

Risk Assessment and Prevention of Pressure Ulcers: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians

Amir Qaseem, MD, PhD, MHA; Tanveer P. Mir, MD; Melissa Starkey, PhD; and Thomas D. Denberg, MD, PhD, for the Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians*

Description: The American College of Physicians (ACP) developed this guideline to present the evidence and provide clinical recommendations based on the comparative effectiveness of risk assessment scales and preventive interventions for pressure ulcers.

Methods: This guideline is based on published literature on this topic that was identified by using MEDLINE (1946 through February 2014), CINAHL (1998 through February 2014), the Cochrane Library, clinical trials registries, and reference lists. Searches were limited to English-language publications. The outcomes evaluated for this guideline include pressure ulcer incidence and severity, resource use, diagnostic accuracy, measures of risk, and harms. This guideline grades the quality of evidence and strength of recommendations by using ACP's clinical practice guidelines grading system. The target audience for this guideline includes all clinicians, and the target patient population is patients at risk for pressure ulcers.

Recommendation 1: ACP recommends that clinicians should perform a risk assessment to identify patients who are at risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: weak recommendation, low-quality evidence)

Recommendation 2: ACP recommends that clinicians should choose advanced static mattresses or advanced static overlays in patients who are at an increased risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence)

Recommendation 3: ACP recommends against using alternating-air mattresses or alternating-air overlays in patients who are at an increased risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: weak recommendation, moderate-quality evidence)

Ann Intern Med. 2015;162:359-369. doi:10.7326/M14-1567 www.annals.org
For author affiliations, see end of text.

Pressure ulcers are defined as localized injury to the skin and/or underlying tissue, usually over a bony prominence, as a result of pressure alone or in combination with shear (1). They commonly occur in patients with limited mobility, such as those in hospitals or long-term care settings. It is estimated that up to 3 million adults in the United States are affected by pressure ulcers (2). The prevalence in the United States is estimated to range from 0.4% to 38% in acute care hospitals, 2% to 24% in long-term care nursing facilities, and 0% to 17% in home care settings (2-4). Between 1990 and 2001, pressure ulcers were reported as a cause of death in nearly 115 000 persons and were listed as the underlying cause of death in more than 21 000 (5). The estimated cost of treating each case of pressure ulcers ranges from \$37 800 to \$70 000, and up to \$11 billion is spent annually in the United States to treat pressure ulcers (2, 6, 7). A growing industry has developed to market various products for pressure ulcer prevention.

Risk factors for pressure ulcers include older age; black race or Hispanic ethnicity; lower body weight; cognitive impairment; physical impairments; and other comorbid conditions that affect soft tissue integrity and healing, such as urinary or fecal incontinence, diabetes, edema, impaired microcirculation, hypoalbuminemia, and malnutrition (8-11). Various risk assessment instruments have been developed, including the Braden,

Cubbin and Jackson, Norton, Ramstadius, and Waterlow scales.

Prevention strategies for pressure ulcers begin with identification of high-risk persons. Many interventions designed to prevent pressure ulcers and reduce friction and shear are available, and categories include various support surfaces (such as mattresses, integrated bed systems, overlays, and cushions), repositioning, nutritional supplementation, skin care (for example, dressing and management of incontinence), and topical creams (Table 1). Studies have suggested that prevention of hospital-acquired pressure ulcers is more effective than standard care (12). Although this guideline focuses on a comparative effectiveness review of individual interventions, we understand that care teams often implement multicomponent interven-

See also:

Related articles	370 and Ann Intern Med. 2013;159:28-38
Editorial comment	387
Summary for Patients	I-34
<i>Web-Only</i>	
Supplement	

* This paper, written by Amir Qaseem, MD, PhD, MHA; Tanveer P. Mir, MD; Melissa Starkey, PhD; and Thomas D. Denberg, MD, PhD, was developed for the Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians. Individuals who served on the Clinical Guidelines Committee from initiation of the project until its approval were Thomas D. Denberg, MD, PhD (*Chair*); Michael J. Barry, MD; Molly Cooke, MD; Paul Dallas, MD; Nick Fitterman, MD; Mary Ann Forciea, MD; Russell P. Harris, MD, MPH; Linda L. Humphrey, MD, MPH; Tanveer P. Mir, MD; Holger J. Schünemann, MD, PhD; J. Sanford Schwartz, MD; Paul Shekelle, MD, PhD; and Timothy Wilt, MD, MPH. Approved by the ACP Board of Regents on 26 July 2014.

Table 1. Pressure Ulcer Preventive Interventions

Intervention*	Description
Advanced static mattresses or overlays	Provide a constant level of inflation/ support and distribute body weight evenly
Alternating-air bed†	Changes the distribution of pressure by inflating or deflating cells within the mattress
Low-air-loss bed‡	Regulates heat and humidity by flowing air and, sometimes, pressure adjustments
Heel supports or boots	Support and cushion the heel, protecting against shear and distributing pressure evenly
Wheelchair cushions	Designed to distribute pressure evenly and provide added cushion support for patients who use wheelchairs
Nutritional supplementation	Addition of nutrients, such as protein, vitamins, and/or minerals, to diet to improve wound healing
Repositioning	Changes in body position to prevent constant contact with a surface
Silicone border foam dressing	Water-resistant dressing with nonexpanding foam to maintain a moist wound site for healing
Intraoperative warming	Application of warmth during surgery to prevent hypothermia
Creams and cleansers	Keep the skin clean and moisturized to prevent cracking

* Brand-name products are listed as examples only and should not be considered endorsements from the American College of Physicians.
 † Duo 2 (Hill-Rom), Lapidus Airfloat System (American Hospital Supply), MicroPulse, Trinova (Pegasus Healthcare), TriCell and AlphaXcell (ArjoHuntleigh Getinge Group), and Air Doctor.
 ‡ TheraPulse (KCI) and KinAir (ArjoHuntleigh Getinge Group).

tions or bundled approaches to preventing pressure ulcers and that pressure ulcer care involves physicians, nurses, and other members of the care team.

The purpose of this American College of Physicians (ACP) guideline is to present the available evidence on the comparative effectiveness of various risk assessment instruments and benefits and harms of strategies to prevent pressure ulcers. The target audience for this guideline is all clinicians, including physicians, nurses, dietitians, and physical therapists. The target patient population comprises all adults at risk for pressure ulcers. For recommendations on the treatment of pressure ulcers, please refer to the accompanying ACP guideline (13).

METHODS

This guideline is based on a systematic evidence review (14), an update of the literature (Supplement, available at www.annals.org), and an evidence report sponsored by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) (17) that addressed the following key questions:

1. Is the use of risk assessment tools effective in reducing the incidence or severity of pressure ulcers, and how does effectiveness vary according to setting and patient characteristics?
2. How do various risk assessment tools compare with one another in their ability to predict the incidence of pressure ulcers?
3. In patients at increased risk for pressure ulcers, what is the effectiveness and comparative effectiveness

of preventive interventions in reducing the incidence or severity of pressure ulcers, and how does effectiveness vary according to assessed risk level, setting, or patient characteristics?

4. What are the harms of interventions for preventing pressure ulcers? Do harms differ according to the type of intervention, setting, or patient characteristics?

We searched MEDLINE (1946 through February 2014), CINAHL (1998 through February 2014), the Cochrane Library, clinical trials registries, and reference lists to identify trials published in English. The outcomes evaluated for this guideline include pressure ulcer incidence and severity; resource use (including duration of hospital stay or cost); diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative likelihood ratios); measures of risk (hazard ratios, odds ratios, and relative risks); discrimination (area under the receiver-operating characteristic curve); and harms, such as dermatologic reactions, discomfort, and infection.

We also supplemented the AHRQ evidence review with another systematic evidence review of multicomponent strategies for preventing pressure ulcers that examined the importance of contextual aspects of programs that aim to reduce facility-acquired pressure ulcers (16). This review included implementation studies (from 2000 to September 2012) of multicomponent initiatives to prevent pressure ulcers in adults in U.S. acute and long-term care settings. Studies were limited to those that reported pressure ulcer rates at least 6 months after implementation of the intervention.

Further details about the methods and inclusion and exclusion criteria applied in the evidence review are available in the full AHRQ report (15) and the Supplement. This guideline rates the quality of evidence and strength of recommendations by using ACP's guideline grading system (Table 2). Details of the ACP guideline development process can be found in ACP's methods paper (17).

COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLS FOR REDUCING THE INCIDENCE OR SEVERITY OF PRESSURE ULCERS

Low-quality evidence from 1 good-quality study showed no difference among the Waterlow scale, the Ramstadius tool (an unvalidated combination risk assessment and intervention protocol), and nurses' clinical judgment alone in reducing the risk for pressure ulcers or length of stay in patients (18). A recent Cochrane review supported this conclusion, citing lack of evidence to conclusively show a difference between the risk assessment tools and clinical judgment in reducing pressure ulcer incidence (19). No study evaluated the effectiveness of risk assessment tools across care settings or patient subgroups.

COMPARATIVE DIAGNOSTIC ACCURACY OF RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLS FOR PREDICTING THE INCIDENCE OF PRESSURE ULCERS

Moderate-quality evidence showed that the Braden, Cubbin and Jackson, Norton, and Waterlow scales had low sensitivity and specificity to identify patients at risk for pressure ulcers. In addition, moderate-quality evidence showed that diagnostic accuracy did not differ substantially among the scales (15). Low-quality evidence showed no clear differences in diagnostic accuracy of the Braden scale according to patient characteristics or settings, with lower optimal cutoffs for surgical or acute care patients. Moderate-quality evidence showed no clear differences in diagnostic accuracy of the Braden scale according to baseline pressure ulcer risk. Although the Cubbin and Jackson scale was initially developed for patients in intensive care units, low-quality evidence showed that it had a similar diagnostic accuracy to the Braden and Waterlow scales in this setting (20, 21). Tables 3 and 4 provide descriptions of the scales as well as sensitivities and specificities; more details are available in the full evidence report (15).

EVIDENCE RELATED TO INDIVIDUAL INTERVENTIONS

Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness of Preventive Interventions to Reduce the Incidence or Severity of Pressure Ulcers

Many interventions were studied by only 1 trial each, and pooling of studies was not practical because of methodological limitations and clinical diversity of the studies. Table 5 summarizes the evidence for the various preventive interventions. Static (moderate-quality evidence) (55-59) and alternating-air (low-quality evidence) (74-76) mattresses or overlays reduced pressure ulcer incidence compared with standard hospital mattresses. Evidence was mixed or showed no statistically significant difference for comparisons of other support surfaces (61-69, 71-83). Low-quality evidence showed no difference in risk for pressure ulcers or mixed results for heel supports or boots

Table 2. The American College of Physicians' Guideline Grading System*

Quality of Evidence	Strength of Recommendation	
	Benefits Clearly Outweigh Risks and Burden or Risks and Burden Clearly Outweigh Benefits	Benefits Finely Balanced With Risks and Burden
High	Strong	Weak
Moderate	Strong	Weak
Low	Strong	Weak
Insufficient evidence to determine net benefits or risks		

* Adopted from the classification developed by the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) workgroup.

(84, 85), different wheelchair cushions (86-89), nutritional supplementation (90-95), various dressings (101, 102), intraoperative warming (103), and various repositioning intervals (low- to moderate-quality evidence) (96-100, 108, 109). Low-quality evidence showed that a skin cream containing fatty acid and a skin cleanser other than soap decreased risk for pressure ulcers (60, 110, 111).

Harms of Interventions to Prevent Pressure Ulcers

A total of 16 trials reported harms for interventions to prevent pressure ulcers. Although details on specific harms were sparse, no serious treatment-related harms were reported. In summary, evidence was insufficient to determine how harms of preventive interventions vary according to the type of intervention, care setting, or patient characteristics.

Mattresses, Overlays, and Other Support Systems

Low-quality evidence from 9 studies of support surfaces reported harms. Heat-related discomfort was reported in 3 trials of sheepskin overlays, which also led to withdrawals (56, 57, 60). One trial reported differences in pain and sleep disturbances between different dynamic mattresses (110). A study comparing a multi-cell pulsating dynamic mattress with a static gel overlay found no differences in risk for adverse events (111).

Table 3. Descriptions of Commonly Used Pressure Ulcer Risk Assessment Tools*

Tool	Population	Subscales	Scoring
Braden scale	General	Mobility, activity, sensory perception, skin moisture, nutrition state, and friction/shear	Scale of 6 to 23; lower score indicates higher risk
Cubbin and Jackson scale	Intensive care unit patients	Age, weight, medical history, skin condition, mental state, mobility, nutrition, respiration, incontinence, hygiene, hemodynamic state, oxygen requirements, use of blood products, surgery within 24 h, and hypothermia	Scale of 9 to 48; lower score indicates higher risk
Norton scale	General	Physical condition, mental state, activity, mobility, and incontinence	Scale of 5 to 20; lower score indicates higher risk
Waterlow scale	General	Build/weight for height, skin condition, sex and age, continence, mobility, appetite, medication, and other risk factors (tissue malnutrition, neurologic deficit, and major surgery or trauma)	Scale of 1 to 64; higher score indicates higher risk

* Adapted from reference 15.

Table 4. Evidence for Pressure Ulcer Risk Assessment Tools*

Characteristic	Quality of Evidence	Data
Braden scale		
Overall diagnostic accuracy	Moderate	Median sensitivity, 0.74 (range, 0.33 to 1.00); median specificity, 0.68 (range, 0.34 to 0.86) (cutoff, ≤ 18); 1 poor-quality, 7 fair-quality, and 8 good-quality studies (22-37)
Across settings	Low	No clear differences across settings (cutoff, ≤ 15 to 18); 10 good-quality, 16 fair-quality, and 2 poor-quality studies (21-36, 38-49)
Optimal cutoff in different settings	Low	Lower optimal cutoff in acute care setting (sensitivity, 0.55; specificity, 0.94) (cutoff, ≤ 15) compared with long-term care setting (sensitivity, 0.57; specificity, 0.61) (cutoff, ≤ 18); statistical significance not reported; 1 good-quality study (30) Lower optimal cutoff in surgical patients (cutoff, ≤ 13 to 14) compared with other settings (cutoff, ≤ 15 to ≤ 18); 1 good-quality and 1 fair-quality study (31, 44)
Differences according to race	Low	No clear differences between black and white patients; 1 fair-quality study (50)
Differences according to baseline pressure ulcer risk	Moderate	No clear differences; 1 good-quality and 2 fair-quality studies (20, 27, 37)
Cubbin and Jackson scale		
Overall diagnostic accuracy	Moderate	Median sensitivity, 0.89 (range, 0.83 to 0.95); median specificity, 0.61 (range, 0.42 to 0.82) (cutoff, ≤ 24 to 29); 1 good-quality and 2 fair-quality studies (20, 21, 44)
Intensive care unit setting	Low	Similar diagnostic accuracy in intensive care unit patients compared with Braden and Waterlow scales; 1 good-quality and 1 fair-quality study (20, 21)
Norton scale		
Diagnostic accuracy	Moderate	Median sensitivity, 0.75 (range, 0.00 to 0.89); median specificity, 0.68 (range, 0.59 to 0.95) (cutoff, ≤ 14); 1 good-quality and 4 fair-quality studies (27, 45, 51-53)
Waterlow scale		
Pressure ulcer incidence or severity (vs. clinical judgment)	Low	No difference compared with nurses' clinical judgment alone: RR, 1.40 (95% CI, 0.82 to 2.40); 1 good-quality study (18)
Diagnostic accuracy	Moderate	Sensitivities, 0.88 and 1.00; specificities, 0.13 and 0.29 (cutoff, ≥ 10); 2 fair-quality studies (20, 53)
Diagnostic accuracy: direct comparisons among risk assessment scales	Moderate	No clear differences among scales; 2 good-quality and 4 fair-quality studies (20, 21, 27, 37, 44, 54)

RR = relative risk.

* Adapted from reference 15.

One study reported no increased risk for adverse events with the Heelift Suspension Boot (DM Systems) compared with standard care (84). One study reported an increased risk for withdrawal due to discomfort with the Jay cushion compared with standard wheelchair cushions (88).

Nutritional Supplementation

Low-quality evidence from 1 study reported that tube feeds were poorly tolerated (54% removed within 1 week and 67% removed within 2 weeks) (93).

Repositioning

Low-quality evidence from 2 studies reported increased nonadherence due to intolerability of repositioning at a 30-degree tilt position compared with standard positioning (108, 109).

Dressings

Low-quality evidence from 1 study showed that application of the Remois Pad (Alcare) resulted in pruritus in 1 patient out of 37 total (112).

Creams, Lotions, and Cleansers

Low-quality evidence from 3 studies reported harms for lotions or creams. Two studies reported 1

case each of a wet sore or rash, and 1 study showed no differences in rash between various creams studied (106, 113, 114).

INTERVENTIONS TO FACILITATE IMPLEMENTATION OF PRESSURE ULCER PREVENTION PROTOCOLS OR GUIDELINES

Low-quality evidence from 1 study showed no difference in incident stage 2 to 4 ulcers between a multicomponent electronic clinical decision-support system or provision of guidelines (1.8% vs. 2.1%; relative risk, 0.85 [95% CI, 0.23 to 3.10]) (107). Evidence from 1 poor-quality study showed that immediate implementation of musical cues was associated with lower risk for incident ulcers in nursing home residents (6.0% vs. 9.4%; relative risk, 0.64 [CI, 0.45 to 0.90]) (115).

EVIDENCE RELATED TO MULTICOMPONENT INTERVENTIONS

Multicomponent interventions are increasingly becoming the standard of care for prevention of pressure ulcers. Bundling care practices and organizing a team

Table 5. Evidence for Interventions to Reduce Incidence and Severity of Pressure Ulcers

Intervention	Quality of Evidence	Effect on Reduction in Incidence and Severity*	Data
Mattresses, overlays, or other support systems			
Static mattress or overlay vs. standard hospital mattress	Moderate	Improved	Reduced ulcer risk: RR range, 0.16 to 0.82; 1 good-quality and 4 fair-quality studies (55-59) Australian medical sheepskin overlay subgroup analysis: RRs, 0.30, 0.58, and 0.58; 2 fair-quality and 1 poor-quality studies (56, 57, 60)
Static mattress or overlay vs. static mattress or overlay	Moderate	Mixed results	3 fair-quality and 6 poor-quality studies showed no differences (61-69) 1 fair-quality study showed that a foam replaceable-parts mattress was associated with lower risk for ulcers than a 4-in-thick, dimpled foam overlay (25% vs. 60%; RR, 0.42 [95% CI, 0.18 to 0.96]) (70)
Low-air-loss bed vs. standard hospital mattress	Low	Mixed results	Lower risk for ≥ 1 pressure ulcer in intensive care unit patients (12% vs. 51%; RR, 0.23 [CI, 0.10 to 0.51]); 1 fair-quality study (71) No differences in cardiovascular surgery patients; 1 poor-quality study (73)
Low-air-loss mattress vs. dual-option (constant low pressure/alternating-air) mattress	Low	No difference	No statistically significant difference in pressure ulcer risk (10% vs. 19%; RR, 0.53 [CI, 0.15 to 1.90]); 1 fair-quality study (73)
Alternating-air overlay or mattress vs. standard hospital mattress	Low	Improved	Lower incidence of pressure ulcers; 3 poor-quality studies (74-76)
Alternating-air overlay or mattress vs. advanced static overlay or mattress	Moderate	No difference	No difference in pressure ulcer incidence or severity; 1 good-quality, 1 fair-quality, and 4 poor-quality studies (68, 74, 75, 77-79)
Alternating-air overlay or mattress vs. alternating-air overlay or mattress	Moderate	No difference	No clear differences among various alternating-air mattresses or overlays; 1 good-quality, 2 fair-quality, and 1 poor-quality studies (76, 80-83)
Heel supports or boots vs. usual care	Low	Mixed results	Decreased risk for heel, foot, or ankle ulcers with Heelift Suspension Boot (DM Systems) compared with usual care without leg elevation in fracture patients for any ulcer (7% vs. 26%; RR, 0.26 [CI, 0.12 to 0.53]) and for stage 2 ulcers (3.3% vs. 13.4%; RR, 0.25 [CI, 0.09 to 0.72]); 1 fair-quality study (84) No difference in risk for ulcers between Foot WAFFLE (EHOB) boot and hospital pillow to prop up legs; 1 poor-quality study (85)
More sophisticated wheelchair cushions vs. standard wheelchair cushions	Low	Mixed results	Inconsistent results from 4 fair-quality studies assessing different cushions (86-89)
Nutritional supplementation vs. standard hospital diet	Low	No difference	No difference overall in pressure ulcer risk with oral or enteral supplementation (5 of 6 studies showed no difference); 1 fair-quality and 5 poor-quality studies (90-95)
Repositioning			
Repositioning intervention vs. usual care	Moderate	Mixed results	Lower risk for pressure ulcers with repositioning at a 30-degree tilt every 3 h compared with usual care (3.0% vs. 11.0%; RR, 0.27 [CI, 0.08 to 0.93]); 1 fair-quality study (96) No difference in risk for stage 2 to 4 ulcers among repositioning every 2, 3, or 4 h (2.5% vs. 0.6% vs. 3.0%, respectively [$P = 0.68$]); 1 good-quality study (97) No difference in risk for pressure ulcers among various repositioning intervals; 1 fair-quality study (98)
Small unscheduled shifts in body position vs. usual care	Low	No difference	No difference in pressure ulcer risk, but only 1 or 2 ulcers were reported in each study; 2 poor-quality studies (99, 100)
Dressings			
Silicone border foam sacral dressing vs. no silicone border foam dressing	Low	No difference	No statistically significant difference in pressure ulcer risk in cardiac surgery patients (2.0% vs. 12.0%; RR, 0.18 [CI, 0.02 to 1.50]); 1 fair-quality study (101)
Changing incontinence pad 3 vs. 2 times per day	Low	No difference	No difference in pressure ulcer risk; 1 fair-quality study (102)
Intraoperative warming vs. usual care	Low	No difference	No difference in pressure ulcer risk in surgical patients (5.6% vs. 10.0%; RR, 0.54 [CI, 0.25 to 1.20]); 1 fair-quality study (103)
Creams, lotions, and cleansers			
Fatty acid cream vs. placebo	Low	Improved	Reduced risk for new pressure ulcers with Mepentol (BAMA-GEVE) lotion (7.3% vs. 17%; RR, 0.42 [CI, 0.22 to 0.80]); 1 fair-quality study (104) Lotion containing 1.6 g of fatty acid: 4.7% vs. 28.0%; RR, 0.17 [CI, 0.04 to 0.70]; 1 poor-quality study (105)
Skin cleanser (Clinisan [Synergy Health]) vs. standard soap and water	Low	Improved	Reduced risk for pressure ulcers in patients with incontinence at baseline (18% vs. 42%; RR, 0.43 [CI, 0.19 to 0.98]); 1 fair-quality study (106)

Continued on following page

Table 5—Continued

Intervention	Quality of Evidence	Effect on Reduction in Incidence and Severity*	Data
Interventions to facilitate implementation of pressure ulcer prevention protocols or guidelines			
Multicomponent electronic clinical decision-support system vs. provision of guideline	Low	No difference	No difference in incident stage 2 to 4 ulcers in 1 fair-quality study (1.8% vs. 2.1%; RR, 0.85 [CI, 0.23 to 3.10]) (107)

RR = relative risk.

*“Improved” denotes that the intervention provided benefit compared with control. “No difference” indicates that the intervention was similar to control. “Mixed results” denotes inconsistent results for different outcomes.

approach to care have been shown to be effective at improving patient outcomes.

Benefits

Moderate-quality evidence from a review of 26 implementation studies showed that multicomponent interventions can improve skin care and reduce pressure ulcer rates in both acute and long-term care settings (16). The review found that key components of successful interventions include simplification and standardization of pressure ulcer-specific interventions and documentation, involvement of multidisciplinary teams and leadership (including ostomy, continence, and other nurses and personnel), designated skin champions who educate staff about skin care and ulcer prevention, ongoing staff education (including team meetings and motivational campaigns), and sustained audit and feedback (including weekly prevalence reports, formal and informal feedback, and all-facility meetings) (16). Successful interventions also incorporated evidence-based guidelines into their practices.

Harms

The systematic review found no harms reported for the multicomponent strategies that were used to prevent pressure ulcers (16).

Costs

The systematic review identified 4 studies (116–120) that reported significant cost savings with the multicomponent approach. In 2008, a 2-hospital system (548 beds in Naples, Florida) estimated annual cost savings of approximately \$11.5 million as a result of statistically significant reductions in pressure ulcer prevalence (117).

SUMMARY

Low-quality evidence showed that risk assessment tools (the Waterlow and Ramstadius scales) were equivalent to clinical judgment alone for reducing pressure ulcer incidence. Evidence on the diagnostic accuracy of the commonly used risk assessment instruments showed that these tools can help in the identification of patients who are at an increased risk for pressure ulcers, although the sensitivities and specificities were low. Diagnostic accuracy did not differ substantially among the various risk assessment instruments, and studies of direct comparisons were limited.

Most of the evidence on preventive interventions came from studies assessing support surfaces. Moderate-quality evidence showed that advanced static mattresses and overlays were associated with a lower risk for pressure ulcers compared with standard mattresses in higher-risk patients. Evidence on other preventive interventions, including nutritional supplementation, lotions, cleansers, and dressings, was limited and inconclusive because most were assessed by few studies.

Little evidence was available on harms of preventive interventions, although no serious harms were reported. Evidence was also insufficient to draw a conclusion about harms based on the type of intervention, care setting, or patient characteristics.

All of the preventive interventions reviewed in this guideline were assessed individually, but they can be bundled to provide optimum care. Evidence shows that multicomponent strategies can improve clinical outcomes. Key components of successful implementation efforts include simplification and standardization of pressure ulcer-specific interventions and documentation, involvement of multidisciplinary teams and leadership, designated skin champions, ongoing staff education, and sustained audit and feedback. The **Figure** summarizes the recommendations and clinical considerations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: ACP recommends that clinicians should perform a risk assessment to identify patients who are at risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: weak recommendation, low-quality evidence)

Risk assessment is often part of bundled care and multicomponent interventions for preventing pressure ulcers. Risk factors for pressure ulcers include older age; black race or Hispanic ethnicity; lower body weight; cognitive impairment; physical impairments; and other comorbid conditions that affect soft tissue integrity and healing, such as urinary or fecal incontinence, diabetes, edema, impaired microcirculation, hypoalbuminemia, and malnutrition. Clinicians should make individualized decisions based on risk assessment on whether to use a single or multicomponent intervention to prevent pressure ulcers in patients.

Figure. Summary of the American College of Physicians guideline on risk assessment and prevention of pressure ulcers.

SUMMARY OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS GUIDELINE ON RISK ASSESSMENT AND PREVENTION OF PRESSURE ULCERS

Disease/Condition	Pressure ulcers
Target Audience	Internists, family physicians, and other clinicians
Target Patient Population	Patients at risk for pressure ulcers
Interventions Evaluated	<p>Risk assessment tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Braden scale Cubbin and Jackson scale Norton scale Waterlow score <p>Preventive interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mattresses and overlays Heel supports Wheelchair cushions Nutritional supplementation Lotions, creams, and cleansers Repositioning Dressings
Outcomes Evaluated	Pressure ulcer incidence and severity, resource use, diagnostic accuracy, measures of risk, and harms
Benefits	<p>Risk assessment instruments: prediction of patients at high risk for pressure ulcers</p> <p>Preventive interventions: reduced pressure ulcer incidence and severity</p>
Harms	<p>Mattresses, overlays, and other support systems: discomfort</p> <p>Nutritional supplementation: poorly tolerated tube feeds</p> <p>Repositioning: intolerability of repositioning at a 30-degree tilt position</p> <p>Dressings: pruritus</p> <p>Creams or lotions: wet sore or rash</p>
Recommendations	<p><i>Recommendation 1: ACP recommends that clinicians should perform a risk assessment to identify patients who are at risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: weak recommendation, low-quality evidence)</i></p> <p><i>Recommendation 2: ACP recommends that clinicians should choose advanced static mattresses or advanced static overlays in patients who are at an increased risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence)</i></p> <p><i>Recommendation 3: ACP recommends against using alternating-air mattresses or alternating-air overlays in patients who are at an increased risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: weak recommendation, moderate-quality evidence)</i></p>
Inconclusive Areas of Evidence	Evidence is insufficient to compare various preventive interventions, such as different types of repositioning and leg elevations, relative to various kinds of usual care. Creams and lotions, dressings, repositioning, and nutritional support, in any combination, are generally regarded as usual care.
High-Value Care	Many hospitals in the United States use alternating-air and low-air-loss mattresses and overlays despite the lack of evidence showing a potential benefit in the reduction of pressure ulcers in high-risk populations. Using these support systems is expensive and adds unnecessary burden on the health care system. On the basis of the review of current evidence, lower-cost support services should be the preferred approach to care.
Clinical Considerations	<p>Identification of high-risk patients is important to prevent pressure ulcers.</p> <p>Prevention of pressure ulcers requires regular monitoring, and patients should be reassessed periodically for any change in status.</p> <p>Pressure relief is an important variable in the prevention of pressure ulcers.</p> <p>The choice of preventive strategies should be based on risk factors and the costs and availability of resources.</p> <p>Individual preventive strategies can be combined in multicomponent interventions</p>

The current evidence does not conclusively show a difference between clinical judgment and risk assessment scales in reducing pressure ulcer incidence. However, tools may be especially useful for clinicians without expert gestalt. Moderate-quality evidence showed that the Braden, Cubbin and Jackson, Norton, and Waterlow scales can predict which patients are more likely to develop a pressure ulcer, and all of these instruments have low sensitivity and specificity. In addition, moderate-quality evidence showed that the diagnostic accuracies of the scales do not differ substantially. No

study evaluated the effectiveness of risk assessment tools across care settings or patient subgroups.

Recommendation 2: ACP recommends that clinicians should choose advanced static mattresses or advanced static overlays in patients who are at an increased risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence)

Moderate-quality evidence showed that the use of advanced static mattresses or overlays was associated with a lower risk for pressure ulcers compared with standard hospital mattresses, and no brand was shown

to be superior. Advanced static mattresses and overlays are also less expensive than alternating-air or low-air-loss mattresses and can be used as part of a multi-component approach to pressure ulcer prevention.

Recommendation 3: ACP recommends against using alternating-air mattresses or alternating-air overlays in patients who are at an increased risk of developing pressure ulcers. (Grade: weak recommendation, moderate-quality evidence)

The current evidence does not show a clear benefit for pressure ulcer prevention using alternating-air beds and overlays compared with static mattresses and overlays, and alternating-air beds and overlays are associated with significantly higher costs. Lower-cost support surfaces should be the preferred approach to care.

INCONCLUSIVE AREAS OF EVIDENCE

Evidence is insufficient to compare various preventive interventions, such as different types of repositioning and leg elevations, relative to various kinds of usual care. Creams and lotions, dressings, repositioning, and nutritional support, in any combination, are generally regarded as usual care. Of note, the comparison group in many studies was standard care that often included repositioning, skin care, and/or nutrition. Therefore, any lack of evidence showing benefit relative to the comparison group of usual care does not mean that usual care should be abandoned.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Data on the efficacy of many of the interventions came only from single studies, and further research into comparative effectiveness of pressure ulcer prevention strategies is warranted. In addition, more research is needed on the comparative efficacy of pressure ulcer risk assessment tools and their efficacy compared with clinical judgment.

HIGH-VALUE CARE

Prevention of pressure ulcers is the first important step, and advanced static mattresses and overlays were associated with a lower risk for pressure ulcers compared with standard mattresses in higher-risk patients. Many hospitals in the United States use alternating-air and low-air-loss mattresses and overlays despite the lack of evidence showing a potential benefit in the reduction of pressure ulcers in high-risk populations. Using these support systems is expensive and adds unnecessary burden on the health care system. Based on the review of the current evidence, lower-cost support services should be the preferred approach to care.

From the American College of Physicians, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New York University Clinical Cancer Center, New York, New York; and Carilion Clinic, Roanoke, Virginia.

Note: Clinical practice guidelines are "guides" only and may not apply to all patients and all clinical situations. Thus, they are not intended to override clinicians' judgment. All ACP

clinical practice guidelines are considered automatically withdrawn or invalid 5 years after publication or once an update has been issued.

Disclaimer: The authors of this article are responsible for its contents, including any clinical or treatment recommendations.

Acknowledgment: The authors thank Dr. Roger Chou for updating the evidence from the original systematic review for the development of this guideline.

Financial Support: Financial support for the development of this guideline comes exclusively from the ACP operating budget.

Disclosures: Authors followed the policy regarding conflicts of interest described at www.annals.org/article.aspx?articleid=745942. Disclosures can be viewed at www.acponline.org/authors/icmje/ConflictOfInterestForms.do?msNum=M14-1567. A record of conflicts of interest is kept for each Clinical Guidelines Committee meeting and conference call and can be viewed at www.acponline.org/clinical_information/guidelines/guidelines/conflicts_cgc.htm.

Requests for Single Reprints: Amir Qaseem, MD, PhD, MHA, American College of Physicians, 190 N. Independence Mall West, Philadelphia, PA 19106; e-mail, aqaseem@acponline.org.

Current author addresses and author contributions are available at www.annals.org.

References

1. European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel, National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel, Pan Pacific Pressure Injury Alliance. Prevention and Treatment of Pressure Ulcers: Quick Reference Guide. Washington, DC: National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel; 2009.
2. Lyder CH. Pressure ulcer prevention and management. *JAMA*. 2003;289:223-6. [PMID: 12517234]
3. Pressure ulcers in America: prevalence, incidence, and implications for the future. An executive summary of the National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel monograph. *Adv Skin Wound Care*. 2001;14:208-15. [PMID: 11902346]
4. VanGilder C, Amlung S, Harrison P, Meyer S. Results of the 2008-2009 International Pressure Ulcer Prevalence Survey and a 3-year, acute care, unit-specific analysis. *Ostomy Wound Manage*. 2009;55:39-45. [PMID: 19934462]
5. Redelings MD, Lee NE, Sorvillo F. Pressure ulcers: more lethal than we thought? *Adv Skin Wound Care*. 2005;18:367-72. [PMID: 16160463]
6. Kuhn BA, Coulter SJ. Balancing the pressure ulcer cost and quality equation. *Nurs Econ*. 1992;10:353-9. [PMID: 1465158]
7. Russo CA, Steiner C, Spector W. Hospitalizations Related to Pressure Ulcers Among Adults 18 Years and Older, 2006. HCUP statistical brief no. 64. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2008.
8. Fogarty MD, Abumrad NN, Nanney L, Arbogast PG, Poulouse B, Barbul A. Risk factors for pressure ulcers in acute care hospitals. *Wound Repair Regen*. 2008;16:11-8. [PMID: 18211574] doi: 10.1111/j.1524-475X.2007.00327.x
9. Lyder C, Ayello E. Pressure ulcers: a patient safety issue. In: Hughes R, ed. Patient Safety and Quality: An Evidence-Based Handbook for Nurses. AHRQ publication no. 08-0043. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2008:1-33.

10. Lyder CH, Yu C, Emerling J, Mangat R, Stevenson D, Empleo-Frazier O, et al. The Braden Scale for pressure ulcer risk: evaluating the predictive validity in Black and Latino/Hispanic elders. *Appl Nurs Res.* 1999;12:60-8. [PMID: 10319520]
11. Baumgarten M, Margolis DJ, Localio AR, Kagan SH, Lowe RA, Kinoshian B, et al. Pressure ulcers among elderly patients early in the hospital stay. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2006;61:749-54. [PMID: 16870639]
12. Padula WV, Mishra MK, Makic MB, Sullivan PW. Improving the quality of pressure ulcer care with prevention: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Med Care.* 2011;49:385-92. [PMID: 21368685] doi: 10.1097/MLR.0b013e31820292b3
13. Qaseem A, Humphrey LL, Forcica MA, Starkey M, Denberg TD; Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians. Treatment of pressure ulcers: a clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162:370-9. doi:10.7326/M14-1568
14. Chou R, Dana T, Bougatsos C, Blazina I, Starmer AJ, Reitel K, et al. Pressure ulcer risk assessment and prevention: a systematic comparative effectiveness review. *Ann Intern Med.* 2013;159:28-38. [PMID: 23817702] doi:10.7326/0003-4819-159-1-201307020-00006
15. Chou R, Dana T, Bougatsos C, Blazina I, Starmer A, Reitel K, et al. Pressure Ulcer Risk Assessment and Prevention: Comparative Effectiveness. Comparative effectiveness review no. 87. (Prepared by Oregon Evidence-based Practice Center under contract no. 290-2007-10057-1.) AHRQ publication no. 12(13)-EHC148-EF. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2013. Accessed at www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/309/1490/pressure-ulcer-prevention-executive-130508.pdf on 5 January 2015.
16. Sullivan N, Schoelles KM. Preventing in-facility pressure ulcers as a patient safety strategy: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med.* 2013;158:410-6. [PMID: 23460098] doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-5-201303051-00008
17. Qaseem A, Snow V, Owens DK, Shekelle P; Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians. The development of clinical practice guidelines and guidance statements of the American College of Physicians: summary of methods. *Ann Intern Med.* 2010;153:194-9. [PMID: 20679562] doi:10.7326/0003-4819-153-3-201008030-00010
18. Webster J, Coleman K, Mudge A, Marquart L, Gardner G, Stankiewicz M, et al. Pressure ulcers: effectiveness of risk-assessment tools. A randomised controlled trial (the ULCER trial). *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2011;20:297-306. [PMID: 21262791] doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2010.043109
19. Moore ZE, Cowman S. Risk assessment tools for the prevention of pressure ulcers. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2014;2:CD006471. [PMID: 24497383] doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006471.pub3
20. Boyle M, Green M. Pressure sores in intensive care: defining their incidence and associated factors and assessing the utility of two pressure sore risk assessment tools. *Aust Crit Care.* 2001;14:24-30. [PMID: 11899757]
21. Jun Seongsook RN, Jeong Ihnsook RN, Lee Younghee RN. Validity of pressure ulcer risk assessment scales; Cubbin and Jackson, Braden, and Douglas scale. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2004;41:199-204. [PMID: 14725784]
22. Bergstrom N, Braden B, Kemp M, Champagne M, Ruby E. Predicting pressure ulcer risk: a multisite study of the predictive validity of the Braden Scale. *Nurs Res.* 1998;47:261-9. [PMID: 9766454]
23. Bergstrom N, Braden BJ, Laguzza A, Holman V. The Braden Scale for predicting pressure sore risk. *Nurs Res.* 1987;36:205-10. [PMID: 3299278]
24. Bergstrom N, Demuth PJ, Braden BJ. A clinical trial of the Braden Scale for predicting pressure sore risk. *Nurs Clin North Am.* 1987;22:417-28. [PMID: 3554150]
25. Braden BJ, Bergstrom N. Predictive validity of the Braden Scale for pressure sore risk in a nursing home population. *Res Nurs Health.* 1994;17:459-70. [PMID: 7972924]
26. Capobianco ML, McDonald DD. Factors affecting the predictive validity of the Braden Scale. *Adv Wound Care.* 1996;9:32-6. [PMID: 9069754]
27. Defloor T, Grypdonck MF. Pressure ulcers: validation of two risk assessment scales. *J Clin Nurs.* 2005;14:373-82. [PMID: 15707448]
28. Goodridge DM, Sloan JA, LeDoyen YM, McKenzie JA, Knight WE, Gayari M. Risk-assessment scores, prevention strategies, and the incidence of pressure ulcers among the elderly in four Canadian health-care facilities. *Can J Nurs Res.* 1998;30:23-44. [PMID: 9807287]
29. Halfens RJ, Van Achterberg T, Bal RM. Validity and reliability of the Braden Scale and the influence of other risk factors: a multi-centre prospective study. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2000;37:313-9. [PMID: 10760538]
30. Langemo DK, Olson B, Hunter S, Hanson D, Burd C, Cathcart-Silberberg T. Incidence and prediction of pressure ulcers in five patient care settings. *Decubitus.* 1991;4:25-6. [PMID: 1872975]
31. Lewicki LJ, Mion LC, Secic M. Sensitivity and specificity of the Braden Scale in the cardiac surgical population. *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs.* 2000;27:36-41. [PMID: 10649141]
32. Lyder CH, Yu C, Emerling J, Mangat R, Stevenson D, Empleo-Frazier O, et al. The Braden Scale for pressure ulcer risk: evaluating the predictive validity in Black and Latino/Hispanic elders. *Appl Nurs Res.* 1999;12:60-8. [PMID: 10319520]
33. Olson K, Tkachuk L, Hanson J. Preventing pressure sores in oncology patients. *Clin Nurs Res.* 1998;7:207-24. [PMID: 9633340]
34. Pang SM, Wong TK. Predicting pressure sore risk with the Norton, Braden, and Waterlow scales in a Hong Kong rehabilitation hospital. *Nurs Res.* 1998;47:147-53. [PMID: 9610648]
35. Ramundo JM. Reliability and validity of the Braden Scale in the home care setting. *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs.* 1995;22:128-34. [PMID: 7599722]
36. Salvadalena GD, Snyder ML, Brogdon KE. Clinical trial of the Braden Scale on an acute care medical unit. *J ET Nurs.* 1992;19:160-5. [PMID: 1420528]
37. Schoonhoven L, Haalboom JR, Bousema MT, Algra A, Grobbee DE, Grypdonck MH, et al; prePURSE study group. The prevention and pressure ulcer risk score evaluation study. Prospective cohort study of routine use of risk assessment scales for prediction of pressure ulcers. *BMJ.* 2002;325:797. [PMID: 12376437]
38. Baldwin KM, Ziegler SM. Pressure ulcer risk following critical traumatic injury. *Adv Wound Care.* 1998;11:168-73. [PMID: 10326336]
39. Barnes D, Payton RG. Clinical application of the Braden Scale in the acute-care setting. *Dermatol Nurs.* 1993;5:386-8. [PMID: 8274348]
40. Chan EY, Tan SL, Lee CK, Lee JY. Prevalence, incidence and predictors of pressure ulcers in a tertiary hospital in Singapore. *J Wound Care.* 2005;14:383-4. [PMID: 16178294]
41. Feuchtinger J, Halfens R, Dassen T. Pressure ulcer risk assessment immediately after cardiac surgery—does it make a difference? A comparison of three pressure ulcer risk assessment instruments within a cardiac surgery population. *Nurs Crit Care.* 2007;12:42-9. [PMID: 17883663]
42. Hagiwara S, Barbenel J. The limits of pressure sore prevention. *J R Soc Med.* 1999;92:576-8. [PMID: 10703495]
43. Jalali R, Rezaie M. Predicting pressure ulcer risk: comparing the predictive validity of 4 scales. *Adv Skin Wound Care.* 2005;18:92-7. [PMID: 15788914]
44. Kim E, Lee S, Lee E, Eom M. Comparison of the predictive validity among pressure ulcer risk assessment scales for surgical ICU patients. *Aust J Adv Nurs.* 2009;26:87-94.
45. Kwong E, Pang S, Wong T, Ho J, Shao-ling X, Li-jun T. Predicting pressure ulcer risk with the modified Braden, Braden, and Norton scales in acute care hospitals in Mainland China. *Appl Nurs Res.* 2005;18:122-8. [PMID: 15991112]
46. Lyder CH, Yu C, Stevenson D, Mangat R, Empleo-Frazier O, Emerling J, et al. Validating the Braden Scale for the prediction of pressure ulcer risk in blacks and Latino/Hispanic elders: a pilot study. *Ostomy Wound Manage.* 1998;44:425-49S. [PMID: 9625997]
47. Serpa LF, Santos VL, Campanili TC, Queiroz M. Predictive validity of the Braden scale for pressure ulcer risk in critical care patients. *Rev Lat Am Enfermagem.* 2011;19:50-7. [PMID: 21412629]

48. Tourtual DM, Riesenber LA, Korutz CJ, Semo AH, Asef A, Talati K, et al. Predictors of hospital acquired heel pressure ulcers. *Ostomy Wound Manage*. 1997;43:24-8. [PMID: 9369740]
49. VandenBosch T, Montoye C, Satwicz M, Durkee-Leonard K, Boylan-Lewis B. Predictive validity of the Braden Scale and nurse perception in identifying pressure ulcer risk. *Appl Nurs Res*. 1996;9:80-6. [PMID: 8871435]
50. Bergstrom N, Braden BJ. Predictive validity of the Braden Scale among Black and White subjects. *Nurs Res*. 2002;51:398-403. [PMID: 12464760]
51. Lincoln R, Roberts R, Maddox A, Levine S, Patterson C. Use of the Norton Pressure Sore Risk Assessment Scoring System with elderly patients in acute care. *J Enterostomal Ther*. 1986;13:132-8. [PMID: 3636346]
52. Stotts NA. Predicting pressure ulcer development in surgical patients. *Heart Lung*. 1988;17:641-7. [PMID: 3192408]
53. Chan WH, Chow KW, French P, Lai YS, Tse LK. Which pressure sore risk calculator? A study of the effectiveness of the Norton scale in Hong Kong. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 1997;34:165-9. [PMID: 9134472]
54. Perneger TV, Raë AC, Gaspoz JM, Borst F, Vitek O, Héliot C. Screening for pressure ulcer risk in an acute care hospital: development of a brief bedside scale. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2002;55:498-504. [PMID: 12007553]
55. Gray D, Campbell M. A randomized clinical trial of two types of foam mattresses. *J Tissue Viability*. 1994;4:128-32.
56. Jolley DJ, Wright R, McGowan S, Hickey MB, Campbell DA, Sinclair RD, et al. Preventing pressure ulcers with the Australian Medical Sheepskin: an open-label randomised controlled trial. *Med J Aust*. 2004;180:324-7. [PMID: 15059051]
57. Mistiaen P, Achterberg W, Ament A, Halfens R, Huizinga J, Montgomery K, et al. The effectiveness of the Australian Medical Sheepskin for the prevention of pressure ulcers in somatic nursing home patients: a prospective multicenter randomized-controlled trial (ISRCTN17553857). *Wound Repair Regen*. 2010;18:572-9. [PMID: 20946141] doi:10.1111/j.1524-475X.2010.00629.x
58. Russell LJ, Reynolds TM, Park C, Rithalia S, Gonsalkorale M, Birch J, et al; PPUS-1 Study Group. Randomized clinical trial comparing 2 support surfaces: results of the Prevention of Pressure Ulcers Study. *Adv Skin Wound Care*. 2003;16:317-27. [PMID: 14652518]
59. van Leen M, Hovius S, Neyens J, Halfens R, Schols J. Pressure relief, cold foam or static air? A single center, prospective, controlled randomized clinical trial in a Dutch nursing home. *J Tissue Viability*. 2011;20:30-4. [PMID: 20510611] doi:10.1016/j.jtv.2010.04.001
60. McGowan S, Montgomery K, Jolley D, Wright R. The role of sheepskins in preventing pressure ulcers in elderly orthopaedic patients. *Proceedings of the First World Wound Healing Congress, Melbourne, Australia, 10-13 September 2000. Primary Intention*. 2000;8:127-34.
61. Collier ME. Pressure-reducing mattresses. *J Wound Care*. 1996;5:207-11. [PMID: 8850903]
62. Cooper PJ, Gray DG, Mollison J. A randomised controlled trial of two pressure-reducing surfaces. *J Wound Care*. 1998;7:374-6. [PMID: 9832744]
63. Gray DG, Smith M. Comparison of a new foam mattress with the standard hospital mattress. *J Wound Care*. 2000;9:29-31. [PMID: 10827665]
64. Hampton S. Efficacy and cost-effectiveness of the Thermo contour mattress. *Br J Nurs*. 1999;8:990-6. [PMID: 10711028]
65. Kemp MG, Kopanke D, Tordecilla L, Fogg L, Shott S, Matthiesen V, et al. The role of support surfaces and patient attributes in preventing pressure ulcers in elderly patients. *Res Nurs Health*. 1993;16:89-96. [PMID: 8502770]
66. Lazzara DJ, Buschmann MT. Prevention of pressure ulcers in elderly nursing home residents: are special support surfaces the answer? *Decubitus*. 1991;4:42-4. [PMID: 1760125]
67. Lim R, Sirett R, Conine TA, Daechsel D. Clinical trial of foam cushions in the prevention of decubitus ulcers in elderly patients. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 1988;25:19-26. [PMID: 3361457]
68. Sideranko S, Quinn A, Burns K, Froman RD. Effects of position and mattress overlay on sacral and heel pressures in a clinical population. *Res Nurs Health*. 1992;15:245-51. [PMID: 1496149]
69. Stapleton M. Preventing pressure sores—an evaluation of three products. *Geriatr Nurs (Lond)*. 1986;6:23-5. [PMID: 3635484]
70. Vyhliadal SK, Moxness D, Bosak KS, Van Meter FG, Bergstrom N. Mattress replacement or foam overlay? A prospective study on the incidence of pressure ulcers. *Appl Nurs Res*. 1997;10:111-20. [PMID: 9274063]
71. Inman KJ, Sibbald WJ, Rutledge FS, Clark BJ. Clinical utility and cost-effectiveness of an air suspension bed in the prevention of pressure ulcers. *JAMA*. 1993;269:1139-43. [PMID: 8433469]
72. Jesurum J, Joseph K, Davis JM, Suki R. Balloons, beds, and breakdown. Effects of low-air loss therapy on the development of pressure ulcers in cardiovascular surgical patients with intra-aortic balloon pump support. *Crit Care Nurs Clin North Am*. 1996;8:423-40. [PMID: 9095813]
73. Theaker C, Kuper M, Soni N. Pressure ulcer prevention in intensive care—a randomised control trial of two pressure-relieving devices. *Anaesthesia*. 2005;60:395-9. [PMID: 15766343]
74. Andersen KE, Jensen O, Kvorning SA, Bach E. Decubitus prophylaxis: a prospective trial on the efficiency of alternating-pressure air-mattresses and water-mattresses. *Acta Derm Venereol*. 1983;63:227-30. [PMID: 6192636]
75. Cavicchioli A, Carella G. Clinical effectiveness of a low-tech versus high-tech pressure-redistributing mattress. *J Wound Care*. 2007;16:285-9. [PMID: 17708377]
76. Sanada H, Sugama J, Matsui Y, Konya C, Kitagawa A, Okuwa M, et al. Randomised controlled trial to evaluate a new double-layer air-cell overlay for elderly patients requiring head elevation. *J Tissue Viability*. 2003;13:112-4. [PMID: 12889398]
77. Conine TA, Daechsel D, Lau MS. The role of alternating air and Silicore overlays in preventing decubitus ulcers. *Int J Rehabil Res*. 1990;13:57-65. [PMID: 2394540]
78. Daechsel D, Conine TA. Special mattresses: effectiveness in preventing decubitus ulcers in chronic neurologic patients. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1985;66:246-8. [PMID: 3985778]
79. Vanderwee K, Grypdonck MH, Defloor T. Effectiveness of an alternating pressure air mattress for the prevention of pressure ulcers. *Age Ageing*. 2005;34:261-7. [PMID: 15764622]
80. Demarré L, Beeckman D, Vanderwee K, Defloor T, Grypdonck M, Verhaeghe S. Multi-stage versus single-stage inflation and deflation cycle for alternating low pressure air mattresses to prevent pressure ulcers in hospitalised patients: a randomised-controlled clinical trial. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2012;49:416-26. [PMID: 22056165] doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.10.007
81. Nixon J, Cranny G, Iglesias C, Nelson EA, Hawkins K, Phillips A, et al. Randomised, controlled trial of alternating pressure mattresses compared with alternating pressure overlays for the prevention of pressure ulcers: PRESSURE (Pressure Relieving Support Surfaces) trial. *BMJ*. 2006;332:1413. [PMID: 16740530]
82. Nixon J, Nelson EA, Cranny G, Iglesias CP, Hawkins K, Cullum NA, et al; PRESSURE Trial Group. Pressure relieving support surfaces: a randomised evaluation. *Health Technol Assess*. 2006;10:1-163. [PMID: 16750060]
83. Taylor L. Evaluating the Pegasus Trinova: a data hierarchy approach. *Br J Nurs*. 1999;8:771-4. [PMID: 10670292]
84. Donnelly J, Winder J, Kernohan WG, Stevenson M. An RCT to determine the effect of a heel elevation device in pressure ulcer prevention post-hip fracture. *J Wound Care*. 2011;20:309-12. [PMID: 21841719]
85. Tymec AC, Pieper B, Vollman K. A comparison of two pressure-relieving devices on the prevention of heel pressure ulcers. *Adv Wound Care*. 1997;10:39-44. [PMID: 9204803]
86. Brienza D, Kelsey S, Karg P, Allegretti A, Olson M, Schmelzer M, et al. A randomized clinical trial on preventing pressure ulcers with wheelchair seat cushions. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2010;58:2308-14. [PMID: 21070197] doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.03168.x

87. Conine TA, Daechsel D, Hershler C. Pressure sore prophylaxis in elderly patients using slab foam or customized contoured foam wheelchair cushions. *OTJR (Thorofare N J)*. 1993;13:101-16.
88. Conine TA, Hershler C, Daechsel D, Peel C, Pearson A. Pressure ulcer prophylaxis in elderly patients using polyurethane foam or Jay wheelchair cushions. *Int J Rehabil Res*. 1994;17:123-37. [PMID: 7960335]
89. Geyer MJ, Brienza DM, Karg P, Trefler E, Kelsey S. A randomized control trial to evaluate pressure-reducing seat cushions for elderly wheelchair users. *Adv Skin Wound Care*. 2001;14:120-9. [PMID: 11905977]
90. Bourdel-Marchasson I, Barateau M, Rondeau V, Dequae-Merchadou L, Salles-Montaudon N, Emeriau JP, et al. A multi-center trial of the effects of oral nutritional supplementation in critically ill older inpatients. GAGE Group. Groupe Aquitain Geriatrique d'Evaluation. *Nutrition*. 2000;16:1-5. [PMID: 10674226]
91. Delmi M, Rapin CH, Bengoa JM, Delmas PD, Vasey H, Bonjour JP. Dietary supplementation in elderly patients with fractured neck of the femur. *Lancet*. 1990;335:1013-6. [PMID: 1970070]
92. Ek AC, Nosson M, Larsson J, Von Schenck H, Bjurulf P. The development and healing of pressure sores related to the nutritional state. *Clin Nutr*. 1991;10:245-50. [PMID: 16839927]
93. Hartgrink HH, Wille J, König P, Hermans J, Breslau PJ. Pressure sores and tube feeding in patients with a fracture of the hip: a randomized clinical trial. *Clin Nutr*. 1998;17:287-92. [PMID: 10205352]
94. Houwing RH, Rozendaal M, Wouters-Wesseling W, Beulens JW, Buskens E, Haalboom JR. A randomised, double-blind assessment of the effect of nutritional supplementation on the prevention of pressure ulcers in hip-fracture patients. *Clin Nutr*. 2003;22:401-5. [PMID: 12880608]
95. Theilla M, Singer P, Cohen J, Dekeyser F. A diet enriched in eicosapentanoic acid, gamma-linolenic acid and antioxidants in the prevention of new pressure ulcer formation in critically ill patients with acute lung injury: a randomized, prospective, controlled study. *Clin Nutr*. 2007;26:752-7. [PMID: 17933438]
96. Moore Z, Cowman S, Conroy RM. A randomised controlled clinical trial of repositioning, using the 30° tilt, for the prevention of pressure ulcers. *J Clin Nurs*. 2011;20:2633-44. [PMID: 21702861] doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2011.03736.x
97. Bergstrom N, Horn SD, Rapp MP, Stern A, Barrett R, Watkiss M. Turning for Ulcer Reduction: a multisite randomized clinical trial in nursing homes. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2013;61:1705-13. [PMID: 24050454] doi:10.1111/jgs.12440
98. Vanderwee K, Grypdonck MH, De Bacquer D, Defloor T. Effectiveness of turning with unequal time intervals on the incidence of pressure ulcer lesions. *J Adv Nurs*. 2007;57:59-68. [PMID: 17184374]
99. Brown MM, Cornwell J, Weist JK. Reducing the risks to the institutionalized elderly: part I. Depersonalization, negative relocation effects, and medical care deficiencies. Part II. Fire, food poisoning, decubitus ulcer and drug abuse. *J Gerontol Nurs*. 1981;7:401-7. [PMID: 6912266]
100. Smith AM, Malone JA. Preventing pressure ulcers in institutionalized elders: assessing the effects of small, unscheduled shifts in body position. *Decubitus*. 1990;3:20-4. [PMID: 2242233]
101. Brindle CT, Wegelin JA. Prophylactic dressing application to reduce pressure ulcer formation in cardiac surgery patients. *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs*. 2012;39:133-42. [PMID: 22415123] doi:10.1097/WON.0b013e318247cb82
102. Fader M, Clarke-O'Neill S, Cook D, Dean G, Brooks R, Cottenden A, et al. Management of night-time urinary incontinence in residential settings for older people: an investigation into the effects of different pad changing regimes on skin health. *J Clin Nurs*. 2003;12:374-86. [PMID: 12709112]
103. Scott EM, Leaper DJ, Clark M, Kelly PJ. Effects of warming therapy on pressure ulcers—a randomized trial. *AORN J*. 2001;73:921-7. [PMID: 11378948]
104. Torra i Bou JE, Segovia Gómez T, Verdú Soriano J, Nolasco Bonmatí A, Rueda López J, Arboix i Perejamo M. The effectiveness of a hyperoxygenated fatty acid compound in preventing pressure ulcers. *J Wound Care*. 2005;14:117-21. [PMID: 15779642]
105. Declair V. The usefulness of topical application of essential fatty acids (EFA) to prevent pressure ulcers. *Ostomy Wound Manage*. 1997;43:48-52. [PMID: 9233238]
106. Cooper P, Gray D. Comparison of two skin care regimes for incontinence. *Br J Nurs*. 2001;10:S6. [PMID: 12070396]
107. Beeckman D, Clays E, Van Hecke A, Vanderwee K, Schoonhoven L, Verhaeghe S. A multi-faceted tailored strategy to implement an electronic clinical decision support system for pressure ulcer prevention in nursing homes: a two-armed randomized controlled trial. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2013;50:475-86. [PMID: 23036149] doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.09.007
108. Defloor T, De Bacquer D, Grypdonck MH. The effect of various combinations of turning and pressure reducing devices on the incidence of pressure ulcers. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2005;42:37-46. [PMID: 15582638]
109. Young T. The 30 degree tilt position vs the 90 degree lateral and supine positions in reducing the incidence of non-blanching erythema in a hospital inpatient population: a randomised controlled trial. *J Tissue Viability*. 2004;14:88. [PMID: 15709355]
110. Pring J, Millman P. Evaluating pressure-relieving mattresses. *J Wound Care*. 1998;7:177-9. [PMID: 9644426]
111. Russell L, Reynolds TM, Carr J, Evans A, Holmes M. Randomised controlled trial of two pressure-relieving systems. *J Wound Care*. 2000;9:52-5. [PMID: 11933280]
112. Nakagami G, Sanada H, Konya C, Kitagawa A, Tadaka E, Matsuyama Y. Evaluation of a new pressure ulcer preventive dressing containing ceramide 2 with low frictional outer layer. *J Adv Nurs*. 2007;59:520-9. [PMID: 17681081]
113. Smith RG, Everett E, Tucker L. A double blind trial of silicone barrier cream in the prevention of pressure sores in elderly patients. *Journal of Clinical & Experimental Gerontology*. 1986;7:337-46.
114. van der Cammen TJ, O'Callaghan U, Whitefield M. Prevention of pressure sores. A comparison of new and old pressure sore treatments. *Br J Clin Pract*. 1987;41:1009-11. [PMID: 3332839]
115. Yap TL, Kennerly SM, Simmons MR, Buncher CR, Miller E, Kim J, et al. Multidimensional team-based intervention using musical cues to reduce odds of facility-acquired pressure ulcers in long-term care: a paired randomized intervention study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2013;61:1552-9. [PMID: 24028358] doi:10.1111/jgs.12422
116. Courtney BA, Ruppman JB, Cooper HM. Save our skin: initiative cuts pressure ulcer incidence in half. *Nurs Manage*. 2006;37:36. [PMID: 16603946]
117. McInerney JA. Reducing hospital-acquired pressure ulcer prevalence through a focused prevention program. *Adv Skin Wound Care*. 2008;21:75-8. [PMID: 18349734] doi:10.1097/01.ASW.0000305410.58350.34
118. Rosen J, Mittal V, Degenholtz H, Castle N, Mulsant BH, Hulland S, et al. Ability, incentives, and management feedback: organizational change to reduce pressure ulcers in a nursing home. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2006;7:141-6. [PMID: 16503306]
119. Tippet AW. Reducing the incidence of pressure ulcers in nursing home residents: a prospective 6-year evaluation. *Ostomy Wound Manage*. 2009;55:52-8. [PMID: 19934464]
120. Xakellis GC, Frantz R. The cost of healing pressure ulcers across multiple health care settings. *Adv Wound Care*. 1996;9:18-22. [PMID: 9069752]

Current Author Addresses: Drs. Qaseem and Starkey: American College of Physicians, 190 N. Independence Mall West, Philadelphia, PA 19106.

Dr. Mir: New York University Clinical Cancer Center, 160 East 34th Street, New York, NY 10016.

Dr. Denberg: Carilion Clinic, PO Box 13727, Roanoke, VA 24036.

Author Contributions: Conception and design: A. Qaseem, T.P. Mir.

Analysis and interpretation of the data: A. Qaseem, M. Starkey, T.D. Denberg.

Drafting of the article: A. Qaseem, T.P. Mir, M. Starkey, T.D. Denberg.

Critical revision of the article for important intellectual content: A. Qaseem, M. Starkey, T.D. Denberg.

Final approval of the article: A. Qaseem, T.P. Mir, T.D. Denberg.

Statistical expertise: A. Qaseem.

Administrative, technical, or logistic support: A. Qaseem, M. Starkey, T.D. Denberg.

Collection and assembly of data: A. Qaseem, M. Starkey.