

# Increasing adoption of a Dual Compression System (DCS) in the USA: What is driving the change from traditional and more established compression bandages to the new technology?

Debashish Chakravarthy, Ph.D; Ashley Neiderer, RN, BSN

## INTRODUCTION

The use of a Dual Compression System (DCS) that combines both long and short stretch bandages allows the achievement of therapeutic pressure under both ambulatory and non ambulatory conditions. This two layer system is now part of the two layer compression bandage landscape in the USA, and has been increasingly adopted since its launch in 2019. We have surveyed the wound centers that have chosen this newer technology, and determined that the primary cause of adoption of this new product and the abandonment of the older products. We present here the reasons why transitions took place in the “top twenty” centers, by volume of adoption, where the transitions took place.

## METHODOLOGY

Using our own internal database, we were able to determine the topmost 20 users (by volume) in 2023 of the Dual Compression System. We contacted both our internal leads, as well as the lead clinicians in these user facilities, where without exception a system of clinician evaluation was used to determine whether the new product was worthy of adoption. We studied the location of these centers in terms of general geography. We noted the previous compression product largely being used, and which was then replaced by the new DCS compression product. We noted whether the adoption was reversed in any of these places where the new DCS system was adopted.

## RESULTS

Table 1 indicates the results of our survey. Figures 2, 3, and 4 provide more summarized details

## DISCUSSION

This methodology provides a snapshot of the situation at the top twenty adopters of a new compression technology. Being a snapshot of the adoption profile, the methodology has some limitations, however certain elements are quite apparent from our brief survey.

- Improved clinical outcomes was the #1 reason for converting but 11/20 adopters of DCS perceived a cost savings despite DCS having a higher price point per bandage kit. We ascribe it due to less wastage of bandages during use due to the nature of the DCS.
- All but 1 of the 20 new adopters continue to use the DCS (one adopter did a systemwide adoption of the wound care products from a different manufacturer)
- Regional adoption is heavy in the southeast (warmer climate)
- Coban2® was the most commonly replaced product

### Figure 1

- Usage:**
  - 19/20 adopters of DCS still using DCS after conversion from a different bandage.
- Reasons for DCS Adoption:**
  - Improved Clinical Outcomes: 20/20 DCS adopters
  - Patient Comfort & Compliance: 18/20 DCS adopters
  - Ease of Application: 15/20 DCS adopters
  - Cost Savings: 11/20 DCS adopters
  - Reduced Time of Application: 8/20 DCS adopters

Table 1

Region:	Reason For Adoption 1:	Reason for Adoption 2:	Reason for Adoption 3:	Reason for Adoption 4:	Reason for Adoption 5:	Product UrgoK2 Replaced:	Adoption Period: (month if available)	Still Using?:
North Central (Ohio)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Time of Application	Ease of Application	Cost Savings	Coban2 & Profore, Unna Boot	Q2 2019	Yes
West (Arizona)	Ease of Application	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Cost Savings			Coban 2	Q1 2023	Yes
Southeast (Maryland)	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Time of Application	Cost Savings			Coban 2, Profore, Coflex	Q1 2022	Yes
South Central (Texas)	Ease of Application	Time of Application	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Cost Savings	Ace Bandage & Kerlix		Yes
South Central ( Texas)	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Ease of Application	Improved Clinical Outcomes			Coflex	Q2 2023	Yes
Southeast (Georgia)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Time of Application	Ease of Application	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Cost Savings	Profore, Coban2, Fourflex, UnnaFlex, Comprifore, Threflex	Q2 2023 (June)	Yes
North Central (Illinois)	Ease of Application	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance			Profore	Q1 2022 (January)	Yes
Southeast (Florida)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Cost Savings			Coban 2	Q3 2022 (July)	Yes
Southeast (Wash DC)	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Time of Application	Cost Savings	Ease of Application	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Coban 2	Q1 2021	Yes
North Central (Indiana)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Ease of Application			Coban 2, Profore	Q2 2022	Yes
South Central (Mississippi)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance				Coflex	Q2 2022	No
North Central (North Dakota)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance				Coban 2	Q1 2023	Yes
South Central (Texas)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Ease of Application	Patient Comfort/ Compliance			Coban 2	Q2 2022	Yes
Northeast (New Jersey)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Ease of Application			Coban 2, Profore, Unna Boot	Q2 2023 (June)	Yes
Southeast (Georgia)	Ease of Application	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Time of Application	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Cost Savings	Coban2	Q4 2022 (Oct)	Yes
Southeast (Alabama)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Ease of Application			Coban 2	Q3 2023 (July)	Yes
North Central (Indiana)	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Improved Clinical Outcomes				Coban 2, Profore	Q4 2022	Yes
Southeast (Georgia)	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Time of Application	Ease of Application	Cost Savings	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Coban2	Q4 2022 (Sept/nov) consistently ordered started Feb 23)	Yes
Southeast (Florida)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Ease of Application	Time of Application	Cost Savings	Coban2, Unna Boots	Q2 2021	Yes
North Central (Illinois)	Improved Clinical Outcomes	Cost Savings	Patient Comfort/ Compliance	Improved Clinical Outcomes		CoflexTLC & Coban 2	Q2 2021	Yes

### Figure 2

- Adoption Period:**
  - 2019: 1 account (Q2)
  - 2020: 0 accounts (COVID PERIOD)
  - 2021: 3 accounts (Q1 x1, Q2 x2)
  - 2022: 9 accounts (Q1 x 2, Q2 x3, Q3 x1, Q4 x3)
  - 2023: 6 accounts (Q1 x 2, Q2 x3, Q3x 1)
  - 1 unknown

- Regions:**
  - Southeast: 8/20 accounts
  - North Central: 6/20 accounts
  - South Central: 4/20 accounts
  - Northeast: 1/20 accounts
  - West: 1/20 accounts

### Figure 3

- Compression Products Replaced by DCS adopters post trial/evaluation:**
  - Coban™ 2: Replaced by 16 (DCS) adopters
  - Profore®: Replaced by 7 adopters
  - Unna Boot: Replaced by 3 adopters
  - Coflex®: Replaced by 4 adopters
  - Fourflex®: Replaced by 1 adopter
  - Jobst® Comprifore: Replaced by 1 adopter
  - ThreeFlex®: Replaced by 1 adopter
  - Ace Bandage: Replaced by 1 adopter
  - Kerlix™: Replaced by 1 adopter
  - UnnaFlex®: Replaced by 1 adopter

## REFERENCES

- Benigni JP, Lazareth I, Parpex P, Gerard JL, Alves M, Vin F, Meaume S, Senet P, Allaert FA. Efficacy, safety and acceptability of a new two-layer bandage system for venous leg ulcers. J Wound Care. 2007 Oct;16(9):385-90.
- Hanna R, Bohbot S, Connolly N. A comparison of interface pressures of three compression bandage systems. Br J Nurs. 2008 Nov 13-26;17(20):S16-24.
- Jünger M, Ladwig A, Bohbot S, Haase H. Comparison of interface pressures of three compression bandaging systems used on healthy volunteers. J Wound Care. 2009 Nov;18(11):474, 476-80.
- Lazareth I, Moffatt C, Dissemond J, Lesne Padiou AS, Truchetet F, Beissert S, Wicks G, Tilbe H, Sauvadet A, Bohbot S, Meaume S. Efficacy of two compression systems in the management of VLU: results of a European RCT. J Wound Care. 2012 Nov;21(11):553-4, 556, 558 passim.
- Stücker M, Münter KC, Erfurt-Berge C, Lützkendorf S, Eder S, Möller U, Dissemond J. Multicomponent compression system use in patients with chronic venous insufficiency: a real-life prospective study. J Wound Care. 2021 May 2;30(5):400-412.
- Lantis JC 2nd, Barrett C, Couch KS, Ehmann S, Greenstein E, Ostler M, Tickner A. A dual compression system: preliminary clinical insights from the US. J Wound Care. 2020 Sep 1;29(Sup9):S29-S37.