Evidence to Decision Frameworks: Biological Dressings

the undesirable effects?

C	linical question Wh	nat biological dressings are effective for supporting healin	ng of pressure injuries?	
Rec 15.		onsider applying collagen dressings to non ound inflammation.	nhealing pressure injuries to improve rate of healing and decrease signs	and symptoms of
C		dressing comparators including basic dressing be	ckground: Most wound dressing collagen is derived from animal skin. It is proposed that applying d via a wound dressing facilitates healing. Collagen (a protein produced by fibroblasts) reduces prages, and promotes angiogenesis, epithelization and granulation.	
	CRITERIA	JUDGEMENTS	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
SMANH 8	What is the overall certainty of the evidence?	No included studies Very low Low Moderate High	 Pressure injuries (n=33, stage unknown) treated with collagen matrix dressing had significantly greater reduction in wound surface area. Pressure injuries (n=33, stage unknown) treated with collagen matrix dressing had significantly greater reductions surface area compared to hydropolymer dressing (65±13% versus 41±11%, p<0.05).⁴ (Level 1, low quality) Healing rate with collagen dressing not significantly different to hydrocolloid dressing when measured by mr Category/Stage II and III pressure injuries at 8 weeks (mean difference 0, 95% CI –9 to 8, p=0.942).¹ (Level 1, Evidence for improvement in protease activity and other markers of inflammation/infection Compared with a foam dressing, a collagen dressing was associated with showed a faster and higher reduction concentration (p<0.04).² (Level 1, moderate quality) 	Level 1, high quality)
	: h	Possibly No Important important Probably no important uncertainty uncertainty important uncertainty or or uncertainty or undesirable variability variability or variability uncertainty or undesirable outcomes		antly greater reduction in
	How substantial are the desirable anticipated effects?	Unclear Not Probably not Probably Substantial substantial substantial		=0.942). ¹ (<i>Level 1, high quality</i>) and higher reduction in MMP-9
	How substantial are the undesirable anticipated effects?	Unclear Not Probably not Probably Substanital substantial substantial	 Compared with a hydropolymer dressing, elastase activity (p<0.05) and plasmin activity (p<0.05) was sign pressure injuries (unknown stage) treated with a collagen dressing.⁴ (<i>Level 1, low quality</i>) Adverse outcomes No adverse events were experience over 8 weeks use.¹ (<i>Level 1, high quality</i>) 	
	Do the desirable	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies	Strength of Evidence: B1 — Level 1 studies of moderate to low quality, plus additional evidence fro	m lower level studies

	CRITERIA	JUDGEMENTS	RESEARCH EVIDENCE AND ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
RESOURCE USE	How substantial are the resource requirements?	Not Not sub- Probably Probably Sub- clear stantial not sub- sub- stanital stantial stantial	Cost analysis Considering dressing materials, ancillary supplies and labor costs, collagen dressing was more expensive that hydrocolloid dressing for 8 weeks for Category/Stage II or III pressure injury (average per patient cost hydrocolloid \$222 versus collagen \$627) (\$US in 2003).¹ Labor Collagen dressing required 3.5 times more nursing interventions than hydrocolloid dressing.¹ Category/Stage II to IV pressure injuries required fewer dressings than a viscose rayon dressing (6 to 15 versus 14 to 52).³
ACCEPTABILITY	Is the option acceptable to key stakeholders?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies No Yes	Collagen dressings are derived from animal skin and may not be acceptable to all individuals with pressure injuries (Expert opinion).
PRIORITY AND A	Is the option a priority for key stakeholders?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies No Yes □ □ □ □	No evidence available
FEASIBILITY	Is the option feasible to implement?	No Probably Uncertain Probably Yes Varies No Yes	Collagen dressings may not be universally available. (Expert opinion)

Balance of consequences	Undesirable consequences clearly outweigh desirable consequences in most settings	Undesirable consequences probably outweigh desirable consequences in most settings	The balance between desirable and undesirable consequences is closely balanced or uncertain	Desirable consequences probably outweigh undesirable consequences in most settings	Desirable consequences clearly outweigh undesirable consequences in most settings		
Strength of recommendation	Strong negative recommendation: Definitely don't it	Weak negative recommendation: Probably don't do it	No specific recommendation	Weak positive recommendation: Probably do it	Strong positive recommendation: Definitely do it		
Justification	There is direct evidence from low, moderate and high quality Level 1 studies to suggest that collagen matrix dressings are as effective as other contemporary wound dressings (e.g. hydrocolloid, hydropolymer and foam) in promoting healing. ¹⁻³ In one low quality Level 1 study, ⁴ a collagen matrix dressing out-performed a hydropolymer dressing in achieving reduction in pressure injury surface area and in other studies, indicators of wound inflammation were more favourable in pressure injuries treated with collagen. ^{2,4} Older studies indicated that collagen matrix dressings cost more with respect to product and labor than other types of wound dressings; however, a cost-benefit analysis is not available. Consideration should be given to resource availability because collagen matrix dressings might be more costly than other contemporary wound dressings ^{1,2} and/or difficult to access. Consideration should also be given to patient preferences (collagen is derived from animal products). ⁵⁻⁷						

References

- 1. Graumlich JF, Blough LS, McLaughlin RG, Milbrandt JC, Calderon CL, Agha SA, Scheibel LW. Healing pressure ulcers with collagen or hydrocolloid: A randomized, controlled trial. J Am Geriatr Soc, 2003; 51(2): 147-154.
- 2. Piatkowski A, Ulrich D, Seidel D, Abel M, Pallua N, Andriessen A. Randomised, controlled pilot to compare collagen and foam in stagnating pressure ulcers. J Wound Care, 2012; 21(10): 505-511.
- 3. Nisi G, Brandi C, Grimaldi L, Calabrò M, D'Aniello C. Use of a protease-modulating matrix in the treatment of pressure sores. Chir Ital, 2005; 57(4): 465-468.
- 4. Kloeters O, Unglaub F, de Laat E, van Abeelen M, Ulrich D. Prospective and randomised evaluation of the protease-modulating effect of oxidised regenerated cellulose/collagen matrix treatment in pressure sore ulcers. Int Wound J, 2016; 13(6): 1231-1236.
- 5. Wu S, Applewhite AJ, Niezgoda J, Snyder R, Shah JP, Cullen B, Schultz G, Harrison J, Hill R, Howell M, Speyrer M, Utra H, de Leon J, Lee W, Treadwell T. Oxidized regenerated cellulose/collagen dressings: Review of evidence and recommendations. Adv Skin Wound Care, 2017; 30: S1-S81.
- 6. Grothier L. Understanding the use of collagen/oxidised regenerated cellulose dressings. Wounds Int, 2015; 6(2): 34-40.
- 7. Fleck CA, Simman R. Modern collagen wound dressings: Function and purpose. J Am Col Certif Wound Spec, 2010 2(3): 50-4.