laser pyrolysis products-genotoxic, clastogenic and mutagenic effects of the particulate aerosol fractions. Mutat Res. 1999 Apr 26;441(1):29-41. PubMed PMID: 10224320. 33) Sanderson C. Surgical smoke. J Perioper Pract. 2012 Apr;22(4):122-8. Review. PubMed PMID: 22567763. 34) Sawchuk WS, Weber PJ, Lowy DR, Dzubow LM. Infectious papillomavirus in the vapor of warts treated with carbon dioxide laser or electrocoagulation: detection and protection. J Am Acad Dermatol. 1989 Jul;21(1):41-9.

PubMed PMID: 2545749. 35) Taravella MJ, Viega J, Luiszer F, Drexler J, Blackburn P, Hovland P, Repine JE. Respirable particles in the excimer laser plume. J Cataract Refract Surg. 2001 Apr;27(4):604-7. PubMed PMID: 11311631.

36) Tomita Y, Mihashi S, Nagata K, Ueda S, Fujiki M, Hirano M, Hirohata T. Mutagenicity of smoke condensates induced by CO2-laser irradiation and electrocauterization. Mutat Res 1981; 89: 145-149.

37) Wu JS, Luttmann DR, Meininger TA, Soper NJ. Production and systemic absorption of toxic byproducts of tissue combustion during laparoscopic surgery. Surg Endosc. 1997 Nov;11(11):1075-9. PubMed PMID: 9348377. 38) Yan J, Wang L, Fu PP, Yu H. Photomutagenicity of 16 Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbos from the US EPA Priority Pollutant List. Mutat Res. 2004 Jan;557(1): 99-108. doi: 10.1016/j.mrgentox.2003.10.004

39) Hill DS, O'Neill JK, Powell RJ, Oliver DW. Surgical smoke - a health hazard in the operating theatre: a study to quantify exposure and a survey of the use of smoke extractor systems in UK plastic surgery units. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg. 2012 Jul;65(7):911-6. doi: 10.1016/j.bjps.2012.02.012. Epub 2012 Mar 23. PubMed PMID: 22445358.

40) Hoffmann D, Hoffmann I. The changing cigarette, 1950-1995. J Toxicol Environ Health. 1997

Mar;50(4):307-64. Review. PubMed PMID: 9120872. 41) Hoffmann D, Hoffmann I, El-Bayoumy K. The less harmful cigarette: a controversial issue. a tribute to Ernst L. Wynder. Chem Res Toxicol. 2001 Jul;14(7):767-90.

Review. PubMed PMID: 11453723.

42) Miller KA, Siscovick DS, Sheppard L, Shepherd K, Sullivan JH, Anderson GL, Kaufman JD. Long-term exposure to air pollution and incidence of cardiovascular events in women. N Engl J Med. 2007 Feb 1;356(5):447-58. PubMed PMID: 17267905.

43) Talhout R, Schulz T, Florek E, van Benthem J, Wester P, Opperhuizen A. Hazardous compounds in tobacco smoke. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2011 Feb;8(2):613-28. doi: 10.3390/ijerph8020613. Epub 2011 Feb 23. Review. PubMed PMID: 21556207; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3084482

44) Zellers L, Thomas MA, Ashe M. Legal risks to

employers who allow smoking in the workplace. Am J Public Health. 2007 Aug;97(8):1376-82. Epub 2007 Jun 28. Review. PubMed PMID: 17600261; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1931463.

45) Chen CC, Willeke K. Aerosol penetration through

surgical masks. Am J Infect Control. 1992

Aug;20(4):177-84. PubMed PMID: 1524265.

46) Chen SK, Vesley D, Brosseau LM, Vincent JH.

Evaluation of single-use masks and respirators for protection of health care workers against mycobacterial aerosols. Am J Infect Control. 1994 Apr;22(2):65-74. PubMed PMID: 8060007.

47) Weber A, Willeke K, Marchioni R, Myojo T, McKay R, Donnelly J, Liebhaber F. Aerosol penetration and leakage

characteristics of masks used in the health care industry. Am J Infect Control. 1993 Aug;21(4):167-73. PubMed PMID: 8239046.

48) Derrick JL, Gomersall CD. Surgical helmets and SARS infection. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004 Feb;10(2):277-9. PubMed PMID: 15030697; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3322924.
49) Surgical smoke evacuation systems. Health Devices. 1999 Sep;28(9):333-62. PubMed PMID: 10489643.
50) Surgical smoke evacuation systems. Health Devices. 1997 Apr;26(4):132-72. PubMed PMID: 9134439.
51) Pillinger SH, Delbridge L, Lewis DR. Randomized clinical trial of suction versus standard clearance of the diathermy plume. Br J Surg. 2003 Sep;90(9):1068-71. PubMed PMID: 12945072.

Author Information

Ronna S. Parsa, D.O.

Midwestern University, Downers Grove and Franciscan St. James Health, Olympia Fields Illinois, USA

Nicholas J. Dirig, D.O.

Midwestern University, Downers Grove and Franciscan St. James Health, Olympia Fields Illinois, USA

Ivan N. Eck, D.O.

Midwestern University, Downers Grove and Franciscan St. James Health, Olympia Fields Illinois, USA

William K. Payne III, M.D.

Midwestern University, Downers Grove and Franciscan St. James Health, Olympia Fields Illinois, USA