

A comparison of two single-use negative pressure wound therapy devices in the prevention of surgical site complications following Caesarean Section: a real-world evidence analysis

Leo Nherera (PhD)¹ & Mandy Spitzer² (MBA, RN, CWOCN, CFCN)

[1] Smith+Nephew, Global Health Economics, Fort Worth, TX. [2] Global Clinical and Medical Affairs, Smith+Nephew Inc., Fort Worth, TX

Correspondence: Leo.Nherera@Smith-Nephew.com

Background and aims

- Post-operative surgical site complications (SSCs) represent a significant burden to healthcare systems globally and pose many challenges for patients undergoing Caesarean Section (CS)¹⁻²
- The rate of cesarean section (C-section) in the United States (US) increased by 55.1% between 1996 and 2021, from 20.7% to 32.1% of all deliveries^{3,4}
- Surgical site infection (SSI), one of the most common surgical site complications (SSC), has an incidence of 5.3–9.6% in C-section delivery and is associated with increased rates of maternal morbidity and mortality, compared with patients without an SSI^{5,6}
- Wound dehiscence, seroma, and hematoma are also common SSCs in C-sections, with dehiscence of the operative wound representing one of the most common causes of maternal morbidity.
- This study aimed to determine whether the use of a single-use negative pressure wound therapy (sNPWT) system over closed surgical incisions could reduce the incidence of SSCs, the length of hospital stay (LOS), and index admission cost and 30-day costs between two commercially available devices (80mmHg and 125mmHg).

Methods

- A retrospective cohort study was performed using the Premier PINC AI Healthcare Database (PHD), all payor hospital inpatient admissions between 2017 to June 2022.
- Patients who were ≥18 years old and had an inpatient encounter where the –80 mmHg or the –125 mmHg devices were used were identified using a pattern-matching algorithm that searched the billing tables.
- The C-section surgical procedure category was selected based on the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Clinical Classifications Software (CCS) tool, which organizes the International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision Procedure Coding System (ICD-10-PCS) codes into categories.
- Patients were excluded if they had been treated with both the –80 mmHg and the –125 mmHg device, and if open wounds were present or if an SSC diagnosis was present on admission as identified by ICD-10 Clinical Modification (ICD-10-CM) codes.
- Additional exclusion criteria included multiple surgical encounters where the –80 mmHg device or the –125 mmHg device were used, additional surgery within 30 days, insufficient follow-up, and cases where the cost of the encounter could not be determined.
- To facilitate the comparability, a 1:1 propensity score matching (PSM) was used,
- A greedy matching method where k=1 was implemented using patient characteristics and comorbidities at the index encounter
- Demographic, hospital, and baseline clinical characteristics were used for matching between 80mmHg and 125mmHg cohorts.
- Hypothesis testing, generalized linear and logistic regression models were applied to evaluate differences in costs and clinical outcomes between cohorts.

A retrospective real-world evidence study using the Premier PINC AI Healthcare database demonstrated that the use of an 80mmHg[◊] negative pressure wound therapy device results in a statistically significant reduction in surgical site complications and costs compared to a 125mmHg* negative pressure wound device in patients undergoing cesarean section

[◊]PICO, Smith+Nephew, Inc. Fort Worth, TX

*3M Prevena, San Antonio, Texas

All Trademarks Acknowledged

Poster presented at Symposium on Advanced Wound Care (SAWC) May 14-18, Orlando, FL

Patient Matching

- After matching, 5332 patients were included for both devices, 5% were smokers, and 0.26% vs 0.58% used steroids, mean age 30, CCI 0.17 and 0.18, see Tables 1a and 1b

Table 1a: Categorical variables

Categorical variable	Level	Unmatched				Matched			
		80 mmHg		125 mmHg		80 mmHg		125 mmHg	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
All	All	2,746	100	505,876	100	2,746	100	8,220	100
Gender	Female	1,555	56.63	311,308	61.54	1,555	56.63	4,764	57.96
	Male	1,191	43.37	194,534	38.45	1,191	43.37	3,456	42.04
Inpatient/Outpatient	Inpatient	904	32.92	353,558	69.89	904	32.92	4,076	49.59
Smoker	No	2,670	97.23	484,439	95.76	2,670	97.23	8,030	97.69
	Yes	76	2.77	21,437	4.24	76	2.77	190	2.31
Steroid use	No	2,740	99.78	504,271	99.68	2,740	99.78	8,206	99.83
	Yes	6	0.22	1,605	0.32	6	0.22	14	0.17

Table 1b: Continuous variables

Cont. Variable	Level	Unmatched		Matched	
		80 mmHg	125 mmHg	80 mmHg	125 mmHg
All	Number	2,746	505,876	2,746	8,220
Age	Mean	65.85	67.3	65.85	65.76
	Median	66	68	66	66
	Min	32	18	32	19
	Max	89	89	89	89
CCI	Mean	0.32	0.62	0.32	0.3
	Median	0	0	0	0
	Min	0	0	0	0
	Max	7	13	7	12

Table 2: Surgical site complications

Endpoint	Unadjusted						Adjusted		
	Number		Complications		% incidence		Odds ratio 80mmHg: 125mmHg	Odds ratio 80mmHg: 125mmHg	p-val
	80 mmHg	125 mmHg	80 mmHg	125 mmHg	80 mmHg	125 mmHg			
SSI at 30 days	5,332	5,332	31	53	0.58	0.99	0.583	0.584	0.0179
Dehiscence at 30 days	5,332	5,332	55	90	1.03	1.69	0.605	0.616	0.0050
Seroma at 30 days	5,332	5,332	2	9	0.04	0.17	0.235	0.302	0.0500
Hematoma at 30 days	5,332	5,332	8	8	0.15	0.15	1.000	0.980	0.9638
Deep SSI at 90 days	5,178	5,239	1	5	0.02	0.10	0.200	0.285	0.0970

Table 3: LOS and costs at index procedure, 30 days, and 90 days

Endpoint	Unadjusted						Adjusted		
	Number		LOS/Cost (\$)		% reduction (80mmHg vs 125mmHg)	p-value	% reduction (80mmHg vs 125mmHg)	p-val	
	80 mmHg	125 mmHg	80 mmHg	125 mmHg					
LOS (days)	5,332	5,332	3.39	3.47	2.31%	0.9916	2.35%	0.1009	
Index admission cost (\$)	5,332	5,332	\$10,613	\$11,103	4.41%	0.0009	3.83%	<.0001	
Total cost at 30 days from surgery (\$)	5,332	5,332	\$9,318	\$9,980	6.63%	<.0001	6.12%	<.0001	
Total cost at 90 days from surgery (\$)	5,178	5,239	\$9,472	\$10,200	7.14%	<.0001	6.55%	<.0001	

Results

- Results demonstrate statistically significant reductions in surgical site infections at 30 days, dehiscence, and seroma while showing no difference in hematoma and deep SSIs (Table 2).
- The mean index admission cost, 30-day, and 90-day were significantly lower for 80mmHg vs 125mmHg, and no differences were observed in LOS (Table 3).

Conclusion

- The prophylaxis use of 80mmHg reduced SSI, dehiscence, and costs compared with 125mmHg in patients undergoing caesarean section.
- No differences were observed for length of stay and the incidence of deep SSI and hematoma.
- The study is bound by the common limitations of administrative discharge data, for example, improper or incomplete coding and missing data.

References

1. Curtin SC, Gregory KD, Korst LM, Uddin SF. Maternal Morbidity for Vaginal and Cesarean Deliveries, According to Previous Cesarean History: New Data From the Birth Certificate, 2013. Natl Vital Stat Rep. 2015;64(4):1-13
2. Kawakita T, Landy HJ. Surgical site infections after cesarean delivery: epidemiology, prevention and treatment. Matern Health Neonatol Perinatol. 2017;3:12.
3. Hamilton B, Martin J, Hamilton B, Osterman M. Births: Provisional Data for 2021. Vital Statistics Rapid Release No 20; 2022.
4. Goldman T, Costa B. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Two Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Devices to Manage Cesarean Section Incisions. Am J Perinatol 2023. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1055/s-0043-1775562
5. Gomaa K, Abdelraheim AR, El Gelany S, Khalifa EM, Yousef AM, Hassan H. Incidence, risk factors and management of post cesarean section surgical site infection (SSI) in a tertiary hospital in Egypt: a five year retrospective study. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2021;21:634.
6. Wloch C, Wilson J, Lamagni T, Harrington P, Charlett A, Sheridan E. Risk factors for surgical site infection following caesarean section in England: results from a multicentre cohort study. BJOG 2012;119:1324–1333.