Water for wound cleansing (Review)

Fernandez R, Griffiths R, Ussia C

This is a reprint of a Cochrane review, prepared and maintained by The Cochrane Collaboration and published in *The Cochrane Library* 2010, Issue 2

http://www.thecochranelibrary.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Intervention Review]

Water for wound cleansing

Ritin Fernandez[1], Rhonda Griffiths[1], Cheryl Ussia[1]

[1]School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Western Sydney, Penrith South DC, Australia

Contact address: Ritin Fernandez, School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Western Sydney, Campbelltown Campus, Locked Bag 1797, Penrith South DC, New South Wales, 1797, Australia. r.fernandez@uws.edu.au.

Editorial group: Cochrane Wounds Group.
Publication status and date: Edited (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 2, 2010.
Review content assessed as up-to-date: 1 November 2007.

Citation: Fernandez R, Griffiths R, Ussia C. Water for wound cleansing. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD003861. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003861.pub2.

ABSTRACT

Background

Various solutions have been recommended for cleansing wounds, however normal saline is favoured as it is an isotonic solution and does not interfere with the normal healing process. Tap water is commonly used in the community for cleansing wounds because it is easily accessible, efficient and cost effective, however, there is an unresolved debate about its use.

Objectives

The objective of this review was to assess the effects of water compared with other solutions for wound cleansing.

Search strategy

Randomised and quasi-randomised controlled trials were identified by electronic searches of Cochrane Wounds Group Specialised Register (November 2007), Ovid MEDLINE (1996-October 2007), Ovid EMBASE (1980-October 2007), Ovid CINAHL (1982-October 2007) and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (Issue 3; 2007). Primary authors, company representatives and content experts were contacted to identify eligible studies. Reference lists from included trials were also searched.

Selection criteria

Randomised and quasi randomised controlled trials that compared the use of water with other solutions for wound cleansing were eligible for inclusion. Additional criteria were outcomes that included objective or subjective measures of wound infection or healing.

Data collection and analysis

Trial selection, data extraction and quality assessment were carried out independently by two authors and checked by a third author. Differences in opinion were settled by discussion. Some data were pooled using a random effects model.

Main results

Eleven trials were included in this review. Seven trials were identified that compared rates of infection and healing in wounds cleansed with water and normal saline, three trials compared cleansing with no cleansing and one trial compared procaine spirit with water. There were no standard criteria for assessing wound infection across the trials which limited the ability to pool the data. The major comparisons were water with normal saline, and tap water with no cleansing. For chronic wounds, the relative risk of developing an infection when cleansed with tap water compared with normal saline was 0.16, (95% CI 0.01 to 2.96). Tap water was more effective than saline in reducing the infection rate in adults with acute wounds (RR 0.63, 95% CI 0.40 to 0.99). The use of tap water to cleanse acute wounds in children was not associated with a statistically significant difference in infection when compared to saline (RR 1.07,

95% CI 0.43 to 2.64). No statistically significant differences in infection rates were seen when wounds were cleansed with tap water or not cleansed at all (RR 1.06, 95% CI 0.07 to 16.50). Likewise, there was no difference in the infection rate in episiotomy wounds cleansed with water or procaine spirit. The use of isotonic saline, distilled water and boiled water for cleansing open fractures also did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference in the number of fractures that were infected.

Authors' conclusions

There is no evidence that using tap water to cleanse acute wounds in adults increases infection and some evidence that it reduces it. However there is not strong evidence that cleansing wounds per se increases healing or reduces infection. In the absence of potable tap water, boiled and cooled water as well as distilled water can be used as wound cleansing agents.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

The effects of water compared with other solutions for wound cleansing

Water is frequently used for cleaning wounds to prevent infection. This can be tap water, distilled water, cooled boiled water or saline (salty water). Using tap water to cleanse acute wounds in adults does not increase the infection rate, however, there is no strong evidence that cleansing per se is better than not cleansing. The reviewers concluded that where tap water is high quality (drinkable), it may be as good as other methods such as sterile water or saline (salty) water (and more cost-effective), but more research is needed.

BACKGROUND

Management of chronic and acute wounds has changed significantly in the last decade however minimal attention has been focused on the types of solutions used for wound cleansing.

The process of wound cleansing involves the application of a non-toxic fluid to remove debris, wound exudate and metabolic wastes to create an optimal environment for wound healing (Murphy 1995; Waspe 1996; Rodeheaver 1999). Clinicians and manufacturers have recommended various cleansing agents for their supposed therapeutic value. Preparations with antiseptic properties have been traditionally used, however published research using animal models has suggested that antiseptic solutions may hinder the healing process (Brennan 1985; Thomlinson 1987; Glide 1992; Bergstrom 1994; Hellewell 1997). The controversy surrounding the use of antiseptics prompted the development of guidelines for the use of antiseptics by wound care experts. These guidelines have resulted in changes in hospital practice.

Normal saline (0.9%) is the favoured wound cleansing solution because it is an isotonic solution and does not interfere with the normal healing process, damage tissue, cause sensitization or allergies or alter the normal bacterial flora of the skin (which would allow the growth of more virulent organisms) (Huxtable 1993; Lawrence 1997; Philips 1997; Joanna Briggs 1998). Tap water is also recommended and has the advantages of being efficient, cost effective and accessible (Fowler 1985; Angeras 1992; Murphy 1995; Thompson 1999). However, clinicians have been cautioned against using tap water to cleanse wounds that have exposed bone or tendon, in which case normal saline is recommended (Lindholm 1999).

There has been much debate in clinical circles about the potential advantages and disadvantages of cleaning exudate from the wound as the exudate itself may contain growth factors and chemokines which contribute to wound healing (Thomson 1998). However the literature also suggests that large amounts of bacteria may inhibit wound healing because of the proteases secreted by the organisms (Robson 1988). Until further research has established its demerits, cleansing will continue to remain an integral part of the wound management process (Hellewell 1997).

Wounds cause considerable cost to individuals in terms of morbidity, and to the health services in terms of the personnel and consumables to perform wound care (Johnson 1997). The purpose of this systematic review was to investigate the effectiveness of water for cleansing wounds in clinical practice.

OBJECTIVES

The objective of this review was to compare the effects of water (tap or cool, boiled or distilled) and saline for wound cleansing.

The review will address the following questions

What are the comparative effects on rates of healing and infection in acute and chronic wounds, of the following cleansing solutions:

- tap water compared with no cleansing
- tap water compared with sterile normal saline
- water (distilled and/or cooled boiled water) compared with sterile normal saline
- tap water compared with cooled boiled tap water
- tap water compared with any other solution

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

All randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and quasi randomised controlled trials comparing wound healing outcomes or infection rates in wounds cleaned with water and those cleaned with normal saline or any other solution were included in this review. A quasi randomised controlled trial uses a method of allocating participants that is not truly random e.g. according to date of birth (odd or even years) (Jadad 1998). Trials were included if they reported an objective measure of infection such as wound culture or biopsy and objective measures of healing such as change in surface area and wound depth. Trials that included only subjective measures of infection such as redness, purulent discharge or swelling around the affected area were also included in the review, however they were analysed separately. Trials undertaken in any country, irrespective of the tap water quality were included, and there was no restriction on the basis of the language in which the trial reports were written.

Types of participants

Trials involving people of all ages with a wound of any aetiology, in any setting (hospital, community, nursing homes, general practice, wound clinics) were included in this review. For the purpose of the review a wound was defined as a break in the skin.
Trials were excluded if they compared solutions for dental procedures or for patients with burns.

Types of interventions

Trials were eligible for inclusion if the solutions compared were used specifically for wound cleansing. For the purpose of this review, wound cleansing is defined as: "the use of fluids to remove loosely adherent debris and necrotic tissue from the wound surface" (Hellewell 1997).
All trials evaluating the following comparisons were eligible for inclusion in the review:

- tap water compared with no cleansing
- tap water compared with sterile normal saline
- water (distilled and/or cooled boiled water) compared with sterile normal saline
- tap water compared with cooled boiled water
- tap water compared with any other solution.

Trials excluded from the review were those that:
1. Utilised solutions for pre operative skin cleansing to prevent postoperative infections;
2. Assessed the effectiveness of solutions as part of the operative procedure, for example lavage with povidone-iodine or normal saline after fascia closure;
3. Compared dressings for patients with ulcers;
4. Used a solution, for example povidone-iodine as a prophylactic treatment.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

The primary outcome of interest was wound infection, as measured objectively by bacterial counts, wound cultures, wound biopsy and/or by subjective indicators of wound infection (e.g. presence of pus, discolouration, friable granulation tissue).

Secondary outcomes

- proportion of wounds that healed
- the rate of wound healing expressed as percentage or absolute change in wound area.
- costs
- pain and discomfort
- patient satisfaction
- staff satisfaction.

Search methods for identification of studies

See Appendix 1 for the search strategy for the first update of the review.

Electronic searches

For this second update the following databases were searched without language or publication status restrictions: The Cochrane Wounds Group Specialised Register (searched 5/11/07);
Ovid MEDLINE (2004-October Week 4 2007)
Ovid CINAHL (2004-October Week 4 2007);
Ovid EMBASE (2004-2007 Week 44);
Nursing Collection (1995 to 2000) and HealthSTAR (1975 to 2000)
The following search strategy was used in the The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials and modified for other databases where appropriate:
#1 MeSH descriptor Wounds and Injuries explode all trees
#2 MeSH descriptor Skin Ulcer explode all trees
#3 MeSH descriptor Diabetic Foot explode all trees
#4 ("wound" or "wounds" or "ulcer" or "ulcers" or "bite" or "bites" or "abrasion" or "abrasions" or "laceration" or "lacerations" or "diabetic foot" or "diabetic feet"):ti,ab,kw
#5 (#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4)
#6 MeSH descriptor Water explode all trees
#7 "water":ti,ab,kw
#8 (#6 OR #7)
#9 (clean* or wash* or irrigat* or shower* or bath* or rins*):ti,ab,kw
#10 (#5 AND #8 AND #9)
The MEDLINE search strategy was run in combination with the Cochrane highly sensitive search strategy for identifying reports of randomised controlled trials (Higgins 2005). The EMBASE and CINAHL searches were combined with the trial filters developed by the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN).

Searching other resources

Investigators were contacted about any additional trials potentially eligible for inclusion. The reference lists and bibliographies within obtained reviews and trials were further scrutinised to identify additional studies. Experts and company representatives in the field of wound care were contacted, however no further articles were elicited from these groups.

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

The references and abstracts of the trials identified by the above search were assessed against the eligibility criteria independently by two authors and confirmed by the third and the full text of potentially relevant trials was obtained. References identified from the search of electronic databases and other literature were entered into a bibliographic software package (End Note). The decision to include or exclude a study against the eligibility criteria was jointly made by two authors and confirmed by the third.

Data extraction and management

The following data were extracted for each trial:

- characteristics of wounds and patients in the trials
- description of main interventions, including tap water quality
- description of concurrent interventions
- setting
- duration of follow-up
- rates of wound infection
- number of wounds healed
- the number and reasons of withdrawals
- costs
- pain score/ level of discomfort
- patient and staff satisfaction

Trials published in duplicate were included only once, however maximum data were extracted from each publication. Data were extracted from included trials, independently by two authors, using a data extraction sheet developed and piloted by the review team, and then summarised. Differences in opinion between the authors were adjudicated by the third author and resolved by discussion. Trials were excluded from the review if they made comparisons that did not include the use of tap water. These trials have been listed with their reasons for exclusion (Characteristics of excluded studies).

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

The reports of all included trials were evaluated by three authors using the Jadad scale (Jadad 1996) plus the following criteria to assess the methodological quality:

- detailed description of inclusion and exclusion criteria used to derive the sample from the target population
- appropriate random sequence generation (e.g. random number tables)
- evidence of sample size calculation
- evidence of allocation concealment at randomisation (e.g. centralised or remote randomisation, sealed opaque envelopes)
- description of baseline comparability of treatment groups
- description of methods used to assess adverse effects
- evidence of blinded outcome assessment
- description of the types of wounds (grades)
- description of withdrawals and dropouts and
- description of the method of statistical analysis.

Differences in opinion between the authors were resolved by discussion.

Data synthesis

The main comparison of water with other wound cleansing solutions was stratified by whether the wounds were classified as acute or chronic (this subgroup analysis was pre-specified in the protocol). A weighted treatment effect across trials was calculated using the Cochrane statistical package, RevMan version 4.2. The trials were assessed for clinical heterogeneity by considering the settings, populations, interventions and outcomes. Where two or more trials compared similar solutions and used the same outcome measures, they were tested for heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic (Higgins 2003). This statistic examines the percentage of total variation across studies due to heterogeneity rather than to chance. Values of I^2 over 75% indicate a high level of heterogeneity and in such cases the appropriateness of pooling would be carefully considered. Dichotomous outcomes (e.g. number of patients developing a wound infection) have been expressed as relative risks with 95% confidence intervals (CI).

RESULTS

Description of studies

See: Characteristics of included studies; Characteristics of excluded studies.

This update includes two new trials (Godinez 2002; Moscati 2007). Twenty nine randomised controlled trials comparing wound cleansing solutions were identified but only eleven were eligible for inclusion in this review. Eighteen trials were excluded as they either compared various types of dressings or used solutions for purposes other than cleansing (e.g. povidone-iodine for infection prophylaxis). These trials are listed in the Characteristics of excluded studies with reasons for their exclusion. The included studies were conducted in Australia (Griffiths 2001), Germany (Riederer 1997; Neues 2000), Singapore (Tay 1999), Sweden (Angeras 1992), USA (Goldberg 1981; Godinez 2002; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007) and Tanzania (Museru 1989).

Trial design

Nine of the eleven trials were conducted in single centres (Goldberg 1981; Museru 1989; Angeras 1992; Riederer 1997; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Bansal 2002; Godinez 2002; Valente 2003). All trials utilised a parallel group design and the studies by Museru 1989 and Neues 2000 had 3 comparison arms.

Participants

The age of the patients ranged from 2 to 95 years. Two trials were undertaken in children (Bansal 2002; Valente 2003). In 5 of the eleven trials (Angeras 1992; Tay 1999; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003) the treatment groups in each individual trial were comparable at baseline. In the trial by Angeras 1992 there were significantly more males than females in both groups and half the patients were between 18 and 35 years. In 8 trials the baseline data were not available. Of the included trials, 5 trials involved people with lacerations (Angeras 1992; Bansal 2002; Godinez 2002; Moscati 2007; Valente 2003), one trial each involved people with open fractures, (Museru 1989) and chronic wounds (Griffiths 2001) while four trials examined people with surgical wounds (Goldberg 1981; Riederer 1997; Tay 1999; Neues 2000).

Interventions

Ten of the elevan trials evaluated patients in the hospital emergency departments and ward settings (Goldberg 1981; Museru 1989; Angeras 1992; Riederer 1997; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Bansal 2002; Godinez 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007) and only one trial (Griffiths 2001) was under taken in the community. The cleansing process was undertaken by the medical or nursing staff (Museru 1989; Angeras 1992; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Godinez 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007) or by the person themselves (Goldberg 1981; Riederer 1997; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Moscati 2007). It was unclear if standard instructions were given to the patients or the health professionals about the cleansing process. Only one trial (Godinez 2002) specified the duration of the cleansing process and only 4 trials reported on the volume of the cleansing fluid used (Museru 1989; Griffiths 2001; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007). The solutions used for wound cleansing included tap water (Goldberg 1981; Angeras 1992; Riederer 1997; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Godinez 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007), cooled boiled water (Museru 1989), distilled water (Museru 1989) and normal saline (Museru 1989; Angeras 1992; Griffiths 2001; Godinez 2002; Moscati 2007). The duration of follow up ranged from 1 to 6 weeks. The method used to contain the solution was reported in four trials and included bowls (Angeras 1992; Godinez 2002), clean washed bottles (Griffiths 2001), and sterile bottles or basins (Museru 1989; Bansal 2002). The method for cleansing included irrigation (Museru 1989; Angeras 1992; Griffiths 2001; Godinez 2002; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007) and showering (Goldberg 1981; Riederer 1997; Neues 2000).

Risk of bias in included studies

The eight point Quality Scale Assessment tool developed by the Cochrane Collaboration (Mulrow 1996) was used to measure the quality of the randomised controlled trials and based on these criteria essential information was absent from 5 of the eleven trials (Goldberg 1981; Museru 1989; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Godinez 2002). All trials stated that allocation to treatment was random; random number tables were used in three trials (Griffiths 2001;

Bansal 2002; Moscati 2007); alternate allocation (in fact quasi-random) in six trials (Goldberg 1981; Angeras 1992; Riederer 1997; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Valente 2003) and the allocation method used was not described in two trials (Museru 1989; Godinez 2002). Two trials(Griffiths 2001; Moscati 2007) clearly described concealed allocation, which was achieved by a computer generated randomisation process with the code held at a remote site.

Eight trials (Goldberg 1981; Museru 1989; Angeras 1992; Riederer 1997; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007) provided a clear description of the inclusion/exclusion criteria; three trials (Angeras 1992; Griffiths 2001; Moscati 2007) provided information on whether the patients and the outcome assessors were blinded to the intervention.

A description of the baseline characteristics of the patients is essential to assess comparability between the groups (indicates if randomisation was successful). It also assists the reader in deciding if the results are applicable to their situation. The baseline characteristics for each treatment group were given in six of the nine trials (Angeras 1992; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003). The sex of the patients in each group was stated in five trials (Angeras 1992; Tay 1999; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003). The distribution of males and females was even in three trials (Angeras 1992; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002) and the trial by Tay (Tay 1999) had recruited only females. There was no difference in the age of the patients in each treatment group in the six trials (Angeras 1992; Tay 1999; Neues 2000; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003) in which age was reported. Comparability between types of wounds was reported in all but one trial (Godinez 2002).

A wide range of outcome measures was used in the included trials. With the exception of trials that compared tap water with no cleansing, other comparisons were represented within single studies. The patients were followed up for a maximum of 6 weeks after therapy (Griffiths 2001), thus it is difficult to determine the long term effects of tap water on the wounds that had not healed. Six of the included trials commented on the attrition rates and described the number and reason for withdrawals (Angeras 1992; Riederer 1997; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007). Sample sizes ranged between 35 to 770 patients (median 111). Two trials described a priori sample size calculation (Valente 2003; Moscati 2007). Cost analysis was reported in only two trials (Griffiths 2001; Moscati 2007).

Effects of interventions

Eleven trials were identified that met the inclusion criteria. Three trials (Goldberg 1981; Riederer 1997; Neues 2000) compared wounds cleansed using tap water with those not cleansed and eight trials (Museru 1989; Angeras 1992; Tay 1999; Griffiths 2001; Bansal 2002; Godinez 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007) compared wound cleansing with water and other solutions. There was significant heterogeneity in the types of the wounds, the cleansing solution used and the outcomes measures used in the trials. All trials used subjective measures to assess wound infection and two trials used blinded outcome assessment (Griffiths 2001; Moscati 2007).

1. Comparison of tap water with no cleansing (Analysis 1)

Three RCTs (Goldberg 1981; Riederer 1997; Neues 2000) were identified that compared infection and healing rates in patients with surgical wounds who were allowed to bathe or shower their wounds and those who were not. The studies allowed patients assigned to the showering group to use cleansing agents.

Primary outcome (Infection)

Data for infection were pooled in a meta-analysis. Neues 2000 assigned participants to one of three groups and those assigned to the control group were required to keep the wounds dry for 8 days following surgery, one intervention group used tap water only and the third group used tap water and shower gel for body cleansing. No wound infection was reported in any of the three groups. As the characteristics of the two groups that showered were comparable, we considered it appropriate to combine the data from those groups for comparison with data from the no cleansing group. Although this approach maintains the randomisation and avoids double counting, it results in unequally sized comparison groups. Overall pooling the results of these three trials (Goldberg 1981; Riederer 1997; Neues 2000) demonstrated no difference in infection rate between wounds that were cleansed using tap water compared with wounds not cleansed (RR 1.06, 95% CI 0.07 to 16.50)(Analysis 01, Outcome 01).

Secondary outcomes

(i) Wound healing

Two trials reported on wound healing (Goldberg 1981; Neues 2000). Neues 2000 reported wound dehiscence as a measure of wound healing. Pooled data demonstrated no statistically significant difference in the number of wounds that did not heal between the groups (RR 1.26, 95% CI 0.18 to 8.66) (Analysis 01, Outcome 02).

(ii) Patient satisfaction

The only secondary outcome for which there were data from both trials was patient satisfaction. Although an objective measurement scale was not used in either trial, a feeling of well being was reported

in both studies among the patients who were allowed to shower their wounds.

2. Comparison of tap water with normal saline (Analysis 2)

Six trials (Angeras 1992; Griffiths 2001;Bansal 2002; Godinez 2002; Valente 2003; Moscati 2007) compared infection and healing rates in acute and chronic wounds irrigated with either tap water or normal saline.

Primary outcome (infection)

(a) Acute wounds

Three trials (Angeras 1992; Godinez 2002; Moscati 2007) compared infection rates in acute soft tissue wounds and lacerations that were sutured and pooled results demonstrated a significant reduction in infection rates in wounds cleaned with tap water compared with normal saline (RR 0.63, 95% CI 0.40 to 0.99; p=0.05) (Analysis 02, Outcome 01). This result is interpreted as a relative risk reduction in the incidence of wound infection of 37% associated with the use of tap water for wound cleansing. A significantly higher infection rate in the saline group was reported in one trial (Angeras 1992) which could be attributed to the difference in the temperature of the irrigant used (tap water was at 37°C whilst normal saline was at room temperature). Two trials (Bansal 2002; Valente 2003) measured infection rates in children and the pooled results demonstrated no statistically significant difference in the infection rates in children whose wounds were cleansed with saline or tap water (RR 1.07, 95% CI 0.43 to 2.64; p=0.88) (Analysis 02, Outcome 01).

(b) Chronic wounds

Griffiths 2001 reported no statistically significant difference in infection rates in non sutured chronic wounds that were cleansed with either tap water or normal saline (RR 0.16, 95% CI 0.01 to 2.96; p=0.22). The low power of this trial to detect a clinically important difference as statistically significant must be emphasised (49 wounds and only 3 infections). (Analysis 02, Outcome 02).

Secondary outcomes

(i) Wound healing

Only one trial reported on wound healing (Griffiths 2001). There was no statistically significant difference in the number of wounds that healed after cleansing with either tap water or normal saline (RR 0.57, 95% CI 0.30 to 1.07) (Analysis 02, Outcome 03).

(ii) Cost analysis

Two trials (Griffiths 2001; Moscati 2007) reported a cost analysis and demonstrated that the use of tap water was inexpensive compared with the use of normal saline. In the trial by Griffiths 2001 the estimated cost per dressing using normal saline was AUD$1.43 plus the cost of the dressing, compared with AUD$1.16 using tap water. If the wound was cleansed during showering, the only cost would be the dressing. Costs for the saline group included staff time, materials and equipment used for the dressings. In the second trial (Moscati 2007) costs were calculated to include supplies, saline and antibiotics if required. The costs were extrapolated to the eight million lacerations that occur in the USA each year. The results demonstrated an adjusted annual saving of US$65,600,000 if wounds were irrigated using tap water.

(iii) Patient satisfaction

Griffiths 2001 cleansed wounds using tap water and normal saline, both administered from a bottle. The authors reported that patients who had showered their wounds prior to participating in the trial preferred that method to irrigation with normal saline. This finding demonstrates that method of cleansing remains as important as the solution used for cleansing wounds.

3. Comparison of water (distilled water and/or cooled boiled water) with normal saline (Analysis 3)

Museru 1989 designed a three arm study to compare the infection and healing rates as a consequence of cleansing by irrigation open fractures using distilled water; cooled boiled water; or isotonic saline. The following comparisons were made:
(A) Distilled water compared with cooled boiled water.
(B) Distilled water compared with isotonic saline.
(C) Cooled boiled water compared with isotonic saline.

(A) Distilled water compared with cooled boiled water

Primary outcome (Infection)

Six out of 35 patients (17%) in the distilled water group and 9/31(29%) in the cooled boiled water group developed a wound infection; this difference was not statistically significant. (RR 1.69, 95% CI 0.68 to 4.22). The small number of wounds cleansed using distilled water (n=35) and cooled boiled water (n=31) means that the study lacked power to detect clinically important differences (Museru 1989)Analysis 3.1.

(B) Distilled water with isotonic saline (Analysis 03, Outcome 02)

Primary outcome (Infection)

Outcomes from the distilled water group were also compared with the isotonic saline group. In this comparison 7/20 (35%) patients whose fractures were cleansed with isotonic saline developed an infection compared with 6/35 (17%) in the distilled water group (RR 0.49, 95% CI 0.19 to 1.26)Analysis 3.1(Museru 1989).

(C) Cooled boiled water with isotonic saline (Analysis 03, Outcome 03)

Primary outcome (Infection)

Outcomes from the isotonic saline group were also compared with the cooled boiled water group. In this comparison 9/31 (29%) patients whose fractures were cleansed with cooled boiled water developed an infection compared with 7/20 (35%) cleansed with isotonic saline (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.37 to 1.87)Analysis 3.1(Museru 1989).

(D) Water (distilled water and/or cooled boiled water) with normal saline (Analysis 03, Outcome 04)

Primary outcome (Infection)

When the results for the distilled and cooled boiled water were pooled and compared with isotonic saline, there was no statistically significant difference in the number of infections (RR 0.65, 95% CI 0.31 to 1.37)(Analysis 3.1). However this comparison was severely under-powered (86 participants, 22 infections)(Museru 1989).

Secondary outcomes

No secondary outcomes were reported for any of the comparisons.

4. Comparison of tap water with cooled boiled tap water

No trials were identified that made these comparisons

5. Comparison of tap water with procaine spirit

Procaine spirit is a preparation of procaine HCL 2% with spirit 70%, that is commonly prescribed as a wound cleansing agent following surgery. One trial compared the use of procaine spirit with tap water for washing postoperative wounds (Tay 1999). Women who had undergone a normal vaginal delivery with an episiotomy were randomised to have the incision site cleaned with either tap water or procaine spirit.

Primary outcomes

The authors reported that there were no statistically significant differences in the number of infections. As actual data were unavailable, analysis using RevMan could not be undertaken.

Secondary outcomes

No statistically significant difference in wound complications was reported and by the 14th day all the wounds had healed well. Another outcome reported was pain and the findings indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in pain scores between women cleansing with procaine and tap water.

Quality of the tap water

Two trials reported on the quality of the water used. Griffiths 2001 reported that the quality of the tap water met the requirements of the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council and Angeras 1992 undertook microbiological cultures of samples of the water used and reported that the bacterial counts were fewer than 5 bacteria /ml except in two instances, when gram negative rods 103/ml and antheroid rods 106/ml were isolated. However none of the bacteria isolated from the tap water were identified in the cultures taken from the wound.

DISCUSSION

This systematic review of the effectiveness of water for wound cleansing has summarised the best available evidence at the time of the report. Following an extensive literature search, eleven trials were identified that met the inclusion criteria and are presented in this review. With the exception of one trial (Angeras 1992) there was no evidence of a benefit of cleansing, nor of any particular type of cleansing solution. However the trial by Angeras 1992 has some methodological flaws; for example the solutions were administered at different temperatures, therefore the evidence needs to be interpreted with caution and more rigorous research is needed. Furthermore the Angeras trial was conducted in Sweden where high quality drinking water is readily available. The use of tap water as a cleanser would not be recommended in a country where a constant supply of potable drinking water is not available.

The fundamental feature of randomised controlled trials is the ability to eliminate selection bias through the method of allocation. In three of the included trials, details of the method of randomisation of patients to treatment groups were absent (Museru 1989; Neues 2000; Godinez 2002) and in six the methods were susceptible to selection bias (Goldberg 1981; Angeras 1992; Tay 1999; Riederer 1997; Neues 2000; Valente 2003) which reduces the strength of the evidence. The ability to extract definitive conclusions from the trials detailed in this review is reduced by the overall poor quality

of the trials and the lack of replication of most comparisons. Although three trials (Goldberg 1981; Museru 1989; Angeras 1992) were completed before the CONSORT guidelines were published (Begg 1996) when recommendations for trial reporting was formalised, the trial by Angeras 1992 was well reported.

It is essential that the eligibility criteria are well defined in order to understand the type of population treated. The eligibility criteria should also define the severity of the patients eligible to participate. For example the description of the type of wound should accord with a standard criteria. This would allow the findings and recommendations to be generalised to other clinical settings.

Data analysis regarding wound infection was complicated by a lack of consistency in the criteria used to assess wound infection. In addition, variance data for the healing outcomes were not reported in the study that compared tap water with procaine spirit (Tay 1999). The use of a standardised and validated tool for the measurement of wound infection and healing and an assessor blinded to the intervention would have enhanced the rigour of the trials and strengthened the evidence. Other outcomes such as patient comfort and satisfaction should be measured.

Meta analysis was restricted to trials of the same intervention that assessed the same outcome and was consequently limited by the lack of replication studies. As a result this report is mainly in the narrative form with figures utilised to highlight particular findings.

The lack of an apparent effect of cleansing on the infection and healing rates in wounds that were not cleansed and those that were cleansed with either tap water or other solutions is important for the clinicians and the health services. The current practice in wound management is to cleanse the wound while showering the patient and in many instances these patients include those who are bedfast (AWMA Inc 2002). In this review although all trials used some type of water only three trials (Goldberg 1981; Riederer 1997; Neues 2000) used showering as a method to cleanse wounds. While the findings of this review do not indicate adverse effects from the use of tap water, practitioners and health service managers should interpret the findings with caution as most of the comparisons were based on single trials, some of which do not report the methodology in sufficient detail to enable assessment of quality.

The availability and cost of resources may also determine which solution is used for cleansing wounds in different settings. One trial reported that in countries with limited resources distilled or boiled water is used for wound cleansing without complications.

Prospective trials in this subject need to be more robust in order to assist clinicians and policy makers in making informed decisions about the appropriate use of solutions for cleansing wounds.

Limitations of the review

Inadequate reporting of the trials made it difficult for the authors to critically appraise the validity of the trials. Although attempts were made to contact the authors to obtain additional data, no response was received and this lack of information is reflected in the report.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

Tap water is a wound cleansing agent commonly used in the community and hospitals, however published data on patient outcomes from tap water cleansing have not previously been reviewed. Based on the randomised trials undertaken to date, evidence suggests that tap water is unlikely to be harmful if used for wound cleansing. The decision to use tap water to cleanse wounds should take into account the quality of water, nature of wounds and the patient's general condition, including the presence of comorbid conditions.

This update includes two trials undertaken in patients with acute lacerations which together with the trial included in the previous review demonstrates a significant reduction in the infection rates in wounds that were cleansed using tap water compared with those cleansed with normal saline. There is evidence that the use of tap water is cost-effective when it is undertaken as part of the patient's personal hygiene as it limits the use of other equipment. The meta analysis indicated no significant difference in the infection and healing rates in postoperative wounds that have been cleansed with tap water (showered) and those that were not cleansed. Clinicians should consider the relative benefits of cleansing clean surgical wounds.

Implications for research

Properly designed multicentre trials are needed to compare the clinical benefits and cost effectiveness of different solutions for wound cleansing in different groups of patients, different types of wounds and in a wide range of settings.

Trials comparing cleansing with no cleansing are required to determine the extent to which cleansing contributes to the healing and infection of acute and chronic wounds.

The strongest evidence for whether tap water is an effective wound cleansing solution, is likely to be provided by trials in which the volume and the temperature of the comparison solution is the same as the tap water.

Future research should have well defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, adequate sample size, methods to ensure baseline comparability of the groups, use of true randomisation with allocation concealment, use of an objective outcome measurement of

wound infection and healing (e.g. percentage and absolute change in wound area), blinded outcome assessment, adequate follow up period and appropriate statistical analysis.

The trials should be reported according to the guidelines set out in the CONSORT statement (Begg 1996) to enable readers to determine the validity and reliability of the results.

Given the purchasing costs of equipment, economic evaluations should be undertaken in future trials.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the Nursing Director of the South Western Sydney Area Health Service (Australia) for funding this review. In addition we would like to acknowledge the assistance of the librarians and library staff of the Liverpool Health Service library for their assistance with the development of the search strategy and the timely retrieval of articles; Rachel Langdon and Soufiane Bofous for their assistance with the statistical analysis; Venita Devi for secretarial support; Jeff Rowland, Brenda Ramstadius and Annette Hodgkinson for reading drafts and commenting on the clinical and policy perspective of the review. Thanks to Associate Professor Rosemary Chester for her support throughout the project and to Adrian Bauman, Bin Jalaludin, Maureen McIlwrath, Claire Matthews and Jenny Morris who peer reviewed the review for methodological rigour, readability and clinical relevance. We also acknowledge the assistance of Heidi Otten and Dr Hashi with interpretation of studies in German. We would like to thank Cheryl Ussia, a community nurse who identified the need for a systematic review as a basis for the development of evidence based practice guidelines for community nurses. Cheryl was then seconded to work with the review team as a clinical expert in wound care and was responsible for organising the retrieval of papers and obtaining data on unpublished studies for the initial version of this review.

The authors would like to thank Cochrane Wounds Group referees (Brian Gilchrist, Carol Dealey, Fuijan Song, Ruth Lewis, Mary Harrison, Raj Mani, Seokyung Hahn) and Editors (Nicky Cullum, Mieke Flour) for their comments to improve the review. In addition the authors would like to thank Ruth Foxlee (Trial Search Coordinator) for updating the search strategy and running the searches for this update and Sally Bell-Syer (Review Group Coordinator) for checking the manuscript, editorial advice and copy editing.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

Angeras 1992 *{published data only}*
* Angeras MH, Brandberg A, Falk A, Seeman T. Comparison between sterile saline and tap water for the cleaning of acute traumatic soft tissue wounds. *European Journal of Surgery* 1992;**158** (6-7):347–50.

Bansal 2002 *{published data only}*
* Bansal BC, Wiebe RA, Perkins SD, Abramo TJ. Tap water for irrigation of lacerations. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2002;**20**(5):469–72.

Godinez 2002 *{published data only}*
Godinez FS, Grant-Levy TR, McGuirk TD, Letterle S, Eich M, O'Malley GF. Comparison of normal saline vs tap water for irrigation of minor lacerations in the emergency department. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2002;**19**(5):396–7.

Goldberg 1981 *{published data only}*
* Goldberg H, Rosenthal S, Nemetz J. Effect of washing closed head and neck wounds on wound healing and infection. *The American Journal of Surgery* 1981;**141**:358–9.

Griffiths 2001 *{published data only}*
* Griffiths RD, Fernandez RS, Ussia CA. Is tap water a safe alternative to normal saline for wound irrigation in the community setting?. *Journal of Wound Care* 2001;**10**(10):407–11.

Moscati 2007 *{published data only}*
Moscati RM, Mayrose J, Reardon RF, Janicke DM, Jehle DV. A multicentre comparison of tap water versus sterile saline for wound irrigation. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2007;**14**:404–10.

Museru 1989 *{published data only}*
* Museru LM, Kumar A, Ickler P. Comparison of isotonic saline, distilled water and boiled water in irrigation of open fractures. *International Orthopaedics* 1989;**13**(3):179–80.

Neues 2000 *{published data only}*
* Neues C, Haas P. Modification of postoperative wound healing by showering [[Beeinflussung der postoperativen wundheilung durch duschen]]. *Chirurg* 2000;**71**(2):234–6.

Riederer 1997 *{published data only}*
* Riederer SR, Inderbitzi R. Does a shower put postoperative healing at risk ?. *Chirurg* 1997;**68**(7):715–7.

Tay 1999 *{published data only}*
* Tay SK. Is routine procaine spirit application necessary in the care of episiotomy wound?. *Singapore Medical Journal* 1999;**40**(9): 581–3.

Valente 2003 *{published data only}*
* Valente JH, Forti RJ, Freundlich LF, Zandieh SO, Crain EF. Wound irrigation in children: saline solution or tap water?. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 2003;**41**:609–16.

References to studies excluded from this review

Bansal 1993 *{published data only}*

* Bansal NK, Mukul MD. Comparison of topical phenytoin with normal saline in the treatment of chronic trophic ulcers in leprosy. *International Journal of Dermatology* 1993;**32**(3):210–13.

Bulstrode 1988 *{published data only}*

* Bulstrode CJ, Goode AW, Scott PJ. A prospective controlled trial of topical irrigation in the treatment of delayed cutaneous healing in human leg ulcers. *Clinical Science* 1988;**75**(6):637–40.

Burke 1998 *{published data only}*

* Burke DT, Ho CH, Saucier MA, Stewart G. Effects of hydrotherapy on pressure ulcer healing. *American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 1998;**77**(5):394–8.

Chisholm 1992 *{published data only}*

* Chisholm CD, Cordel WH, Rogers K, Woods JR. Comparsion of a new pressurized saline canister versus syringe irrigation for laceration cleansing in the emergency department. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 1992;**21**(11):1364–7.

Falk 1989 *{published data only}*

Falk A, Brandberg Å, Hall-Angerås M, Seeman T. Irrigation of acute traumatic soft tissue wounds - a comparision between sterile saline and tap water. *Annales Chirurgiae et Gynaecologiae* 1989;**78** (suppl 204):48.

Fraser 1976 *{published data only}*

* Fraser I, Askew A, Biles J, Pinchin J. Prospective randomised controlled trial of early postoperative bathing. *BMJ* 1976;**1**(6024): 1506–7.

Greenway 1999 *{published data only}*

* Greenway SE, Filler LE, Greenway FL. Topical insulin in wound healing: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Journal of Wound Care* 1999;**8**(10):526–8.

Johnson 1985 *{published data only}*

* Johnson JN, Croton RS, McGlinchey JJ, McLoughlin GA. The effect of povidone-iodine irrigation on perineal wound healing following proctectomy for carcinoma. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 1985;**6**(Suppl A):81–6.

King 1984 *{published data only}*

King J, Bulstrode C, Revell P. Irrigating fluid in arthroscopy. *Lancet* 1984;**84**(8369):159–60.

Manhold 1976 *{published data only}*

* Manhold JH, Manhold EA, Singh S. Animal experimental procedure used in human subjects to compare healing effectiveness of saline, placebo, and a type of commercial oxygenating agent. *Journal of Dental Research* 1976;**55**(48):B73.

Medves 1997 *{published data only}*

* Medves JM, O'Brien BA. Cleaning solutions and bacterial colonization in promoting healing and early separation of the umbilical cord in healthy newborns. *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 1997;**88**(6):380–2.

Patterson 2005 *{published data only}*

Patterson MM. Multicenter pin care study. *Orthopaedic Nursing* 2005;**24**(5):349–50.

Scondotto 1999 *{published data only}*

* Scondotto G, Aloisi D, Ferrari P, Martini L. Treatment of venous leg ulcers with sulodexide. *Angiology* 1999;**50**(11):883–9.

Selim 2000 *{published data only}*

* Selim P. Will water do? Cleansing of leg ulcers in the community. *ACCNS Journal for Community Nurses* 2000;**5**:11–13.

Selim 2001 *{published data only}*

* Selim P, Bashford C, Grossman C. Evidence-based practice: tap water cleansing of leg ulcers in the community. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2001;**10**:372–9.

Svedman 1983 *{published data only}*

* Svedman P. Irrigation treatment of leg ulcers. *The Lancet* 1983;**2** (8349):532–4.

Sweet 1976 *{published data only}*

* Sweet JB, Butler DP, Drager JL. Effects of lavage techniques with third molar surgery. *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology* 1976;**41**(2):152–8.

Voorhees 1982 *{published data only}*

* Voorhees E, Rosenthal D. Early postoperative showering. *Military Medicine* 1982;**147**(11):967–8.

References to studies awaiting assessment

Valente 2001a *{unpublished data only}*

Valente JH, Forti RJ, Freundlich LF, Zandieh SO, Crain EF. Wound irrigation: Tap water or saline?. *Pediatric Research* 2001;**49**(4):78A.

Valente 2001b *{unpublished data only}*

Valente JH, Forti RJ, Freundlich LF, Zandieh SO, Crain EF. Wound irrigation in children: saline solution or tap water?. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2001;**8**(5):539.

Valente unknown *{unpublished data only}*

Valente JH, Forti RJ, Freundlich LF, Zandieh SO, Crain EF. Wound irrigation: Tap water or saline?. Emergency conference.

Weiss 2007 *{published data only}*

* Weiss E, Lin M, Oldham G. Tap water is equally safe and effective as sterile normal saline for wound irrigation; a double blind, randomized, controlled, prospective clinical trial. Society for Academic Emergency Medicine 2007 Annual Meeting; 2007 May 16-19; Chicago, IL. 2007:S146–47.

Additional references

AWMA Inc 2002

The Australian Wound Management Association Inc. Standards for wound management. Australian Wound Management Association Inc 2002.

Begg 1996

Begg C, Cho M, Eastwood S, Horton R, Moher D, Olkin I, et al.Improving the quality of reporting of randomized controlled trials: the CONSORT statement. *JAMA* 1996;**276**(8):637–9.

Bergstrom 1994

Bergstrom N, Bennett MA, Carlson CE. Pressure Ulcer Treatment.. *Clinical practice guideline No. 15*. Rockville, MD: US: Department of Health and Human services, Public health service, Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, 1994:1–144.

Brennan 1985

Brennan SS, Leaper DJ. The effects of antiseptics on the healing wound: A study using the rabbit ear chamber. *British Journal of Surgery* 1985;**72**(10):780–2.

Fowler 1985
Fowler E. Wound cleansing. *Journal of Gerontical Nursing* 1985;**11**(8):42–3.

Glide 1992
Glide S. Cleaning choices. *Nursing Times* 1992;**88**(19):74–8.

Hellewell 1997
Hellewell TB, Major DA, Foresman PA, Rodeheaver GT. A cytotoxicity evaluation of antimicrobial and non antimicrobial wound cleansers. *Wounds* 1997;**9**(1):15–20.

Higgins 2003
Higgins J, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring in consistency in meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2003;**327**:557–60.

Higgins 2005
Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. Highly sensitive search strategies for identifying reports of randomized controlled trials in MEDLINE. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions 4.2.5 [updated May 2005] Appendix 5b. http://www.cochrane.org/resources/handbook/hbook.htm. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, (accessed 5 November 2007), issue Issue 4.

Huxtable 1993
Huxtable K. Ritual cleansing. *Nursing New Zealand* 1993;**1**(3):14–16.

Jadad 1996
Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJ, Gavaghan DJ, McQuay HJ. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary?. *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1996;**17**(1):1–12.

Jadad 1998
Jadad A. *Randomised controlled trials. A user's guide*. London: BMJ Books, 1998.

Joanna Briggs 1998
Joanna Briggs Institute. *Wound Dressing*. Adelaide: Joanna Briggs Institute Margaret Graham Building , Royal Adelaide Hospital, North Terrace, 1998.

Johnson 1997
Johnson M, Grosvenor J, Nguyen Q, Chang S, McVernon S. *Validation of the community home nursing groups and cost weights home*. Sydney: South Western Sydney Centre for Applied Nursing Research, 1997:A5-2 A5-3.

Lawrence 1997
Lawrence JC. Wound irrigation. *Journal of Wound Care* 1997;**6**(1):23–6.

Lindholm 1999
Lindholm C, Bergsten A, Berglund E. Chronic wounds and nursing care. *Journal of Wound Care* 1999;**8**(1):5–10.

Mulrow 1996
Mulrow C, Oxman A. *How to conduct a Cochrane systematic review*. London: BMJ Publishing Group, 1996.

Murphy 1995
Murphy A. Wound Care. Cleansing Solutions. *Nursing Times* 1995;**91**(22):78–80.

Philips 1997
Philips D, Davey C. Clinical Corner. Wound cleansing versus wound disinfection: a challenging dilemma. *Perspectives* 1997;**21**(14):15–6.

Robson 1988
Robson M. Disturbances of wound healing. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 1988;**17**(12):1274–8.

Rodeheaver 1999
Rodeheaver GT. Pressure ulcer debridement and cleansing: A review of current literature. *Ostomy Wound Management* 1999;**45**(1A (Suppl)):80S–85S.

SIGN
Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN). Search filters. http://www.sign.ac.uk/methodology/filters.html#random accessed 5 November 2007.

Thomlinson 1987
Thomlinson D. To clean or not clean?. *Nursing Times* 1987;**83**(9):71–5.

Thompson 1999
Thompson S. Towards evidence based emergency medicine: best BETS from the Manchester Royal Infirmary. Wound cleaning methods. *Journal of Accident and Emergency Medicine* 1999;**16**(1):63–4.

Thomson 1998
Thomson P. Microbiology of wounds. *Journal of Wound Care* 1998;**7**(9):477–8.

Waspe 1996
Waspe J. Tissue viability. Treating leg ulcers with high pressure irrigation devices. *Nursing Standard* 1996;**11**(6):53–4.

* *Indicates the major publication for the study*

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies *[ordered by study ID]*

Angeras 1992

Methods	Quasi-randomised controlled trial (allocation by alternation). Baseline characteristics comparable.
Participants	705 patients with soft tissue wounds less than 6 hours old, requiring sutures. Exclusion criteria: wounds that had connection with the thoracic cavity, abdominal cavity or the joints.
Interventions	1) wounds irrigated with tap water (n= 295) 2) wounds irrigated with sterile normal saline (n= 332)
Outcomes	1) Wound infection (defined as pus visible in the wound and prolonged healing time as judged by the nurse).
Notes	88 patients evenly distributed between the two groups were lost to follow-up. Follow-up was undertaken 1 to 2 weeks after wound closure. Bacterial cultures taken every week from the tap water. Temperature of the tap water was 37 degrees C while the saline was delivered at room temperature.

Risk of bias

Item	Authors' judgement	Description
Allocation concealment?	No	C - Inadequate

Bansal 2002

Methods	Randomised controlled trial. Allocation using randomisation schedule. Baseline characteristics comparable.
Participants	46 children with simple lacerations
Interventions	1) cleansing with tap water (n=21) 2) cleansing with saline (n=24)
Outcomes	1) Wound Infection - Criteria for wound complications (one or more of the following) 1. Cellulitis or erythema of the wound margin of more than 4 mm with tenderness 2. Purulent discharge from the wound 3. Ascending lymphangitis 4. Dehiscence of the wound with wound separation of >2mm
Notes	Person performing the wound irrigation was blinded to the solution used. Wound irrigated with 35 ml syringe attached to an irrigation shield (25-40 psi).

Bansal 2002 (*Continued*)

Risk of bias		
Item	**Authors' judgement**	**Description**
Allocation concealment?	Yes	A - Adequate

Godinez 2002

Methods	Randomised controlled trial. Method of allocation not stated. Baseline comparability not stated.
Participants	94 participants with minor extremity lacerations.
Interventions	1) irrigation with tap water (n=36) 2) irrigation with saline (n=41)
Outcomes	1) Wound infection
Notes	Wounds were irrigated with tap water at a flow rate of 7litres/minute. Saline was poured in a basin and aspirated using a syringe and irrigation was done using a pulsatile motion.

Risk of bias		
Item	**Authors' judgement**	**Description**
Allocation concealment?	Unclear	B - Unclear

Goldberg 1981

Methods	Quasi randomised controlled trial. Method of allocation by alternation. Consecutive patients allocated to each group. Does not state if the assessor was blinded
Participants	200 patients with lacerations or incisions who were operated.
Interventions	1) Patients allowed to rinse all over with soap and water after 24 hours (n=100) 2) Patients kept their wounds dry (n=100)
Outcomes	1) Wound Infection
Notes	

Risk of bias		
Item	**Authors' judgement**	**Description**

Goldberg 1981 (*Continued*)

Allocation concealment?	No	C - Inadequate

Griffiths 2001

Methods	Randomised controlled trial. Allocation was by a list of random numbers nominated by person not entering patients into the trial (closed list). Both patients and outcome assessors were blinded to the treatment. Baseline characteristics comparable.
Participants	35 patients with 49 chronic wounds. Exclusion criteria: Grade 1 & 4 wounds, patients receiving antibiotics or who were immuno suppressed due to therapy, and wounds with a sinus where the base was not visible.
Interventions	1) wounds irrigated with tap water (n= 23) 2) wounds irrigated with normal saline (n=26)
Outcomes	1) Wound infection (defined as presence of pus, discolouration, friable granulation tissue, pain tenderness, pocketing or bridging at base of the wound, abnormal smell and wound breakdown. 2) Number of wounds that healed 3) Cost effectiveness 4) Patient satisfaction 5) Variance in wound size.
Notes	4 patients in each group withdrew from the study. Wounds were assessed at the end of 6 weeks. Quality of tap water reported to meet Australian National Health and Medical Research Council requirements.

Risk of bias

Item	**Authors' judgement**	**Description**
Allocation concealment?	Yes	A - Adequate

Moscati 2007

Methods	Randomised controlled trial. Allocation using computer based random numbers generator. Baseline comparability between groups not stated. Person performing the assessment was blinded to the solution used.
Participants	715 subjects with uncomplicated skin lacerations requiring staple or suture repair
Interventions	1) irrigation with tap water (n=334) 2) irrigation with minimum 200 mls of sterile saline (n=300) Irrigation with tap water undertaken by patient while irrigation with sterile saline was undertaken by the

	provider. Wounds were irrigated with a 35 ml syringe using a splash guard.
Outcomes	1) Wound infection defined as wounds that required a significant change in their course of treatment such as surgical debridement, antibiotics or early removal of sutures. 2) Costs
Notes	

Risk of bias

Item	Authors' judgement	Description
Allocation concealment?	Yes	A - Adequate

Museru 1989

Methods	Randomised controlled trial. No information on the method of randomisation. Blinding not mentioned. No loss to follow up. Baseline characteristics of patient not stated however baseline description of wounds comparable.
Participants	86 patients with open fractures. No exclusion criteria stated.
Interventions	1) wounds irrigated with distilled water (n= 35) 2) wounds irrigated with boiled water (n= 31) 3) wounds irrigated with isotonic saline (n=20)
Outcomes	1) Wound infections (No definition for wound infection) 2) Chronic osteomyelitis 3) Tetanus 4) Gangrene
Notes	Length of follow up not stated.

Risk of bias

Item	Authors' judgement	Description
Allocation concealment?	Unclear	B - Unclear

Neues 2000

Methods	Quasi-randomised controlled trial (allocation by the month). Blinding not mentioned. Both groups comparable for age however comparability for gender not stated.
Participants	817 patients having surgery for varicose veins. Exclusion criteria not specified.
Interventions	1) wounds showered on day two (water only)(n=274) 2) wounds showered on day two (water + shower gel)(n=268) 3) wounds kept dry for 8 to 10 days (not cleansed)(n=302)
Outcomes	1) Wound infections (not defined)
Notes	94 patients in the non showered group, 130 in the group that used only water and 40 patients in the group that used water and shower gel were lost to follow up.

Risk of bias

Item	Authors' judgement	Description
Allocation concealment?	No	C - Inadequate

Riederer 1997

Methods	Quasi-randomised controlled trial (allocation by alternation). Blinding not mentioned. Patient demographics not stated.
Participants	121 patients having surgery for inguinal hernia. Exclusion criteria not stated.
Interventions	1) wounds showered on day one (n= 49) 2) wounds kept dry for 14 days (not cleansed)(n=52)
Outcomes	1) Wound infection (defined as irritation, slight redness of skin and stitch abscess). 2) Patient satisfaction.
Notes	Wounds assessed after 14 days.

Risk of bias

Item	Authors' judgement	Description
Allocation concealment?	No	C - Inadequate

Tay 1999

Methods	Quasi-randomised controlled trial (allocation by the month). Blinding of outcome assessors not mentioned. Participants in both groups comparable for age, parity, educational level and duration of 1st and second stage of labour.
Participants	100 women having an episiotomy for a normal vaginal delivery. No loss to follow up. No exclusion criteria specified.
Interventions	1) perineal toilet using water and procaine spirit (n=50) 2) perineal toilet using water only (n=50)
Outcomes	1) Wound infection (not defined). 2) Wound healing (assessed for the degree of edema, bruising, erythema, wound union and wound discharge with a score of 0-2 for each parameter. 3) Pain score assessed using a verbal analogue scale between 0-10.
Notes	Wounds assessed on day 14

Risk of bias

Item	Authors' judgement	Description
Allocation concealment?	No	C - Inadequate

Valente 2003

Methods	Quasi randomised controlled trial. Method of allocation was by alternation.
Participants	530 children with simple lacerations.
Interventions	1) Cleansing with tap water (n=259) 2) Cleansing with saline (n=271) Wounds assigned to the normal saline group were irrigated using a 30-60 ml syringe and a 18G angio-catheter or splash guard. Wounds assigned to the tap water group were irrigated under running tap water for 10 seconds.
Outcomes	Wound Infection Criteria for wound infection not stated.
Notes	Tap water pressure and flow rates were measured prior to the study.

Risk of bias

Item	Authors' judgement	Description

Valente 2003 (*Continued*)

Allocation concealment?	No	C - Inadequate

Characteristics of excluded studies *[ordered by study ID]*

Bansal 1993	This study compared the effects of topical phenytoin powder and normal saline on the healing of trophic leprosy ulcers.
Bulstrode 1988	This study compared the addition of dilute and concentrated amino acids to saline on the rate of healing of chronic leg ulcers.
Burke 1998	Study was excluded because the intervention was combined with saline dressings and whirlpool therapy (water). It is therefore not possible to attribute any effect to whirlpool therapy (water).
Chisholm 1992	This study compared two devices used for irrigation of wounds. Irrigating solution used with both devices was Normal saline.
Falk 1989	This study is a duplicate citation of the included study by Angeras (1992).
Fraser 1976	The purpose of the trial was not to assess the cleansing of the wound.
Greenway 1999	Study excluded because it evaluates the effect of insulin and normal saline on the healing rate of wounds.
Johnson 1985	Study excluded because it compares irrigation of perineal wounds with either 1% povidone-iodine or normal saline.
King 1984	Wound cleansing in this study was part of the operative procedure.
Manhold 1976	The study compared normal saline and glycoside for irrigation during dental procedures.
Medves 1997	The study evaluates solution used to cleanse umbilical cord. A systematic review focusing on umbilical cord care has been undertaken.
Patterson 2005	This study used antibacterial soap along with water for cleansing which could influence the findings.
Scondotto 1999	This study evaluates the efficacy of sulodexide compared to cleansing with physiological solution and the application of elastic compression on the healing of venous ulcers.
Selim 2000	Review
Selim 2001	No data reported
Svedman 1983	Compares two different methods of wound irrigation. Isotonic saline was the irrigant used in both groups.

(*Continued*)

Sweet 1976	Not relevant to the review. This study compares two different devices for the irrigation of third molar surgical sites with high volumes of normal saline.
Voorhees 1982	The purpose of the trial was not to assess the cleansing of the wound.

DATA AND ANALYSES

Comparison 1. Tap Water vs No Cleansing

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Infection	3	873	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.06 [0.07, 16.50]
2 2. Wounds not healed	2	772	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.26 [0.18, 8.66]

Comparison 2. Tap Water vs Normal Saline

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Infection (acute wounds only)	5		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Adults	3	1338	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.63 [0.40, 0.99]
1.2 Children	2	535	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.07 [0.43, 2.64]
2 Infection (chronic wounds only)	1	49	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.16 [0.01, 2.96]
3 Healing	1	49	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.57 [0.30, 1.07]

Comparison 3. Water (distilled water and/or cool boiled water) vs Normal Saline

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 1. Infection	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Distilled water vs Cool boiled water	1	66	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.69 [0.68, 4.22]
1.2 Distilled water vs Isotonic Saline	1	55	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.49 [0.19, 1.26]
1.3 Cool boiled water vs Isotonic saline	1	51	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.83 [0.37, 1.87]
1.4 Water (Distilled and Boiled) vs Isotonic saline	1	86	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.65 [0.31, 1.37]

Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Tap Water vs No Cleansing, Outcome 1 Infection.

Review: Water for wound cleansing

Comparison: 1 Tap Water vs No Cleansing

Outcome: 1 Infection

Study or subgroup	Water n/N	No cleansing n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Goldberg 1981	0/100	0/100		0.0 [0.0, 0.0]
Neues 2000	0/364	0/208		0.0 [0.0, 0.0]
Riederer 1997	1/49	1/52		1.06 [0.07, 16.50]
Total (95% CI)	**513**	**360**		**1.06 [0.07, 16.50]**

Total events: 1 (Water), 1 (No cleansing)

Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.0, df = 0 (P = 1.00); I^2 =0.0%

Test for overall effect: Z = 0.04 (P = 0.97)

Analysis 1.2. Comparison 1 Tap Water vs No Cleansing, Outcome 2 2. Wounds not healed.

Review: Water for wound cleansing

Comparison: 1 Tap Water vs No Cleansing

Outcome: 2 2. Wounds not healed

Study or subgroup	Water n/N	No Cleansing n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Goldberg 1981	1/100	0/100		28.2 %	3.00 [0.12, 72.77]
Neues 2000	1/364	1/208		71.8 %	0.57 [0.04, 9.09]
Total (95% CI)	**464**	**308**		**100.0 %**	**1.26 [0.18, 8.66]**

Total events: 2 (Water), 1 (No Cleansing)

Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.60, df = 1 (P = 0.44); I^2 =0.0%

Test for overall effect: Z = 0.23 (P = 0.82)

Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Tap Water vs Normal Saline, Outcome 1 Infection (acute wounds only).

Review: Water for wound cleansing

Comparison: 2 Tap Water vs Normal Saline

Outcome: 1 Infection (acute wounds only)



Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Tap Water vs Normal Saline, Outcome 2 Infection (chronic wounds only).

Review: Water for wound cleansing

Comparison: 2 Tap Water vs Normal Saline

Outcome: 2 Infection (chronic wounds only)



Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2 Tap Water vs Normal Saline, Outcome 3 Healing.

Review: Water for wound cleansing

Comparison: 2 Tap Water vs Normal Saline

Outcome: 3 Healing

Study or subgroup	Tap Water n/N	Normal Saline n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Griffiths 2001	8/23	16/26		100.0 %	0.57 [0.30, 1.07]
Total (95% CI)	**23**	**26**		**100.0 %**	**0.57 [0.30, 1.07]**
Total events: 8 (Tap Water), 16 (Normal Saline)					
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.76 (P = 0.079)					



Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3 Water (distilled water and/or cool boiled water) vs Normal Saline, Outcome 1 1. Infection.

Review: Water for wound cleansing

Comparison: 3 Water (distilled water and/or cool boiled water) vs Normal Saline

Outcome: 1 1. Infection

Study or subgroup	water n/N	saline n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI
1 Distilled water vs Cool boiled water					
Museru 1989	9/31	6/35		100.0 %	1.69 [0.68, 4.22]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**31**	**35**		**100.0 %**	**1.69 [0.68, 4.22]**
Total events: 9 (water), 6 (saline)					
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.13 (P = 0.26)					
2 Distilled water vs Isotonic Saline					
Museru 1989	6/35	7/20		100.0 %	0.49 [0.19, 1.26]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**35**	**20**		**100.0 %**	**0.49 [0.19, 1.26]**
Total events: 6 (water), 7 (saline)					
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.49 (P = 0.14)					
3 Cool boiled water vs Isotonic saline					
Museru 1989	9/31	7/20		100.0 %	0.83 [0.37, 1.87]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**31**	**20**		**100.0 %**	**0.83 [0.37, 1.87]**
Total events: 9 (water), 7 (saline)					
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.45 (P = 0.65)					
4 Water (Distilled and Boiled) vs Isotonic saline					
Museru 1989	15/66	7/20		100.0 %	0.65 [0.31, 1.37]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**66**	**20**		**100.0 %**	**0.65 [0.31, 1.37]**
Total events: 15 (water), 7 (saline)					
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.14 (P = 0.26)					

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Search strategy for the first update of the review

For the first update of this review The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (Issue 3, 2005) was searched using the following search strategy:
1. WOUNDS AND INJURIES explode all trees (MeSH)
2. ULCER explode all trees (MeSH)
3. SKIN ULCER explode all trees (MeSH)
4. FOOT ULCER explode all trees (MeSH)
5. LEG ULCER explode all trees (MeSH)
6. VARICOSE ULCER explode all trees (MeSH)
7. VENOUS ULCER explode all trees (MeSH)
8. DIABETIC FOOT explode all trees (MeSH)
9. ((leg near ulcer*) or (foot near ulcer*))
10. ((skin near ulcer*) or (diabetic near foot))
11. ((skin near wound*) or (skin near burn*))
12. ((varicose near ulcer*) or (venous near ulcer*) or (chronic near ulcer*))
13. ((stasis near ulcer*) or (diabetic near ulcer*) or (arterial near ulcer*))
14. ((chronic near wound*) or (stasis near wound*) or (arterial near wound*))
15. ((diabetic near wound*) or (plantar near ulcer*) or (heel near ulcer*))
16. ((leg near injur*) or (foot near injur*) or (bed next sore))
17. ((decubitus near ulcer*) or (pressure near ulcer*))
18. (wound* near clean*)
19. (wound* near irrigation)
20. (#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10)
21. (#11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or#17 or #18 or #19)
22. (#20 or #21)
23. water
24. (shower or bath)
25. (cleaning or cleansing)
26. irrigation
27. (#23 or #24 or #25 or #26)
28. (#22 and #27)

FEEDBACK

Data and Conclusions

Summary

The abstract data needs correcting. The first OR given is not the OR it is the RR. The second estimate is also confused as the RevMan graph on this occasion is set to RR and the figures are different. The last estimate in the abstract doesn't seem to connect to anything, or maybe the first comparison in the relevant graph.
The conclusions about the quality of tap water are not conclusions from the data provided.

Reply

We have replied to each of the points raised as follows:
1. The first OR given is not the OR it is the RR.
Author's reply: This was amended when the review was updated and RR is now used.

2. The second estimate is also confused as the RevMan graph on this occasion is set to RR and the figures are different.
Author's reply: This was amended when the review was updated. RR is now used and the figures are now consistent between abstract and graph.
3. The last estimate in the abstract doesn't seem to connect to anything, or maybe the first comparison in the relevant graph.
Author's reply: This estimate was quoted in error. The correct estimate has now been inserted.
4. The conclusions about the quality of tap water are not conclusions from the data provided.
Author's reply: The conclusions of the review have been amended in the light of this comment.

Contributors

Feedback received: Professor Paul Garner, International Health Research Group, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine.
Responses: Author, Ritin Fernandez.

Data queries, 26 May 2008

Summary

I have two comprehension questions concerning the review Water for wound cleansing 2008, Issue 1.
1.Under description of studies/intervention: Doesn't it mean Ten of the eleven studies instead of eight of the nine?
2. Under results/3. Comparison of water (...) with normal saline/ (A): Are it nine out of 31 patients (29%) in the distilled water group and 6/35 (17%) in the cooled boiled water group who developed a wound infection or vice versa like described in paragraph (B) and (C) respectively?

Reply

Thanks for bringing the correction to my attention. Please note the following changes which have been made to the text of the review:
1. Ten of the eleven studies is correct
2. Comparison 3. A) Distilled water compared with cooled boiled water (Analysis 03, Outcome 01)
Primary outcome (Infection)
Six out of 35 patients (17%) in the distilled water group and 9/31(29%) in the cooled boiled water group developed a wound infection; this difference was not statistically significant. (RR 1.69, 95% CI 0.68 to 4.22). The small number of wounds cleansed using distilled water (n=35) and cooled boiled water (n=31) means that the study lacked power to detect clinically important differences (Museru 1989).

Contributors

Feedback received: Sibylle Wenzler, Occupation medical scientist. Freiburgh.
Responses: Author, Ritin Fernandez.

WHAT'S NEW

Last assessed as up-to-date: 1 November 2007.

20 January 2010	Amended	Contact details updated.

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 4, 2000

Review first published: Issue 4, 2002

13 May 2009	Amended	Contact details updated.
18 June 2008	Feedback has been incorporated	Feedback queries received and answered
18 June 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format.
2 November 2007	New citation required and conclusions have changed	Substantive amendment For this second update, new searches were carried out in November 2007. Four studies were identified, of which 2 (Godinez 2002; Moscati 2007) were included and two studies were excluded.
18 June 2004	New search has been performed	For the first update new searches were carried out in June 2004. Five studies were identified, of which 3 (Bansal 2002; Goldberg 1981; Valente 2003) were included and 2 were excluded.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

Both authors designed the review.

The review was coordinated by Ritin Fernandez. In addition she was responsible for writing to authors for additional information, data management and data entry into RevMan.

Ritin Fernandez and Rhonda Griffiths undertook data collection, developed the search strategy, searched the literature, screened search results, retrieved papers, appraised trial quality, analysed and interpreted data and wrote the review.

Funding for the review was obtained by Rhonda Griffiths from the South Western Sydney Area Health Service.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The authors of the review conducted one of the trials included in the review, however the authors did not receive from any commercial entity any payments or any pecuniary, in-kind or other professional or personal benefits that were related in any way to the subject of the work. This trial was also subjected to the same rigorous quality assessment as other trials included in the review.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- University of Western Sydney Macarthur, Australia.
- South Western Sydney Area Health Service, Australia.

External sources

- No sources of support supplied

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW

The published protocol was titled: 'Normal saline vs tap water for wound cleansing'. This has been changed at the review stage to: 'Water for wound cleansing' to reflect the different types of water used in the studies.

INDEX TERMS

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

*Fresh Water; *Water Supply; Irrigation [*methods]; Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic; Skin Ulcer [*therapy]; Sodium Chloride [therapeutic use]; Wound Infection [*prevention & control]; Wounds and Injuries [therapy]

MeSH check words

Humans