Demonstration of a Bioelectric Wound Care Device for Wound Healing within a Rehabilitation Center Patient Population

Emily Whitcomb, NHA^{a,b}, Nina Monroe, RN, DON^a, Jennifer Hope-Higman^a, LPN, Penny Campbell, PT, CWS, FACCWS, DAPWCA^{a,b,c} ^aBethany Health and Rehab Center, Nashville, TN; ^bTrevecca Health and Rehab Center, Nashville, TN; ^cVomaris Innovations, Inc., Chandler, AZ

BACKGROUND

Wound care in a rehabilitation environment is a costly and difficult problem. An IRB-approved retrospective, observational study was performed in a population of rehabilitation and long-term care patients with acute and chronic wounds of varied etiology to evaluate differences in wound healing outcomes when treated with a bioelectric wound care device* as compared to standard local wound care methods. The bioelectric device generates a microcurrent in the presence of an electrolyte such as wound exudate or sterile saline. It has been shown to facilitate wound repair (1) and has been associated with faster reepithelialization (2) and reduced expression of inflammatory biomarkers (3) such as cytokine Interleukin-1 α in recent studies.

METHODS

Data files of 38 patients who received either standard wound treatment (SOC: n=20), or were treated with a bioelectric wound device (n=18) were retrospectively reviewed. Wounds were assessed until deemed clinically to have healed with up to 100% epithelialization. All patients (18 - 99 years) with single wounds were included. Statistical analysis was performed to compare the wounds in two groups for the number of days to heal, the rate of wound volume reduction, or the monotonically decreasing, or the increasing and then decreasing characteristic of the wounds. All subjects received the best standard wound care (SOC) appropriate to their specific etiologies (i.e. antimicrobials, alginates, NPWT, etc.) alone or in conjunction with the bioelectric wound device for management of his or her wound.

RESULTS

The wounds in the SOC group healed on average at 36.25 days (SD 28.89), while the bioelectric device group healed significantly faster in 19.78 days (SD 14.45), p=0.036. The rate of volume reduction per day was -3.83% for SOC vs. -9.82% volume reduction per day (p=0.013) for the bioelectric group. The SOC group had 50% of its wounds heal monotonically vs. 83.3% in the bioelectric device group (p=0.018)

CONCLUSION

This multicenter retrospective study demonstrated a 45.4% faster, and more robust healing of wounds with the use of the bioelectric wound care device, when compared to SOC in a rehabilitation center environment, which translates to improved patient care, and potentially, significant cost savings.

	Bioelectric Dressing	Standard of Care	Cumulative wound survival	Cumulative average trend for wound healing for the SOC ar
Number of cases	18	20	trend as a function of Days	bioelectric device group, using
Females	14	13	Group	interpolated values. The overa
Males	4	7	Gloup	the wound trajectory is much
Age [Years (SD)]	80.17 ± 10.24	81.5 ± 9.79		the bioelectric group compared
0. (),			SOC	
Wound size	Min 0.03	Min 0.01	Bioelectric	
[Volume, cc]	Max 224.1	Max 312.1	Dioelectric	
	Mean 21.1 ± 55.03	Mean 30.4 ± 74.18		

Stage II Blister

Patient 6- Bioelectric Device 85 y/o with recent fall and non-operable fx

Dx: Tib/Fib and ankle fxs, dM, Peripheral Neuropathy, Coronary Arteriosclerosis, Pacemaker, HTN, chronic renal disease, COPD, CHF, MI Blister completely resolved in 5 days



Initial



Patient 9- SOC 83 v/o femaleRight medial thigh Dxs: Right TKR, chronic pain, HTN, Vitamin D def., h/o Uterine CA



Patient 9- SOC

85 v/o female

9/29/11

Initial



Initial

Open Hematoma



Day 21



70 y/o male

Initial

Surgical Dehiscence

Patient 8- Bioelectric Device

65 y/o female

Dxs: Intestinovesical fistula, colovesicle fistula s/p repair, diverticular bowel, left uteter stent repair, UTI, sepsis, perforation of intestine, AF, DM II, HTN, CAD, anxiety, depression, bilateral renal cysts, anemia, morbid obesity, hypokalemia, s/p polyp removal vagina, hypothyroidism, Vitamin D deficiency

Tx: NPWT + bioelectric device; treatment began 5/11/12 and NPWT discharged 6/8/12



Day 6

Initial

Day 13

Day 23

Day 7

Dxs: Surgical dehiscence with MRSA, HTN, edema, MI, immune thrombocytopenia

Tx: NPWT + antimicrobial wound filler. Treatment began 9/8/11; discharged NPWT

anemia, hypothyroidism, hyperlipidemia, renal arterial stenosis, CVA, AAA, h/o

bilateral iliac occlusion with s/p stent, femoral bypass

Day 14



Patient 15- Bioelectric Device 88 y/o female Left back

Dxs: Hypothyroidism, DM II, hyperlipidemia, anemia, dementia, depression, HTN, coronary arteriosclorosis, congestive heart failure, AF, chronic renal disease, hypokalemia, hyponatremia, CVD, bipolar, COPD, CVD



Initial

Day 5



Day 10 Day 14

REFERENCES

1. Sheftel SN. The role of a bio-electric, antimicrobial dressing in the healing of acute and chronic wounds [abstract]. Clinical Symposium on Advances in Skin and Wound Care, Las Vegas, NV. October 2008; (suppl): 217.

2. Blount AL, Foster S, Rapp DA, Wilcox R. The Use of Bioelectric Dressings in Skin Graft Harvest Sites: A Prospective Case Series. J Burn Care Res. 2012;33(3):354-357.

3. Harding AC, Gil J, Valdes J, Solis M, Davis SC. Efficacy of a Novel Bio-electric Dressing in Healing Deep Partial-thickness Wounds in a Porcine Model. Ostomy Wound Manage, 2012:58(9):50-55

percentage nd the g the 5-day all trend for steeper for to SOC.

Group SOC Bioelectric



Patient 2- SOC

Hematoma occurred on 6/28/12, opened on 7/8/12 Dxs: long-term anticoagulant therapy, chronic kidney disease (stage III), coronary arteriosclerosis, CAD, CABG, pacemaker, h/o MI, AF, HTN, cerebrovascular disease, CVA, cardiac failure, DM II, depression, dependent edema, venous insufficiency, hypothyroidism, anemia, hypercalcemia, hyperlipidemia, DVT



Day 9



Day 21

Patient 3-SOC

psychosis, senile dementia

90 v/o, female



Day 29

Dxs: Alzheimer's disease, HTN, hypothyroidism, h/o DVT, CAD,

edema, depression, CVD, CVA, cerebral arterioscloerosis, falls,



Day 35





Initial

Day 3



Day 9