

[Peter Flogger Alsén](#)

What are your views on sterile gloves?

I use them. As do two other shops (four other piercers) in this country (SE) but the other piercers in the country seem to not do it. My guess is money, people think it's too expensive (even though it's not that bad).

Does this cause as much debate as internally/externally threaded jewelry?

Like · · Unfollow Post · [2 hours ago](#)



[Kcir Elohssa](#) there is an ongoing debate in the suspension community over using them, but there isn't enough proven benefit to using them to make the majority of us switch. i would use them when doing heavy modification (even if it's simply running them through the statim) but not for common procedures. personally, i don't think they're necessary.

[2 hours ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) the internal/external debate is way more silly, as there is a logical reason against one side, where this is simply preference and speculation.

[2 hours ago](#) · Like



[Carlene Meshell](#) In Florida we are required to wear sterile gloves during the actual procedure. During the set up, marking, cleaning and break down we can wear "clean" gloves. We're also required to wear a face mask.

[2 hours ago](#) via [mobile](#) · Unlike · [1](#)



[Derek Mastropietro](#) for piercing in my shop I use sterile gloves, for pulls in my shop I use sterile gloves, if I had high enough ceilings to suspend in shop I would use sterile gloves. Suspending or pulls not in the shop, I use regular box gloves.

[2 hours ago](#) · Like

[Brian Skellie](#) The benefits of sterilizing gloves are not a matter of opinion or speculation. That was settled in medicine nearly 100 years ago. Either the gloves have been sterilized, and you eliminate that risk with proper aseptic donning and handling, or they are contaminated from the source. This bears repeating: non-sterile gloves are colonized in the box, before opening. Sterilized gloves have been cleaned and processed to eliminate this risk.

This is not a matter of choice, it is a matter of law in France, Florida, South Carolina are all examples of where this was understood when the regulations were written.

*It is strongly advised that piercers use sterilized gloves for any contact with jewelry and needle, or use an aseptic non-touch technique. Sterile gloves are less expensive and safer than reprocessing the tools needed for a no-touch technique.

[Peter](#) : to directly answer your question, yes, professional piercers still debate this.
[about an hour ago](#) · Like



[Peter Flogger Alsén](#) I don't see the point of buying expensive gear to sterilize needles, jewelry, tools etc. and then before inserting them into someone touch them with non-sterile gloves.

Nice to see that in France, Florida and South Carolina they actually have laws regarding this.
[about an hour ago](#) · Unlike · [1](#)



[Kcir Elohssa](#)

though i do agree that it is beneficial, i've not seen a single case of infection due to using non-sterile gloves in a piercing. even non-sterile products are typically sterilized at one point pre-shipping. the fact that sterility exists only inside an autoclave or completely non-permeable container doesn't prevent airborne contaminants, contaminants from the outside of the packaging transferred during the procedure, or any other contaminant that can be introduced pre- or post-procedural. obviously, there is logic to using a fully sterile setup. however, i don't feel the benefit is worth the direct cost of purchasing pre-sterile gloves.

[53 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) [Kcir](#), this statement is false and misleading: "even non-sterile products are typically sterilized at one point pre-shipping."

This is an unacceptable and indefensible argument:

Dismissal of safety precautions due to "not seeing" germs is what Ignaz Semmelweis fought against in the 1800's (and it killed him.)

[48 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) i don't purchase sterile gloves. i did say i sterilized them. and most products from paper towels to gloves are gamma radiation sterilized.

[46 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) The point I want to underscore is that sterilized gloves, whether done in house, or

purchased from a manufacturer, make a difference that is quantified. It has been observed for a century.

[45 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) [Kcir Elohssa](#): "and most products from paper towels to gloves are gamma radiation sterilized."

When and where? Show me an example? These sort of controls cost money, and require validation.

Paper towels and gloves arrive colonized.

[43 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#)

i agree. but there are millions of steps that could be taken to further increase safety. most shops don't use hepa filters or single use metal instruments, both of which could have a positive impact on safety. there is no limit to what levels of precautions you can take. at some point you have to determine what is acceptable limits to you and what starts to become overkill. to me it is not cost effective to purchase sterile gloves when i can simply run gloves when i need them.

[42 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Ignore the straw man

If you choose to sterilize your own gloves, I accept your choice, and will not tell you you are wrong for it.

Here is a direct link to why: <http://brnskl.com/shares/statim/#h.fgj52jj132hi>

I agree that we can keep this discussion to functional, validated safety precautions that make a clinically significant difference.

[39 minutes ago](#) · Like

[Kcir Elohssa](#) brian, i must admit, you're probably the only person i am actually reticent to debate with. however, i will attempt to find supporting documents.

[38 minutes ago](#) · Unlike · [2](#)



[Peter Flogger Alsén](#) [Brian](#), feel free to mention this at your seminar in Sweden, you might inspire a change in the swedish industry :)

[35 minutes ago](#) · Unlike · [1](#)



[Brian Skellie](#)

I'm not debating the validity of sterilizing your own gloves.

I do want to make it clear that if a piercer does not use sterilized gloves, they should use a no-touch technique: long handled sterilized items are used to touch the needle and jewelry.

Simply put: the needle and anything else inserted into the body during piercing such as a taper and the jewelry should be handled only by sterilized items. Whether they are sterilized gloves or hemostats, for example, is not relevant. I mentioned earlier that gloves are more affordable and safer than instrument reprocessing.

I have tried to find proof that some commonly used items are sterilized at the factory or before shipping, but have come up with nothing for twenty years now. I feel strongly that "factory sterile" is a myth, and a dangerous one. When I search for references to prove that exam gloves and paper towels are manufactured and or delivered in aseptic conditions, I find the opposite.

[30 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) while we're on the subject...if non-sterile gloves come colonized why are they safe to use on any procedure? trauma can be introduced during any procedure which could cause the opening of tissue or a porthole to the circulatory system.

[29 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) They aren't. They are used to protect the wearer against contamination, not the other way around. That is why gloves and other objects are sterilized.

[28 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) and i have to admit, frantic googling has yet to return me a viable resource to use in my defense. i seem to be in error as to factory sterilization. at the least it seems unprovable.

[27 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Phlebotomy is supposed to be done as a no-touch technique, and the same goes for injection, therefore non-sterile exam gloves are used. A catheter requires sterile gloves.

[27 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) in theory :)

[26 minutes ago](#) · Unlike · [1](#)



[Brian Skellie](#) There were recent articles in the news about contaminated paper towels as well. There is a biofilm that forms in paper mills that is tenacious and pathogenic.

[26 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) damn you skellie. stop learnin' me.

[24 minutes ago](#) · Like · [1](#)



[Kcir Elohssa](#) you mentioned using sterile tools to handle jewelry/needle during the procedure if not wearing sterile gloves. i've always tried to keep metal on metal contact to a minimum to prevent burrs, abrasions, or deformations. what is your opinion on that?

[21 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Correct, metal on metal contact, even with brass or other softer metal tipped tools should be avoided for the reasons you mention. I suggested using sterile gloves, though I accept that some people use plastic tools or pad the tips of metal tools with sterile gauze or bandages with acceptable results. I've tried sterile band-aids to cover the tips of metal tools in certain cases, and that worked out.

The sterile bandages need to be applied with a no-touch technique as well, handling them only by their wrappers

[10 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Peter Flogger Alsén](#) Since sterile gloves are packed in pairs (at least mine are), when opened up there is a sterile field to work on which simplifies things as well, not having to buy extra stuff for that. I spend \$3 per pair but it's seriously one of the best investments I make in my shop :)

[7 minutes ago](#) · Unlike · [2](#)



[Brian Skellie](#) Depending on your order quantity, you can get quality sterilized pairs for \$0.25 each. I prefer powder-free synthetics, which brings the cost per pair up to about \$0.50 each. Are you buying from a local hospital supply distributor?

[3 minutes ago](#) · Like

[Kcir Elohssa](#) <http://ebm.bmj.com/content/9/6/182.full>

<http://www.o-wm.com/article/1544?page=0%2C0>

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1524-4725.2011.01949.x/abstract>

<http://ebm.bmj.com/content/9/6/182.full.pdf>

[http://www.annemergmed.com/article/S0196-0644\(03\)00969-7/abstract](http://www.annemergmed.com/article/S0196-0644(03)00969-7/abstract)

about a minute ago · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) each of those studies comes to the same basic conclusion. "This study demonstrated that there is no clinically important difference in infection rates between using

clean nonsterile gloves and sterile gloves during the repair of uncomplicated traumatic lacerations."

about a minute ago · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Nonsense- these are talking about contaminated wounds- try again. ER studies like these are not comparative to our work. We create a clean wound. These are more relative to dealing with a contaminated piercing for a jewelry change.

[a few seconds ago](#) · Like



[Peter Flogger Alsén Kcir](#), many long words, I'm but a humble swede :)

a few seconds ago · Like

[Peter Flogger Alsén](#) Then what's the point of sterilizing anything [Kcir](#)?

[3 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Nonsense

[3 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) how so? airborne contaminants don't exist?

[2 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Colonized items that were not processed or sterilized have been compared to ones that were in situations specific to creating a new wound. Sterilized items win

The moment the package is opened, it must be used immediately to avoid picking up enough airborne contamination to be a hazard.

Airborne and aerosol contamination are of serious concern. They do not absolve the requirement for terminal sterilization of devices prior to use.

[a few seconds ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) exactly. immediately. as in the package is opened and jewelry is in your skin with 0ms delay

sterile process ends the second of exposure. at that point it's sanitary.

6 minutes ago · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Your argument is not valid. Nonsense

[5 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Carlene Meshell](#) Brian, where do you find sterile gloves at such a great price??

[5 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) how is it not valid?

if you want to take it to the level that you worry about contaminants how do you draw the line and say that the next level of contaminants are not just as important?

[2 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Sterile processing is to remove major sources of transmission, airborne is of much lower consequence. The level of airborne contamination in the moments from when a package is opened to when the contents are used increases steadily. This does not mean "don't bother sterilizing things in the first place" which is the invalid argument. This means that they need to be opened only just before they are needed, and used the moment that they are opened. There is plenty of information on best practices for the maintenance of a sterile field. AORN is one of the best.

You draw the line at sterilized. That is your baseline ZERO. That is where you start. From there, if your only contamination is from airborne, and you are able to reduce that by air filtration, a mask, clean clothing, proper hygiene, and housekeeping practices, then you have a quantifiable process with very limited risk.

The level of airborne risk can be greatly reduced by design.

[a few seconds ago](#) · Like

[Kcir Elohssa](#) ok. i'm specifically referring to your argument that what we do is a "clean wound." not that we should not be using sterile tools

[24 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) We create a wound

[24 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) which is immediately contaminated

[23 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) No

It is not immediately contaminated, especially if you used an antiseptic prep with a prolonged effect.

The wound CAN be contaminated, but should not be

[22 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) which they wouldn't do in the studies i provided?
in theory :)

[22 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) We should make each effort to avoid contamination on our end. After that, the client has to deal with it.

The studies you provided were distracting, and superfluous. They were designed by companies that wanted to cut costs in hospitals.

[21 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) everyone has an agenda.

it could be said that someone who sells equipment to sterilize things would take the opposing side automatically.

[20 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Surprisingly, I'd like to side with the ability to reprocess and sterilize things. I side with single use instead. Ad hominem attacks are not useful. Don't take any of this personally.

A study about wound repair in the emergency department of a hospital is dealing with contaminated lacerations. Not the same as starting a new wound. They use strong antiseptics to clean the area, and offer antiseptic and prophylactic antibiotic treatment afterwards if needed.

A study about changing the dressings on a healing wound is not the same as starting a new wound either. It describes the type of slippery slope environmental exposures you mentioned that get in the way of aseptic aftercare.

[12 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) with all the precaution we take in preparation, it'd be nice to be able to cast a lvl 5 wall of force around the piercing to keep outside contaminants out. Do you have any dressings

you prefer clients use?

[9 minutes ago](#) · Unlike · [1](#)



[Brian Skellie](#) The Perelman trial also conversely reports an infection rate that is higher with sterilized gloves, and stands to reason that there is more to such infection rates than the gloves. The patients came in with contaminated wounds. Either they got infected or they didn't and the procedure had little to do with it.

We can not draw a meaningful conclusion from this that relates to making a new wound.

I bandage most piercings with a sterile dressing, whether that be sterile gauze or Tegaderm (or other transparent dressings made for covering catheters) and I suggest clients wear clean clothes and to wear a sterile bandage, changing it when needed until the piercing has sealed itself.

[5 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Kcir Elohssa](#) i think aseptic technique, proper work environment, education of clients, and proper aftercare are more important factors to infection than sterile gloves. anyone can purchase sterile gloves, using them improperly does nothing.

[4 minutes ago](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) These things are not mutually exclusive.

Not using anything without training and understanding can lead to unexpected results. I agree that asepsis, environmental controls and education as well as aftercare round out the professionals required list of skills and competences.

[2 minutes ago](#) · Like

[Kcir Elohssa](#) "unexpected results." http://www.toplessrobot.com/exploding_head.jpg



http://www.toplessrobot.com/exploding_head.jpg

www.toplessrobot.com

[2 minutes ago](#) · Unlike · [1](#)

[Brian Skellie](#) For history's sake: <http://brnskill.com/.../sterile-gloves-first-in-1897-by-w.../>

[Peter Flogger Alsén](#) I love that his name is mandevil :)

[March 14, 2012 at 1:32pm](#) · Like



[Brian Skellie](#) Faustus! Faustus!

[March 14, 2012 at 3:29pm](#) · [Like](#)



[Brian Skellie](#) Are you using sterile gloves? Here is a bit of perspective from the [APP The Point](#) archives that I gathered and reviewed <http://brnskill.com/shares/sterile-gloves-use-rationale/>