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Background
Skin care and maintenance of skin integrity is an important indicator of quality care in hospitals. The Ottawa Hospital (TOH), an acute tertiary care hospital composed of five sites, has over the past 10 years developed a comprehensive data set from our annual Pressure Ulcer Prevalence (PUP) studies. Specifically, the PUP data from the past several years have revealed significant differences in prevalence rates between the medical units on different campuses. Prevalence data provide a “snapshot” of pressure ulcers at a given point in time. They do not provide information helpful in understanding the reasons for these differences in prevalence rates. Thus, we conducted a pilot incidence study to identify unit and patient characteristics that might uncover contributing factors for the differences in prevalence rates on the units.

Study Methodology
Comparable medical units (identified as Unit A and Unit B) from the two large inpatient campuses participated in this pilot study. The study underwent review and received approval from the Ottawa Health Research Institute Ethics Board. The two main objectives were to document the occurrence of pressure ulcers over the 10-week study period and to profile the study units and their populations. Two of the study questions were as follows:

1. What is the prevalence and incidence of pressure ulcers on the study units?

2. What patient-related or unit-related factors are associated with the difference of prevalence and incidence of pressure ulcers on the units?

A prospective point prevalence (12 hours) was conducted followed by a cumulative incidence survey over 10 weeks. A Pressure Ulcer Incidence Data Collection Tool was developed from our standard prevalence tool that included admission data, the presence, site, and stage of all pressure ulcers, a daily record of skin and Braden Scale risk assessments. Nurses completed this tool for each patient admitted to the study units on a daily basis. The indicators for the ulcer outcome measures are detailed in Table 1.

Data were entered, verified and...
analyzed using the SPSS-PC version 11.0 statistical software package. Descriptive statistics (means, medians and frequency distributions) were calculated to report both clinical and unit data; T tests (for continuous variables) and Chi square (for categorical variables) were used to determine if there were differences between the groups. A Braden Scale deficit was defined as a loss of one point or more on any of the subscales. This study was not intended (nor powered) to detect differences on which to base conclusions, but rather to generate hypotheses for future study.

Findings

Prevalence Estimates and Cumulative Incidence. During the 10-week study period, 19 per cent of patients (128 of the 669) on the two medical units were found to have ulcers. The point prevalence on day one for both medical units combined was 33 per cent (all stages). The incidence rate over the 10-week period for both units combined was nine per cent for all stages and four per cent for Stage II and greater ulcers.

Comparison of Unit A and B.
The two units were similar in staffing characteristics except that Unit A was composed of registered nurses (RNs) and aides and Unit B had all professional staff consisting of RNs and registered practical nurses (RPNs). Their patient populations were significantly different, with the type of conditions and the admitting service with Unit A having more emergency or non-elective admissions and patients with higher numbers of co-morbidities. Unit A also had patients at greater risk of pressure ulcers. The characteristics of the units, the patient populations, prevalence estimates and incidence rates are presented in Table 2.

In comparing the population who developed pressure ulcers with those who remained ulcer-free on the units, several factors appeared to be important (Table 3). Patients who developed ulcers were older, had a greater number of co-morbid conditions, were more likely to be diabetic, and were more likely to have deficits in five to six of the subscales of the Braden Risk Assessment. No significant differences were noted between those patients with ulcers and those without in terms of gender, time in the emergency room and admitting diagnosis. A greater proportion of the patients on Unit A were noted to have the characteristics of the population likely to develop ulcers.

A small proportion (17 per cent) of the ulcers that were first identified as being Stage I ulcers deteriorated to a more serious stage during the study. Although the average time from admission to ulcer development was longer on Unit A (mean 16 days, median seven days) than on Unit B (mean 11 days, median five days), this difference was not statistically significant.

Discussion
The incidence rate (nine per cent for all stages) on these two units is in the lower range found in the literature where studies have reported incidence rates.
between 1.1 and 21 per cent in acute-care settings and 9.7 per cent for patients over 65. Significant differences were found in the incidence rates for pressure ulcers (all stages) on the two units (Unit A with 12 per cent and Unit B with six per cent). Organizational characteristics, patient demographics and clinical factors differed on the units, which may help to explain the variation in pressure ulcer occurrence. Although this study was not set up to test the association between unit and population characteristics on the occurrence of pressure ulcers, there were some interesting findings relevant for further study. Unit A had a lower proportion of full-time staff as well as a lower proportion of RN staff than Unit B. A recent Ontario study found that patients in hospital units where there were more RNs and RPNs had better outcomes on discharge. U.S. studies and have also documented that staffing mix and staffing levels make a difference in achieving positive patient outcomes. This relationship deserves more attention given the preliminary findings of this pilot study.

Patient population characteristics also appear to be important in terms of understanding varying rates of pressure ulcers on generically described “medical” units. The significant differences in Unit A’s patient population, mean age, number of co-morbidities, and the number of Braden deficits likely are contributing factors for the development of more pressure ulcers compared with Unit B.

### Conclusion

This descriptive cohort study provided preliminary information to explain to decision-makers how seemingly similar units may be quite different for the purposes of understanding pressure ulcer development. Findings from this study suggest that patients who have deficits in five to six of the Braden Scale subscales and four or more co-morbidities are at higher risk to develop pressure ulcers. Unit staffing mix and levels of staff appear to be an important unit characteristic worthy of further study with regard to pressure ulcer development. A large-scale prospective cohort over a longer period of time would contribute to understanding this relationship more. Other variables/factors that may also play a role in the disparity of prevalence and incidence rates on these units were not explored in this study. Factors to consider for future research include nursing skin-care practices, nurses’ knowledge and attitudes regarding skin care, and more specific patient data such as illness acuity, nutritional status, activity levels and skin conditions.

**Special thanks to the other members of the pilot incidence study team: Nicole Denis, RN, ET Nurse, MScN, and Sue Sarrazin, RN, ET Nurse. This project was supported by The Ottawa Hospital Nursing Research Work Group.**
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### Table 3

**Profile of Patients with Pressure Ulcers and Characteristics of Unit Populations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile of Patients with Pressure Ulcers</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Unit A</th>
<th>Unit B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Mean age (years)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more co-morbidities</td>
<td>Mean number of co-morbidities</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been in hospital longer</td>
<td>Average length of stay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a co-morbidity of diabetes</td>
<td>% diabetic</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have deficits in each of the Braden Subscales</td>
<td>% with six subscale deficits</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose Heelift® Suspension Boot—The Pressure-Free Solution

We’ve been telling you for years that Heelift® Suspension Boots provide a pressure-free environment to help eliminate the onset of pressure ulcers for those patients who may be most susceptible to them as well as those patients already suffering from them.

• Choose from our convoluted foam for added ventilation or our smooth foam for those with edematous legs or sensitive skin
• Friction-free backing for improved patient mobility
• Stiffener prevents boot from buckling

HERE’S THE PROOF

Using a 16-sensor, force sensing pad carefully affixed to the left heel of two subjects, pressure was “mapped” while the patients were lying supine and also with the knee flexed 30 degrees. Pressure mapping readings were done separately with the patient using various pressure reduction mattresses and numerous foot positioners, and heel protectors.

In all tests, Heelift® provided a pressure-free solution compared to the other typically used options.