Journal of Positive Psychology & Wellbeing
2022, Vol. 6, No. 4, 335-339

http://journalppw.com
ISSN 2587-0130

Clinical Laboratory Test And Radiological Methods In Diagnosis Of Orthopedics Condition: Role Of Nurses In Facilitating These Procedures: Review

Faisal Sager Alanazy[1], Salman Dubays Mirsan Alharbi[2], Adnan Hameed Almalki[3], Saad Mahdi Saleh Alamri[4], Mohammed Awadh Salem Alshehri[5], Faris Marzouq Mubarak Alyami[6], Mohammed Jaber Saeed Alwadai[7], Ali Mobarak Abdullah Gadrah[6], Yousef Hussain Saleh Alyami[6], Tariq Bakr Alharbi[8], Mashael Middas Aljahdali[9], Miaad Hasan Alharbi[9], Aliaamin Abdulmonem Hassan[10], Tariq Mohammed A Aloraik[11], Haifaa Ahmed Essa Daeya[12]

[1]orthopedic Surgery, Al Iman General Hospital
[2]technician-Laboratory, Dhariya Generl Hospital
[3]lab Technician, King Abdulaziz Hospital
[4]laboratory Technician, Riyadh Regional Laboratory
[5]lab Technician, King Saud Medical City
[6]laboratory Technician, Maternity And Children Hospital In Najran
[7]laboratory Specialist Non – Doctor, Maternity And Children Hospital In Najran
[8]laboratory Technician, Wadi Fara General Hospital , Madinah Health Cluster
[9]maternity And Children Hospital , Laboratory Specialist
[10]king Fahad General Hospital In Jeddah , Diagnostic Radiology Specialest
[11]senior Lab.Specialist, Riyadh Regional Lab
[12]nursing Technician, Sabyea Aljededah &Salhbah Primary Health Care Center

Abstract

Despite the fact that the fields of radiological imaging, pathology, and laboratory analysis appear to be very different from one another, the medical diagnostic information that these sources provide has a great deal in common with one another. This information can be utilized effectively by encouraging the sharing of quantitative and qualitative results through the utilization of modern information technology processes. Developing the capacities of informatics to coordinate the analysis of pictures produced by clinical radiological imaging, anatomic cellular and molecular pathology, and data gained from the analysis of biomarkers in the laboratory; this method is based on the development of these capabilities. This skill helps to stimulate the formation of novel "integrated diagnostics" in orthopedic disorders, and nursing plays an important part in the technical aspects of many orthopedic operations.

Keywords: *biomarkers, Orthopedic, nursing.*

Introduction

In orthopedic practice, the diagnostic value of a great number of physical tests has been called into doubt, and it has been discovered that a number of these tests correspond poorly with anatomical models [1]. It is possible for doctors to go directly to more invasive or technologically complicated 'definitive' investigations in certain instances; however, this is not always desirable, practical, or economical [2]. It has been suggested, for instance, that the more direct method is to blame for diagnostic

delays as well as the incorrect classification of hip joint disorders.

Recent years have seen the publication of a number of diagnostic reviews of physical examinations of the hip, and these reviews, in general, lend support to the viewpoint that the majority of studies are of a poor to intermediate quality. Within this group of evaluations, three of them focused on labral pathologies and/or femoroacetabular impingement, whereas the fourth one investigated a more comprehensive range of disorders [3].

Surgical site infections (SSIs) in patients who have undergone orthopaedic procedures are particularly devastating because they are associated with permanent functional loss, a greater risk for reoperations and readmissions to the hospital, and consequently, much higher costs. This is despite the fact that all healthcare-associated infections are linked with increased length of hospital stay, disability, and mortality. They can also lead to the failure of an orthopaedic implant, which would require the implant to be removed and would have an effect on the patient's ability to function in the future [4].

Patients are under the care of nurses around the clock during their hospital stays, as well as during the pre-, peri-, and post-operative phases of their recovery. When it comes to the care of orthopaedic patients, nurses who work in orthopaedic settings and are involved in ambulatory/outpatient care, preoperative care, perioperative care, postoperative care, and post-discharge care have a significant part to play in the surveillance and detection of surgical site infections (SSI). The process of wound infection surveillance includes the early recognition and diagnosis of wound infections, which is an essential component of quick treatment and is also a part of the process. In order for nurses to be able to perform this function effectively, they need to have an understanding of how to appropriately recognize wound infections as well as their involvement in the surveillance of wound infections [5].

Review:

In accordance with the standards established by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), a Surgical Site Infection (SSI) might take place within thirty days of a surgical procedure if there is no implant left in place, or within one year if there is an implant present. It is essential to stop the spread of surgical site infections (SSIs) in order to ensure the safety, efficiency, and enhancement of healthcare services [6]. Using evidence-based techniques, which include normal infection control precautions, surgeons and other health professionals being provided feedback on their performance, and policies such as surveillance, it is common knowledge that the rates of surgical site infections (SSI) may be lowered. Early detection of surgical site infections (SSIs) by the use of efficient diagnostic procedures is essential to the safety of patients because it enables infections to be treated promptly and prevents future complications such as the breakdown of the wound (dehiscence), sepsis, and implant failure [6].

For the purpose of limiting the spread of infection, reducing the severity and incidence of complications, and minimizing bad outcomes, early detection of surgical site infections (SSI) plays a significant role. A surgical site infection (SSI) that is not treated can result in a deep wound infection, sepsis, the formation of an abscess, failure of wound healing and dehiscence, and failure of implant, in addition to having an impact on other elements of the patient's wellbeing and functional recovery. When it comes to ensuring that infections are diagnosed as early as possible, the observation of patients and their wounds by nurses is absolutely necessary [7].

In most cases, the evaluation of clinical signs and symptoms is the primary factor that guides the diagnosis of any particular health issue. Within the majority of wounds, the findings of clinical examination are the most effective method for diagnosing infection. Damage to tissue triggers a number of physiological cascades, one of which is inflammation. These cascades exhibit themselves as symptoms, which might serve as potentially helpful signs that an infection is present. Inflammation is a response that occurs when tissue is injured. It is this reaction, which occurs as a response to the invasion of microorganisms, that shows as symptoms of infection. It is this reaction that enables patients and physicians to recognize the possibility that there is an infection present. When an injury or infection occurs, the

inflammatory response is triggered in order to transport protective cells and fluid to the area of the body that is affected. As part of the process of wound healing, the acute inflammatory response that occurs after surgery or damage should only persist for a few days. However, if there is an infection present, the acute inflammatory response may last for a significantly longer period of time. This is because the host's inflammatory response is a response to the invasion of microorganisms in the tissues [8].

In acute infections, there are various 'cardinal' indications that represent external signs of the inflammatory tissue response to the invasion of microorganisms. These signs include redness, heat, swelling, discomfort, and loss of function. The most reliable method for determining whether or not a wound is infected is by clinical observation of the patient and the wound for diagnostic reasons [9]. This method is far more effective than laboratory tests.

The only thing that laboratory testing can do is establish the presence of superficial organisms in or around a surgical wound. They are unable to provide any information regarding whether or not these organisms are having a negative impact on the tissue that is being treated. This recommendation was made by the National Institute for Clinical Excellence in 2008, which stated that wound sampling should only be considered in cases where the wound is not responding to antibiotics that have been selected based on their likelihood of battling the most likely bacteria. It is possible that wound swabbing will be beneficial in the event that there is purulent discharge coming from the incision, a sinus, or if the wound is open. However, this is not typically the case for orthopaedic surgical sites, and as a result, a significant amount of time and resources are frequently spent in the processing and reporting of wound swab samples that are not appropriate because this fundamental issue is lacking in comprehension [9].

The goals of social security disability insurance (SSI) surveillance at the national level are to monitor trends and drive planning, investigate the impact of initiatives, gather information on the quality of treatment, and distribute resources. Important aspects of an efficient surveillance system include the collection of appropriate and consistent data, the use of standardised protocols, and the adequacy of resources (for example, professionals trained in epidemiology and information technology systems). Stratification by risk variables (for example, the surgeon performing the surgery, the health status of the patient, and the time and complexity of surgery) should also be included in the collection of data.

In addition to outcome indicators, such as the rates of surgical site infections (SSIs), process measures, which refer to the actions taken to avoid infections, should also be measured and analyzed through surveillance. This is done to support the implementation of infection prevention and control treatments and to enhance performance. Compliance with antimicrobial prophylaxis recommendations (such as the correct type/administration/discontinuation of prophylaxis), guidelines for hair removal and peri-operative glucose control, and best practices in aseptic postoperative wound care are some of the process measures that are included among others [11]. There have been a number of organizations that have produced guidelines for the prevention of surgical site infections (SSIs), and these guidelines have been covered in a prior practice development paper [11].

It is the rate of SSI that is utilized as an outcome indication the most frequently. It has been suggested by a few writers that the incidence density of surgical site infections (SSIs) is a more suitable indication of outcome since it takes into consideration the varying lengths of hospital stays experienced by patients who are hospitalized. There is also the possibility of using the risk-adjusted SSI rates [12].

When attempting to make a realistic comparison regarding the rates of surgical site infections (SSI) among surgeons, hospitals, and over time, it is necessary for these rates to reflect the variance in the risk factors of patients. This is because the rates alone cannot take into account differences in risk between populations. Risk adjustment is typically accomplished by the utilization of the CDC National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) risk index. This index is designed to forecast the occurrence of a surgical site infection (SSI) in a specific patient. Based on the following factors, this risk index score can range from 0 (which indicates that there is no risk factor) to 3 (which indicates that

there are three risk factors): a) an American Society of Anesthesiologists score that is equal to or greater than three; b) a surgical operation that is classified as contaminated or dirty-infected; and c) an operation that lasts longer than expected (which offers practitioners the opportunity to adjust the surgical site infection rates based on the number of risk factors that are present [13].

Conclusion:

In conjunction with clinical laboratory tests and radiographic examinations The clinical importance of the laboratory test that their patients have undergone is something that orthopaedic nurses need to be aware of because the critical examination of the results is necessary for making clinical decisions. The nurses are supposed to incorporate the findings into their own individual treatment plans. One method for the surveillance of surgical site infections (SSI) is the formation of multidisciplinary teams at each and every hospital. These teams are responsible for providing direction, clinical expertise, and feedback. In the same way that all interventions should be created and implemented by a multidisciplinary team, infection prevention processes should also be designed and implemented by such a team in order to achieve commitment from all of the disciplines involved in order to embed sustainable change. Infection control physicians, microbiologists, medical staff, operating department staff, information technology staff, and the nursing team, which should include clinical nurse specialists, ward nurses, infection control nurses, and surveillance nurses, should all be members of a multidisciplinary surveillance group for SSI. One of the most common roles that nurses play in infection prevention and control programs is that of coordinators or leaders.A relatively small percentage of the physical examinations performed on the hip in routine clinical practice are supported by evidence that can be considered reliable for diagnostic purposes. In order to exclude radiologically undetected hip fractures, the patellar-pubic percussion test was utilized, and the hip abduction sign was utilized for the purpose of identifying sarcoglycanopathies in patients who were already diagnosed with muscular dystrophies. Both of these tests revealed strong diagnostic usefulness.

Reference

[1] Hegedus EJ, Goode A, Campbell S, Morin A, Tamaddoni M, Moorman CT 3rd, Cook C. Physical examination tests of the shoulder: a systematic review with meta-analysis of individual tests. Br J Sports Med. 2008;42:80–92. discussion 92.

[2] Sackett DL, Rennie D. The science of the art of the clinical examination. JAMA. 1992;267:2650–2652.

[3] McAlister FA, Straus SE, Sackett DL. Why we need large, simple studies of the clinical examination: the problem and a proposed solution. CARE-COAD1 group: clinical assessment of the reliability of the examination-chronic obstructive airways disease group. Lancet. 1999;354:1721–1724.

[4] Burgess RM, Rushton A, Wright C, Daborn C. The validity and accuracy of clinical diagnostic tests used to detect labral pathology of the hip: a systematic review. Manual Ther. 2011;16:318–326.

[5] Leibold MR, Huijbregts PA, Jensen R. Concurrent criterion-related validity of physical examination tests for hip labral lesions: a systematic review. J Man Manip Ther. 2008;16:E24–41.

[6] Reiman MP, Goode AP, Hegedus EJ, Cook CE, Wright AA. Diagnostic accuracy of clinical tests of the hip: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med . 2012;47:893–902.

[7] Hedrick, T.L., Harrigan, A.M., Sawyer, R.G., Turrentine, F.E., Stukenborg, G.J., Umapathi, B.A., et al., 2015. Defining surgical site infection in colorectal surgery: an objective analysis using serial photographic documentation. Dis. Colon Rectum 58 (11), 1070–1077.

[8] Henkelmann, R., Frosch, K.H., Glaab, R., Lill, H., Schoepp, C., Seybold, D., et al., 2017. Infection following fractures of the proximal tibia – a systematic review of incidence and outcome. BMC Muscoskel. Disord. 18, 481.

[9] Henneman, E.A., Gawlinski, A., Giuliano, K.K., 2012. Surveillance: a strategy for improving patient safety in acute and critical care units. Crit. Care Nurse 32 (2), e9–18.

[10] Horan, T.C., et al., 1992. CDC definitions of nosocomial surgical site infections, 1992: a modification of CDC definitions of surgical wound infections. Am. J. Infect. Contr. 20, 271–274.
[11] Kasatpibal, N., et al., 2006. Impact of surgeon-specific feedback on surgical site infection rates in Thailand. J. Hosp. Infect. 63, 148–155.
[12] Reilly, J., Noone, A., Clift, A., Cochrane, L., Johnston, L., Rowley, D.I., Phillips, G., Sullivan, F., 2005. A study of telephone screening and direct observation of surgical wound infections after discharge from hospital. J. Bone Joint Surg. Br. 87 (7), 997–999.
[13] Scottish Surveillance of Healthcare Infection Programme (SSHAIP), 2019a. Health Protection Scotland Surgical Site Infection Surveillance Protocol Edition 7.1.