Laying-up of sterile instruments in the operating theatre: equal or superior protection by using a horizontal unidirectional air flow system
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SUMMARY

Background: A system for the preparation of sterilized instruments with unidirectional horizontal air flow (UDHF) has several advantages over a unidirectional down flow system (UDDF). The advantages are based on the installation of the system being more flexible and easier to use, no cooling of the air flow being necessary and less air being needed for circulation, resulting in reduced energy use.

Objectives: The objective of this study was to determine whether a system with UDHF performs equal or superior to a system with UDDF in terms of prevention of contamination of the air (the presence of particles and micro-organisms) during the laying-up process.

Methods: The degree of protection (DP) offered by two UDHF system variants and two UDDF system variants was determined for several static set-ups and a dynamic simulation of the process. In addition to determining the level of protection for several categories of particle size, colony-forming units (CFU) were also measured during process simulations.

Findings: When maximum protection (no particles present) is considered, the UDHF systems performed significantly better than the UDDF systems for particles ≥0.3 and ≥0.5 μm. However, the performance of the UDHF system was superior to that of the UDDF system (DP) for particles ≥1.0 μm representing the bacteria-carrying particles. During the process measurements, no CFU were found with the UDDF system in 64% of the measurements, compared with 90% for the UDHF system (P = 0.012).

Conclusions: The UDHF system offers equal or superior protection to the UDDF system against contamination of the clean area within which the laying up takes place. Despite our finding that the differences did not always reach statistical significance (due to low background concentrations), there is a clear trend, from the small-sized particles
Introduction

Laying-up of sterile instruments in the operating theatre is an important quality process and should keep instruments sterile to be used for the procedure. There is an unresolved and ongoing debate as to which air treatment systems create the best conditions for this process. In The Netherlands, laying-up of sterile instruments is increasingly done in a separate and dedicated preparation room with a special ventilation system to provide an ultraclean environment for the lay-up process in order to reduce the number of surgical side infections as much as possible. These rooms are attached to an operation room or more centrally located in the operating department. Newly built lay-up systems in The Netherlands almost exclusively use unidirectional down flow systems (UDDF systems), similar to the systems used in operating rooms. However, a system with horizontal flow [unidirectional horizontal flow system (UDHF system)] would seem to offer advantages from a hygiene point of view. In the case of a down flow system, the person doing the lay-up is (partially) located within the down flow. In the case of emission of particles by this person (the so-called spraying from the neck opening of the clothing), these particles – possibly contaminated with micro-organisms – are carried to the laying-up table by the down flow, creating a risk of contamination of the instruments. By contrast, in a system with a UDHF the falling particles are carried away from the instrument table, as long as the particles are not too heavy and the air flow is strong enough.

From an installation point of view, a UDHF system also has advantages for both new build and renovation of operating rooms. The advantages of a UDHF system compared with a UDDF system are three-fold. First, the system is simpler because it requires no cooling (energy conservation and cost reduction). Because of this, it is easier to install and may even be mobile. Second, less air is needed to protect the same number of instrument tables (energy conservation). Third, the system set-up results in a less ambiguous process because of the location of sterile material between the air coming from the UDHF and the scrub nurse. Hoffman et al. pointed out that the air change rate in preparation rooms used for laying up sterile instruments should be around 37 air changes per hour – a greater air change rate than in theatres. Thus, it has not been clear whether the performance in terms of air quality achieved in the laying-up zone of a UDHF system equals or exceeds that of a UDDF system during the laying-up of instruments in a separate preparation room.

The objective of this experimental comparative study is to answer the following research question: What is the difference in contamination (presence of particles and micro-organisms) of the clean area within which laying up takes place when a UDHF system is used versus when a UDDF system is used?

Methods

Principles

By emitting particles in the lay-up area and evaluating whether these particles land on the instrument table, it may be determined whether there is a risk of contamination and whether the system offers protection from these environmental conditions. If the number of particles found is the same or less with a UDHF system as with a UDDF system, we conclude that it gives at least the same level of protection against airborne contamination as the UDDF system.

Because it is impossible to maintain the background concentration of particles ($C_{\text{ref}}$, see below) at exactly the same level for both systems, we chose to make use of the degree of protection (DP) concept described in DIN 1946, part 4, annex C. The DP is derived according to the following formula:

$$DP_x = -\log(C_x/C_{\text{ref}})$$

$DP_x$ = degree of protection in the ‘clean’ area $x$

$C_x$ = concentration of particles in the ‘clean’ area $x$

$C_{\text{ref}}$ = concentration of particles outside the ‘clean’ area, i.e. the background

The DP in our analysis was limited to a factor of 7 (i.e. a $10^7$-fold reduction in counts) for the situation in which no particles were found at a given measuring point ($x$).

A range of particle sizes was used including the range of particles containing bacteria. The sizes were divided into six categories (µm): $\geq 0.30$, $\geq 0.50$, $\geq 1.0$, $\geq 2.5$, $\geq 5.0$ and $\geq 10.0$.

Systems

The two systems (UDHF and UDDF) were subjected to the same experimental procedures. The experiments with the UDHF system were carried out with a nominal air velocity of 0.45 m/s (UDHF) and a lowered air velocity: 'low flow' (UDHF_LF: 0.3 m/s). The experiments with the UDDF system were carried out at an air velocity of 0.3 m/s with air cooling (UDDF) and without air cooling: 'no cooling' (UDDF_NC). The temperature of the cooled air was roughly 2–3 K lower than the ambient temperature. The systems were installed and tested in the same room, one after the other, so that the environmental factors during the experiments (air flow, temperature, number of people present, etc.) were as similar as possible.

Experiments

Particles were emitted into the room so that the background concentration ($C_{\text{ref}}$) in the room was kept at a relatively high level. The particle concentration in the background was
created by the vaporization of tap water with an ultrasonic
fogger (Lighthouse Volcano P6). The small (2–4 μm) water
droplets emitted by the machine vaporize very fast (a few
seconds) and the mineral residues from the evaporated tap
water remain as solid particles airborne in the air flow in the
room.5,7 Two emission positions A and B were used one at a
time (Figure 1). The particles in this study were emitted at a
height of 1.5 m (average neck height). Airborne particles were
measured using three particle counters (Lighthouse 3016-IAQ,
Fremont, CA, USA).

Set-up

The experimental set-up used was placed in a general pur-
pose room with no special air ventilation in the hospital.
The UDHF and UDDF systems were supplied with air by two
ventilator boxes connected to the plenum with tubes. The
plenum was supplied with air using two filter boxes fitted with
high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) grade 14 (H 14) filters.8 A
homogeneous air velocity over the outlet surface of the plenum
was created by fitting the plenum chambers with an air
distributor consisting of two layers of air distribution cloth that
were 1 cm apart.

Particle measurement

Airborne particles were measured on the instrument table
(M2,P), the Mayo stand (M1,P), and in the background (M3,P,CFU,)
(Figure 1). At 30 s intervals, particles in the size categories (μg)
of ≥0.3, ≥0.5, ≥1.0, ≥2.5, ≥5.0, and ≥10.0 were read online
via a computer. The airflow through the instrument was
2.8 dm³/min. Each measurement had a duration of ≥10 min, so
a total amount of ≥28 dm³ of air was sampled. Outcome
parameter was the DP at the instrument table and the Mayo
stand, determined on the basis of the reduction in particle
counts at these measuring points compared with the back-
ground measurement.

Colony-forming units measurement

The number of micro-organisms was determined using an
active air sampler, sampling at a volume flow of 200 dm³/min.
Two Biotest Diagnostics® RCS Plus Centrifugal Air Samplers
(Denville, NJ, USA) were used for this purpose. One of these air
samplers measured the background concentration (M3,P,CFU),
just as with the particle measurement (Figure 1), and the other
air sampler was placed between the instrument table and the

![Diagram of UDHF and UDDF systems](image_url)

**Figure 1.** Layout of the measuring set-up, unidirectional horizontal air flow (UDHF) and unidirectional down flow (UDDF) systems. Point A, emission particles position A; point B, emission particles position B; M1,P, measuring point 1, particles; M2,P, measuring point 2, particles; M3,P,CFU, measuring point 3, particles and cfu; M4,CFU, measuring point 4, cfu; Dummy, 120 W.
The first outcome variable was maximum protection (yes or no), where ‘yes’ equalled a DP value of 7, and ‘no’ equalled a value <7. The second outcome variable was DP (value <7) and was only applicable for the situations without maximum protection (i.e. value of 7 removed). The latter outcome was approximately normally distributed. Consequently, for each particle size, we analysed the data to answer the following research questions: first, do the systems differ in their percentages of maximum protection? (i.e. ‘no particles present’); second, in the situations without maximum protection: do the systems differ in their mean DP? The difference between the systems in percentages of maximum protection was analysed by chi-square tests.

Whether the difference in percentages depended on the type of table (‘instrument table’ or ‘Mayo stand’) or the dummy variable (‘present’ or ‘not present’) was analysed using logistic regression analysis. The outcome variable in this analysis was maximum protection (yes or no); the predictor variables were type of system (categorical variable with four categories: UDDF, UDHF, UDDF_NC, UDHF_LF), type of table and the interaction effect between type of system and type of table (i.e. cross-product). The same type of analysis was repeated with, instead of type of table, either the dummy variable (with dummy or no dummy) or the emission variable (position A or B).

The difference between the systems in mean DP (for the situations without maximum protection) was tested with analysis of variance. The outcome variable in this analysis was DP, and the independent factor was type of system. Whether the differences between the systems in mean DP depended on type of table or dummy or emission, was also investigated with analysis of variance. Type of table (or dummy or emission) was included as an extra factor, and a full-factorial design was used (including the interaction effect). Again, a significant interaction effect indicated that the difference between the systems in mean DP depended on, for example, type of table. For all analyses, two-sided \( \alpha = 0.05 \) was considered significant. The analyses were performed using SPSS, version 20 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

### Results

#### Measurement 1 (experiments carried out without instruments or Mayo stand)

The DP offered by the UDDF system without cooling at 1.0 m was \( \leq 2 \) at 70 cm from the back wall and \( \leq 1 \) at 105 cm. Both sides of the system showed a similar rapid decrease in DP (constriction). At 69 cm from the sides and 70 cm from the back wall, a DP of 2 was reached. The DP of this area was not symmetrical relative to the central line. This is because the air on the left side cannot flow out freely.

Cooling the air emitted by the UDDF system to 2–3 K lower than the ambient temperature was found to increase the size of the clean area at 1 m above the ground. At 105 cm from the back wall, the DP was still maximum (no particles found). At 117 cm from the back wall, the DP had decreased to \( < 1 \). Substantial improvement was also measured along the sides of the system. At 70 cm from the back wall and 56 cm from the side, the DP was still maximum. At 43 cm from the side a DP of 1.0 was measured. In conclusion, the area with a DP of \( \geq 2 \) with a UDDF system with cooling was found to be substantially larger.
The experiments with a UDHF system resulted in an area with a DP $\geq 2$ reaching to 110 cm from the plenum. Measured at a height of 30 cm above the bottom of the plenum (at half height) and at a distance of 80 cm from the plenum and 30 cm to the side, the DP was still maximum. Thus the breadth and depth of this area (1.914 m$^2$) exceeded that of the UDFF system with cooling. At a lower air velocity (reduced from 0.45 to 0.30 m/s), the size of the equivalent area measured at 30 cm above the bottom of the plenum hardly changes in comparison with the UDHF system. A higher air velocity was found to have positive effects (less constriction) for the outer area. Compared with the UDHF system the size of the usable clean area (DP $\geq 2$) of the UDFF system was 49% smaller (1.281 vs 1.914 m$^2$).

Before starting measurements 2 and 3, experiments were conducted to determine the optimum positioning of air supply and tables. Initially, the bottom of the air supply surface was positioned at a level that was nearly the same as the top of the tables. This set-up offered no protection because contaminated air was entrained from the environment. The horizontal flow attracted air containing particles from under the table, ‘sucking’ the particles into the ‘clean area’ (Figure 2, left). By lowering the air supply surface, the air flow split into a flow over the table with covering material and a flow under the table (Figure 2, right), creating a clean area above the table. All experiments were carried out with tables that were 99 cm high and with the bottom of the air supply surface located 79 cm above the floor, that is, 20 cm below the surface of the table. The distance between the air supply surface and the tables became an important parameter. Positioning the air supply surface so that there was a 20 cm distance to the tables led to an increase of entrained air from under the table. At a distance of ~5 cm between the air supply surface and the tables, the UDHF system functioned properly. This is the distance that was used during all experiments with the tables.

**Measurement 2 (experiments carried out with instruments and Mayo stand)**

Table I gives an overview per system showing that the percentage of observations in which no particles were found on the tables (maximum protection) increases with the size of the particles. The percentage is especially low for the two lowest particle categories (≥0.3 and ≥0.5 μm). There is a significant difference between the systems for all particle categories except for the ≥0.3 μm category. If only the UDFF and UDHF systems are compared, the UDHF system performs significantly better than the UDFF systems for the particle categories ≥2.5, ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm ($P < 0.01$), whereas for particle size ≥0.5 μm the UDFF system performs better. For the ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm particle categories almost no particles were found (≥99% of the observations) using the UDHF system. The UDHF system shows that in 68% of the observations no particles are encountered.

The difference in the percentage of observations in which no particles were found between the four systems does not depend on the type of table (instrument table or Mayo stand) except for the case of the ≥5.0 μm particle category. The difference between the two most important system types (UDFF, UDHF) does not depend on the type of table either. In addition, the difference between UDFF and UDHF depends on the presence of a dummy only in the case of the ≥1.0 μm particle category. The difference between UDFF and UDHF does not depend on the emission position (position A or B).

Table II shows the mean DP per system for the observations in which particles were found (DP < 7) for the UDFF and UDHF system. Only the particle categories ≥0.3, ≥0.5, ≥1.0 and ≥2.5 μm are displayed. The number of observations in which particles are found for the UDFF system particle categories ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm ($N \leq 1$) was too low for statistical analyses.

![Figure 2. Air flow for too high positioning and proper positioning of the air supply surface for a unidirectional horizontal air flow system.](image-url)
Results of analysis of variance indicated that there was no significant difference between the performance of the two systems for the ≥0.3 and ≥0.5 μm particle categories. In the case of the ≥1.0 and ≥2.5 μm particle categories, the UDHF system performs significantly better than the UDDF system ($P < 0.01$). The difference in performance of the two systems was slightly influenced by ‘type of table’ (instrument table or Mayo stand). Only for the ≥0.5 μm particle category was a significant interaction effect between ‘table’ and ‘type of system’ found ($P < 0.01$). In this situation the DP of UDHF system on the Mayo stand was higher.

The presence or absence of a heated dummy has an effect on all particle categories. There was a significant interaction effect for the ≥0.3 and ≥0.5 μm particle categories. For these particle sizes, the UDDF system performed better than the UDHF system when the dummy was present.

The mean values in Table II show that there is a remarkable difference between the performance of the UDHF system with and without a dummy, whereas there was hardly any difference between the performance of the UDHF system with and without a dummy.

If the position from which the particles are emitted (position A or B) is taken into consideration, the emission position only had an effect on the difference in performance of the systems for the ≥0.3 and ≥1.0 μm particle categories.

**Table II**

Differences between the two main systems in mean degree of protection for different particle sizes and different design factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design factor</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>≥0.3 μm</th>
<th></th>
<th>≥0.5 μm</th>
<th></th>
<th>≥1.0 μm</th>
<th></th>
<th>≥2.5 μm</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDDF (N = 83)</td>
<td>UDDF (N = 86)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UDDF (N = 64)</td>
<td>UDDF (N = 86)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UDDF (N = 40)</td>
<td>UDDF (N = 36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Table</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Mayo stand With dummy</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.78a</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>&lt;0.01a</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.49a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumb</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location A With dummy</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.01a</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.03a</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.13a</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.02a</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.01a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement 3 (experiments carried out with a simulated process)

Table III shows that during the process measurements, no CFU were found with the UDHF system in 64% of the measurements, compared with 90% for the UDHF system ($P = 0.012$). When CFU were found, the mean number of CFU for the UDDF system was 19.2 CFU/m$^3$ compared with 5.0 CFU/m$^3$ for the UDHF system ($P = 0.05$). The difference in background concentrations was not significant ($P = 0.96$) for the different experiments at 91.4 CFU/m$^3$ for the UDDF system, and at 90.7 CFU/m$^3$ for the UDHF system.

Based on the analysis of variance of the mean DP for the laying-up process (process steps 2–5) the difference in performance (DP) between the two main systems was not significant for any of the particle categories. If ‘type of table’ (instrument table or Mayo stand) was taken into consideration, there was a limited and non-significant influence ($P > 0.05$) on performance of the different systems.

**Discussion**

This study has partially answered the research question of whether the UDHF system equals or performs better than a UDDF system in controlling contamination (presence of

**Table I**

Percentage of observations with maximum protection (degree of protection = 7) per type of system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>≥0.3 μm</th>
<th>≥0.5 μm</th>
<th>≥1.0 μm</th>
<th>≥2.5 μm</th>
<th>≥5.0 μm</th>
<th>≥10.0 μm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UDDF (N = 84)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHF (N = 86)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHF_NC (N = 80)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHF_LF (N = 40)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-values:

- UDHF, unidirectional down flow; UDHF, unidirectional horizontal flow; UDHF_NC, unidirectional down flow without cooling the supply air; UDHF_LF, unidirectional horizontal flow with a lower air velocity.

- Results from Fisher exact tests are reported for particle sizes ≥0.3, ≥0.5, ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm due to frequencies <5.

- Comparison between the UDDF and UDHF only.

- Results from chi-square tests are given for differences between the systems in maximum protection (yes or no) for particle sizes ≥1.0 and ≥2.5 μm. Results from Fisher exact tests are reported for particle sizes ≥0.3, ≥0.5, ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm due to frequencies <5.

- P-value of interaction effect: System (UDDF, UDHF) * Design factor.
particles and micro-organisms) of the clean area within which laying up takes place. On the one hand, there is a significant difference in the percentage of observations where no particles were found for the larger particle categories (≥2.5, ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm), clearly favouring the UDHF system. On the other hand, for the ≥0.5 μm category, there is a significant difference favouring the UDDF system. For the ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm particle categories, almost no particles were found (≥99% of the observations) using the UDHF system. The UDDF system yielded a no-particles result in only 68% of the observations.

However, the reliability of observations for the ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm particle categories is low due to the relatively low background concentration (Figure 3). ISO 14644-1 Annex B.4.2 indicates that, for a statistically reliable measurement, it should be possible to detect a minimum of 20 particles at the class limit. This research took a similar approach and used this minimum number of particles that would be acceptable to find, given the background concentration and DP, to check whether the measurements were reliable. At the sample volume used (28.8 L per measurement), a DP of 5.0, 4.0, 3.0 and 2.5 were determined to be statistically reliable for the particle categories ≥0.3, ≥0.5, ≥1.0 and ≥2.5 μm, respectively. No statistically reliable degrees of protection were determined for the ≥5.0 and ≥10.0 μm particles due to the low background concentration for these particle sizes.

The presence or absence of a dummy has an influence on the performance of the systems for the 0.3 and 0.5 μm particle categories. The UDDF system performs better with a dummy than without a heated dummy. For the UDHF system there is hardly any difference in performance with or without a heated dummy. This is probably because the static dummy guides the UDHF air stream over the instrument table. This effect is not likely to occur if a moving person is present. The difference in performance with and without a dummy is much larger for the UDDF system than for the UDHF system, leading to the conclusion that the UDDF system is less robust than the UDHF system. The position from which the particles were emitted is of importance because of the unusual behaviour of these particles in the air stream. In order for these experiments to reflect the actual situation in the operating room as closely as possible, particles needed to be emitted from the position they would come from in practice. We chose to emit the particles at a height of 1.5 m (average neck height), on the assumption that when dressed in operation clothing with cuffs and a sterile overcoat and gloves, particles (flakes of skin) are mainly released from the neck area. This release of particles is caused by the presence of a gap between the clothing and the body at the neck, and the convection effect (upward flow of air around the body).

The percentage of observations for which no CFU were found was significantly higher for the UDHF system. When CFU were found, their number was higher for the UDDF system than

### Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFU between the tables</th>
<th>CFU background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of observations</td>
<td>Mean CFU/m³ if CFU were observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDDF</td>
<td>64% (N = 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHF</td>
<td>90% (N = 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UDDF, unidirectional down flow; UDHF, unidirectional horizontal flow.

**Figure 3.** Mean background concentration (●) during the measurements.
for the UDHF system (\(P = 0.05\)). The DP during the process did not vary significantly between a UDDF and UDHF system.

Taking both systems into consideration, based on the bigger difference in performance of the UDDF system for the design factors table, dummy and location (Table II), we conclude that the UDHF system offers a more robust solution than the UDDF system, provided that good work instructions are given and the height of the table and height of the plenum are correctly adjusted. A UDHF system could easily be made mobile because cooling is not necessary. However, whether a mobile system would also offer a more robust solution needs to be carefully considered.

The DP offered by the different systems is influenced by environmental factors and human behaviour. For instance, the differences in measurements with the UDHF system on the left and right side shows that the distance of the plenum to the side wall or other obstructions is of influence. It is clear from our experiments that the height of the instrument tables relative to the height of the UDHF system is also critical. If the tables are too low in relation to the UDHF system, the non-filtered air below the table is sucked along by the air flow from the UDHF system, possibly leading to contamination of the instruments. To function properly, the UDHF system needs to be set up in such a way that the air flow from it is divided into a flow above and below the table.

We based our research method on the fact that the presence of particles has been shown to be a good proxy of the risk of the instruments being contaminated with micro-organisms.11 Particle composition includes bacteria with a mean equivalent diameter of 12.3 \(\mu\)m, with a distribution of between 4 and 18 \(\mu\)m. Research in a Korean hospital has shown that most airborne bacteria occur in the range between 1.1 and 2.1 \(\mu\)m.12 There was also a good correlation between particles sized 5–7 \(\mu\)m and the number of micro-organisms found in air samples in ultra-clean operating theatres.12 Hambraeus et al. showed that 7.9% of the measured bacteria-carrying particles in an operating room have a diameter from 1.1 to 2.1 \(\mu\)m, 12.7% from 2.1 to 3.3 \(\mu\)m, 17.9% from 3.3 to 4.7 \(\mu\)m, 23.7% from 4.7 to 7.0 \(\mu\)m, and 35.7% >7.0 \(\mu\)m.4 Based on these studies it can be stated that smaller particles (1.1–5.0 \(\mu\)m) may carry bacteria as well as larger ones. Very small-sized particles (<1.0 \(\mu\)m) are seen as ‘indicator’ particles for larger particles which potentially carry bacteria. Counting of these particles is considered a good approximation of the relative presence of larger particles. Since they are more frequently present in higher numbers they can be measured more reliably than the larger bacteria-carrying particles. Particles with sizes <4.5 \(\mu\)m are also considered to be completely airborne.13 They behave much like a gas (‘Brownian motion’), and will follow the air stream they are in.14 Skin particles released by staff are a potential greater source of contamination because they may carry more micro-organisms than other particles, and these micro-organisms come directly from humans.15 These skin particles, measuring 10–25 \(\mu\)m and ~1 \(\mu\)m thick, bear many staphylococci.16–19 This group of micro-organisms is responsible for postoperative wound infections especially in implantation surgery.15 We have found no other research literature related to contamination of sterile instruments during the laying-up process with respect to different air systems or to the air quality provided by different systems during this process.

Apart from the choice of UDDF or UDHD, other procedures are also important to protect instruments from contamination. It was shown that the contamination rate of surgical instruments exposed to the air in an operating theatre was 1.18 times higher than that of instruments which had been covered with sterile guard.20,21 The exposure time also had a positive correlation with the bacterial contamination rate. Chosky et al. concluded that setting up instruments in the ultra-clean air theatre and covering them until the patient was transferred on to the operating table produced an overall 28-fold reduction in instrument contamination compared with instruments set up in the conventional plenum-ventilated preparation room.22 By contrast, covering the instruments after setting them up in the preparation room produced only an overall four-fold reduction compared with not covering them.

In conclusion, The UDHF system offers the same or better protection against contamination (the presence of particles and micro-organisms) of the clean area within which the laying-up takes place compared with the UDDF system. For large particles, the UDHF system offers superior protection. However, for the \(\geq5.0\) and \(\geq10.0\) \(\mu\)m particles the difference is not statistically reliable due to the low background concentration for these particle sizes. The results based on the measurements of particles (DP) and the measured number of CFU both show that the UDHF system offers the same or better protection against contamination. Although the differences between the two systems did not always reach statistical significance, there is a clear trend, from small-sized particles up to the largest sizes considered, including bacteria-carrying particles (\(\geq1.1\) \(\mu\)m), that demonstrates the superiority of the horizontal flow system. The UDHF system offers a more robust solution than the UDDF system, provided that good work instructions are given and the height of the table and height of the plenum are properly adjusted.
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