The use of a novel dual compression system (DCS) in lower limb skin improvement while also managing edema and venous leg ulcer: analysis of results from a large observational study

Nathalie Janot, MSc; Laetitia Thomassin, PhD, Debashish Chakravarthy, PhD; Peter Mallow, PhD

INTRODUCTION

- The use of compression in the management of the venous reflux condition is highly recommended.
- The Dual Compression System (DCS) that combines long and short stretch bandages that provide compression.
- DCS is designed to confidently apply consistent therapeutic pressure (30-50 mm Hg) via visual indicators.
- It is also known that patients with venous reflux conditions frequently suffer from skin problems in the lower limb.
- An analysis of skin improvement from this real-life study is presented.

METHODS

- The clinical data from a large prospective, multicentre, observational study treated with the DCS in outpatient settings or during home visits for a maximum duration of six weeks (4 clinician visits maximum) was obtained for this study.
- For this work, all clinical data related to skin condition were extracted and analysed from the original study.
- The primary outcome was the improvement of the skin by the final visit.
- The condition of the skin was assessed on a five-point scale where one was ('healthy') to five ('severely damaged').
- Additional outcome measures included other standard measures such as wound healing rate, wound healing progression, local tolerability and acceptance of the compression therapy.
- The McNemar test was used to determine if patients changed from an Altered state (Skin condition score of 2 to 5) to Healthy state, or vice versa, randomly or not.
- A p value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

- A total of 702 patients were followed for an average of 27 (SD 17) days and two follow-up visits were performed at day 7 (+/-5) and 15 (+/- 10).
- At baseline, the condition of the skin was rated as healthy (score: 1) in 9.5%, damaged (score 2, 3 or 4) in 60.3%, severely damaged (score 5) in 5.6% patients. (Table 1)
- The physician's final assessment found the skin condition compared with the initial visit was 'improved' in 73.9% patients, 'unchanged' in 20.2% patients and 'deteriorated' in 0.4% patients. (Table 1)
- At the 1st follow-up visit, 195 (36.9%) with a baseline score of 2 to 5 already showed an improvement of their skin condition. (Table 2)
- In particular, 19 patients (3.2%) moved from Altered to Healthy skin condition. (Table 3)
- At the 2nd follow-up visit, 339 (72.2%) with a baseline score of 2 to 5 showed an improvement of their skin condition. (Table 2)
- In particular, 106 patients (20.3%) moved from Altered to Healthy skin condition. (Table 5)
- Patient acceptance rates were high with "very well' or 'well' tolerated and 'very well' or 'well' accepted by >95% of patients.
- At the final visit, 30.9% of wounds had healed, 61.8% had improved, 66.7% limb oedema resolved, and 44.2% reported improvement in ankle mobility.

Table 1. Change in Skin Condition from Baseline Visit to Final Visit

Parameter	Total (n = 702)		
Skin condition at baseline (N, %)			
1 - Healthy	67 (9.5)		
2	217 (30.9)		
3	206 (29.3)		
4	88 (12.5)		
5 – Severely Damage	39 (5.6)		
Missing	85 (12.1)		
Skin evolution at final visit			
Improved	519 (73.9)		
Unchanged	142 (20.2)		
Worsened	3 (0.4)		
Missing	38 (5.4)		

Table 2. Skin Condition at 1st Follow-up Visit According to Condition at Baseline

	Dasciii C					
	Skin Condition at Baseline					
Parameter	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	(n = 67)	(n = 217)	(n = 206)	(n = 88)	(n = 39)	(n = 617)
Skin condition	61	202	200	88	38	589
1st visit						
1 - Healthy	56 (91.8)	17 (8.4)	2 (1.0)	0	0	75 (12.7)
2	5 (8.2)	176	95 (47.5)	6 (6.8)	0	282
		(87.1)				(47.9)
3	0	8 (4.0)	100	55 (62.5)	3 (7.9)	166
			(50.0)			(28.2)
4	0	1 (0.5)	3 (1.5)	27 (30.7)	17 (43.6)	28 (5.4)
5 – Severely	0	0	1 (0.6)	1 (1.2)	1 (2.6)	3 (0.6)
Damage						
Missing	6	15	6	0	1	28

Column percentages are presented in parentheses.

Table 3. Skin Condition at 1st Follow-up Visit According to Skin Condition at Baseline (N = 702)

	Skin Condit	Skin Condition at Baseline		
Parameter (1997)	Healthy (n = 67)	Altered (n = 550)	p-value	
Skin condition 1st visit, N	61	528	0.0066	
Healthy	56 (9.5)	19 (3.2)		
Altered	5 (0.9)	509 (86.4)		
Missing	6	22		

McNemar test compared patients who changed health states. Patients who remain in the same health state at both visits are not considered.

Table 4. Skin Condition at 2nd Follow-up Visit According to Condition at Baseline

	Skin Condition at Baseline					
Parameter	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	(n = 67)	(n = 217)	(n = 206)	(n = 88)	(n = 39)	(n = 617)
Skin condition	54	168	178	84	39	523
2nd visit						
1 - Healthy	50 (92.6)	82 (48.8)	22 (12.4)	2 (2.4)	0	156
						(29.8)
2	4 (7.4)	80 (47.6)	123	38 (45.2)	4 (10.3)	249
			(69.1)			(47.6)
3	0	6 (3.6)	30 (16.9)	34 (40.5)	17 (43.6)	87 (16.6)
4	0	0	2 (1.1)	9 (10.7)	17 (43.6)	28 (5.4)
5 – Severely	0	0	1 (0.6)	1 (1.2)	1 (2.6)	3 (0.6)
Damaged						
Missing	13	49	28	4	0	94

Column percentages are presented in parentheses.

Table 5. Skin Condition at 2^{nd} Follow-up Visit According to Skin Condition at Baseline (N = 702)

Parameter	Skin Condit		
	Healthy (n = 67)	Altered (n = 550)	p-value
Skin condition 2nd visit, N	54	469	<0.0001
Healthy	50 (9.6)	106 (20.3)	
Altered	4 (0.8)	363 (69.4)	
Missing	13	81	

McNemar test compared patients who changed health states. Patients who remain in the same health state at both visits are not considered.

LIMITATIONS

• The primary study did not include a comparator of other multi-layer bandage systems. However, the efficacy of DCS has been established in several studies.

CONCLUSION

- Concurrent with improvement in the venous reflux condition and wound healing/edema reduction, skin quality improvement was observed in a large and rigorous study on patients with venous ulcers and or edema.
- Comparative studies in this regard are suggested.

REFERENCES

- 1. 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. doi: 10.12968/jowc.2021.30.5.400. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33979221/
- 2. Lazareth I, Moffatt C, Dissemond J, Lesne Padieu AS, Truchetet F, Beissert S, Wicks G, Tilbe H, Sauvadet A, Bohbot S, Meaume S. Efficacy of two compression systems in the management of VLUs: results of a European RCT. J Wound Care. 2012 Nov;21(11):553-4, 556, 558 passim. doi: 10.12968/jowc.2012.21.11.553. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23413494/
- 3. 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. doi: 10.12968/jowc.2020.29.Sup9.S29. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32924806/
- 4. Bowering CK. Use of layered compression bandages in diabetic patients. Experience in patients with lower leg ulceration, peripheral edema, and features of venous and arterial disease. Adv Wound Care. 1998 May-Jun;11(3):129-35. PMID: 9729944.
- 5. 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. doi:
- 10.12968/jowc.2007.16.9.27866. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17987751/
 6. Hanna R, Bohbot S, Connolly N. A comparison of inferface pressures of three compression bandage systems. Br J Nurs. 2008 Nov 13-26;17(20):S16-
- 24. doi: 10.12968/bjon.2008.17.Sup9.31661. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19043323/
- 7. 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. doi: 10.12968/jowc.2009.18.11.45000. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19901877/
- 8. Garrigues-Ramón M, Julián M, Zaragoza C, Barrios C. Inability of Laplace's law to estimate sub-bandage pressures after applying a compressive bandage: a clinical study. J Wound Care. 2021 Apr 2;30(4):276-282. doi: 10.12968/jowc.2021.30.4.276. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33856905/
- 9. Wu SC, Crews RT, Skratsky M, et al. Control of lower extremity edema in patients with diabetes: Double blind randomized controlled trial assessing the efficacy of mild compression diabetic socks. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2017;127:35-43. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2017.02.025