



DERMATOLOGÍA PRÁCTICA

[Translated article] Postoperative Wound Care in Dermatologic Surgery: Update And Narrative Review

A. Sanchez-Puigdollers^{a,b}, A. Toll^b, D. Morgado-Carrasco^{b,c,*}

^a Servicio de Dermatología, Hospital Sagrat Cor, Barcelona, España

^b Servicio de Dermatología, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, España

^c Servicio de Dermatología, Hospital de Figueres, Fundació Salut Empordà, Figueres, Girona, España

Received 27 November 2023; accepted 8 May 2024

KEYWORDS

Wound care;
Dermatologic surgery;
Mohs surgery;
Dressings;
Grafts

Abstract Dermatologic surgery is associated with a very low risk of complications. There is no widely accepted, evidence-based protocol with recommendations for postoperative wound care after dermatologic surgery. In this narrative review, we will be discussing the evidence on surgical wound care products and procedures. Overall, we found relatively few studies and, in many cases, a lack of statistically significant differences, possibly because of the low rate of complications. We'll be discussing the evidence on when we should initiate wound care procedures and their frequency, the type of ointment and antiseptics that should be applied, and the type of dressings that should be used. Despite the very few studies available on postoperative wound care following dermatologic surgery, there is sufficient evidence as to not recommend the use of prophylactic topical antibiotics. We also analyze the currently available evidence on surgical wound care in special situations, such as management of skin grafts, partial skin graft donor sites, xenografts/biomembranes, and surgical wounds to the legs.

© 2024 AEDV. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

PALABRAS CLAVE

Curas;
Herida quirúrgica;
Cirugía dermatológica;
Cirugía de Mohs;
Apósitos;
Injertos

Cuidado de la herida quirúrgica tras cirugía dermatológica. Una actualización y revisión narrativa

Resumen La cirugía dermatológica asocia un riesgo de complicaciones muy bajo. No existe un protocolo universalmente aceptado sobre las recomendaciones de curas poscirugía dermatológica. En esta revisión narrativa, discutimos la evidencia sobre productos y procedimientos para el cuidado de la herida quirúrgica. En general, encontramos escasos estudios y en muchas ocasiones, falta de diferencias estadísticamente significativas, posiblemente dada la baja tasa de complicaciones. Discutimos la evidencia sobre cuándo iniciar las curas y su frecuencia, el tipo

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ad.2024.05.020>

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: morgadodaniel8@gmail.com (D. Morgado-Carrasco).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ad.2024.09.014>

0001-7310/© 2024 AEDV. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Please cite this article as: A. Sanchez-Puigdollers, A. Toll and D. Morgado-Carrasco, [Translated article] Postoperative Wound Care in Dermatologic Surgery: Update And Narrative Review, ACTAS Dermo-Sifiliográficas, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ad.2024.09.014>

de ungüento a aplicar, los antisépticos y el tipo de apósito a utilizar. Pese a los escasos estudios sobre las curas tras cirugía dermatológica, existe evidencia suficiente para desaconsejar la utilización de antibióticos tópicos profilácticos. También analizamos la evidencia publicada sobre el cuidado de la herida quirúrgica en situaciones especiales, como son los injertos cutáneos, las zonas dadoras de injertos cutáneos de espesor parcial, los xenoinjertos/biomembranas y las heridas quirúrgicas en las piernas.

© 2024 AEDV. Publicado por Elsevier España, S.L.U. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la CC BY-NC-ND licencia (<http://creativecommons.org/licencias/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

Dermatologic surgery has a low rate of complications,¹ with surgical wound infection (SWI) rates between 0.7 and 4.0%, even in the absence of prophylactic antibiotics, preoperative skin preparation, or use of sterile gloves.^{2,3} Additionally, SWIs are generally mild and easy to treat.²

The physiological wound healing process is complex, involving neutrophils, macrophages, fibroblasts, and keratinocytes, and consisting of several phases: inflammatory, proliferative, and remodeling (Table 1). In recent years, some studies have suggested that the skin microbiome may also play an important role in the healing process.⁴ Post-dermatologic surgery wounds care is a controversial topic, and there is no universally accepted protocol to this date. Numerous studies show wide variability in recommendations, such as antiseptic use, topical antibiotics, dressing type, and frequency of care, among others.⁵

The aim of this work is to review the procedures and products recommended for post-dermatologic surgery wound care and discuss the evidence supporting them.

Methods

We conducted a narrative literature review, searching PubMed and Google Scholar in August 2023 using the Spanish and English terms: “dermatologic surgery”; “wound care”; “surgical wound care”; “skin graft”; “direct closure”; “secondary intention closure”; “biomembrane”; “topical antibiotics”; “petrolatum”; “vaseline.” We included prospective and retrospective clinical studies, clinical trials, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses. Articles were selected based on their relevance. Isolated clinical case reports were excluded.

Results

Moisturizers and topical antibiotics

A systematic review and meta-analysis—including 4 randomized clinical trials (RCTs) for a total of 4170 excisions—that evaluated the rates of SWI after dermatologic surgery by comparing topical antibiotics vs vaseline or paraffin found no significant differences.² A recent meta-analysis found no differences either in the rates of SWI in dermatologic, ophthalmologic, orthopedic, and cardiothoracic surgeries.⁶

Previously, a Cochrane review⁷ concluded that the use of topical antibiotics could reduce the risk of SWI vs not using them or using antiseptics. However, it included not only dermatologic procedures but also appendectomies, C-sections, trauma, and cardiothoracic surgeries. A RCT with 231 patients undergoing dermatologic surgery—not included in former systematic reviews—evaluated the application of a topical silicone gel vs an ointment consisting of 3 antibiotics (bacitracin, neomycin, and polymyxin B). A similar incidence of SWI was reported. The risk of contact dermatitis was significantly higher in the topical antibiotic group (19%) vs the silicone one (0%)⁸ (Table 2).

A prospective study compared the application of vaseline, a reparative ointment (Aquaphor®), and no ointment in 76 patients undergoing Mohs surgery. The study confirmed a higher incidence of crusting in the no-ointment group along with a higher incidence of erythema and inflammation in the reparative ointment group. Both differences were significant.⁹

Start and frequency of care

It is generally recommended to keep the wound covered for the first 48 hours. However, a multicenter RCT (n = 857) evaluated the risk of SWI in patients undergoing dermatologic surgery between early dressing removal and bathing with soap and water 12 hours after surgery vs late removal after 48 hours, finding no significant differences in the rates of SWI.¹⁰

A survey of 64 patients undergoing Mohs surgery reported that hydrocolloid dressings applied for an average of 6.4 days without removal were associated with greater comfort, better scar appearance, and higher satisfaction vs conventional daily dressings. Complications such as infections, fever, and pain were similar in both groups.¹¹ Similarly, studies conducted on patients undergoing dermatologic surgery on the legs, where dressings were changed weekly—using compression bandages and zinc oxide—did not show a higher rate of SWI vs conventional daily care.¹²

Dressings

Traditionally, gauze, bandages, and cotton have been used for postoperative wound coverage. More recently, advanced dressings such as interface films, foams, hydrogels, hydrocolloids, and alginates have been developed (Table 3). Although the frequency of dressing changes depends on the

Table 1 Physiological process of wound healing.

Common phases in wounds ⁵⁵	Hemostasis and early inflammation (first 4 to 6 days)	The damaged blood vessel constricts, and the surrounding endothelium and platelets activate the coagulation cascade. The clot releases cytokines and growth factors that initiate the inflammatory response.
	Chemotaxis and macrophage activation (48 to 96 hours)	The clot recruits neutrophils, which release proteolytic substances to degrade bacteria and excess tissue. The accumulation of inflammatory mediators activates macrophages, which participate in the onset of angiogenesis.
	Proliferative phase: re-epithelialization, angiogenesis, and granulation (days 4 to 14) Maturation and remodeling (Day 8 to 1 year)	Epithelialization is initially stimulated by fibroblasts, occurring from the edges of the epithelium toward the center of the wound. Vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), mainly secreted by keratinocytes in response to hypoxia, stimulates the formation of new capillaries. Hypoxia in endothelial cells promotes the secretion of nitric oxide, which causes vasodilation. Fibroblasts migrate to the wound, activate, synthesize collagen, proliferate, and transform into myofibroblasts, which will eventually cause wound contraction. Initially, the matrix is composed mainly of fibrin and fibronectin. Subsequently, fibroblasts synthesize a provisional, disorganized matrix of glycosaminoglycans, proteoglycans, and other proteins. This temporary matrix is eventually replaced by a stronger and more organized collagen matrix.
Phases associated with skin grafts	Plasma imbibition phase (first 24 to 48 hours)	The graft is fixed to the receptor bed, allowing it to absorb exudate and remain hydrated and nourished during the avascular phase.
	Inosculation (48 to 72 hours)	Anastomosis between the receptor bed and the dermal vessels of the graft.
	Neovascularization and blood flow bridging between graft and bed (up to 4 to 7 days) Re-epithelialization (From day 4-8 to several weeks later)	

123 type of dressing, the goal is to space out the care provided.¹³
124 A prospective study of 226 small wounds closed by secondary
125 intention, such as shaves and 3 mm punch biopsies, showed
126 that the use of advanced occlusive dressings was associated
127 with shorter re-epithelialization time and pain vs traditional
128 dressings.¹⁴ Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the hydro-
129 colloid dressing kept in place for about a week was preferred
130 by the patients over conventional daily care.¹¹

131 Antiseptics

132 We did not find any studies comparing the use of antiseptics
133 or detergents such as soap, povidone-iodine, hydrogen per-
134 oxide, chlorhexidine, and alcohol solutions, among others,
135 for the management of dermatologic surgical wounds.

136 For years, it has been suggested that although povidone-
137 iodine may be toxic to fibroblasts and keratinocytes in
138 vitro,¹⁵ no healing delays have ever been confirmed.^{16–19}
139 A systematic review described iodine as superior to other
140 antiseptic agents, such as silver sulfadiazine cream and non-
141 antiseptic dressings in reducing bacterial load and was not
142 associated with impaired healing, or long healing time.²⁰

Negative pressure therapy

143
144 Negative pressure therapy (NPT) may be useful in wound
145 management, offering various advantages (Table 4). In
146 surgical wounds with primary closure, it has not proven par-
147 ticularly significant.²¹ We only found 1 study in dermatologic
148 surgery: 1 RCT with 49 patients with grafts on their legs

Table 2 Prospective studies on the use of topical antibiotics on post-dermatologic procedure wound infection rates.

Author and year	Study type	Number of wounds	Intervention	Main results
Smack et al., 1996 ⁴⁵	RCT	1249 dermatological wounds	Comparison of petroleum jelly vs bacitracin ointment	- No significant differences in the rates of surgical wound infection (2.0% vs 0.9%; p = 0.37). - No significant differences in contact dermatitis rates (0% vs 0.9%; p = 0.12). - No significant postoperative differences in healing between treatment groups on day 1 (p = 0.98), day 7 (p = 0.86), or day 28 (p = 0.28)
Dixon et al., 2006 ⁴⁶	RCT	1801 surgical wounds	Comparison of no ointment before the postoperative dressing vs petroleum jelly vs mupirocin ointment	- No significant differences in infection rates (1.4%, 1.6%, and 2.3%, respectively; p = 0.490). - No significant differences in the rates of complications (including the rates of bleeding, scarring, dehiscence, and SWI; 3.5%, 4.7%, and 4.8%, respectively; p = 0.590). - No differences in postoperative pain, discomfort level, or overall satisfaction with treatment.
Heal et al., 2009 ⁵⁶	RCT	972 minor dermatological surgeries	Comparison of paraffin vs chloramphenicol ointment	- The incidence of SWI was significantly lower in the chloramphenicol group (6.6%) vs the control one (11.0%) (p = 0.010).
Taylor et al., 2011 ⁴⁷	Prospective split-face study	20 patients with 2 facial papulosis nigra lesions	Comparison of repair ointment (Aquaphor®) on one lesion vs antibiotic ointment (polymyxin B/bacitracin) on a different lesion	- No SWI reported. - No observed differences in erythema, edema, re-epithelialization, crusting, hyperpigmentation, irritation, or pain.
Draelos et al., 2011 ⁴⁸	Prospective split-face study	30 patients with 2 seborrheic keratoses on the trunk	Comparison of repair ointment (Aquaphor®) on one lesion vs antibiotic ointment (polymyxin B/bacitracin) on a different lesion	- No SWI reported. - No differences in erythema, edema, re-epithelialization, or crust formation. - Greater subjective irritation reported in the antibiotic group within the first week. - 1 case of allergic contact dermatitis with antibiotics was reported
Benedetto et al., 2021 ⁸	RCT	231 (67 underwent MMS and 164 various dermatological procedures)	Comparison of silicone gel (Stratamed®) vs a product with 3 topical antibiotics (Neosporin®)	- No significant differences in the rates of SWI. - The antibiotic product was associated with 19% contact dermatitis (0% in the silicone group) (p < 0.001). - Healing time and tissue quality were better with silicone gel.

RCT, randomized clinical trial; MMS, Mohs micrographic surgery; SWI, surgical wound infection.

149 after skin cancer excision compared graft success rates with
150 NPT vs dressing and rest. No significant differences were
151 reported between the 2 groups at the 6- and 12-week follow-
152 ups.²² Nonetheless, one meta-analysis with 10 RCTs including

488 patients with partial-thickness skin grafts (PTSGs) for
various indications (burns, traumatic wounds, chronic leg
wounds, and oncologic excisions in the legs) reported sig-
nificant differences in viable graft percentage, shorter time

153
154
155
156

Table 3 Types of advanced dressings.

Type	Composition	Characteristics	Indications	Change frequency
Film	Polyurethane or copolyester with acrylic adhesive backing.	- Permeable to gas but not to liquid water and bacteria. - Highly moisturizing, no absorbent capacity.	Dry wounds.	Few times a week, up to 7 days.
Hydrogel	Cross-linked starch polymers in 80% up to 90% water base. Available as fluid gels, flexible sheets, and impregnated gauze. No adhesive backing.	- Semi-permeable to gases and fluids. - Highly moisturizing. - Promotes autolytic debridement, granulation, and re-epithelialization. - Limited absorbent capacity. - Reduces temperature by about 5 °C, which may decrease pain perception.	Wounds with light exudate or dry wounds.	Every 1 to 3 days, depending on wound hydration. Care is advised to avoid maceration of surrounding skin.
Hydrocolloid	Hydrophilic and adhesive matrix of polymers such as gelatin and pectin, with an outer layer of polyurethane.	- Semi-permeable to water and gas, but impermeable to fluids and bacteria. - Moisturizing. - Promotes autolytic debridement, angiogenesis, granulation, and re-epithelialization.	Wounds with light to moderate exudate.	Initially once a day, then every 3 to 7 days.
Foam	Opaque polyurethane or sponge-like polymer with a semi-occlusive and hydrophobic backing.	- Permeable to gas, but not to liquid water and bacteria. - Highly absorbent. - Provides cushioning and thermal insulation.	- Wounds with moderate-to-severe exudate. - Wounds covered by granulation tissue or skin. - Donor site for graft. - Secondary intention wounds. ^a	From once a day to once or twice a week.
Alginate	Alginate acid fibers (similar to cellulose but marine-derived) covered with calcium and sodium salts. No adhesive backing.	- Highly absorbent. - Not moisturizing. - Sodium ions from exudate are exchanged for calcium from the dressing, forming a hydrophilic gel. - Calcium activates prothrombin and the coagulation cascade.	Highly exudative wounds.	From week 1 or until the gel loses viscosity.

^a Foam dressings have proven beneficial in surgical wounds healing by secondary intention, in terms of reducing healing time, pain, and nursing interventions vs conventional gauzes.³⁷
Source: Axibal and Brown.¹³

157 to healing (9.18 days vs 12.5 days in the control group), and
158 lower reintervention rates with NPT.²³ Similar results were
159 reported in a former meta-analysis of 5 cohort studies and
160 7 RCTs (653 patients overall).²⁴

161 For the combination of NPT with xenografts (biomem-
162 branes), one RCT with 36 patients with wounds exposing
163 bone or tendon compared the application of the Integra®
164 biomembrane vs the biomembrane plus NPT. They observed
165 significantly superior results with NPT and shorter healing
166 times ($p < 0.001$).²⁵

Special situations

Care of surgical wounds with skin grafts

167 Traditionally, the tie-over bolster dressing (sutured compres-
168 sion dressing-SCD) has been used as a reinforcement
169 technique. Multiple alternatives have been described
170 (Table 5), highlighting the non-reinforced coverage, espe-
171 cially in grafts up to 5.5 cm², with results comparable
172 to SCD. Advantages include shorter surgical times and
173 increased patient comfort.^{26–29} The graft is covered with
174
175

Table 4 Mechanism of action and potential advantages of negative pressure therapy in postoperative wound care.

Mechanism of Action ⁵⁷	Potential advantages in postoperative wound care ⁵⁸
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases capillary flow - Promotes granulation tissue - Decreases bacterial load - Maintains a moist environment - Removes excess exudate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces shear forces - Restricts seroma and hematoma formation - May increase patient comfort - May reduce epithelialization time

Table 5 Techniques for fixing skin grafts and materials in contact with the graft.

Fixation technique	Material in contact with the graft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sutured compression dressing (SCD) - Continuous reinforcement suture⁵⁹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Petrolatum-impregnated gauze⁶³ - Antibiotic-impregnated gauze or iodine povidone gauze¹⁹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reinforcement with Telfa® and staples²⁶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bismuth tribromophenate-impregnated gauze (XeroformTM)²⁹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reinforcement with polyurethane foam^{60,61} - Unreinforced coverage⁷⁻⁹ - Mattress sutures⁶² - ‘‘Sandwich’’ suture for nasal wing defects⁶³ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-adhesive contact dressings (MepitelTM)⁷⁻⁹ - Foam⁶⁰ - Sponges⁶⁰

176 a non-adhesive dressing, with or without another non-
177 adhesive contact dressing or rolled gauze impregnated over
178 the graft. It can be secured with sterile bands, elastic ban-
179 dage, or adhesive dressing.

180 We have not found any studies directly comparing the
181 results between different materials, or between different
182 types of dressings after covering with skin grafts in derma-
183 tologic surgery.

184 **Donor site wounds for skin grafts**

185 A systematic review that included 35 studies compar-
186 ing different modalities of dressings in the donor site
187 of PTSG—mostly comparing dry dressing (with gauze) vs
188 advanced dressings—reported better pain control and faster
189 healing in the latter group.³⁰ Two previous systematic
190 reviews showed similar results.^{31,32} A multicenter RCT with
191 288 patients with donor site defects, mainly from the thigh
192 and > 10cm² compared alginate dressings, films, gauze,
193 hydrocolloids, Hydrofiber®, and silicone. They observed that
194 re-epithelialization time with hydrocolloid dressings was 7
195 days shorter vs other dressings. The rate of SWI with gauze
196 was twice that of other dressings (RR, 2.38; CI, 1.14-4.99).³³

197 **Wounds covered with dermal xenografts**

198 Biomembranes or dermal xenografts are used to cover com-
199 plex defects. They promote neovascularization of the bed,
200 which will later facilitate re-epithelialization by secondary
201 intention, coverage with skin grafts, or flaps. This process
202 usually takes 14 to 21 days. The biomembrane should be kept
203 covered by an external protective layer, usually silicone. We
204 have not found any clinical studies yet on the type of dress-
205 ings to be performed during this period. Commercial brands
206 recommend occlusive coverage with antimicrobials for the
207 first 5 to 7 days, which is similar to a skin graft. Contact

of the graft with enzymatic debridement agents such as
collagenase is ill-advised.³⁴

Surgical wounds with secondary intention healing

Wounds with secondary intention healing (SIH) after derma-
tological surgery are not associated with a higher risk of
SWI than direct closure, according to the results of a recent
systematic review.³⁵ In an extensive Cochrane review (14
centers, n=886), a reduction in the risk of SWI in SIH with
topical antibiotics was suggested. However, the included
studies were small and with different types of wounds, such
as post-diabetic foot amputation, pilonidal sinus surgery and
hemorrhoids, abscesses, post-C-section complications, and
colostomies.³⁶

A systematic review included 13 RCTs comparing dif-
ferent dressings, such as gauze, foam, powders, alginate,
and hydrocolloid in SIH. The included wounds were due
to the excision of pilonidal cysts, abdominal postoperative
complications, and leg amputations. In general, patients
experienced more pain and lower satisfaction with the use
of gauze. Foam dressings appeared to be superior to conven-
tional gauze in terms of patient satisfaction, pain reduction,
and nursing care.³⁷

Surgical wounds on the legs

Multiple studies have described a higher rate of
complications after dermatological surgery below the
knee³⁸ (Table 6). Recently, a retrospective study that
included 23,121 excisions in dermatological surgery proved
that this location was associated with a higher risk of SWI
(odds ratio [OR], 1.908; CI, 1.126-3.235) and higher rates of
dehiscence (OR, 4.037; CI, 2.654-6.140), which increased
significantly if the patient was ≥ 80 years old (OR, 9.632;
CI, 5.635-16.464)¹.

Studies on post-dermatologic surgery dressings on the
legs are scarce. We found 2 retrospective studies in which

Table 6 Factors associated with increased risk of surgical wound infection.

Wound characteristics	Patient characteristics	Wound location	Surgical complexity
- Bacterial contamination	- Diabetes	- Below the knee	- Prolonged duration
- Hair around	- Obesity	- Groin	- Flap creation
- Extensive inflammatory skin disease	- Smoking habit	- Genitals	- Use of grafts
	- Chronic kidney disease	- Nose	- Longer scar
	- Carrier of nasal <i>S. aureus</i>	- Ear	

Sources: Rosengren et al.⁶⁴, Schlager et al.³⁵ and Pynn et al.³⁸.

zinc oxide and compression was used. A recent study (n = 80) evaluated the time until complete healing of the surgical wound with primary closure in individuals undergoing excision of skin lesions on the legs. They compared a group with conventional dressings—gauze and non-adhesive dressings—vs a different group with gauze impregnated with zinc oxide and compression with an elastic bandage (the dressing was changed weekly). By day 19, 66% of patients from the first group and 92% of the zinc oxide + compression group had achieved complete healing (p < 0.001). A total of 14% of the group with conventional dressings had complications vs 0 individuals from the zinc oxide + compression group.¹² Similar results were found in a small clinical trial (n = 10) of patients with surgical wounds left to heal by secondary intention using a Unna boot (a bandage with zinc oxide-impregnated wraps). The dressing was changed weekly.³⁹

For the role of compression, a recent systematic literature review⁴⁰ found 2 studies evaluating its role in post-dermatologic surgery dressings: the above-mentioned clinical trial using the Unna boot,³⁹ and a retrospective study (n = 366) that revealed that pre- and postoperative compression was associated with a statistically nonsignificant lower rate of complications (OR, 0.67).⁴¹

Discussion

In general, the evidence on dressings after dermatological surgery is limited. Some recommendations come from other specialties, which perform procedures that may have higher rates of complications, and therefore, these recommendations may not be generalizable.

We found a wide variability of postoperative recommendations among dermatologists. A study analyzed a total of 169 care protocols from 119 centers, mostly American. A total of 84% recommended the application of petroleum-based products, specifically petrolatum (75%) and Aquaphor® (43%), 43% indicated topical antibiotics, and 24% discouraged them.⁵ A recent survey of 196 dermatologic surgeons proved that 95% recommended some antiseptic for surgical wound care, mainly washing with water and soap (65%), followed by other unspecified antiseptics, hydrogen peroxide, acetic acid, and chlorhexidine.⁴²

The ideal dressing should be hemostatic, protective against infections, immobilizing, moist, and absorbent of excess exudate. Comparative studies of gauze vs advanced dressings come mainly from general surgery and chronic or traumatic wounds. In general, no differences

in healing time, aesthetic outcomes, or SWI have been demonstrated.^{13,43} In dermatology, although evidence is limited, advanced dressings may be more comfortable for the patient and require fewer dressing changes,¹¹ but at a higher cost.

Dermatology is one of the specialties that most prescribes antibiotics.⁴⁴ The use of prophylactic topical antibiotics is not recommended for clean dermatological surgical wounds.^{7,8,45–48} In addition to not being beneficial, their use may be associated with bacterial resistance and the development of allergic contact dermatitis.⁸ Necrosis of the wound has even been reported with the use of mupirocin.⁴⁶ In general, petrolatum or topical silicone is preferred instead.^{2,6,8,49}

Despite the lack of evidence, in SIH and skin grafts, an emollient like petrolatum and an occlusive or semi-occlusive dressing may be used to prevent desiccation and infection.⁵⁰ Skin grafts should remain covered for 5 to 7 days. Once the dressing has been removed, it is suggested to keep the wound hydrated and clean. A survey of 294 Mohs surgeons revealed that most recommended petroleum jelly or Aquaphor® for care (64% and 38%, respectively), and that more than 85% did not change this recommendation in SIH or grafts.⁵¹

For postoperative wounds below the knee, the combination of zinc oxide and compression seems to be a good option. Although compression is widely recommended to treat venous ulcers in this location, its evidence in surgical wounds is scarce.¹² In a recent study, only 7.5% of patients with dermatological surgical wounds below the knee received postoperative compression.⁵² Table 7 illustrates recommendations and their level of evidence in the management of wounds after dermatologic surgery.

In general, patients follow post-dermatologic surgery wound care instructions. However, a significant number of patients—especially the elderly—have difficulty understanding them, highlighting the need to explain them adequately and adapt them to their social reality.^{53,54}

Limitations

This review is limited by being a narrative and not a systematic literature review. The studies included are methodologically heterogeneous, and in many cases, there are no comparative studies across the various agents/procedures. Furthermore, clinical trials on the topic are scarce.

Table 7 Recommendations for managing wounds after dermatological surgery.

Recommendation	Level of evidence	Grade of recommendation
Avoid prophylactic topical antibiotics	1 +	B
Apply petroleum jelly as a moisturizer	1 +	B
Apply silicone gel as a moisturizer	2-	D
Wash the wound early 12 hours after surgery	2 +	C
Prefer advanced dressings	2-	D
Use antiseptics in dressings	4	D
Use NPT on xenografts (biomembranes)	2-	D
Use hydrocolloid dressings on the graft donor site	1-	B
Use non-reinforced coverage on the grafts	4	D
Use compression bandages on the legs	2-	D

NPT, negative pressure therapy.

^a According to the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN).

Conclusions

There is significant variability in postoperative wound care recommendations in dermatology. The evidence on the superiority of different agents and techniques is, in most cases, limited. However, there is sufficient evidence to discourage the use of prophylactic topical antibiotics. The use of petrolatum or silicone gel offers similar results, with lower complication rates. Although advanced dressings may be more comfortable than conventional ones due to less frequent changes, they are not superior in terms of healing time or incidence of SWI. In SIH, foam dressings appear to be superior to conventional gauze. Prospective comparative studies are needed to provide evidence-based recommendations.

Funding

None declared.

Conflicts of interest

None declared.

References

- Harding TP, Levin NJ, Solomon JA. Complications in dermatologic surgery: A case-control study exploring factors associated with postsurgical infection and wound dehiscence in a large national group practice. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2023;88:930–2.
- Saco M, Howe N, Nathoo R, Cherpelis B. Topical antibiotic prophylaxis for prevention of surgical wound infections from dermatologic procedures: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Dermatol Treat.* 2015;26:151–8.
- Brewer JD, Gonzalez AB, Baum CL, Arpey CJ, Roenigk RK, Otley CC, et al. Comparison of Sterile vs Nonsterile Gloves in Cutaneous Surgery and Common Outpatient Dental Procedures: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Dermatol.* 2016;152:1008–14.
- Tomic-Canic M, Burgess JL, O'Neill KE, Strbo N, Pastar I. Skin Microbiota and its Interplay with Wound Healing. *Am J Clin Dermatol.* 2020;21:36–43.

- Nguyen JK, Huang A, Siegel DM, Jagdeo J. Variability in Wound Care Recommendations Following Dermatologic Procedures. *Dermatol Surg.* 2020;46:186–91.
- Chen P-J, Hua Y-M, Toh HS, Lee M-C. Topical antibiotic prophylaxis for surgical wound infections in clean and clean-contaminated surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJJ Open.* 2021;5:zrab125.
- Heal CF, Banks JL, Lepper PD, Kontopantelis E, Van Driel ML. Topical antibiotics for preventing surgical site infection in wounds healing by primary intention. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016:2016.
- Benedetto AV, Staidle JP, Schoenfeld J, Benedetto EA, Benedetto PX. Comparing the use of a novel antibiotic-free film-forming topical wound dressing versus a topical triple antibiotic in dermatologic surgical procedures including Mohs micrographic surgery. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol.* 2021;35:247–55.
- Morales-Burgos A, Loosemore MP, Goldberg LH. Postoperative wound care after dermatologic procedures: a comparison of 2 commonly used petrolatum-based ointments. *J Drugs Dermatol.* 2013;12:163–4.
- Heal C, Buettner P, Raasch B, Browning S, Graham D, Bidgood R, et al. Can sutures get wet? Prospective randomised controlled trial of wound management in general practice. *BMJ.* 2006;332:1053–6.
- Holmes SP, Rivera S, Hooper PB, Slaven JE, Que SKT. Hydrocolloid dressing versus conventional wound care after dermatologic surgery. *JAAD Int.* 2022;6:37–42.
- Thompson CB, Wiemken TL, Brown TS. Effect of Postoperative Dressing on Excisions Performed on the Leg: A Comparison Between Zinc Oxide Compression Dressings Versus Standard Wound Care. *Dermatol Surg.* 2017;43:1379–84.
- Axibal E, Brown M. Surgical Dressings and Novel Skin Substitutes. *Dermatol Clin.* 2019;37:349–66.
- Nemeth AJ, Eaglstein WH, Taylor JR, Peerson LJ, Falanga V. Faster healing and less pain in skin biopsy sites treated with an occlusive dressing. *Arch Dermatol.* 1991;127:1679–83.
- Niedner R. Cytotoxicity and sensitization of povidone-iodine and other frequently used anti-infective agents. *Dermatol Basel Switz.* 1997;195 Suppl 2:89–92.
- Wade RG, Burr NE, McCauley G, Bourke G, Efthimiou O. The Comparative Efficacy of Chlorhexidine Gluconate and Povidone-iodine Antiseptics for the Prevention of Infection in Clean Surgery: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-analysis. *Ann Surg.* 2021;274:e481–8.
- Alves PJ, Barreto RT, Barrois BM, Gryson LG, Meaume S, Monstrey SJ. Update on the role of antiseptics in the management of chronic wounds with critical colonisation and/or biofilm. *Int Wound J.* 2021;18:342–58.

18. Bigliardi PL, Alsafoff SAL, El-Kafrawi HY, Pyon J-K, Wa CTC, Villa MA. Povidone iodine in wound healing: A review of current concepts and practices. *Int J Surg.* 2017;44:260-8.
19. Vehmeyer-Heeman M, Van den Kerckhove E, Gorissen K, Boeckx W. Povidone-iodine ointment: No effect of split skin graft healing time. *Burns.* 2005;31:489-94.
20. Vermeulen H, Westerbos SJ, Ubbink DT. Benefit and harm of iodine in wound care: A systematic review. *J Hosp Infect.* 2010;76:191-9.
21. Webster J, Liu Z, Norman G, Dumville JC, Chiverton L, Scuffham P, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for surgical wounds healing by primary closure. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2019;2019. CD009261.
22. Vather R, Ker H, Rolfe G, Chen L, Hammodat H, Gale K, et al. Wound Outcomes in Negative Pressure Dressings (WOUND) study - A randomised trial in lower limb skin cancer grafts. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthetic Surg.* 2018;71:1100-2.
23. Jiang Z-Y, Yu X-T, Liao X-C, Liu M-Z, Fu Z-H, Min D-H, et al. Negative-pressure wound therapy in skin grafts: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Burns.* 2021;47:747-55.
24. Yin Y, Zhang R, Li S, Guo J, Hou Z, Zhang Y. Negative-pressure therapy versus conventional therapy on split-thickness skin graft: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg.* 2018;50:43-8.
25. Zhu B, Cao D, Xie J, Li H, Chen Z, Bao Q. Clinical experience of the use of Integra in combination with negative pressure wound therapy: An alternative method for the management of wounds with exposed bone or tendon. *J Plast Surg Hand Surg.* 2021;55:1-5.
26. Hoffman HT, La Rouere M. A simple bolster technique for skin grafting. *Laryngoscope.* 1989;99:558-9.
27. Armstrong D, Van Gijn D, Newlands C. Are tie-over bolster dressings necessary for healing or success of full thickness skin graft reconstruction following facial skin cancer excision? *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2022;60:951-5.
28. Langtry JA, Kirkham P, Martin IC, Fordyce A. Tie-over bolster dressings may not be necessary to secure small full thickness skin grafts. *Dermatol Surg.* 1998;24:1350-3.
29. Edelman A. 24-7 Dressing Technique to Optimize Wound Healing After Mohs Micrographic Surgery. *Cutis.* 2021;107:149-50.
30. Brown JE, Holloway SL. An evidence-based review of split-thickness skin graft donor site dressings. *Int Wound J.* 2018;15:1000-9.
31. Wiechula R. The use of moist wound-healing dressings in the management of split-thickness skin graft donor sites: A systematic review. *Int J Nurs Pract.* 2003;9:9-17.
32. Voineskos SH, Ayeni OA, McKnight L, Thoma A. Systematic review of skin graft donor-site dressings. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2009;124:298-306.
33. Brölmann FE, Eskes AM, Goslings JC, Niessen FB, de Bree R, Vahl AC, et al. Randomized clinical trial of donor-site wound dressings after split-skin grafting. *Br J Surg.* 2013;100:619-27.
34. Integra LifeSciences s.f.
35. Schlager JG, Hartmann D, Ruiz San Jose V, Patzer K, French LE, Kendziora B. Procedure-Related Risk Factors for Surgical Site Infection in Dermatologic Surgery. *Dermatol Surg.* 2022;48:1046-50.
36. Norman G, Dumville JC, Mohapatra DP, Owens GL, Crosbie EJ. Antibiotics and antiseptics for surgical wounds healing by secondary intention. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016:2022.
37. Vermeulen H, Ubbink DT, Goossens A, de Vos R, Legemate DA. Systematic review of dressings and topical agents for surgical wounds healing by secondary intention. *Br J Surg.* 2005;92:665-72.
38. Pynn EV, Ransom M, Walker B, McGinnis E, Brown S, Gilberts R, et al. Healing of Excisional wounds on Lower legs by Secondary intention (HEALS) cohort study. Part 1: A multicentre prospective observational cohort study in patients without planned compression. *Clin Exp Dermatol.* 2022;47:1829.
39. Stebbins WG, Hanke WC, Petersen J. Enhanced Healing of Surgical Wounds of the Lower Leg Using Weekly Zinc Oxide Compression Dressings. *Dermatol Surg.* 2011;37:158-65.
40. Mann J, Ashraf I, McGinnis E, Veitch D, Wernham A. Does the use of compression bandaging as an adjunct improve outcomes for people following excision of keratinocyte cancers of the lower leg with secondary intention healing? *Clin Exp Dermatol.* 2022;47:984-5.
41. Lindholm VM, Isoherranen KM, Schröder MT, Pitkänen ST. Evaluating complications in below-knee skin cancer surgery after introduction of preoperative appointments: A 2-year retrospective cohort study. *Int Wound J.* 2020;17:363-9.
42. Bogner R, Nielson CB, Thompson C, Brown T. Use of Antiseptic Solutions in Postoperative Wound Care: An American College of Mohs Surgery (ACMS) Member Survey. *Dermatol Surg.* 2021;47:1287-9.
43. Ubbink DT, Vermeulen H, Goossens A, Kelner RB, Schreuder SM, Lubbers MJ. Occlusive vs gauze dressings for local wound care in surgical patients: A randomized clinical trial. *Arch Surg.* 2008;143:950-5.
44. Barbieri JS, Bhat K, Hartnett KP, Fleming-Dutra KE, Margolis DJ. Trends in Oral Antibiotic Prescription in Dermatology, 2008 to 2016. *JAMA Dermatol.* 2019;155:290-7.
45. Smack DP, Harrington AC, Dunn C, Howard RS, Szkutnik AJ, Krivda SJ, et al. Infection and allergy incidence in ambulatory surgery patients using white petrolatum vs bacitracin ointment. A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 1996;276:972-7.
46. Dixon AJ, Dixon MP, Askew DA, Wilkinson D. Prospective study of wound infections in dermatologic surgery in the absence of prophylactic antibiotics. *Dermatol Surg.* 2006;32:819-26, discussion 826-827.
47. Taylor SC, Averyhart AN, Heath CR. Postprocedural wound-healing efficacy following removal of dermatosis papulosa nigra lesions in an African American population: A comparison of a skin protectant ointment and a topical antibiotic. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2011;64:530-5.
48. Draelos ZD, Rizer RL, Trookman NS. A comparison of postprocedural wound care treatments: Do antibiotic-based ointments improve outcomes? *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2011;64:S23-9.
49. Lee DH, Kim DY, Yoon SY, Park HS, Yoon H-S, Cho S. Retrospective Clinical Trial of Fusidic Acid versus Petrolatum in the Postprocedure Care of Clean Dermatologic Procedures. *Ann Dermatol.* 2015;27:15-20.
50. Strickler AG, Shah P, Bajaj S, Mizuguchi R, Nijhawan RI, Oduyungbo M, et al. Preventing and Managing Complications in Dermatologic Surgery: Procedural and Post-surgical Concerns. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2021;84:895-903.
51. Nijhawan RI, Smith LA, Mariwalla K. Mohs surgeons' use of topical emollients in postoperative wound care. *Dermatol Surg.* 2013;39:1260-3.
52. Gilberts R, McGinnis E, Ransom M, Pynn EV, Walker B, Brown S, et al. Healing of Excisional wounds on Lower legs by Secondary intention (HEALS) cohort study. Part 2: Feasibility data from a multicentre prospective observational cohort study to inform a future randomized controlled trial. *Clin Exp Dermatol.* 2022;47:1839-47.
53. Reddy HA, Maytin A, DeMeo D, Wilkowski CM, Carroll BT. Health literacy screening tools to identify patients at risk of misunderstanding wound care instructions after dermatologic surgery. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2023;89:837-9.
54. Chen R, Krueger S, Flahive J, Mahmoud BH. Wound Care Adherence in Mohs Micrographic Surgery: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Dermatol Surg.* 2023;49:921-5.
55. Broughton G, Janis JE, Attinger CE. The Basic Science of Wound Healing. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2006;117:12S-34S.

- 552 56. Does single application of topical chloramphenicol to high risk
553 sutured wounds reduce incidence of wound infection after
554 minor surgery? Prospective randomised placebo controlled double
555 blind trial - PMC s. f.
- 556 57. Apelqvist J, Willy C, Fagerdahl AM, Fracalvieri M, Malmsjö M,
557 Piaggese A, et al. Negative Pressure Wound Therapy – overview,
558 challenges and perspectives. *J Wound Care*. 2017;26 Suppl
559 3:S1–113.
- 560 58. Petrie K, Cox CT, Becker BC, MacKay BJ. Clinical applications of
561 acellular dermal matrices: A review. *Scars Burns Heal*. 2022;8,
562 20595131211038313.
- 563 59. Adams DC, Ramsey ML, Marks VJ. The running bolster suture for
564 full-thickness skin grafts. *Dermatol Surg*. 2004;30:92–4.
- 565 60. Nakamura M, Ito E, Kato H, Watanabe S, Morita A. A multilayered
566 polyurethane foam technique for skin graft immobilization. *Dermatol Surg*. 2012;38:224–9.
61. De Gado F, Chiummariello S, Monarca C, Dessy LA, Rizzo MI, 567
Alfano C, et al. Skin grafting: Comparative evaluation of two 568
dressing techniques in selected body areas. *Vivo Athens Greece*. 569
2008;22:503–8. 570
62. Kromka W, Cameron M, Fathi R. Tie-Over Bolster Dressings vs 571
Basting Sutures for the Closure of Full-Thickness Skin Grafts: 572
A Review of the Literature. *J Cutan Med Surg*. 2018;22: 573
602–6. 574
63. Davis M, Baird D, Hill D, Layher H, Akin R. Management of 575
full-thickness skin grafts. *Bayl Univ Med Cent Proc*. 2021;34: 576
683–6. 577
64. Rosengren H, Heal C, Smith S. An Update on Antibiotic 578
Prophylaxis in Dermatologic Surgery. *Curr Dermatol Rep*. 579
2012;1:55–63. 580

UNCORRECTED PROOF