Confidence in your Surface Selection Process

5 Steps to Consider



Selecting the Right Surface has Many Variables



5-Step Surface Selection Process





© 2016 Hill-Rom Services, Inc. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. 197174 rev 1 18-MAR-2016 ENG – US

Page 3

Step 1 - Determine Support Application



"Specialized devices for pressure redistribution designed for management of tissue loads micro-climate and or other therapeutic functions."

NPUAP, S3I Terms and Definitions, 2007





Step 2 - Identify Patient Needs for a Support Surface

Understand there are 5 "surface related" factors to skin care.

 Patient risk factors for moisture and mobility impact surface selection.

• The care setting and other patient acuities drive specific surface needs.



The Impact a Surface Can Have on the Skin

			Factors		Implications		
	10000000000000000000000000000000000000	Pressure (1,2,3,15) •	Pressure compresses tissue	•	Tissue deformed and blood f impeded Tissue may die as a result of oxygen	low is lack of	
	+++	Shear (1,4,5,6,15)	Tissue is stretched	•	Tissue deformation, blood fl impeded due to stretching a distortion of vessels	ow is nd	
	4888	Friction (1,7) •	Rubbing of surface or bedding against skin	•	Broken skin is more suscepti other factors of pressure, sh and moisture	ble to ear,	
	sie	Heat • (1,8,9, 12,13,14)	Heat build-up can lead to perspiration				
	C. C	Moisture • (1,8,9,10,11)	Excessive moisture impairs the ability of tissue to absorb oxygen and rid itself of waste	•	Moist skin becomes more from susceptible to forces of press shear, and friction	agile and sure,	
Determi	ne Support	Identify Patient	t Determine Type	of	Research Surface	Review C	Other
Арр		Needs	Sunace			Decision	



Select the Right Surface Based on Risk Factors

Evidence based on WOCN [®] Support Surface Consensus ¹⁶					
	BRADEN MOBILITY SUBSCALE SCORES*				
BRADEN MOISTURE SUBSCALE SCORES	4 or 3 No limitation or slightly limited	2 or 1 Very limited or completely immobile			
4 or 3 Rarely or occasionally moist	 Reactive/CLP^b (air, foam, gel, fiber, or viscous fluid, or combinations) AMG sheepskin overlay (Prevention only)^c 	 Reactive/CLP Active with AP feature 			
2 Very moist	 Reactive/CLP Reactive/CLP with LAL feature 	 Reactive/CLP with LAL feature 			
1 Constantly moist	 Reactive/CLP Reactive/CLP with LAL feature 	 Reactive/CLP with LAL feature Reactive/CLP with AF feature (Treatment only) 			

AF = air fluidized; AMG = Australian Medical grade; AP = alternating pressure; CLP = constant low pressure; LAL = low air loss.

Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points



h.,

© 2016 Hill-Rom Services, Inc. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED 197174 rev 1 18-MAR-2016 ENG – US

Page 7

Select the Right Surface Based on Care Setting

Can the Surface Assist in:

- Skin Care?
- Pulmonary Needs?
- Patient Mobility?

ICU

_

- Percussion and Vibration Features
- Lateral Rotation
- Frame Integration

Acute Care / LTC

- Pressure Redistribution
- Low Air Loss
- Air Fluidized Therapy
- Affordable Sleep Surface



Can the Surface Assist in:

- Moisture Management?
- Wound Healing?
- Patient
 Comfort?

Determine Support
ApplicationIdentify Patient
NeedsDetermine Type of
SurfaceResearch Surface
PerformanceReview Other
Decision Points



Step 3 - Determine the Type of Surface Needed

• Understand the NPUAP terms and definitions for a support surface.

- How each surface type works to provide therapy
- Determine therapeutic benefits of other surface features.



NPUAP Surface Definitions

NPUAP* Term ¹⁶	NPUAP Definition ¹⁶
Constant Low Pressure (CLP) or Reactive	Consensus definition: A powered or non-powered support surface that provides pressure redistribution in response to an applied load (patient) through immersion and envelopment. <i>Includes alternative, contoured, or textured foam; gel or silicone; fiber; viscous fluid; static air-, water-, or bead-filled mattresses or overlays; and Australian Medical-grade sheepskin</i>
Alternating Pressure (AP) or Active	Provides pressure redistribution via cyclic changes in loading and unloading as characterized by frequency, duration, amplitude, and rate of change parameters.
Low Air Loss (LAL)	Provides a flow of air to assist in managing the heat and humidity (microclimate) of the skin.
Air Fluidized (AF)	Provides pressure redistribution via a fluid-like medium created by forcing air through beads as characterized by immersion and envelopment.

Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points



Reactive / Constant Low Pressure (CLP)



Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points



Alternating Pressure vs. Continuous Low Pressure



Shear management

Periodic Shear Reduction

Low Friction /Compliant Materials

Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points



Low Air Loss (LAL)_{17,18}

Uses the flow of air to combat the build-up of heat and humidity on skin

Mild Skin Cooling

- Cooler skin has a reduced need for nutrients, making it less vulnerable to wounds caused by unrelieved pressure
- Maintains skin temperature below threshold for local perspiration
- Normally increases comfort

Removal of Moisture



Air Fluidized Therapy

Air cushions between beads allow them to move independently

High Air-Flow and Fluidized Bath

- Excellent envelopment and immersion (low interface pressure)
- Low Shear
- High heat and moisture management capability (high evaporative capacity)



Other Features of Support Surfaces

Therapy	Feature
Detion to Commont	Weight-based Pressure Redistribution
Patient Support	Shear Relief Features
	Percussion / Vibration
Pulmonary	Lateral Rotation
	Turn Assist
Patient Handling	Chair Egress
	Bed Exit Alarm
Patient Safety	Welded Seams / No Removable Parts

Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points



Ν.

Step 4 – Research Surface Performance Testing and Results

• What is the NPUAP Support Surface Standards Initiative

- Understand how each test is performed and interpret the results
- Know why pressure mapping is not a valid method of measurement





Surface Performance Testing – Why do it?

- The importance of a support surface and it's impact on the skin
- The need to have a standardized method to compare surfaces to empower the caregiver in product selection

Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points
			Enhan	rcing outcomes for

Hill-Kom

patients and their caregivers.

Support Surface Standards Initiative (S3I) - NPUAP

- The Support Surfaces Standards Initiative (S3I) was founded in 2001 by the NPUAP to develop:
 - uniform terminology
 - test methods
 - reporting standards
- These guidelines provide an objective means for evaluating and comparing support surface characteristics to make an educated surface choice.

Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Poin



S3I Test Methods

Test methods address key surface-related pressure ulcer risk factors:







Pressure Redistribution - mmHG

Pressure



- How is it done? Pelvic shaped indenter attached to force and immersion measuring device. Indenter is impressed into seat section with a force appropriate for patient weight and HOB angle.
- Multiple trials conducted to spatially sample the seat region
- How to interpret results? Peak pressure measured in mmHG and higher numbers indicate increased risk of skin breakdown.







Pressure Redistribution - mmHG



Shear / Friction - Newtons of Pushback Force

Shear **Horizontal Stiffness** Test measures shear forces using an Indentor 'pulled' across the surface.

- How is it done? Pelvic indenter pulled toward foot of bed ٠ 10mm by force measuring device.
- Pushback force measured every 60 seconds for 5 minutes.

How to interpret the results?

- Peak shear at 0 min indicates instantaneous maximum pushback force

patients and their caregivers.

- Pushback force at 5 min indicates high sustained shear



Shear / Friction - Newtons of Pushback Force



"Sweaty Butt" - Sweating Guarded Hot Plate



Temperature - Watts/meter² Heat



Heat Withdrawal 'Drv Flux' Test measures the amount of heat withdrawn from the surface.

- **How is it done?** "Sweaty butt" test device placed in seat section of support surface.
- Measures heat withdrawal characteristics of the surface.

How to interpret the results?

- High levels of heat withdrawal indicate high level of skin cooling
- Degree of skin cooling can affect patient comfort, tissue ischemia and local perspiration

patients and their caregivers.



Temperature - Watts/meter² Heat



Moisture - Grams/meter² H2O



Evaporative Capacity 'Wet Flux' Test measures the amount of moisture removal from surface with simulated

'Sweaty Butt'.

- How is it done? "Sweaty butt" test device placed in seat section of support surface.
- Measures moisture withdrawal characteristics of the surface.

How to interpret the results?

- High levels of moisture withdrawal indicate ability to evaporate moisture effectively
- Effective LAL products are meant to evaporate sweat but not incontinence





Moisture - Grams/meter² H2O



Why not Pressure Mapping?

- Lack of precision
 - Peak Sacral Pressure Testing results \rightarrow +/- 1% variance
 - Vs.
 - Pressure Mapping Results → +/- 15% variance (no difference between "green" and "orange")
- Pressure Mapping Pads affects surface performance
 - Thick and non-conforming to surface
 - Impacts true immersion and envelopment





• Different patients for every test = lack of comparability

- Every test patient has different body type
- BMI, muscle mass, height, weight etc.

Determine Support	Identify Patient	Determine Type of	Research Surface	Review Other
Application	Needs	Surface	Performance	Decision Points



Step 5 - Other Factors to Consider

- Durability
- "Cleanability"
- Cost
- Warranty
- Service
- Clinical Support

Determine Support Application	Identify Patient Needs	Determine Type of Surface	Research Surface Performance	Review Other Decision Points	
30		Enhan patients a	cing outcomes for Hill-Ron	h.	

References

- 1. Agency for Health Care Policy Research (1994). Clinical Practice Guideline: Treatment of Pressure Ulcers. AHCPR Publication No. 95-0652.
- 2. NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, Nuffield Institute for Health, University of Leeds. The Prevention and Treatment of Pressure Ulcers. Effective Health Care; October 1995, Volume 2, Number 1.
- 3. Reswick JB and Rogers JE. (1976). Experience at Rancho Los Amigos Hospital with Devices and techniques to Prevent Pressure Sores. In Kenedi RM, Cowden JM. (Eds.), Bedsore Biomechanics, Baltimore, MD, University Park Press, 301 310.
- 4. Bennett L, Kavner D, Lee BK and Trainor FA. (1979). Shear vs. Pressure as causative factors in Skin Blood Flow Occlusion. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 60: 309 314.
- 5. Zhang M and Roberts V. The Effect of Shear Forces Externally Applied to the Skin Surface on Underlying Tissues. J Biomedical Engineering, 15(6): 451 6.
- 6. Taler G. (2005). Natural History of Pressure Ulcers and Deep Tissue Injury Pathogenesis Tissue Tolerance. Presentation at 9th Annual National NPUAP Conference. February 25, 2005, Tampa, FL.
- 7. European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel (2006). Pressure Ulcer Prevention Guidelines.
- 8. Leyden JJ. (1984). Corn Starch, Candida Albicans, and Diaper Rash. Pediatric Dermatology (4): 322 325.



Page 31

References (cont.)

- 9. Leyden JJ, Katz S, Stewart R, Kligman AM. (1977). Urinary Ammonia and Ammonia-Producing Micro-Organisms in Infants with and without Diaper Dermatitis. Archives of Dermatology 113(12): 1678 1680.
- 10. Zimmerer RE, Lawson KE, Calvert CJ. (1986). The Effects of Wearing Diapers on Skin. Pediatric Dermatology. 3(2): 95 101.
- 11. Schell V. C., Wolcott L. E. (1976). Etiology, Prevention, and Management of Decubitus Ulcers. Mo. Med. 63: 109 112.
- 12. Kokate JY, Leland KJ, Held AM, Hansen GL, Kveen GI, Johnson BA, et al. Temperature-Modulated Pressure Ulcers: A Porcine Model. Arch. Phys Med Rehabil. 1995:76:666-673.
- Patel S, Knapp CF, Donofrio JC, Salcido R. Temperature Effects on Surface Pressure-Induced Changes in Rat Skin Perfusion: Implications in Pressure Ulcer Development. Journal of Rehabilition Research and Development. 1999:36(3). Landis, E. M. (1930). Micro-Injection Studies of Capillary Blood Pressure in Human Skin. Heart 15: 209 – 228, 1930.
- 14. DuBois EF. (1936). Basil Metabolism in Health and Disease. 3rd. Edition: Lea and Febiger.
- 15. Loerakker S, Stekelenburg A, Strijkers GJ, Rijpkema JJM, Baaijens FPT, Bader DL, Nicolay K & Oomens CWJ. (2010). Temporal effects of mechanical loading on deformation-induced damage in skeletal muscle tissue. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering, 38(8), 2577-2587*.
- 16. McNichol, et al. J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurse. 2015;42(1):19-37.
- 17. American National Standards Institute, Inc. Requirements and Test Methods for Full Body Support Surfaces. October 2014.
- 18. Lachenbruch C. Microclimate Management...So much more than just airflow. Hill-Rom Company, Inc. 2008.
- 19. Nicholson G, Scales J, Clark R, de Calcina-Goff M. A method for determining the heat transfer and water vapor permeability of patient support systems. *Med Engineer Phys.* 1999;21:701–712.

