

DRESSING'S EFFICIENCY AND PERFORMANCE FOR PRESSURE ULCERS TREATMENT: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW WITH META-ANALYSIS

Francisco Pedro García-Fernández¹, Pedro Luís Pancorbo-Hidalgo², José Verdú³, Javier Soldevilla⁴, Manuel Rodríguez⁵, Manuel Gago⁶, Fernando Martínez⁷, Justo Rueda⁸

¹University Hospital of Jaén, Jaén, Spain, ²University of Jaén, Jaén, Spain, ³University of Alicante, Alicante,, Spain, ⁴Hospital de la Rioja, Logroño, La Rioja, Spain, ⁵Residencia de ancianos José Matia Calvo, Cádiz, Spain, ⁶C.S. Pinillo Chico, Puerto de Santa María, Cadiz, Spain, ⁷Residencia Mixta de ancianos, Gijón, Asturias, Spain, ⁸CAP Terrassa Nord, Terrassa, Barcelona, Spain

Aims: To evaluate dressing's clinical efficiency and dressing performance of products for pressure ulcers available for pressure ulcers (PU) treatment based on moist wound healing (MWH).

Methods: Published studies were searched over: CINAHL, Cuiden Plus, Embase, LILACS and MEDLINE databases. Also an inverse search was carried out, with secondary recovery. Unpublished studies were not included. The search included clinical trials comparing: a) products based on MWH and traditional treatments (TT) and b) different types of products of MWH, for PU treatments. Every paper was assessed independently by two reviewers, using CASP and the GRADE system for the quality of evidence. Data extracted were: general data and data on clinical efficiency. To estimate the effect we used the relative risk (RR) with 95% confidence interval. A meta-analysis (random effects model) was carried out when appropriate.

Results: 66 potentially relevant studies were identified. 30 were excluded because of scoring CASP <5 and 10 were not considered for analysis because of a very low quality of evidence. A meta-analysis shows the advantage on the use of hydrocolloid (HCL) vs. TT (RR=2.05 IC95% 1.20-3.52). Individual studies that do not permit meta-analysis show the advantage of other MWH dressings (hydrogels, alginates and others) vs. TT. A metaanalysis of all studies comparing MWH vs. TT confirms it (RR=1.61 IC95% 1.28-2.02). There aren't differences in clinical efficiency of HCL vs. polyurethane foam (RR=1.11 IC95% 0.60-2.05), neither other products among itself. Specific sacrum hydrocolloid dressings had easier application and longer duration than normal hydrocolloid. Foams show greater exudates absorption capacity and were removed easier than hydrocolloid.

Conclusions: There are many studies with a very low quality of evidence or with a very small sample, that don't permit to consider them. MWH dressings for PU treatments have greater clinical efficiency than TT. There is no difference in the clinical efficiency between different types of MWH products. Foams advantage HCL in comfort and exudates absorption.

Honorary Lecture, GNEAUPP