

The importance of high level disinfection of transvaginal ultrasound probes in fertility settings

Critical Summary

- The vaginal and uterine microbiome is important for establishing a favorable environment for successful implantation and development of the conceptus in early pregnancy.
- Disruption of this microbiome, termed dysbiosis, is linked to infertility in prospective and retrospective trials.
- Preventing pathogen transmission into the vaginal and uterine microbiome is important to lower the risk of dysbiosis and associated infections.
- Transvaginal ultrasound probes should undergo high level disinfection (HLD) and be used in conjunction with a sterile sheath, as per FDA and CDC guidance, to help prevent the risk of infection transmission.



The role of the vaginal microbiome in fertility

The composition of the vaginal microbiome profoundly influences all stages of female reproduction from conception, throughout pregnancy, to birth.¹ A healthy microbiome helps establish a favorable endometrium environment, thereby improving the success of the reproductive process.²⁻⁴

It was once believed that the endometrium provided a sterile environment for fertilization and gestation.⁵ Now, we know there are microbes present within the female genital tract that interact with and alter this environment.^{3,6,7} A healthy vaginal microbiome includes both aerobic and anaerobic species, but is dominated by *Lactobacillus*.^{1,8-10} Lactobacilli provide a front-line defense against pathogens through the production of hydrogen peroxide and lactic acid, as well as low-level immune system activation.^{8,11} These processes help maintain a vaginal pH of <4.5 and create a hostile environment for colonization by other bacteria, viruses and fungi.¹²

An alteration or disruption of the composition of the vaginal microbiome is termed dysbiosis. Typically, this takes the form of a reduction in the prevalence of lactobacilli and an increase in competing species.⁹ Dysbiosis can result from biological or hormonal changes, environmental factors like diet and nutrition, or infection.^{9,13} It can have far-reaching effects on the uterine environment, leading to failed fertility cycles, infection, and adverse pregnancy outcomes.^{4,8,9}

Dysbiosis increases infection risk

Dysbiosis can increase a patient's susceptibility to infections including bacterial vaginosis (BV), chronic endometritis (CE) and pelvic inflammatory disease (PID). BV, CE and PID have all been linked to infertility,⁸ and diagnosis may be complicated as symptoms can vary and be mild, nonspecific or absent.¹⁴

Common infections of the female genital tract caused by dysbiosis

Bacterial Vaginosis

BV is the most common cause of lower genital tract infections in women of reproductive age.¹⁵ There is no single microorganism implicated in the diagnosis of BV, but rather a decrease in the prevalence of lactobacilli and overgrowth of competing bacteria.⁹ BV can lead to an increased risk of many other infections of the reproductive tract.^{8,16-19}

Chronic endometritis and pelvic inflammatory disease

When an infection, such as BV, ascends from the vagina to the endometrium, cervix, or fallopian tubes, it can cause CE or PID.^{8,9} CE is a persistent inflammation of the endometrial lining that commonly results from an altered endometrial microbiome.^{20,21} PID can present with a variety of nonspecific symptoms and is associated with serious adverse health outcomes. Both CE and PID can develop secondary to BV, with more than 85% of cases of PID found to be caused by BV-related bacteria or sexually transmitted infections.⁸

Dysbiosis can cause failed fertility cycles

As well as having a role in susceptibility to infection, the uterine and vaginal microbiota also influence endometrial receptivity, and dysbiosis has been associated with implantation failure or pregnancy loss.⁴

The outcome of IVF is influenced by the composition of the vaginal microbiome on the day of embryo transfer.²² Women with a lower prevalence of vaginal lactobacilli are less likely to have successful embryo implantations,²³ while other dysbiotic states are also associated with poor reproductive outcomes following IVF.²⁴

Dysbiosis can also increase a woman's susceptibility to genital tract infections,⁹ which in turn can lead to failed fertility cycles. BV can decrease conception rates and may also increase early pregnancy losses.²⁵⁻²⁷ Women with CE also have lower implantation rates,²⁰ with one study identifying CE in 30.3% of women with repeated implantation failure at IVF.²⁸ Managing infections like BV and CE could reduce the number of treatment cycles needed, increase pregnancy rates, and have beneficial effects on couple well-being and healthcare costs.¹

Dysbiosis can lead to pregnancy complications

Dysbiosis has also been linked to infections that disrupt the feto-placental complex,⁹ which may lead to preterm birth or pregnancy complications including pre-eclampsia, miscarriage, fetal growth restriction, stillbirth, low birth weight, and neonatal sepsis.^{9,29} Once within the uterine cavity, infectious agents induce the release of pro-inflammatory cytokines, prostaglandins and metalloproteases. These inflammatory agents trigger cervical ripening and weakening of membranes, potentially leading to prelabor rupture of membranes or preterm birth.³⁰⁻³²

Infections like PID can cause pregnancy complications including ectopic pregnancy and tubo-ovarian abscess.^{33,34} Intrauterine infection is implicated in up to 40% of cases of spontaneous preterm birth,³⁵ and potentially preventable infections may account for up to 15% of early miscarriages and up to 66% of late miscarriages.³⁶

Epidemiological study finds patients undergoing transvaginal ultrasound were at a greater risk of infection

An epidemiological study commissioned by a national health authority, revealed an unacceptable risk of infection associated with endocavitary ultrasound procedures.³⁷ The longitudinal study followed 982,911 patient journeys retrospectively through linked national health databases over a period of six years. Patients in the gynecology cohort undergoing transvaginal (TV) scans were at a 41% greater risk of infection, and were 26% more likely to be prescribed antibiotics in the 30 days following the procedure, compared to those who did not receive TV scans.^{36,37}

This heightened infection risk was attributed to clinically insufficient TV probe disinfection practices (low level disinfection, LLD). The national health authority now mandates high level disinfection (HLD) for all procedures utilizing a TV probe (Figure 1). The authors stated “failure to comply with [HLD] will continue to result in an unacceptable risk of harm to patients”³⁷

Devices used in non-invasive procedures: Low Level Disinfection (LLD)

LLD destroys vegetative bacteria, some fungi, some viruses, but not mycobacteria or bacterial spores.

Devices used in semi-critical procedures: High Level Disinfection (HLD)

HLD destroys all microorganisms except bacterial spores.

Figure 1. Levels of disinfection and criteria governing their use. Low level and high level disinfection have different spectrums of efficacy against microorganisms. An appropriate level of disinfection should be performed before reuse according to the intended use of the device^{38,39}

Ultrasound probes are contaminated even after LLD

Studies demonstrate that LLD wipes and sprays can fail to eliminate bacteria and viruses from covered TV probes after patient use.^{40,41} A meta-analysis found a prevalence of 12.9% for frequently occurring bacteria and 1% for viruses on TV & transrectal probes after LLD wipes and sprays.⁴⁰ TV probes have also been found contaminated with pathogens that cause sexually transmitted infections like *Chlamydia trachomatis*, hepatitis C virus (HCV) and human papillomavirus (HPV), after LLD.^{40,41}

HPV infection has been linked to the development of BV⁴² and is associated with 99.7% of cervical cancers.⁴³ Random surveillance has shown that 3-7% of endocavitary probes remain contaminated with HPV DNA following disinfection with wipes and sprays.^{41,44,45} HPV is a stable virus able to survive on fomites for extended periods of time, and is available for non-sexual modes of transmission.^{46,47} Common ultrasound probe LLD wipe and spray chemistries (e.g. quaternary ammonium compounds) are not effective against native HPV.⁴⁸

National Standards and Federal Guidelines require transvaginal probes undergo HLD

Transvaginal ultrasound probes contact mucous membranes and are classified as semi-critical devices according to the Spaulding Classification. Federal guidelines and national standards require TV ultrasound undergo a minimum of high level disinfection, and be used in combination with a sheath, to help protect patients from infection risk.^{38,49,50}

National Standards

Semi-critical devices are those that contact intact mucous membranes or nonintact skin during use, but do not usually penetrate the blood barrier or other normally sterile areas. If a semi-critical device cannot be sterilized, it must be subjected to a high-level disinfection process in which a sterilant is used but for a shorter exposure time than required to achieve sterilization. -AAMI ST 58, 2013⁵⁰

Federal Guidelines

Probes used in semi-critical applications should undergo sterilization between uses whenever feasible, but high level disinfection is minimally acceptable. In addition, the use of a sterile sheath is recommended for every semi-critical use of the probe. -FDA 2019⁴⁹

For clinical applications of a semi-critical or critical nature (e.g., intraoperative, transrectal, transvaginal, transesophageal, or biopsy procedures), labeling should recommend, when appropriate, the use of sterile, legally marketed probe sheaths. -FDA 2019⁴⁹

A vaginal probe and all endocavitary probes without a probe cover are semi-critical devices because they have direct contact with mucous membranes (e.g., vagina, rectum, pharynx). While use of the probe cover could be considered as changing the category, this guideline proposes use of a new condom/probe cover for the probe for each patient, and because condoms/probe covers can fail, the probe also should be high-level disinfected. -CDC 2008³⁸

Professional Societies

Transvaginal ultrasound transducers always should be covered with a single-use disposable cover when used. However, disposable protective covers are not without risk of rupture or defect, and it is recommended that transvaginal ultrasound transducers undergo high-level disinfection between each use -ACOG 2016⁵¹

After each use, transvaginal ultrasound probes should be cleaned and then treated with high-level disinfection. Wipe down and spray are low-level disinfection procedures and are not sufficient for transvaginal probes. -SMFM 2020⁵²

Disinfection of all internal transducers (e.g. transvaginal, transrectal, and transesophageal transducers), as well as intra-operative transducers, require HLD before they can be used on another patient. -AIUM 2020⁵³

...HLD is required for a semi-critical transducer that contacts mucous membranes or non-intact skin. -SDMS 2022⁵⁴

Conclusion

Preventing pathogen transmission into the vaginal and uterine microbiome and the subsequent induction of a biotic imbalance is critical for successful fertility treatment. Dysbiosis can cause infections that put patients at risk of failed fertility cycles and adverse pregnancy outcomes. Transvaginal ultrasound probes should undergo high level disinfection and be used with a sterile sheath, per FDA and CDC guidelines and national standards, to help lower the risk of pathogen transmission and dysbiosis.

Contact us today to discuss your specific needs on when to HLD at your facility.



References: 1. Ricci, S., et al. PLoS One, 2018. 13(11): p. e0207684. 2. Chen, W., et al. Front Cell Dev Biol, 2021. 9: p. 693267. 3. Moreno, I., et al. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2016. 215(6): p. 684-703. 4. Młodzik, N., et al. Ginekol Pol, 2020. 91(1): p. 45-48. 5. Ansbacher, R., W.A. Boyson, and J.A. Morris. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 1967. 99(3): p. 394-6. 6. Bashiri, A., K.I. Halper, and R. Orvieto. Reprod Biol Endocrinol, 2018. 16(1): p. 121. 7. Mitchell, C.M., et al. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2015. 212(5): p. 611.e1-9. 8. Ravel, J., I. Moreno, and C. Simón. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2021. 224(3): p. 251-257. 9. Bagga, R. and P. Arora. Front Public Health, 2020. 8: p. 225. 10. Zhou, X., et al. Isme J, 2007. 1(2): p. 121-33. 11. Witkin, S.S., I.M. Linhares, and P. Giraldo. Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol, 2007. 21(3): p. 347-54. 12. O'Hanlon, D.E., T.R. Moench, and R.A. Cone. PLoS One, 2013. 8(11): p. e80074. 13. Ravel, J. and R.M. Brotman. Genome Med, 2016. 8(1): p. 35. 14. Moreno, I. and J.M. Franasiak. Fertil Steril, 2017. 108(1): p. 32-39. 15. Koumans, E.H., et al. Sex Transm Dis, 2007. 34(11): p. 864-9. 16. Atashili, J., et al. Aids, 2008. 22(12): p. 1493-501. 17. Leitich, H., et al. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2003. 189(1): p. 139-47. 18. Bautista, C.T., et al. Am J Prev Med, 2017. 52(5): p. 632-639. 19. Wiesenfeld, H.C., et al. Obstet Gynecol, 2002. 100(3): p. 456-63. 20. Kimura, F., et al. J Obstet Gynaecol Res, 2019. 45(5): p. 951-960. 21. Franasiak, J.M. Fertil Steril, 2019. 112(4): p. 649-650. 22. Fanchin, R., et al. Fertil Steril, 1998. 70(5): p. 866-70. 23. Koedooder, R., et al. Hum Reprod, 2019. 34(6): p. 1042-1054. 24. Haahr, T., et al. Bjog, 2019. 126(2): p. 200-207. 25. Salm, R., et al. Hum Reprod, 2002. 17(2): p. 337-40. 26. Eckert, L.O., et al. Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol, 2003. 11(1): p. 11-17. 27. Ralph, S.G., A.J. Rutherford, and J.D. Wilson. Bmj, 1999. 319(7204): p. 220-3. 28. Quaas, A. and A. Dokras. Rev Obstet Gynecol, 2008. 1(2): p. 69-76. 29. Romero, R., et al. Microbiome, 2014. 2: p. 18. 30. Ramos Bde, A., et al. Am J Reprod Immunol, 2015. 73(5): p. 363-9. 31. Goldenberg, R.L., J.C. Hauth, and W.W. Andrews. N Engl J Med, 2000. 342(20): p. 1500-7. 32. Kamińska, D. and M. Gajęcka. Benef Microbes, 2017. 8(3): p. 327-343. 33. Weström, L., et al. Sex Transm Dis, 1992. 19(4): p. 185-92. 34. Haggerty, C.L., et al. Sex Transm Dis, 2005. 32(5): p. 293-9. 35. Kemp, M.W. Front Immunol, 2014. 5: p. 574. 36. Giakoumelou, S., et al. Hum Reprod Update, 2016. 22(1): p. 116-33. 37. Scott, D., et al. Ultrasound, 2018. 26(3): p. 168-177. 38. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Guideline for Disinfection and Sterilization in Healthcare Facilities. 2008. 39. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Content and Format of Premarket Notification [510(k)] Submissions for Liquid Chemical Sterilants/High Level Disinfectants. 2000. 40. Leroy, S. J Hosp Infect, 2013. 83(2): p. 99-106. 41. M'Zali, F., et al. PLoS One, 2014. 9(4): p. e93368. 42. Gillet, E., et al. BMC Infect Dis, 2011. 11: p. 10. 43. Taylor, S., et al. BMC Infect Dis, 2016. 16: p. 293. 44. Ma, S.T., et al. Emerg Med J, 2013. 30(6): p. 472-5. 45. Casalegno, J.S., et al. PLoS One, 2012. 7(10): p. e48137. 46. Liu, G., et al. J Infect Dis, 2016. 213(2): p. 191-8. 47. Ryndock, E., R. Robison, and C. Meyers. J Med Virol, 2016. 88(6): p. 1076-80. 48. Meyers, J., et al. J Antimicrob Chemother, 2014. 69(6): p. 1546-50. 49. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Marketing Clearance of Diagnostic Ultrasound Systems and Transducers. 2019. 50. AAMI, ST58:2013 Chemical sterilization and high-level disinfection in health care facilities. 51. Practice Bulletin No. 175: Ultrasound in Pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol, 2016. 128(6): p. e241-e256. 52. Hamm, R.F., C.A. Combs, and C.M. Davidson. Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2020. 223(3): p. B2-b6. 53. American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine (AIUM). Guidelines for Cleaning and Preparing External- and Internal-Use Ultrasound Transducers and Equipment Between Patients as well as Safe Handling and Use of Ultrasound Coupling Gel. 2020. 54. Society of Diagnostic Medical Sonographers (SDMS). Guidelines for infection prevention and control in sonography: reprocessing the ultrasound transducer. 2022.

Nanosonics Limited 14 Mars Road, Lane Cove, NSW 2066, Australia, T: +61 2 8063 1600 E: info@nanosonics.com.au W: www.nanosonics.com.au

USA & Canada. Nanosonics Inc. 7205 E 87th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46256, USA T: +1-844-876-7466 E: info@nanosonics.us W: www.nanosonics.us