HYDROFIBRE* DRESSING WITH SILVER IN THE MANAGEMENT OF SPLIT-THICKNESS DONOR SITES
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Aim: Previous studies have shown the effectiveness of a Hydrofibre* dressing with silver (HDS) in partial thickness burns. In addition, many physicians have also adopted HDS in the management of donor sites. A multi-centre prospective randomized clinical trial was conducted to demonstrate opportunities for usage in this indication.

Methods: This study evaluated two HDS protocols of care to manage donor sites on the anterior thigh: one using a film dressing cover to maintain a gelled state, the other using a gauze dressing enabling an adherent state. Both protocols required a mandatory dressing change at 24-48 hours post-op with subsequent assessments at days 5, 10, 14 and 21. The primary objective of the study was to assess the proportion of subjects healed (90%-100% reepithelialized) by visit day 14. Secondary endpoints included safety, pain, resource utilization, and clinical acceptability.

Results: A total of 70 subjects were randomized and treated from 9 centres within the US and Canada. Subjects in both groups were similar in age, gender and reason for grafting. The average donor site size was 308 cm². 77% of all subjects had healed by visit day 14; 88% in the gelled group and 67% in the adherent group. There were no treatment related serious adverse events reported. Three subjects experienced adverse events considered related to treatment; skin irritation, redness and one suspected infection. In both groups resource utilization was minimized with an average of 2 dressing changes during the study, one of which was mandatory. Investigating clinicians preferred a HDS protocol to their current practice in five of six areas: Speed of healing, quality of healing, comfort during wear, pain during dressing change, and overall simplicity. Management as an outpatient was equivalent. Pain measured during rest and mobility using a visual analog scale (1-10) with the gelled group illustrated clinically significant results.

Conclusions: This study demonstrated that HDS is clinically effective and versatile in the management of donor sites with the majority of investigators favoring a HDS protocol to their current regimen.

* Hydrofiber®