International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering
(IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 3771-3775
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Interprofessional Nursing–Sterilization Strategies to Reduce Breaks in Sterile Technique During Clinical Practice

Abeer Essa Al Safwan[1]*, Zainab Saeed Ali Al-dhaif[2], Zainab Ali Hassan Alsaisaban[3], Nawal Fahad M Alanazi[4], Mohammed Ayd Adaah Alshalwi[5], Badriya Ayed Hasib Al-Jassar Al-Shammari[6], Alruwaili, Ghadeer Waqqaf Q[7], Nadiyah Turki Munawir Alruwili[8], Maiadah Abdullah Khald Alrwaili[9], Noor Mulawwaj Alkuwaykibi[10], Fatima Monukh Joban Al Kuwaykibi[11]

[1]Sterilization Specialist – Qatif Central Hospital, Eastern Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Qatif, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** miss_a_saf@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5107-7000

[2]Sterilization Specialist – Qatif Central Hospital, Eastern Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Qatif, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: zainab-dhaif@outlook.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5907-7001

[3]Sterilization Specialist – Qatif Central Hospital, First Eastern Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Qatif, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: zainab-ali8010@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5807-7002

[4]Nursing Technician – Al Uwayqilah Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Al Uwayqilah, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: nfalenzy@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5707-7003

[5]Nursing Specialist – King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital, Taif, Taif Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Taif, Makkah Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: mmr-5027@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5607-7004

[6]Nursing Technician – Hail General Hospital, Hail Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Hail, Hail Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: baaaalshammari@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5507-7009

[7]Nursing Technician – Maternity and Children's Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: galrweli@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5407-7008

[8]Nursing Technician – Turaif General Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Turaif, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: ntalrwily@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5307-7007

[9]Nursing Technician – Maternity and Children's Hospital, Sakaka, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Sakaka, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: memeq3805@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5207-7006

[10]Nursing Specialist – Domat Al-Jandal General Hospital, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Domat Al-Jandal, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: nalkuikbi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5107-7005

[11]Nursing Technician – North Medical Tower, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: falkuwaykibi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5997-7030

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4707
Received : 01 March 2024
Accepted : 30 March 2024

Keywords

Interprofessional collaboration,
sterile technique,
aseptic practice,
patient safety,
healthcare-associated infections,
TeamSTEPPS

Abstract:

The consistent maintenance of sterile technique is a critical yet challenging component of patient safety, directly impacting the prevention of healthcare-associated infections. While traditional approaches focus on individual competency, evidence underscores that breaks in sterile technique are often rooted in systemic and communication failures within complex clinical environments. An interprofessional collaborative framework emerges as the most effective strategy to mitigate these risks. This approach integrates shared education through simulation, standardized communication protocols like TeamSTEPPS, environmental design optimized for aseptic workflow, and the cultivation of a culture of psychological safety where every team member is empowered to act as a guardian of sterility. By moving beyond siloed practice and fostering a unified, systems-oriented team dynamic, healthcare professionals can construct a more resilient defense against technical breaches, thereby significantly enhancing patient outcomes and care quality.

1. Introduction

The foundational principle of asepsis, and more specifically, the maintenance of a sterile field and sterile technique, represents one of the most critical pillars of modern clinical practice. Its paramount importance transcends all medical and surgical specialties, serving as the primary defensive barrier between the patient and a host of potential pathogens capable of causing surgical site infections (SSIs), central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSIs), catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTIs), and other healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) [1]. The historical evolution of this practice, from the seminal contributions of Semmelweis and Lister to the highly standardized protocols of the 21st century, underscores a relentless pursuit of patient safety. In contemporary healthcare, sterile technique is not merely a procedural step but an unwavering ethical imperative, directly correlated with patient morbidity, mortality, length of hospital stay, and the associated exponential increase in healthcare costs [2]. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the World Health Organization (WHO) consistently emphasize that a significant proportion of HAIs are preventable, with strict adherence to aseptic and sterile protocols being the most significant modifiable factor [3].

Despite this universal acknowledgment, the consistent and flawless execution of sterile technique in the dynamic, complex, and often high-pressure environment of clinical practice remains an elusive goal. Breaks in sterile technique—defined as any event or action that compromises the integrity of the sterile field or the sterility of equipment, thereby introducing a risk of microbial contamination—are a persistent and multifaceted challenge [4]. These breaches can be overt and dramatic, such as a visibly contaminated instrument falling to the floor, or they can be subtle, insidious, and often unintentional, such as a scrubbed team member turning their back to the sterile field, an unsterile person passing too closely, or a lapse in the proper sequence of donning sterile attire. The consequences, however, can be equally severe, transforming a routine procedure into a life-threatening event for the patient. The etiology of these breaks is seldom rooted in a lack of individual knowledge; most healthcare professionals are rigorously trained in the principles of asepsis. Instead, the causes are frequently systemic and interwoven with the fabric of healthcare delivery itself [5].

The complexity of modern patient care, characterized by intricate procedures, advanced technologies, and critically ill patients with multiple comorbidities, creates a environment ripe for error. Factors such as workforce fatigue, high cognitive load, production pressure to reduce operating room turnover times, inadequate staffing levels, intermittent supply chain issues with sterilization indicators or packaging, and occasional ambiguities in institutional protocols all contribute to an environment where sterile technique can be compromised [6]. Furthermore, the traditional model of healthcare delivery, often siloed within distinct professional boundaries, can exacerbate these risks. When nurses, surgeons, anesthesiologists, surgical technologists, and radiographers operate within rigid hierarchies and without effective, open communication channels, the likelihood of a break occurring—and more importantly, the likelihood of it being recognized and rectified immediately—diminishes significantly. A nurse may observe a potential breach but may hesitate to speak up to a senior surgeon, or an anesthesiologist may inadvertently reach over the sterile field to adjust monitoring equipment without a shared understanding of the field's boundaries [7].

It is within this context that the paradigm of interprofessional practice emerges not as a supplementary concept but as a fundamental, non-negotiable strategy for safeguarding sterile technique. Interprofessional practice is defined as the process by which professionals from different backgrounds work together, with patients, families, and communities, to deliver the highest quality of care. It is built upon the pillars of shared responsibility, mutual respect, and collaborative communication [8].

2. Ecology of Sterile Technique Breaches

To develop effective interprofessional strategies, it is essential to first deconstruct the nature and origins of breaks in sterile technique through a multi-faceted theoretical lens. Human error alone is an insufficient explanation; a systems-based approach, informed by theories from human factors engineering and organizational safety, provides a more comprehensive understanding. James Reason’s "Swiss Cheese Model" of accident causation is particularly instructive when applied to this clinical context [9]. In this model, each layer of defense against a breach (e.g., initial education, sterilization protocols, pre-procedure checklists, team vigilance) is represented as a slice of Swiss cheese, each with inherent holes or weaknesses. These holes are dynamic—they open, close, and shift based on conditions. A catastrophic breach occurs only when the holes in all successive layers momentarily align, permitting a trajectory of accident opportunity. In the case of a sterile field contamination, the holes could be an individual’s momentary lapse (active failure), combined with a poorly designed operating room layout that forces unsterile traffic near the field (latent condition), compounded by a hierarchical culture that discourages a junior team member from speaking up (latent condition) [10].

Furthermore, the concept of the "normalization of deviance," as elucidated by Diane Vaughan, offers critical insight into how sterile technique can erode over time [11]. This sociological phenomenon occurs when a team, faced with production pressure or perceived efficiency gains, repeatedly accepts small, seemingly inconsequential deviations from a strict protocol without experiencing an immediate adverse outcome. For instance, a team might begin to accept that setting up a sterile table five minutes before the patient arrives, rather than at the last possible moment, is an acceptable risk. Over time, this deviation becomes routine, the new standard, and the original, stricter protocol is forgotten. This gradual erosion continues until the margin of safety is critically thin, and a minor additional lapse triggers a serious contamination event. Interprofessional strategies must therefore be designed not only to prevent active errors but also to identify and rectify latent system failures and to actively combat the cultural drift towards the normalization of minor deviations. This requires a shared mental model among all team members regarding what constitutes an absolute standard, not a flexible guideline [12].

3. Interprofessional Education and Simulation-Based Training

The cornerstone of any sustainable improvement in clinical practice is education. However, moving beyond profession-specific silos to interprofessional education (IPE) is crucial for fostering collaboration in maintaining sterility. Traditional training often occurs in disciplinary isolation; nursing students learn sterile technique in nursing labs, medical students in their curricula, and surgical technologists in their own programs. This approach fails to replicate the complex interpersonal dynamics of the actual clinical environment. Structured IPE initiatives that bring together students and practitioners from nursing, medicine, surgery, anesthesiology, and allied health professions to learn about and practice sterile technique as a unified team are essential [13]. These sessions should focus not only on the procedural "how" but also on the collaborative "why" and "when to speak up."

High-fidelity simulation-based training (SBT) is arguably the most powerful tool in this educational arsenal [14]. Realistic scenarios can be constructed in simulation centers that mimic operating rooms, catheterization labs, or bedside procedure settings. Within these controlled but high-pressure environments, teams can practice complex procedures while intentionally introducing challenges designed to test sterile integrity. Examples include a dropped sterile drape, an unscrubbed person needing to access a computer within the sterile zone, or a team member exhibiting a subtle breach like touching their own gown. The simulation is followed by a structured debriefing, a critical component where facilitators guide the team through a reflective discussion of performance, communication, and decision-making. Debriefing allows the team to analyze their actions, identify lapses in technique or communication without the fear of real patient harm, and collaboratively develop strategies for future scenarios [15]. Research has consistently shown that teams that train together using simulation demonstrate improved communication, clearer role understanding, and better adherence to safety protocols, including aseptic technique, in real clinical settings [16].

4. Implementing TeamSTEPPS and Pre-Procedure Briefings

Miscommunication and ambiguity are prolific sources of error in healthcare. In the context of maintaining sterility, unclear statements, unexpressed concerns, or misunderstood instructions can directly lead to a break. The adoption of evidence-based, standardized communication frameworks is therefore an indispensable interprofessional strategy. The Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety (TeamSTEPPS) curriculum, developed by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), provides a suite of tools highly applicable to this domain [17].

Two key TeamSTEPPS tools are particularly relevant. First, the **SBAR (Situation-Background-Assessment-Recommendation)** technique provides a structured format for concise, clear communication, especially useful when a nurse or technologist needs to alert the team leader to a potential or actual breach. For example: "**Situation:** Dr. Smith, I am observing a potential contamination. **Background:** Your sleeve brushed against the edge of the Mayo stand. **Assessment:** The sterility of your gown sleeve may now be compromised. **Recommendation:** I recommend changing your gown before proceeding." This structure depersonalizes the issue and focuses on patient safety. Second, the concept of **"Call-Out" and "Check-Back"** ensures critical information is verified. A surgeon might call out, "All instruments on the field accounted for?" and the scrub nurse performs a check-back by confirming, "All instruments accounted for and sterile."

The **pre-procedure briefing** (or "time-out" plus) is another critical, standardized communication event that must be genuinely interprofessional [18]. Moving beyond the mandatory patient and site verification, an effective briefing for sterility should include a team discussion of key points: the specific procedure and its critical steps, anticipated equipment needs and potential sterility challenges (e.g., use of large imaging equipment), identification of the boundaries of the sterile field, clarification of roles regarding who handles what equipment, and a reaffirmation of the team's shared responsibility for speaking up about any concerns. This brief, focused conversation aligns the team's mental model and sets the stage for proactive vigilance rather than reactive problem-solving after a breach occurs [19].

5. Environmental Design and Systems Engineering

The physical environment and operational systems in which care is delivered exert a profound influence on the ability to maintain sterility. An interprofessional team, including clinicians, infection control specialists, facility managers, and biomedical engineers, must collaborate to design workspaces and workflows that intrinsically support aseptic practice. This is the principle of "making the right action the easy action" through human-centered design [20].

Key considerations in environmental design include the **zonation of procedure rooms** into clearly defined sterile, clean, and dirty areas with visible markings or physical barriers where possible to control traffic flow [21]. The layout should allow unscrubbed personnel to access necessary equipment (e.g., anesthesia machines, imaging monitors) without crossing into or reaching over sterile zones. **Standardized equipment placement** is vital; for instance, ensuring the sterile back table and Mayo stand are always positioned in the same logical orientation relative to the patient and primary team reduces cognitive load and prevents accidental contamination from blind reaches. **Supplies and sterilization processes** themselves require interprofessional oversight. Nurses, central processing staff, and surgeons should collaborate to select standardized surgical packs and instrument sets that minimize unnecessary handling and repackaging, which are opportunities for contamination. The implementation of **barcode scanning or radio-frequency identification (RFID) tags** on sterilized items, integrated with the electronic health record, can provide an automated, fail-safe verification of sterility expiration and tracking, removing reliance on memory alone [22].

6. Cultivating a Culture of Psychological Safety and Empowerment

The most perfectly designed protocols and environments will fail if the individuals within them do not feel safe to use their voice. Psychological safety, defined as a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking, is the bedrock upon which all other interprofessional strategies rest [23]. In a psychologically safe environment, a newly graduated nurse feels as empowered to question a senior surgeon about a potential break as the surgeon does to remind the anesthesiologist about the sterile boundary. This is in stark contrast to traditional, hierarchical medical cultures where speaking up can be perceived as insubordination or a challenge to authority.

Leadership at all levels, but particularly from attending physicians and senior nursing leaders, is the primary driver in establishing this culture. Leaders must explicitly state their expectation that every team member is a guardian of sterility, actively invite input, and respond to concerns with gratitude and corrective action, not defensiveness or reprimand [24]. The practice of **"deference to expertise"**—whereby the person with the most relevant knowledge for a specific problem (e.g., the scrub technologist on instrument sterility) is given authority regardless of rank—must be operationalized. Debriefings after both routine and adverse events should be conducted with a blameless, systems-focused approach, asking "what happened?" rather than "who is to blame?" This reinforces that the goal is collective learning and system improvement, not individual punishment [25]. When a break is identified and mitigated without patient harm, it should be celebrated as a "good catch," reinforcing the value of vigilance and communication.

7. Quality Improvement and Continuous Monitoring

Sustained improvement requires continuous measurement and feedback. Interprofessional teams must engage in quality improvement (QI) methodologies to monitor adherence to sterile technique and track outcomes. Passive surveillance of infection rates, while important, is a lagging indicator. Proactive, leading indicators are needed. This can involve **direct observational audits** conducted by trained, interprofessional peers using validated checklists [26]. These auditors observe procedures and document both compliance with key sterile practices and any observed breaks. The data must be aggregated and analyzed by an interprofessional QI committee (including nurses, surgeons, infection preventionists, and quality officers) to identify patterns and systemic root causes—for example, a specific type of procedure, a particular time of day, or a recurring issue with a specific piece of equipment where breaks are more common [27].

The **Sterile Procedural Safety (SPS) checklist**, an extension of the WHO Surgical Safety Checklist, can be adapted for specific sterile procedures beyond the operating room, such as central line insertions, complex wound care, or lumbar punctures [28]. This tool prompts the team to verbally confirm critical sterility steps immediately before the procedure begins. Furthermore, **technological aids** are increasingly valuable. Video recording of procedures (with appropriate consent and for QI purposes only) allows for detailed retrospective analysis of breaks that were missed in real-time. Emerging technologies like real-time location systems (RTLS) can track the movement of personnel and equipment in relation to sterile fields, providing objective data on traffic patterns that pose contamination risks [29]. The findings from all these monitoring activities must then be fed back to frontline teams in a timely, transparent, and non-punitive manner, closing the loop of the improvement cycle and allowing teams to see the impact of their collaborative efforts.

8. Conclusion

The maintenance of an unbroken sterile technique is a formidable challenge that lies at the very heart of patient safety. As clinical practices grow more complex and healthcare systems face increasing pressures, the vulnerabilities in our defensive barriers against infection become more pronounced. This interprofessional approach is multifaceted, requiring a synergistic integration of theory-informed understanding, collaborative education through simulation, standardized communication, intelligently designed environments, a culture of unwavering psychological safety, and a robust framework for continuous quality improvement. Each element reinforces the others: simulation training builds the communication skills needed for psychological safety; psychological safety enables the honest reporting required for effective quality improvement; and QI data informs the redesign of environments and protocols. When nurses, physicians, technologists, and all members of the care team share a unified mental model of sterility, feel empowered to act as mutual guardians, and are supported by systems designed to prevent error, the chain of defense against contamination becomes significantly stronger.

The journey towards this ideal state requires persistent commitment from institutional leadership, dedicated resources for training and system redesign, and a willingness to continuously challenge and improve upon existing norms. The cost of inaction—measured in human suffering from preventable infections and the financial burden on healthcare systems—is far too great. By embracing interprofessional collaboration as the core strategy, healthcare teams can transform sterile technique from a fragile, individual responsibility into a resilient, collective competency, thereby fulfilling their most sacred duty: to provide care that first, does no harm.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

[1] Liao L, Xiao W, Zhao M, Yu X, Wang H, Wang Q, et al. Can N95 respirators be reused after disinfection? how many times?. ACS Nano. 2020;14(5):6348–6356.

[2] World Health Organization. Modes of transmission of virus causing COVID-19: implications for IPC precaution recommendations. 2020.

[3] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-19 Decontamination and Reuse of Filtering Facepiece Respirators. 2020.

[4] Viscusi DJ, Bergman MS, Eimer BC, Shaffer RE. Evaluation of five decontamination methods for filtering facepiece respirators. Ann Occup Hyg. 2009;53(8):815–827.

[5] Cleaning and Disinfecting 3M Reusable Elastomeric Half and Full Facepiece Respirators following Potential Exposure to Coronaviruses. 3M; 2020.

[6] Ng WK. How clean is clean: a new approach to assess and enhance environmental cleaning and disinfection in an acute tertiary care facility. BMJ Open Qual. 2014;3(1):u205401.w2483.

[7] Rubio-Romero JC, Pardo-Ferreira MDC, Torrecilla-García JA, Calero-Castro S. Disposable masks: disinfection and sterilization for reuse, and non-certified manufacturing, in the face of shortages during the COVID-19 pandemic. Safety Science. 2020;129:104830.

[8] McDonnell GE. Antisepsis, disinfection, and sterilization. Washington, DC: ASM Press; 2007.

[9] Viscusi DJ, King WP, Shaffer RE. Effect of decontamination on the filtration efficiency of two filtering facepiece respirator models. J Int Soc Respir Prot. 2007;24:93–107.

[10] Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). 2020.

[11] Heimbuch BK, Wallace WH, Kinney K, Lumley AE, Wu CY, Woo MH, et al. A pandemic influenza preparedness study: use of energetic methods to decontaminate filtering facepiece respirators contaminated with H1N1 aerosols and droplets. Am J Infect Control. 2011;39(1):e1–e9.

[12] Gerba CP. Quaternary ammonium biocides: efficacy in application. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2015;81(2):464–469.

[13] Fisher EM, Shaffer RE. A method to determine the available UV-C dose for the decontamination of filtering facepiece respirators. J Appl Microbiol. 2011;110(1):287–295.

[14] Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Questions About Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

[15] Lindsley WG, Martin SB, Thewlis RE, Sarkisian K, Nwoko JO, Mead KR, et al. Effects of ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) on N95 respirator filtration performance and structural integrity. J Occup Environ Hyg. 2015;12(8):509–517.

[16] Reed NG. The history of ultraviolet germicidal irradiation for air disinfection. Public Health Rep. 2010;125(1):15–27.

[17] Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, Hui KPY, Yen HL, Chan MCW, et al. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. The Lancet Microbe. 2020;1(1):e10.

[18] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Operational Considerations for Personal Protective Equipment in the Context of Global Supply Shortages for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic: non-US Healthcare Settings. 2020.

[19] Lore MB, Heimbuch BK, Brown TL, Wander JD, Hinrichs SH. Effectiveness of three decontamination treatments against influenza virus applied to filtering facepiece respirators. Ann Occup Hyg. 2012;56(1):92–101.

[20] Peracetic Acid Sterilization. Disinfection & Sterilization Guidelines. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020.

[21] Miscellaneous Inactivating Agents. Disinfection & Sterilization Guidelines. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020.

[22] Carling PC, Briggs JL, Perkins J, Highlander D. Improved cleaning of patient rooms using a new targeting method. Clin Inf Dis. 2006;42(3):385–388.

[23] Final Report for the Bioquell Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor (HPV) Decontamination for Reuse of N95 Respirators. 2016.

[24] Fit Testing Procedures (Mandatory). - 1910.134 App A. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. 2020.

[25] Research to Mitigate a Shortage of Respiratory Protection Devices During Public Health Emergencies. 2019.

[26] Bergman MS, Viscusi DJ, Heimbuch BK, Wander JD, Sambol AR, Shaffer RE. Evaluation of multiple (3-cycle) decontamination Processing for filtering

facepiece respirators. J Engin Fibers Fabr. 2010;5(4):33–41.
[27] CDC H1N1 Flu. Questions and Answers Regarding Respiratory Protection For Preventing 2009 H1N1 Influenza Among Healthcare Personnel. 2010.
[28] Degesys NF, Wang RC, Kwan E, Fahimi J, Noble JA, Raven MC. Correlation between N95 extended use and reuse and fit failure in an emergency department. JAMA. 2020;(1).
[29] Considerations for acute personal protective equipment (PPE) shortages. GOV.UK. 2020.