





The Nursing Management of Leg Ulcers in the Community: A Critical Review of Research

• Objectives:

- to critically review the research underpinning the nursing management of leg ulcers in the community and
- develop a research agenda to inform and improve nursing practice

The first systematic review in wound care and one of the first in nursing

Question	Answer?
What is the underlying pathology?	X/✓
How many people affected?	X
What are the risk factors/early warning signs?	X/✓
(How) can we prevent them?	X
(How) can we reduce recurrence?	X
Which treatments are used?	X/✓
Which treatments are effective?	X
What are the adverse effects of treatments? Can they be reduced?	X/✓
How should nurses assess people with leg ulcers?	X
How and where is care currently delivered?	X/✓
Contribution to nursing workload?	X
Impact on the patient of having a leg ulcer?	X
Important outcomes?	X









Systematic Reviews

- Address a focused, answerable question (clear objectives)
- Scientific method (pre-specified protocol, systematic and transparent approach, minimisation of bias, reproducible)
- Comprehensive (try to find ALL eligible studies)
- Systematic assessment of validity of primary study findings
- Systematic presentation and synthesis of included studies
- May include meta-analysis

Systematic Reviews

- Address a focused, answerable question (clear objectives)
- Scientific method (pre-specified protocol, systematic and transparent approach, minimisation of bias, reproducible)
- Comprehensive (try to find ALL eligible studies)
- Systematic assessment of validity of primary study findings
- Systematic presentation and synthesis of included studies
- May include meta-analysis

<text><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item>

Cochrane Wounds Group

- Cochrane Collaboration was established 1993; the Wounds Group in 1995
 - -14 Editors
 - -560 Authors
 - –105 Referees
 - ->100 systematic reviews published to date with many more in production

Scope of Wounds Group Reviews

- Systematic reviews of the effects of interventions to prevent and treat wounds and their complications
- includes
- prevention of pressure ulcers, leg and foot ulcers;
- prevention of wound complications, e.g. surgical site infection, scarring;
- treatment of wounds including burns, e.g. dressings, bandages, support surfaces;
- infection control
- Systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy studies relevant to wounds









Key Findings		
Review	Findings	
Support surfaces	High specification foam better than standard hospital mattresses Relative merits of AP and CLP unclear Operating table overlays can reduce pressure ulcers Medical sheepskins prevent pressure ulcers	
Water for wound cleansing	No evidence that cleansing with sterile saline superior to cleansing with tap water	
Compression for VLU	Compression better than no compression Multi-component systems better than single component systems 4LB better than SSB	
Honey for wounds	Honey doesn't increase healing of VLU Honey may delay burn healing cf. grafting	
Risk assessment for PU prevention	No evidence that structured risk assessment better than unstructured risk assessment	





PRESSURE Trial

- NIHR HTA (£1,012,641)
 Alternating pressure (AP) mattresses (c.£4k) vs. AP
- overlays (c. £1k)11 centres, 1972 participants
- More costly mattress replacements more likely to be cost saving (delay to pressure ulceration and lower costs)







VenUS IV

- Funded by NIHR HTA Programme (£976,422)
- A pragmatic randomised controlled trial comparing the clinical and cost-effectiveness of two-layer hosiery with the four layer bandage in terms of time to healing of venous leg ulcers
- Primary Outcome: Time to healing of the reference ulcer



Conclusions

- Two layer hosiery:
 - as effective as the four layer bandage for healing venous leg ulcers
 - more cost effective, probably as a result of reducing the frequency of nurse consultations and enhancing self-management
 - was associated with a reduced risk of ulcer recurrence after healing



Quality of RCTs of Treatments for Complex Wounds

- 167 RCTs published 2004 2011 in English
 - 63 leg ulcers
 - 57 foot ulcers
 - 31 pressure ulcers
 - 16 mixed wounds
 - 42 wound dressings/topical agents
 - 33 drugs
 - 16 growth factors
 - 16 bandages/stockings
 - 11 tissue grafts
 - 23 miscellaneous

Funding of Complex Wound Trials

- 35% reported as commercially funded (58/167)
- 33% not commercially funded (55/167)
- 26% (44/167) did not report funder or nature of funder unclear
- 6% (10/167) mix of commercial and noncommercial

Study Conduct and Reporting Quality

- Median total sample size 60 or 28 perver
- Median duration of follow up 12 weeks
- Only 59% reports identified conimary outcome Of which 48% were intermediate measures of healing and 11% unrelated to sealing
- 40% adequates adom sequence generation (59%)
- unclear) 25% relevante allocation concealment (74% venear)
- 334% blinded outcome assessment



"Spin" in Wound Care Research

- · Authors' use of language and emphasis on results for particular outcomes potentially misleads readers (as per Boutron et al¹)
- May "result from ignorance... Unconscious bias, or wilful intent to deceive"
- Set out to determine the prevalence of spin in wound care studies with no statistically significant treatment effect AND the prevalence of wound care studies with no specified primary outcome
- Excluded Phase I trials and equivalence/noninferiority/pilot trials and conference abstracts JAMA 2010; 303:2058-2064.

Sample

- 71 eligible RCTs of interventions for leg, foot, pressure ulcers published 2004 to 2009
 - -28 had a clear primary outcome for which there was a statistically non-significant result (Cohort A)
 - -43/132 studies (33%) had no clear primary outcome specified (Cohort B)



Results • 20/28 studies in Cohort A contained spin • 63% of Cohort A abstracts contained spin (30% claimed effectiveness) • 43/132 (33%) of reports did not specify the

primary outcome (Cohort B) but reported a median of 9 outcomes and 86% claimed a favourable treatment effect in the abstract.

(71%)





- Final top 12 priorities released in May 2013

JLA Pressure Ulcer Priorities

- 1. How effective is *repositioning* in the prevention of pressure ulcers?
- How effective at preventing pressure ulcers is *involving patients, family* and *lay carers* in patient care?
- Does the education of health and social care staff on prevention lead to a reduction in the incidence of pressure ulcers and, if so, which are the most effective education programmes (at organisational and health/social care level)?
- 4. What is the relative effectiveness of the different types of pressure relieving beds, mattresses, overlays, heel protectors and cushions(including cushions for electric and self-propelling wheelchairs) in preventing pressure ulcers?
- 5. What impact do different service models have on the incidence of pressure ulcers including staffing levels, continuity of care [an on-going relationship with same staff members] and the current organisation of nursing care in hospitals?
 - te for Health Research and is a partneythin battoren remoters and communication from the term

- 6. What are the best service models (and are they sufficiently accessible) to ensure that patients with pressure ulcers receive the best treatment outcomes (including whether getting people with pressure ulcers and their carers more involved in their own pressure ulcer management improves ulcer healing and if so, the most effective models of engagement)?
- For wheelchair users sitting on a pressure ulcer, how effective is *bed rest* in promoting pressure ulcer healing?
- 8. How effective are *wound dressings* in the promotion of pressure ulcer healing?
- 9. Does *regular turning of patients in bed* promote healing of pressure ulcers?
- 10. Does *improving diet (eating) and hydration (drinking)* promote pressure ulcer healing?
- 10. How effective are *surgical operations* to close pressure ulcers? 12. How effective are topical *skin care* products and skin care regimes at

preventing pressure ulcers?





CLAHRC-GM: Wound Care Objectives Years 1-2

Overall goal is to build a network for collaboration in wounds research and implementation

- Identify key stakeholders and map activity
- Identify and develop research areas/priorities for implementation
- Research project set up and conduct (including implementation projects)

Reflections on Developing an Evidence Base in Wound Care

- Strategic approach to summarising evidence, prioritising primary research questions, updating evidence summaries
- Importance of identifying areas of clinical and patient need (NHS priorities) and asking the right research questions ... clearly!
- Collaboration with high quality methodologists essential (ideally leading edge); importance of methodological research
- Collaborations between researchers and clinicians essential to getting the questions and the impact right
- Importance of epidemiological approaches