

1 **Telemedicine for surgical site**
2 **infection diagnosis: a systematic**
3 **review protocol**

4 Ross Lathan^{1*}, Misha Sidapra¹, Marina Yiasemidou², Judith Long¹, Joshua Totty¹, George
5 Smith¹, Ian Chetter¹

6

7 ¹Academic Vascular Surgical Unit, Hull Royal Infirmary, Hull, United Kingdom

8 ²Academic Clinical Lecturer, Bradford Teaching Hospitals, Bradford, United Kingdom

9

10 *Corresponding Author

11 Email: ross.lathan2@nhs.net

12

31 **Authors:**

32 Ross Lathan: Corresponding Author

33 Protocol development, Literature search and screening, data extraction and
34 analysis, final review

35 Misha Sidapra: Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

36 Literature search and screening, data extraction and analysis, final review

37 Marina Yiasemidou: Bradford University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

38 Final review drafting

39 Judith Long: Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

40 Final review drafting

41 Joshua Totty: Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

42 Protocol development, final review drafting

43 George Smith: Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

44 Final review drafting

45 Ian Chetter: Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

46 Final review drafting

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55 **Amendments**

56 Protocol version number will be annotated on the title page and thereby footer of each

57 page. A list of major

58 amendment changes to the protocol will be kept in the table below.

Amendment Number	Amendment Summary	Protocol Section

59

60

61

62 **Important Dates**

Assessed as up to date	03/01/2022
Date of search	
Next stage expected	
Protocol first published	

63

Definitions

Surgical Site Infection	An infection occurring after surgery in the part of the body where surgery took place
Telemedicine	The remote diagnosis and treatment of patients by means of communications technology
Telehealth	The delivery of healthcare services, where patients and providers are separated by distance.
eHealth	The use of information communication technology for health.
mHealth	A component of eHealth where medical and public health practices are supported by mobile devices.
Virtual Care	All the ways healthcare providers remotely interact with their patients

65 Table of Contents

66	1	ABSTRACT	7
67	2	BACKGROUND	8
68	2.1	TARGET CONDITION BEING DIAGNOSED	8
69	2.2	INDEX AND GOLD STANDARD TESTS	8
70	2.3	CLINICAL PATHWAY	9
71	2.4	RATIONALE	11
72	2.5	OBJECTIVES	12
73	2.5.1	<i>Research Question</i>	12
74	2.5.2	<i>Objectives</i>	12
75	3	METHODS	13
76	3.1	PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT	13
77	3.2	CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERING STUDIES FOR THIS REVIEW	13
78	3.2.1	<i>Types of studies</i>	13
79	3.2.2	<i>Participants</i>	14
80	3.2.3	<i>Index and Comparative Tests</i>	14
81	3.2.4	<i>Target Condition</i>	15
82	3.2.5	<i>Reference Standards</i>	15
83	3.3	SEARCH METHODS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF STUDIES	15
84	3.3.1	<i>Electronic searches</i>	15
85	3.3.2	<i>Searching other sources</i>	15
86	3.4	DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	16
87	3.4.1	<i>Selection of Studies</i>	16
88	3.4.2	<i>Data extraction and management</i>	16
89	3.4.3	<i>Assessment of methodological quality</i>	16
90	3.4.4	<i>Statistical analysis and data synthesis</i>	17
91	4	DISCUSSION	18
92	5	REFERENCES	19
93	6	APPENDIX / SUPPORTING INFORMATION	22
94	6.1	PRISMA-P (PREFERRED REPORTING ITEMS FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS PROTOCOLS) 2015	
95		CHECKLIST: RECOMMENDED ITEMS TO ADDRESS IN A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW PROTOCOL(15)	22
96	6.2	SSI CLASSIFICATION	25
97	6.3	ASEPSIS SCORE	29
98	6.4	QUADAS-2	30
99	6.5	EXAMPLE SEARCH STRATEGY FOR MEDLINE OR EMBASE	37

100

101

102

103

104 1 Abstract

105 Since the COVID-19 pandemic there has been a rapid uptake and utilisation of telemedicine in all
106 aspects of healthcare. This presents a key opportunity in surgical site infection surveillance. Remote
107 follow up methods have been used via telephone, with photographs and questionnaires for post-
108 operative reviews with varying results.

109 This review therefore aims to comprehensively synthesise available evidence for the diagnostic
110 accuracy of all forms of SSI telemedicine monitoring. The protocol has been established as per both
111 PRISMA-P and the Cochrane handbook for reviews of diagnostic test accuracy.

112 Medline, Embase, CENTRAL and CINAHL will be searched using a complete search strategy
113 developed with librarian input, in addition to google scholar and hand searching. All study designs
114 with patients over 18 and undergone a primarily closed surgical procedure will be eligible. Index tests
115 will include all forms of telemedicine and a subgroup analysis performed for each of these.

116 Comparative tests must include face to face review, and all reference standards will be included again
117 for sub-group analyses. Search results will be screened by two investigators independently with a
118 third providing consensus review on disagreements. Methodological quality will be assessed using the
119 QUADAS-2 tool, first validated by two investigators as per the Cochrane handbook.

120 Exploratory analysis will formulate summary receiver operating characteristic curves and forest plots
121 with estimates of sensitivity and specificity of the included studies. Sources of heterogeneity will be
122 identifying and investigated through further analysis.

123 Potential benefits of telemedicine integration in surgical practice will reduce cost and travel time to
124 patients in addition to avoiding wasted clinic appointments, important considerations in a peri-
125 pandemic era. To avoid missed or further complications, there must be confidence in the ability to
126 diagnose infection. This review will systematically determine whether telemedicine is accurate for
127 surgical site infection diagnosis, which methods are well established and if further research is
128 indicated.

129

130 2 Background

131 2.1 Target condition being diagnosed

132 This review primarily aims to identify surgical site infections (SSI). The Centre for Disease
133 Control and Prevention (CDC) defines SSI as an infection within 30 days of an operation or
134 up to 90 days if an implant is left in place and the infection is related to an operative
135 procedure(1). SSI are further classified as ‘superficial incisional SSI’, ‘deep incisional SSI’, and
136 ‘organ/space SSI’; further details of these definitions can be found in appendix one(2).

137

138 Surgical site infections complicate over 30% of operations, depending on the type of
139 procedure(3, 4). Up to 60% of these present after discharge and so accurate and timely
140 diagnosis requires intensive follow-up and potentially significant travel distances on the
141 patient’s behalf(5). For patients, SSI may have a significant impact on morbidity and
142 mortality with subsequent time and cost implications(6). Unsurprisingly, the burden of
143 infection encompasses healthcare providers too, with a recent UK study showing an
144 association of SSI with a 92% increase in length of stay and an adjusted episode cost of
145 £3040(7). Treatment for SSI can range from an oral course of antibiotics, to the need for
146 reintervention (drainage or debridement), prolonged inpatient readmission and the
147 subsequent risk of further morbidity (i.e. thrombotic and ischaemic events).

148

149 2.2 Index and Gold Standard Tests

150 The current ‘gold standard’ for diagnosing SSI is a ‘face-to-face’ review using the US CDC
151 criteria(2). However, other scoring systems or criteria may be used during a face-to-face
152 review. The ASEPSIS score uses weighted, objectively measurable criteria to identify surgical

153 wounds as satisfactory healing, impaired wound healing or infected (appendix three)(8). A
154 newly developed utility, the Bluebelle wound healing questionnaire (WHQ) has been
155 validated in general surgery as a patient or clinician reported outcome measure to identify
156 surgical site infection(9).

157

158 Diagnosis of SSI using remote, digitally based contact between patients and clinicians
159 (telemedicine) is being investigated as the primary index test in this review. In this review
160 we are focussing on digital remote follow-up. There are many ways of implementing this in
161 practice. These include the use of photographic images and/or video, either in real time or
162 deferred, telephone review and instant messaging. There may be other novel methods not
163 listed here that are identified during the review process.

164

165 2.3 Clinical Pathway

166 Patients undergoing surgery may present with SSI at one of three typical time points.
167 If an infection does occur, the first potential route of diagnosis is prior to discharge and
168 within the first week. Infections at this point will depend on the surgical procedure,
169 underlying comorbidities, and age, as these factors will influence typical length of stay (LOS)
170 and wound healing. They are likely to be picked up on ward rounds or through dressing
171 changes with the nursing team then highlighting issues to the surgeon. Face to face
172 diagnosis using CDC criteria in this instance is straightforward as the patient has not left the
173 department. The patient may have to undergo further observation, dressing changes and
174 antibiotic course. Rarely, further imaging or intervention may be required.

175

176 The second point is typically patient initiated, after discharge but prior to any planned
177 follow up, within 30 days of operation. Infections at this stage may not reach the surgeon's
178 knowledge as they are often managed by the patient's primary care physician. However,
179 without specialist input some infections progress in severity. Patients with evidence of deep
180 incisional or organ/space infections may be referred to secondary care by the primary care
181 team, may present to the emergency department or may contact the surgical team directly
182 through an aftercare number. Only once seen can the gold standard assessment take place.
183 Further imaging, microbiology culture and sensitivity testing are often implemented to
184 ensure appropriate and specific management. Further surgical intervention may be
185 required.

186

187 Finally, patients may not be contemporaneously identified as having SSI. Delayed or missed
188 mild SSI diagnosis may present when the patient arrives in clinic for review (often after 30
189 days postoperatively, or if this is telephonic, it may be apparent through the history).

190 Patients with more severe infection usually will have presented at the emergency
191 department by this point, but if missed can impact on morbidity. Management will focus on
192 ensuring no ongoing infection and alleviating further complications.

193

194 Index tests in this setting will likely be used as a comparative to face-to-face, gold standard
195 review at planned review points. Potential implications of digital remote follow up are early
196 and avoidance of missed diagnosis within the 30-day window for the CDC criteria.

197

198 2.4 Rationale

199 Widespread technological innovation and adoption have been exponential in the 21st
200 century. Sophistication of the mobile phone now allows for instantaneous communication
201 all over the planet. Users can even transfer image and video data in real time. In 2019, 88%
202 of individuals in the UK were estimated to own a smartphone(10). Naturally, the use of
203 technology in healthcare has too progressed. Telemedicine is the remote diagnosis and
204 treatment of patients by use of technology(11). Coined in the 1970s, this concept has
205 broadened with the advent of the smartphone and mobile data. Mobile health (mHealth) is
206 a contemporary classification whereby healthcare is supported by the use of mobile
207 devices(12). The use of telemedicine has enabled patients in isolated centres access to
208 specialist review through transfer of medical imaging, and teleconsultations are coming into
209 practice(13). In surgery, the process of postoperative care is changing with the introduction
210 of telemedicine.

211

212 In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic caused a countrywide lockdown in the UK, and many other
213 countries all over the world. Elective operations were cancelled, expanding already lengthy
214 waiting lists. This also posed a challenge for outpatient follow up, as patients requiring
215 review would be at risk of COVID-19 in attending the hospital, and departments adapted to
216 comply with social distancing regulations, limiting the number of people allowed in
217 outpatient spaces at any one time.

218

219 Remote follow-up has the potential to reduce unnecessary clinic visits providing benefits for
220 both patients and healthcare providers. The rationale of this review, therefore, is to

221 synthesise the current available evidence for using telemedicine to diagnose or exclude SSI
222 in the context of post-operative follow up.

223

224 2.5 Objectives

225 2.5.1 Research Question

226 Primary: Is digital remote follow-up accurate for the diagnosis of surgical site infection?

227 Secondary:

228 - What methods are used to facilitate SSI diagnosis?

229 - What are the limitations of telemedicine in SSI diagnosis?

230

231 This systematic review aims to assess the diagnostic accuracy of using telemedicine to
232 identify SSI post-operatively. It will also aim to identify which methods are currently in use
233 for this and any limitations of telemedicine methods in SSI diagnosis.

234

235 2.5.2 Objectives

236 Primary: To determine the diagnostic accuracy of digital remote follow-up for the diagnosis
237 of surgical site infection

238

239 Secondary objectives

240 - To determine what methods of digital remote follow-up have been used

241 - Evaluate the accuracy of different digital remote follow-up methods

242 - To determine limitations of digital remote follow-up

243

244 3 Methods

245 3.1 Protocol Development

246 This protocol and review have been developed using the Cochrane handbook for reviews of
247 diagnostic test accuracy and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
248 Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statements(14, 15). In addition, this protocol is reported in line
249 with the PRISMA statement for review protocols (PRISMA-P) which is attached in appendix
250 one(15).

251

252 3.2 Criteria for considering studies for this review

253 3.2.1 Types of studies

254 There will be no restrictions on inclusion based upon prospective or retrospective study
255 designs, however given the nature of the novel interventions, it is unlikely that retrospective
256 studies will be available. Study designs which result in measures of test accuracy will be
257 included, including randomised and observational studies. There will be no limitations on
258 study sample sizes, or quality to thoroughly synthesise the available literature, but this will
259 be accounted for in a quality of evidence assessment.

260

261 All study types will be included, and a sub group analysis performed for direct, fully paired
262 and randomised studies.

263

264 Narrative and systematic review articles, letters and opinion pieces will be excluded from
265 this review, however the reference lists of review articles will be hand searched for
266 completeness.

267

268 3.2.2 Participants

269 All patients over 18, who have undergone a procedure involving surgical incisions and
270 followed up in a postoperative pathway will be eligible. Studies involving children under the
271 age of 18 years and written in language other than English will be excluded from the review.

272

273 The study setting will vary depending on whether the index or reference test is being
274 examined. The index tests can be performed anywhere as they are remote, the reference
275 will be in a secondary care setting, likely clinics.

276

277 The index and reference tests will be applied on clinical assessment and on suspicion of
278 surgical wound infection, no prior tests are required.

279

280 3.2.3 Index and Comparative Tests

281 The index test to be reviewed is digital remote follow-up. Telemedicine is the remote
282 diagnosis or treatment of patients using communications technology, which encompasses
283 the term digital remote follow-up and will be used as a synonym in this review. Specifically,
284 this entails the use of photographs or video, either deferred or in real time, telephone
285 review and/or instant messaging. All index test methods will be evaluated through subgroup
286 analyses.

287

288 The comparative tests are face to face review with the patient to directly observe the
289 wound and obtain a history.

290

291 3.2.4 Target Condition

292 Surgical site infection as defined by CDC is the target condition for this review; infection
293 within 30 days of surgery or within 90 days if an implant is left in place. This is further
294 discussed in section 1.1. Some studies may categorise this further into superficial, deep and
295 organ/space SSI (more details in appendix two).

296

297 3.2.5 Reference Standards

298 The same diagnostic criteria will be used for both tests. The gold standard for assessment of
299 SSI is the US CDC criteria which clearly define indication of infection. Other possible
300 methods are the ASEPSIS score with infection clearly define at a score of 21 or greater, and
301 bluebelle WHQ. The latter has been suggested with an infection cut off score of 6-8. All
302 methods of remote diagnosis will be extracted and a sub-group analysis performed for each
303 type.

304

305 3.3 Search Methods for Identification of Studies

306 3.3.1 Electronic searches

307 Medline, Embase, CENTRAL and CINAHL databases will be searched from inception to the
308 current date. Additional resources will be identified through google scholar.

309

310 3.3.2 Searching other sources

311 Additional searches will be conducted through handsearching the reference lists of included
312 articles and excluded review articles. An example search strategy is provided in appendix
313 five.

314 3.4 Data Collection and Analysis

315 3.4.1 Selection of Studies

316 Search results will be deduplicated and uploaded to the specialised online review tool,
317 Rayyan. Study titles and abstracts will be screened by two investigators, RL and MS,
318 independently. Any disagreement will be resolved by consensus decision from a third
319 investigator. Articles included at this stage will be retrieved for full text screening, again by
320 two authors acting independently. Those included after full text screening will go on to data
321 extraction.

322

323 3.4.2 Data extraction and management

324 Data extraction will be into a bespoke designed spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel), hosted
325 remotely and updated in real-time. Information on study design, country of origin,
326 participant age and gender, sample size, surgery performed, drop out rates, time to follow-
327 up and type of remote follow-up (photograph / video / telephone / other) will be extracted.
328 Details on infection rates for remote and face to face methods as well as sensitivity and
329 specificity of diagnosis will also be extracted. If information is available on specifics of
330 superficial, deep and organ/space SSI rates, these data will also be extracted.

331

332 3.4.3 Assessment of methodological quality

333 Methodological quality will be assessed using the QUADAS-2 tool (appendix four)(16). Due
334 to the nature of varying study design, systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy are
335 often prone to heterogenous results. In 2003, the quality assessment of diagnostic studies
336 (QUADAS) tool was developed. This has since been revised as QUADAS-2 and is

337 recommended for use in such reviews by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality,
338 Cochrane Collaboration, and the UK National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence(16).

339

340 Two authors will assess each manuscript as per the QADAS-2 tool, with a third independent
341 author providing consensus review when discrepancies occur. Further details on the
342 QUADAS-2 process can be found in appendix four.

343

344 3.4.4 Statistical analysis and data synthesis

345 SSI diagnosed using any diagnostic criteria as part of a face-to-face review will be the
346 reference standard. The patient will be the unit of analysis. Forest plots and receiver
347 operating characteristic (ROC) curves will be produced as part of the initial, exploratory
348 analysis and used to display estimates of sensitivity and specificity of the included studies.

349

350 Summary measures of sensitivity and specificity will be produced using a bivariate model for
351 meta-analysis, if there are sufficient studies.

352

353 *Receiver Operator Characteristic Curves*

354 Summary receiver operator characteristic (sROC) curves will be plotted using each study
355 included as a data point. Confidence regions will also be calculated. Plots will be produced
356 using metaDTA(17).

357

358 *Sensitivity Analysis*

359 Sensitivity analysis based upon risk of bias will be evaluated. Studies with a high or unclear
360 risk of bias identified by the QADAS-2 tool will be excluded in a separate analysis.

361

362 *Assessment of Heterogeneity*

363 Several sources of potential heterogeneity have been identified, and their effects will be
364 investigated through the use of subgroup analysis and metaregression. The diagnostic
365 criteria used to diagnose SSI (CDC, ASEPSIS, Bluebelle WHQ or others) may influence the test
366 accuracy as different tools have been found to have poor correlation(18).

367 **4 Discussion**

368 Integration of telemedicine has multiplied in recent years, exponentially so in response to
369 the COVID-19 pandemic. One prospective application is remote diagnosis of SSI.
370 Consolidation of telemedicine in surgical practice has the potential to reduce cost to both
371 patient and care provider, as well as improved time implications for both parties. This would
372 also reduce unnecessary visits to hospital clinic with a healthy surgical wound, an important
373 consideration during a pandemic. To avoid further complications however and allow for
374 confidence in diagnosis, telemedicine must be accurate in the detection of SSI. Previous
375 studies have shown erythema detection to be difficult in review of wound images compare
376 to face to face, which may influence a diagnosis of infection(19). This review aims to
377 comprehensively examine the accuracy for all methods of remote diagnosis of SSI thereby
378 enabling evidence-based decision making on remote reviews of post-operative patients.

379

380 5 References

- 381 1. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Surgical Site Infection (SSI) Event
382 2017 [Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/pdfs/psscmanual/9pssccurrent.pdf>.
- 383 2. Horan TC, Gaynes RP, Martone WJ, Jarvis WR, Emori TG. CDC definitions of
384 nosocomial surgical site infections, 1992: a modification of CDC definitions of surgical
385 wound infections. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 1992;13(10):606-8.
- 386 3. GlobalSurg Collaborative. Determining the worldwide epidemiology of surgical site
387 infections after gastrointestinal resection surgery: protocol for a multicentre, international,
388 prospective cohort study (GlobalSurg 2). *BMJ Open.* 2017;7:e012150.
- 389 4. Saeed MJ, Dubberke ER, Fraser VJ, Olsen MA. Procedure-specific Surgical Site
390 Infection Incidence Varies Widely within Certain National Healthcare Safety Network
391 Surgery Groups. *American Journal of Infection Control.* 2015;43((6)):617-23.
- 392 5. Woelber E, Schrick EJ, Gessner BD, Evans HL. Proportion of Surgical Site Infections
393 Occuring after Hospital Discharge: A Systematic Review. *Surgical Infections.* 2016;17(5).
- 394 6. Astagneau P, Rioux C, Golliot F, Brücker G. Morbidity and mortality associated with
395 surgical site infections: results from the 1997-1999 INCISO surveillance. *J Hosp Infect.*
396 2001;48(4):267-74.
- 397 7. Totty JP, Moss JWE, Barker E, Mealing SJ, Posnett JW, Chetter IC, et al. The impact of
398 surgical site infection on hospitalisation, treatment costs, and health-related quality of life
399 after vascular surgery. *International Wound Journal.* 2020;18(3):261-8.
- 400 8. Wilson AP, Treasure T, Sturridge MF, Grüneberg RN. A scoring method (ASEPSIS) for
401 postoperative wound infections for use in clinical trials of antibiotic prophylaxis. *Lancet.*
402 1986;1(8476):311-3.

- 403 9. Validation of the Bluebelle Wound Healing Questionnaire for assessment of surgical-
404 site infection in closed primary wounds after hospital discharge. *Br J Surg.* 2019;106(3):226-
405 35.
- 406 10. Deloitte. Global Mobile Consumer Survey: UK cut 2019 [Available from:
407 [https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/uk/Documents/technology-media-
408 telecommunications/deloitte-uk-plateauing-at-the-peak-the-state-of-the-smartphone.pdf](https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/uk/Documents/technology-media-telecommunications/deloitte-uk-plateauing-at-the-peak-the-state-of-the-smartphone.pdf).
- 409 11. WHO. Telemedicine Opportunities and developments in Member States. 2010.
- 410 12. WHO. mHealth: New horizons for health through mobile technologies.: World Health
411 Organisation; 2011.
- 412 13. Maani R, Camorlinga S, Eskicioglu R. A Remote Real-time PACS-based Platform for
413 Medical Imaging Telemedicine. *Proceeding of SPIE.* 2009;7264.
- 414 14. Cochrane. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Diagnostic Test Accuracy.
415 Cochrane Training; 2021.
- 416 15. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
417 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015
418 statement. *Systematic Reviews.* 2015;4(1):1.
- 419 16. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, et al.
420 QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann
421 Intern Med.* 2011;155(8):529-36.
- 422 17. Freeman SC, Kerby CR, Patel A, Cooper NJ, Quinn T, Sutton AJ. Development of an
423 interactive web-based tool to conduct and interrogate meta-analysis of diagnostic test
424 accuracy studies: MetaDTA. *BMC Medical Research Methodology.* 2019;19(1):81.

- 425 18. Wilson AP, Gibbons C, Reeves BC, Hodgson B, Liu M, Plummer D, et al. Surgical
426 wound infection as a performance indicator: agreement of common definitions of wound
427 infection in 4773 patients. *Bmj*. 2004;329(7468):720.
- 428 19. Totty JP, Harwood AE, Wallace T, Smith GE, Chetter IC. Use of photograph-based
429 telemedicine in postoperative wound assessment to diagnose or exclude surgical site
430 infection. *Journal of wound care*. 2018;27(3):128-35.
- 431
- 432

433 **6 Appendix / Supporting Information**

434 **6.1 PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-**
 435 **Analysis Protocols) 2015 Checklist: recommended items to address in a**
 436 **systematic review protocol(15)**

437

Section and Topic	Item No.	Checklist Item
Administrative information		
Title		
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number
Authors:		
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments
Support		
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol
Introduction		

Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)
Methods		
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated
Study records		
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications
Outcomes and prioritisations	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis

Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)

438

439

440 6.2 SSI Classification

441

442 *Superficial incisional infection*

443 Defined as a surgical site infection occurring within 30 days of surgery and involves only the
444 skin or subcutaneous tissue of the incision, and meets at least one of the following criteria:

445

446 Criterion 1: Purulent drainage from the superficial incision.

447

448 Criterion 2: The superficial incision yields organisms from the culture of aseptically
449 aspirated fluid or tissue, or from a swab and pus cells are present.

450

451 Criterion 3: At least two of the following symptoms and signs:

452 - pain or tenderness

453 - localised swelling

454 - redness

455 - heat

456 AND a. the superficial incision is deliberately opened by a surgeon to manage the infection,
457 unless the incision is culture-negative

458 OR b. the clinician diagnoses a superficial incisional infection.

459 Note: Stitch abscesses are defined as minimal inflammation and discharge confined to the
460 points of suture penetration, and localised infection around a stab wound. They are not
461 classified as surgical site infections.

462

463

464 *Deep incisional infection*

465 Defined as a surgical site infection involving the deep tissues (i.e. fascial and muscle layers)
466 that occurs within 30 days of surgery if no implant is in place, or within 90 days if an implant
467 is in place and the infection appears to be related to the surgical procedure, and meets at
468 least one of the following criteria:

469

470 Criterion 1: Purulent drainage from the deep incision but not from the organ/space
471 component of the surgical site.

472

473 Criterion 2: The deep incision yields organisms from the culture of aseptically aspirated
474 fluid or tissue, or from a swab and pus cells are present.

475

476 Criterion 3: A deep incision that spontaneously dehisces or is deliberately opened by a
477 surgeon when the patient has at least one of the following symptoms or signs (unless the
478 incision is culture negative):

479 - fever (>38°C)

480 - localised pain or tenderness

481

482 Criterion 4: An abscess or other evidence of infection involving the deep incision that is
483 found by direct examination during re-operation, or by histo-pathological or radiological
484 examination.

485

486 Criterion 5: Diagnosis of a deep incisional surgical site infection by an attending clinician.

487 Note: An infection involving both superficial and deep incision is classified as deep incisional
488 SSI unless there are different organisms present at each site.

489

490

491 *Organ/space infection*

492 Defined as a surgical site infection involving any part of the anatomy (i.e. organ/space),
493 other than the incision, opened or manipulated during the surgical procedure, that occurs
494 within 30 days of surgery if no implant is in place, or within 90 days if an implant is in place
495 and the infection appears to be related to the surgical procedure, and meets at least one of
496 the following criteria:

497

498 Criterion 1: Purulent drainage from a drain that is placed through a stab wound into the
499 organ/space.

500

501 Criterion 2: The organ/space yields organisms from the culture of aseptically aspirated fluid
502 or tissue, or from a swab and pus cells are present.

503

504 Criterion 3: An abscess or other evidence of infection involving the organ/space that is
505 found by direct examination, during re-operation, or by histo-pathological or radiological
506 examination.

507

508 Criterion 4: Diagnosis of an organ/space infection by an attending clinician

509 Note: 1. Occasionally, an organ/space infection drains through the incision. Such infection
510 generally does not require re-operation and is considered to be a complication of the
511 incision, and is therefore classified as a deep incisional infection.

512 2. Where doubt exists, refer to the Definitions of specific site of organ/space
513 infection to determine if the organ/space infection meets the definition

514

515 6.3 Asepsis Score

Scores awarded for ASEPSIS components

	Score
Wound characteristic	
Serous exudates	3
Erythema	3
Purulent exudates	6
Separation of wound edges	6
Additional treatment	
Postoperative Antibiotics	10
Abscess drainage	5
Wound debridement	10
Isolation of bacteria	10
Prolonged stay/admission to hospital	5

516

517 **An ASEPSIS score of ≥ 21 is taken as indicating the presence of infection, whilst a score of \leq**

518 **10 is taken to represent satisfactory healing.**

519

520 6.4 QUADAS-2

521 The process occurs in four phases;

522

523 1. Statement of the review question

524 This involves a summary of the review at hand in the form of patients, index tests, reference
525 standards and target condition, details of which can be found in sections 2.2.2 – 2.2.5.

526

527 2. Validation of QUADAS-2 tool

528 Both authors will utilise the tool in two example papers to be included as suggested in the
529 QUADAS-2 supporting material. Agreement of 80% or more across all categories will be
530 taken as sufficient and QUADAS-2 taken forward for assessment of all studies. Insufficient
531 agreement will lead to further refinement of the tool through addition or omitting signalling
532 questions and the process repeated until agreement is satisfactory.

533

534 3. Flow diagram

535 The primary study's flow diagram will be taken (or synthesised if not provided) to facilitate
536 judgments of risk of bias in phase four. This will provide information on the method of
537 patient recruitment, the order of test execution, the number of patients undergoing the
538 index test and reference standard

539

540 4. Judgments on bias and applicability

541 *Risk of Bias*

542 The tool itself comprises four separate domains, the first section of each concerns bias and
543 has three sections.

- 544 - Information used to support the risk of bias judgment; to make the rating
545 transparent and can aid discussion between independent review authors
- 546 - Signalling questions; presented to assist judgements. Answered 'yes', 'no', or
547 'unclear' so that 'yes' would indicate a low risk of bias.
- 548 - Judgement of the risk of bias; 'low', 'high', or 'unclear'. If all signalling questions are
549 answered 'yes' then risk of bias is to be judged as 'low'. If any signalling question
550 returns 'no' there would be potential for bias. The guidelines from phase two will
551 assist authors in the judgement. 'Unclear' should only be used if insufficient data are
552 reported to allow a judgement.

553

554 *Applicability*

555 These sections do not include signalling questions. Authors should record information on
556 which the applicability judgement is made and then rate their concern that the study does
557 not match the review question. This can be rated as 'low', 'high' or 'unclear'. Again, 'unclear'
558 is only to be used when insufficient data are available.

559

560 Guidance for completing the QUADAS-2 tool

561

562 **Domain 1: Patient Selection**

563 *Risk of bias: Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?*

- 564 - Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled?
- 565 - Was a case control design avoided?
- 566 - Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions?

567 Ideally studies should enrol all consecutive or a random sample of patients undergoing
568 surgery, otherwise there is potential for bias. Inappropriate exclusions (difficult diagnosis)
569 may skew estimates of diagnostic accuracy. Enrolment of patients with known SSI may also
570 exaggerate diagnostic accuracy.

571

572 *Applicability: Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the*
573 *review question?*

574 Patients included in the study should match those in the review question to ensure
575 applicability of results. This can be in terms of SSI severity, demographics, comorbidity,
576 study setting.

577

578 **Domain 2: Index Text**

579 *Risk of Bias: Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?*

580 - Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the
581 reference standard?

582 - If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified

583 The first signalling question refers to blinding, and the potential for bias with regards to
584 testing order. If the index test is always conducted and interpreted prior to the reference
585 standard, then this item can be rated 'yes'.

586 The second question depends on the method of telemedicine used. If bluebelle WHQ is
587 used in any of the methods this should be indicated what the cut off for SSI is.

588

589 *Applicability: Are there concerns that the index test, it's conduct, or interpretation differ*
590 *from the review question?*

591 Variations in test technology, execution or interpretation may affect estimates of it's
592 diagnostic accuracy. If these vary from those specified in the review question there may be
593 concerns of applicability.

594

595 **Domain 3: Reference Standard**

596 *Risk of Bias: Could the reference standard, its conduct, or its interpretation have introduced*
597 *bias?*

- 598 - Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition?
- 599 - Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of
600 the index test?

601 What version of the reference standard was used? CDC / ASEPSIS / Bluebelle / other? How
602 likely is that to have correctly identify SSI?

603 Potential for bias is related to the potential influence of prior knowledge on the
604 interpretation of the reference standard, similar to that in domain two.

605

606 *Applicability: Are there concerns that the target condition as defined by the reference*
607 *standard does not match the question?*

608 The target condition, SSI, defined by the reference standard, may differ from the SSI
609 specified in the review question.

610

611 **Domain 4: Flow and Timing**

612 *Risk of Bias: Could the patient flow have introduced bias?*

- 613 - Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard?

614 Ideally results on the index test and reference standard are collected on the same patient at
615 the same time. Delay or initiation of treatment between one of the two tests may result in
616 misclassification due to recovery or deterioration in SSI criteria.

617

618 - Did all patients receive the same reference standard?

619 Verification bias occurs when not all the study patients receive confirmation of diagnosis by
620 the same reference standard.

621

622 - Were all patients included in the analysis?

623 All patients recruited into the study should be included in the analysis. If the number of
624 patients enrolled differs from the number of patients included in the 2x2 table of results,
625 there is potential for bias.

626

627 Presentation of QUADAS-2 results

628 Overall generalisable statements of 'low' or 'high risk of bias' will not be used unless a study
629 is judged to be 'low' across all domains or if the study has been judged 'high' or 'unclear' in
630 one or more domains it may be at risk of bias or as having concerns regarding applicability.

631

632 Results will be presented in the following cross tabulation whereby '+' indicates high risk or
633 concern, '-' indicates low risk or concern and '?' indicates unclear.

634

635

636

Study	Risk of bias				Applicability Concerns		
	Patient Selection	Index Test	Reference Standard	Flow and Timing	Patient Selection	Index Test	Reference Standard
Study 1	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?
Study 2	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?
Study 3	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?
...	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?	+ / - / ?

637 Table 1: Representation of tabulation for QUADAS-2 analysis on systematic review studies.

638

639 Recommended quality items derived from QUADAS tool

640

-
1. Was the spectrum of patients representative of the patients who will receive the test in practice? (representative spectrum)
 2. Is the reference standard likely to classify the target condition correctly? (acceptable reference standard)
 3. Is the time period between reference standard and index test short enough to be reasonably sure that the target condition did not change between the two tests? (acceptable delay between tests)
 4. Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample, receive verification using the intended reference standard? (partial verification avoided)
 5. Did patients receive the same reference standard irrespective of the index result? (differential verification avoided)
-

-
6. Was the reference standard independent of the index test (i.e the index test did not form part of the reference standard) incorporation avoided)
 7. Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? (index test results blinded)
 8. Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard (reference standard results blinded)
 9. Were the same clinical data available when test results were interpreted as would be available when the test is used in practice? (relevant clinical information)
 10. Were uninterpretable/intermediate test results reported? (uninterpretable results reported)
 11. Were withdrawals from the study explained? (withdrawals explained)

Additional items

-
12. Is the technology of the index test unchanged since the study was carried out?
 13. Did the study provide a clear definition of what was considered to be a positive result?
 14. Were data on observer variation reported and within an acceptable range?
 15. Was treatment withheld until both the index test and reference standard were performed?
 16. Were objectives pre-specified?
-

641

642

643 **6.5 Example Search Strategy for Medline or Embase**

644 (exp (Telemedicine)/ OR (remote consultation).mp OR (teleconsultation).mp OR

645 (teleconsultation).mp OR (mobile health).mp OR (telehealth).mp OR (ehealth).mp OR

646 (mhealth).mp OR (e*health).mp OR (e health).mp OR (m*health).mp OR (m health).mp OR

647 (telephon*).mp OR (photograph*).mp OR (video*).mp OR (mobile app*).mp)

648 AND

649 (exp (surgical wound infection)/ OR (surgical wound dehiscence).mp OR surgical site

650 infection).mp OR (postoperative infection).mp OR (SSI).mp OR (wound infection).mp OR

651 (surgical wound complication).mp OR (post-surgical infection).mp OR (post operative

652 infection).mp OR (post-operative infection).mp)

653

654