Research Question: Can we objectively assess the quality of debridement in open injuries?

Background:

Adequate surgical debridement is considered the single most important intervention in preventing infection following open fractures. Current principles advocate the systematic excision of all devitalized tissue, removal of contaminants and foreign material, and preservation of viable soft tissue and bony structures essential for reconstruction. Despite its critical importance, there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes an "adequate" debridement.

Traditionally, surgeons assess tissue viability based on subjective clinical criteria. Muscle viability has classically been evaluated using the "four Cs" (colour, consistency, contractility, and capacity to bleed), while skin, fascia, and bone are judged based on appearance, bleeding characteristics, attachment to surrounding tissues, and perceived contamination. However, these assessments are inherently subjective and demonstrate considerable inter-observer variability, particularly among less experienced surgeons.

Several adjunct technologies, including indocyanine green fluorescence angiography, near-infrared spectroscopy, laser doppler flowmetry, deep tissue microbiological cultures, and molecular techniques for bacterial quantification, have been investigated to improve objectivity. Nevertheless, none have demonstrated sufficient accuracy, reproducibility, practicality, or outcome benefit to support routine clinical use.

Current guidelines from leading academic organisations, such as the guideline standards for trauma from the British Orthopedic Association (BOAST), emphasize that debridement quality depends primarily on adherence to established surgical principles and multidisciplinary decision-making rather than on objective measurement tools. Consequently, repeat or second look debridement remains an accepted strategy whenever tissue viability remains uncertain.

Data extraction:

Clinical studies, Reviews and Clinical practice guidelines:

No	Author, Year & Country	Design	Sample size	Study population	Intervention/Comparison	Key findings
1	Crowley et al. 2007. USA/UK	Systematic review	365 studies	Open fractures	Timing and principles of debridement	Concluded that the quality of debridement rather than timing determines outcomes. No objective method for assessing adequacy of debridement was identified
2	Minehara et al. 2023. Int. Review	Narrative review	N/A	Open fractures	Current treatment perspectives	Emphasized that meticulous surgical debridement remains the cornerstone of management but acknowledged the lack of standardized objective assessment criteria.
3	Govaert et al. 2020. International consensus group	Consensus review	Expert panel	Fracture related infection	Diagnostic criteria for FRI	Found that intraoperative cultures cannot reliably determine adequacy of debridement, given poor predictive value for subsequent infection.
4	Metsemakers et al. 2018. International expert group	Consensus definition paper	Expert panel	Fracture related infection	Definition for FRI	Identified that infection diagnosis relies on confirmatory and suggestive criteria, but no objective markers exist to determine completeness of debridement during index surgery.
5	D'Cunha et al, 2023. UK	Review article	N/A	Severe grade open fractures	Orthoplastic management principles	Reinforced that assessment of tissue viability remains surgeon-dependent, often requiring serial debridements when uncertainty exists.
6	BOAST 4 guidelines. 2020. UK	Guidelines	Expert consensus	Open lower limb fractures	Management recommendations	Recommend that debridement be performed by experienced orthoplastic teams but do not specify objective criteria to assess debridement adequacy
7	NICE guidelines NG37. 2016.UK	Practice guidlines	Expert consensus	Major trauma/Open fractures	Initial management recommendations	States that all devitalized tissue should be excised; however, objective tools to determine tissue viability are lacking.

8	Ndlovu S, et al, 2023. UK	Meta-analysis	788 patients	Open fractures	Limb salvage - prediction	Highly accurate in predicting success of limb salvage and secondary outcomes. Decision on adequacy of debridement is still subjective.

Adjunctive imaging and Artificial intelligence:

No	Author, year & country	Design	Sample size	Study population	Intervention/comparison	Key findings
9	Breuking EA et al. 2025. Netherlands	Systematic review	13 studies	Traumatic limb injuries	Indocyanine green (ICG) fluroscence angiography	Reinforces the use of ICG - FA in open injuries. Recognise the huge promise in identifying tissue perfusion and use in identifying margins in debridement and also can reduce the need for second look debridement
10	Saiko G et al. 2020. International	Systematic review	31 studies	Acute and chronic wounds	Hyperspectral imaging	Hyperspectral imaging predicted wound healing potential better than visual assessment; application to open fracture debridement remains unvalidated but feasible
11	Hobbs et al, 2001. UK	Diagnostic study	NA	Experimental tibial osteotomies	Laser Doppler imaging	Measurement of bone flux by LDF may have a role in the objective evaluation of the viability of bone fragments
12	Wang et al, 2021. China	Machine learning study	1351 images	Acute and chronic wounds	Deep learning based tissue wound classification	AI algorithms accurately differentiated granulation tissue, necrosis, and slough, suggesting potential for future objective assessment of tissue viability, although not evaluated in open fractures.

Results:

The available evidence consistently demonstrates that no validated objective method currently exists to reliably assess the adequacy of debridement in open fractures. Despite being regarded as the cornerstone of infection prevention and successful limb reconstruction, the quality of debridement continues to rely predominantly on surgeon judgment and adherence to established surgical principles rather than standardized objective criteria.

Contemporary reviews and consensus statements emphasize that the thoroughness of debridement is more important than the timing of surgery. Crowley et al. highlighted that the adequacy of excision of devitalized tissue, rather than adherence to arbitrary time thresholds, has a greater impact on infection outcomes. Similarly, the OTA International review by Minehara et al. reaffirmed that meticulous debridement remains fundamental to open fracture management but acknowledged the absence of objective tools to determine when debridement is complete.

Traditional assessment of tissue viability continues to be based on subjective intraoperative findings. Muscle viability is commonly evaluated using the classical "four Cs" (Color, Consistency, Contractility, and Capacity to bleed), whereas decisions regarding skin, fascia, and bone excision depend largely on the surgeon's experience and interpretation. Current guidelines, including BOAST and NICE recommendations, advocate aggressive removal of clearly devitalized tissues but do not provide measurable criteria or validated scoring systems to assess debridement adequacy. In situations where tissue viability remains uncertain, these guidelines support the use of planned serial or second-look debridement.

One of the few validated attempts to reduce subjectivity in open injury assessment is the Ganga Hospital Open Injury Score (GHOIS). Unlike traditional classifications, GHOIS separately evaluates injury to the skin, skeletal structures and musculotendinous tissues after debridement and incorporates important patient-related factors influencing reconstruction. Validation studies demonstrated that the score reliably predicts limb salvage, reconstructive requirements and resource utilization. Nevertheless, the score relies on the surgeon's intraoperative assessment of tissue viability and therefore standardizes documentation of injury severity rather than objectively measuring the completeness or adequacy of debridement itself

Studies evaluating microbiological methods have demonstrated that intraoperative cultures obtained during initial debridement have poor predictive value for subsequent fracture-related infection and therefore cannot be used as surrogate markers of debridement quality. International consensus definitions of fracture-related infection similarly recognize that no microbiological or laboratory parameter currently exists to confirm the adequacy of initial debridement.

Several adjunctive technologies aimed at improving objectivity have been investigated. Perfusion-based modalities such as indocyanine green fluorescence angiography, laser Doppler imaging, and hyperspectral imaging have shown potential in identifying tissue perfusion deficits and distinguishing viable from non-viable tissue. However, these studies remain limited to small observational cohorts, and none have demonstrated improved clinical outcomes, reduced infection rates, or validated thresholds for guiding debridement decisions in open fractures.

Artificial intelligence (AI) represents an emerging area of interest in wound assessment. Machine learning and computer vision algorithms have shown promising results in automated wound segmentation, tissue classification, estimation of wound healing potential, and prediction of complications in chronic wounds and burns. These technologies may eventually facilitate objective assessment of tissue viability by integrating clinical images, perfusion imaging, and patient-specific variables. However, current evidence is limited to proof-of-concept studies, and no AI-based systems have been prospectively validated for assessing debridement adequacy in open fractures or demonstrated superiority over expert clinical judgment.

Overall, the available evidence indicates that assessment of debridement quality remains largely dependent on experienced surgical evaluation within an orthoplastic framework, with repeat debridement recommended when uncertainty exists. Emerging technologies, including AI-assisted decision support systems, hold promise for future standardization but currently remain investigational and should not replace established surgical principles.

Discussion:

The absence of objective criteria for assessing debridement quality represents a major gap in open fracture management. Although advances in fixation strategies, antimicrobial therapies, and soft-tissue reconstruction have improved outcomes substantially, the fundamental assessment of whether all devitalized tissue has been adequately removed remains subjective.

Historically, the "four Cs" of muscle viability have formed the basis for debridement decisions. While these criteria provide a useful framework, they are susceptible to considerable interobserver variability. Factors such as reperfusion following ischemia, the effects of tourniquet use, and surgeon experience may influence interpretation. Similar challenges exist when assessing bone viability, contamination burden, and soft-tissue perfusion.

The distinction between objective assessment of tissue injury and objective assessment of debridement adequacy is important. The Ganga Hospital Open Injury Score represents one of the most comprehensive and prospectively validated systems for standardizing evaluation of severe open extremity injuries. By separately grading damage to skin, bone and functional tissues, the score improves communication between surgeons and assists decisions regarding limb salvage, timing of reconstruction and orthoplastic management. However, assignment of each tissue score still depends on intraoperative clinical judgment regarding tissue viability. Consequently, GHOIS reduces variability in documenting injury severity but does not objectively determine whether all non-viable tissue has been adequately excised. This distinction highlights the continuing absence of a validated objective endpoint for debridement despite advances in structured injury assessment

Importantly, microbiological assessment has also not proven useful in determining debridement adequacy. Multiple studies have demonstrated poor predictive value of intraoperative cultures obtained at the time of initial debridement. Consequently, contemporary guidelines do not recommend routine cultures as a means of evaluating the completeness of debridement.

Novel imaging modalities aimed at assessing tissue perfusion have generated increasing interest. Indocyanine green fluorescence angiography, laser Doppler flowmetry, and near-infrared spectroscopy may provide additional information regarding tissue viability. However, these technologies remain expensive, are not widely available, and lack sufficient evidence demonstrating improved patient outcomes. Their role currently appears adjunctive rather than definitive.

Emerging technologies incorporating artificial intelligence may address the current lack of objective criteria for assessing debridement quality. Machine learning algorithms combined with computer vision techniques, hyperspectral imaging, and fluorescence angiography have shown promise in wound assessment and tissue viability analysis. Although these technologies could potentially reduce interobserver variability and standardise debridement decisions, their application in open fractures remains investigational, with no validated systems currently available for routine clinical use.

Given these limitations, the concept of "second-look" debridement remains highly relevant. Planned serial debridement allows reassessment of tissues that may declare their viability over time and reduces the risk of retaining necrotic tissue. This approach is particularly important in high-energy injuries, severe crush injuries, and wounds with extensive contamination.

The available evidence therefore supports an approach centered on adherence to sound surgical principles, involvement of experienced orthoplastic teams, and readiness to perform repeat debridement when uncertainty exists. Future research should focus on developing validated, reproducible tools capable of objectively assessing tissue viability and predicting infection risk following debridement.

Risk of bias of included studies: (Moderate to high)

Most available evidence consists of expert opinion, narrative reviews, consensus statements, retrospective observational studies, and small diagnostic accuracy studies evaluating adjunctive technologies. High-quality prospective studies validating objective assessment methods are lacking.

Response/ recommendation:

No validated objective method currently exists to determine the adequacy of debridement in open fractures. Structured assessment systems such as the Ganga Hospital Open Injury Score may improve consistency in documenting injury severity and planning reconstruction, but they do not objectively assess the completeness of debridement because they remain dependent on surgeon evaluation of tissue viability. Emerging adjunctive imaging techniques and artificial intelligence remain investigational and should not replace meticulous surgical debridement performed by experienced orthoplastic teams. When tissue viability remains uncertain, planned repeat debridement should be undertaken.

Strength of Evidence (LOW)

Justification:

*Absence of randomized controlled trials or prospective validation studies.
*Available evidence consists predominantly of expert consensus, narrative reviews, and small observational studies.
*Existing adjunctive technologies have not demonstrated sufficient diagnostic accuracy or improved clinical outcomes to support routine use.

*Significant heterogeneity exists in definitions of "adequate debridement" across studies.

References:

1. Crowley DJ, Kanakaris NK, Giannoudis PV. Debridement and wound closure of open fractures: the impact of the time factor on infection rates. Injury. 2007 Aug;38(8):879-89. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2007.01.012.

2. Minehara H, Maruo A, Amadei R, Contini A, Braile A, Kelly M, Jenner L, Schemitsch GW, Schemitsch EH, Miclau T 3rd. Open fractures: Current treatment perspective. OTA Int. 2023 Jun 16;6(3 Suppl): e240. doi: 10.1097/OI9.0000000000000240.

3. Govaert GAM, Kuehl R, Atkins BL, Trampuz A, Morgenstern M, Obremskey WT, Verhofstad MHJ, McNally MA, Metsemakers WJ; Fracture-Related Infection (FRI) Consensus Group. Diagnosing Fracture-Related Infection: Current Concepts and Recommendations. J Orthop Trauma. 2020 Jan;34(1):8-17.

4. Metsemakers WJ, Morgenstern M, McNally MA, Moriarty TF, McFadyen I, Scarborough M, Athanasou NA, Ochsner PE, Kuehl R, Raschke M, Borens O, Xie Z, Velkes S, Hungerer S, Kates SL, Zalavras C, Giannoudis PV, Richards RG, Verhofstad MHJ. Fracture-related infection: A consensus on definition from an international expert group. Injury. 2018 Mar;49(3):505-510.

5. D'Cunha EM, Penn-Barwell JG, McMaster J, Fries CA. Orthoplastic Treatment of Open Lower-Limb Fractures Improves Outcomes: A 12-Year Review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2023 Feb 1;151(2):308e-314e. doi: 10.1097/PRS.0000000000009861.

6. https://www.boa.ac.uk/static/3b91ad0a-9081-4253-92f7d90e8df0fb2c/29bf80f1-1cb6-46b7-afc761119341447f/open fractures.pdf

7. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng37/chapter/Recommendations#hospital-settings

8. Ndlovu S, Naqshband M, Masunda S, Ndlovu K, Chettiar K, Anugraha A. Clinical effectiveness of the Ganga Hospital Open Injury Severity Score for limb salvage versus amputation in patients with complex limb injuries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Bone Joint J. 2023 Jan;105-B(1):21-28.

9. Breuking EA, de Fraiture EJ, Krijgh DD, van Wessem K, de Bruin IG, Hietbrink F, Ruiterkamp J. Current applications of indocyanine green fluorescence angiography in trauma patients and its potential impact: a systematic review. BMJ Open. 2025 May 23;15(5): e099755.

10. Saiko G, Lombardi P, Au Y, Queen D, Armstrong D, Harding K. Hyperspectral imaging in wound care: A systematic review. Int Wound J. 2020 Dec;17(6):1840-1856.

11. Hobbs CM, Watkins PE. Evaluation of the viability of bone fragments. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2001 Jan;83(1):130-3.

12. Wang C, Anisuzzaman DM, Williamson V, Dhar MK, Rostami B, Niezgoda J, Yu Z. Image-based artificial intelligence in wound assessment: a systematic review. *ArXiv.* 2020. arXiv:2009.07141.