© APR 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 10 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I10-1716848

# Surgical Site Infections (SSI): Evidence Based Strategies for Prevention

DR. AJISAFE TAIYE ABDULAFEEZ
*Independent Researcher*

***Abstract —Surgical site infections affect low and middle income countries badly because it's tough to afford and manage the usual prevention methods there. This conceptual paper examines how low cost variations and innovations can be theorized, categorized, and integrated into surgical practice without compromising core principles of infection control. The paper takes Donabedian's model, tweaks it for low resource surgeries, and lays out a framework that connects the dots between the resources available, how surgeries are done, and what happens to patients Key concepts include "frugal innovation," "principle-based substitution," and "contextual fidelity." The analysis identifies three domains of low cost innovation: material substitution, process redesign, and task realignment. The discussion touches on how policy, education, and global surgery could be affected. This work argues that SSI prevention in constrained settings requires shifting from a compliance based to a principles determined paradigm. Future research needs to check out this new idea and see how it works in different surgery areas***

***Keywords— Surgical site infection, SSI, frugal fidelity, evidence based, low cost, high cost***

## I. INTRODUCTION

Surgical site infections, a conceptual framework for frugal innovation in low-cost global surgery, with a focus on infection prevention in LMICs Introduction The worldwide problem with infections after surgery shows it's not just about germs but also unfairness in how surgeries are done (Weiser et al., 2016) The World Health Organization and the CDC offer guidelines backed by solid research, but they're counting on a steady flow of supplies, clean, one-time-use medical stuff, and enough staff to make it work (Berríos-Torres et al., 2017 For most people around the globe, these ideas don't really apply District hospitals in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and parts of Latin America often don't have steady electricity or clean water

The persistence of high SSI rates in these contexts has generated a body of practice-based innovations: dilute antiseptics, reusable drapes, alternative wound closure timing, and locally adapted checklists. Yet these innovations are often dismissed as "substandard" because they deviate from high-income country protocols. We're lacking a way to tell the difference between risky shortcuts and smart adaptations This paper lays out a pretty solid conceptual framework Instead of just looking at the results of experiments, the question is: How can we come up with ideas for preventing SSIs that are cheap, and make sure we're judging them by what they actually do to bacteria, not by the brand they're from The purpose is to provide clinicians, policymakers, and researchers with a model for understanding, designing, and scaling context-appropriate SSI prevention.

### Statement of the Problem

The main approach to stopping SSIs is making sure everyone follows a list of specific products and steps that have been proven effective in well-funded studies This approach in low-income countries sets up a false choice: either go for pricey packages that no one can afford or do nothing about prevention The issue at hand is conceptual: we're missing a clear-cut way to distinguish between the method of cutting down microbes and the actual substance or tool we use to do it Without this distinction, frontline innovators can't defend their adaptations, and policymakers can't back them up The outcome is avoidable sickness and emotional strain for the surgical crew .

### Research Questions

1. How can low- cost SSI prevention innovations be conceptually categorized to reflect underlying infection control principles? .
2. What theoretical model best explains the relationship between structural constraints, adapted processes, and SSI outcomes in resource-limited settings? .
3. What are the conceptual implications of shifting from product-based to principle-based SSI prevention?.

Research Objectives

1. To build a list of budget-friendly strategies for stopping infections
2. To adapt Donabedian's structure-process- The outcome model sheds light on affordable strategies fro stopping SSI
3. To explain the practical effects of a principle based conceptual model, we need to consider how it applies to real-world actions and decisions

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Concepts Frugal Innovation in Health economical innovation refers to solutions that are affordable, robust, and simple, created under resource constraints (Radjou & Prabhu, 2015). In surgery, frugal innovations are not Inferior versions of "real" tools but distinct solutions optimized for different constraints. The concept of "more with less for more" captures the ethical imperative driving these adaptations (Bhatti et al., 2017). Principle determined Infection Control Modern SSI theory identifies core mechanisms:

(a) reduce microbial load at incision site.
(b) prevent intraoperative contamination,
(c) optimize host response.
(d) avoid postoperative inoculation.

Any action that gets these results is theoretically solid, no matter the brand This principle-based view contrasts with product-based guidelines that mandate chlorhexidine 2% rather than "effective skin antisepsis." . Contextual Fidelity Borrowed from implementation science, situation fidelity is basically the extent to which the key parts of an intervention stay the same even when we disrupt its form (Hawe, 2015) when we apply to Surgical site infections, using boiled cotton drapes maintains the function "sterile barrier" even though the form differs from disposable drapes. .Task-Shifting and Process Redesign Global surgery literature demonstrates that outcomes depend more on adherence to principles than on cadre of provider (Federspiel et al., 2018). Task shifting wound, closure or instrument processing is therefore a process innovation, not a quality compromise, if training and supervision preserve the core function. because it's tough to afford and manage the usual prevention methods there This conceptual paper examines how low-cost variations and innovations can be theorized, categorized, and integrated into surgical practice without compromising core principles of infection control. The paper takes Donabedian's model, tweaks it for low-resource surgeries, and lays out a framework that connects the dots between the resources available, how surgeries are done, and what happens to patients Key concepts include "frugal innovation," "principle-based substitution," and "contextual fidelity." The analysis identifies three domains of low-cost innovation: material substitution, process redesign, and task realignment. The discussion touches on how policy, education, and global surgery could be affected This work argues that SSI prevention in constrained settings requires shifting from a compliance-based to a principles-based paradigm. Future research needs to check out this new idea and see how it works in different surgery areas Keywords: Surgical site infections, a conceptual framework for frugal innovation in low-cost global surgery, with a focus on infection prevention in LMICs Introduction The worldwide problem with infections after surgery shows it's not just about germs but also unfairness in how surgeries are done (Weiser et al., 2016) The World Health Organization and the CDC offer guidelines backed by solid research, but they're counting on a steady flow of supplies, clean, one-time-use medical stuff, and enough staff to make it work (Berríos-Torres et al., 2017 For most people around the globe, these ideas don't really apply District hospitals in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and parts of Latin America often don't have steady electricity or clean water

The persistence of high SSI rates in these contexts has generated a body of practice-based innovations: dilute antiseptics, reusable drapes, alternative wound closure timing, and locally adapted checklists. Yet these innovations are often dismissed as "substandard" because they deviate from high-income country protocols. We're lacking a way to tell the difference between risky shortcuts and smart adaptations This paper lays out a pretty solid conceptual framework Instead of just looking at the results of experiments, the question is: How can we come up with ideas for preventing SSIs that are cheap, and make sure we're judging them by what they actually do to bacteria, not by the brand they're from Baine et al.,( 2014 )The purpose is to provide clinicians, policymakers, and researchers with a model for understanding, designing, and scaling context-appropriate SSI prevention. Statement of the Problem The main approach to stopping SSIs is making sure everyone follows a list of specific products and steps that have been proven effective in

well-funded studies This approach in low-income countries sets up a false choice: either go for pricey packages that no one can afford or do nothing about prevention The issue at hand is conceptual: we're missing a clear-cut way to distinguish between the method of cutting down microbes and the actual substance or tool we use to do it Without this distinction, frontline innovators can't defend their adaptations, and policymakers can't back them up The outcome is avoidable sickness and emotional strain for the surgical crew

Research Questions

1. How can low- cost SSI prevention innovations be conceptually categorized to reflect underlying infection control principles? .
2. What theoretical model best explains the relationship between structural constraints, adapted processes, and SSI outcomes in resource-limited settings? .
3. What are the conceptual implications of shifting from product-based to principle-based SSI prevention?.

Research Objectives

1. To build a list of budget-friendly strategies for stopping infections
2. To adapt Donabedian's structure-process- The outcome model sheds light on affordable strategies fro stopping SSI
3. To explain the practical effects of a principle-based conceptual model, we need to consider how it applies to real-world actions and decisions

Literature Review of Concepts Frugal Innovation in Health economical innovation refers to solutions that are affordable, robust, and simple, created under resource constraints (Radjou & Prabhu, 2015). In surgery, frugal innovations are not Inferior versions of "real" tools but distinct solutions optimized for different constraints. The concept of "more with less for more" captures the ethical imperative driving these adaptations (Bhatti et al., 2017). .Principle-Based Infection Control Modern SSI theory identifies core mechanisms:

(a) reduce microbial load at incision site,
(b) prevent intraoperative contamination,
(c) optimize host response, and
(d) avoid postoperative inoculation

Any action that gets these results is theoretically solid, no matter the brand This principle based view contrasts with product-based guidelines that mandate chlorhexidine 2% rather than "effective skin antisepsis." .

Contextual Fidelity Borrowed from implementation science, the situational fidelity is basically the extent to which key parts of an intervention stay the same even when we tweak its form (Hawe, 2015) when applying to SSI, using boiled cotton drapes maintains the function "sterile barrier" even though the form differs from disposable drapes. . Task-Shifting and Process Redesign Global surgery literature demonstrates that outcomes depend more on complying to principles than on cadre of provider (Federspiel et al., 2018). Task shifting wound closure or instrument processing is therefore a process innovation, not a quality compromise, if training and supervision preserve the core function.

Conceptual Framework

This paper suggests the Principle Based Surgical site infection prevention Framework for Constrained Settings gotten from Donabedian (1988).

1. Structure Domain: Defines the constraints and what enables it. Constructs include Material Scarcity, policy the workforce Composition,and concrete inrastructure Reliability. Environment structure does not ascertain outcomes but bounds the range of practicable processes.

2. Process Domain: Contains three change pathways:
a. Material Substitution: Replcing costly items with less costly options which achieves the same process. Example: 0.6% chlorhexidine alcohol for 3% solution. Principle preserved: microbial kill on skin surface.
b. Process Refinement: Turning sequence or timing to shorten resource utilizing. Example: prolonged primary closure for contaminated wounds. Principle preserved: prevent closing over bacterial inoculum.
c.Task Recalibration: Redistribution steps to available cadres. Example: nurse led subcuticular closure. Principle preserved: smallest tissue trauma and dead area.

3. Outcome fields: this is measured as Surgical Site Infection casualty, but also cost per surgical Site infection averted, sustainability and acceptability,. The framework argues that outcomes enhance when processes preserve fidelity of context to infection control principles undermining structural limitations.

Feedback Loopholes: Plausible outcomes spawn evidence that changes procurement and policy, thereby altering structures. This shows how pilot innovations scale to nationalist guidelines.

Approach

As a conceptual paper, this work uses conceptual synthesis and theoretical analysis instead of primary data collection. Concepts were deduced from global surgery, implementation science, and infection prevention literature from 2010–2026. The framework was industrialised with iterative mapping of reported innovating against core surgical site infection mechanisms. transparency is addressed through clearness with laid down theory, explanting power, and aligning with documented practice.

Implications of Study

1. Practice: Surgeons and nurses can utitilize the "principle mechanism form" test: asking questions like: "What mechanism am I preserving?" before replacing a product. This legalizes secure innovation and flags unsafe shortcuts.
2. Policy: Ministries of healthcare should commission principle dependent national SSI guidelines that lists forms, rather than mandate brands. This reduces procurement delays.
3. Education: Tutorials and training systems should emphasize microbiology and wound healing science so graduates can change when supply chains fail. Competence is knowing why chlorhexidine works, not just that it is required.
4. Research: The framework provides variations for future studies: degree of contextual fidelity, type of innovation pathways, and managing effect of structure on the outcome.

## III. FUTURE RESEARCH

Future conceptual work should test the framework's boundaries: should it apply to implant surgery or just clean contaminated cases? Empirical studies should operationalize "contextual fidelity" into a accessible and measurable checklist. Mixed-methods research could be used to explore how providers and patients understand the principle based substitutions in order to address concerns about "secondary care." Finally, financial modeling should compare the cost effectiveness of scaling principle determined guidelines against donating commodities.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Surgical site infection precaution in resource tightened settings is constrained not by microbiology but by conceptual models that combine products with principles. By reframing new structures through the Principle determining surgical site infection prevention framework. Safe adaptations distinguish hazardous shortcuts. Low cost does not mean low quality when the background mechanism of microbial control is protected. Surgical outcomes is the path to equity and requires material investment as much as intellectual : we must give frontline teams the conceptual tools to innovate responsibly. This paper provides one such tool. The next step is to test, disseminate and refine, and it so that "what we have" becomes enough to keep patients safe.

## REFERENCES

[1] Baine, S. O., & Kasangaki, A. (2014). A scoping study on task shifting; the case of Uganda. _BMC Health Services Research_, 14, 184. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-184
[2] Berríos-Torres, S. I., et al. (2017). CDC guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 2017. _JAMA Surgery_, 152(8), 784–791. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2017.0904
[3] Bhatti, Y., et al. (2017). Frugal innovation: Models, means, methods. _Cambridge University Press_. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316986783
[4] Donabedian, A. (1988). The quality of care: How can it be assessed? _JAMA_, 260(12), 1743–1748. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1988.03410120089033
[5] Federspiel, F., et al. (2018). Global epidemiology of surgical site infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. _International Journal of Surgery_, 57, 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2018.06.033
[6] Hawe, P. (2015). Lessons from complex interventions to improve health. _Annual Review of Public Health_, 36, 307–323. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122403
[7] Mangram, A. J., et al. (1999). Guideline for prevention of surgical site infection, 1999. _Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology_, 20(4), 247–278. https://doi.org/10.1086/501620

[8] Radjou, N., & Prabhu, J. (2015). _Frugal innovation: How to do more with less_. The Economist Books.
[9] Weiser, T. G., et al. (2016). Size and distribution of the global volume of surgery in 2012. _Bulletin of the World Health Organization_, 94(3), 201–209F. https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.15.159293
[10] World Health Organization. (2022). _Global guidelines for the prevention of surgical site infection_ (2nd ed.). WHO Press.