Pressure injury prevention in the perioperative setting: An integrative review

Abstract

Background: Pressure injury (PI) has a significant impact on patients and their families, and are costly to healthcare institutions. Perioperative PI remains problematic, although little is reported about current perioperative pressure injury prevention (PIP) strategies.

Aim: To identify the key perioperative PIP strategies, following a systematic review of published research, to describe existing gaps in the literature, and to inform the development of subsequent observational study.

Design: An integrative literature review method developed by Whittemore and Knafl was used.

Method: Research inclusion and exclusion criteria were identified a priori. Six data bases were searched and search terms included pressure ulcer/sore prevention, perioperative, operating room. Two review authors evaluated the quality of the studies using a validated tool, and a third author arbitrated when there was a discrepancy. Agreement between the two rates was measured using an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC).

Findings: Based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 270 papers were screened and 10 quantitative studies were included. Quality scores ranged from 29% to 89%, resulting in an ICC of 0.955 (95% confidence interval, 0.821 to 0.989, p < 0.0001). Five key PIP strategies were identified, including skin inspection, support surfaces and positioning aids, thermoregulation, medical devices and/or equipment, and interprofessional communication.

Conclusions: This review confirmed the scarcity of current evidence of perioperative PIP practice and identified five key perioperative PIP strategies. Most of the reviewed studies focused on one main PIP strategy, and no direct observational studies have been undertaken in relation to perioperative PIP.

Keywords: operating room, perioperative, pressure injury prevention, risk assessment, positioning aids, support surface, thermoregulation, pre-warming, medical devices/equipment, communication.

Background

Pressure injury (PI) is defined as an injury on or underneath the skin that can occur in less than one hour under certain constant pressures. If constant pressure is greater than 32 mmHg, it will result in an occlusion of blood flow, which may ultimately affect the skin, soft tissue, muscle and bone, and lead to the development of localised ischemia, tissue inflammation, tissue anoxia and necrosis. PI is recognised as one of the most costly and complicated conditions. PI can have devastating effects on personal and social life of patients and their families, and impose heavy financial burdens on healthcare institutions. While hospitalised patients with restricted mobility have increased risk of developing PI, anaesthetised patients undergoing surgery are at even greater risk. However, little is known about the strategies that are used during anaesthesia and surgery.
to minimise this group’s risk of developing a PI in the postoperative period.

Despite international guidelines\textsuperscript{3} and a growing evidence base for pressure injury prevention (PIP), surgical patients are at high risk of developing hospital acquired pressure injury (HAPI)\textsuperscript{9}. It is imperative to understand current perioperative PIP practice compliance with the relevant guidelines. To address this issue, we undertook a comprehensive literature review in relation to perioperative PIP practice.

**Aim**

The objectives of this integrative literature review were twofold:

- to identify the key PIP strategies used in perioperative settings, based on assessment of published research related to current perioperative PIP practice
- to identify the existing gaps in the literature to inform the development of a subsequent observational study.

**Methods**

**Design**

This review used an integrative review design, based on a systematic and comprehensive approach. An integrative review can incorporate various study methodologies and subsequently has the potential to capture a broad range of issues relative to the status of current perioperative PIP practice, as reported in research literature. A widely accepted framework developed by Whittemore and Knafl\textsuperscript{1} guided the development of this review across five stages: problem identification, literature searches, data evaluation, data integration and results presentation.

**Literature search methods**

The databases used to search the literature included Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL, via EBSCOhost), Medline (via EBSCOhost), PubMed, ProQuest Central, Cochrane Central, Web of Science and Scopus. The Google Scholar database does not have similar Boolean operator functions; thus, it was only used to retrieve information when the full text of an article was not found. Reference lists of selected journal articles were also reviewed, as well as articles recommended by the research student’s supervisors. The following combinations of keywords, categorised into three groups, were used as search terms:


**Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were based on the review’s aims, and thus focused on articles that were relevant to perioperative PIP practice. The following inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied.

**Inclusion criteria:**

- primary research articles, using either quantitative or qualitative methods,
- quality improvement studies,
- abstract and full text available in English,
- published from 2006 to 2017, and
- perioperative settings with adult inpatients.

**Exclusion criteria:**

- the topic’s interest was not directly related to or did not describe PIP in the perioperative setting,
- the study was conducted in ambulatory settings where patients were discharged on the day of surgery, and
- simulation studies conducted in perioperative settings.

**Data extraction**

Guided by research aims and the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the titles and abstracts of all searched articles were first reviewed by the research student for data extraction. Data were extracted and synthesised according to author, year, country, aim/design, sampling/measures, key findings, and limitations. One of the student’s co-supervisors then independently screened the titles and abstracts against the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Where there was a difference of opinion, the other co-supervisor reassessed the articles to make a final decision.

**Data evaluation**

Following data extraction, the selected studies were critically assessed using a quantitative checklist, as described by Pluye, Gagnon, Griffiths, and Johnson-Lafleur\textsuperscript{10}. This checklist, known as the Mixed Studies Review, provided quality scores using 14 assessment criteria (based on quantitative methods). In each criterion, the scores ranged from 0 to 2, where 0 = ‘no’, 1 = ‘partial’, 2 = ‘yes’ and ‘NA’ = ‘not applicable’. A final score was calculated for each article as a percentage indicating the proportion of items applicable to each study.
Agreement between raters was measured using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). A coefficient of ≥0.70 was considered acceptable for internal consistency. Similar to the data extraction process, the quality assessment of the selected articles was independently appraised by the research student first, then by the student’s co-supervisor.

**Data synthesis**

The included studies were analysed using a qualitative approach to categories the key PIP strategies. The research student independently read, and re-read each article to identify commonalities and differences in study methods and PIP strategies used across perioperative settings in the included studies. This process was iterative and regular meetings with the student’s research supervisors were held to clarify and discuss categorised findings.

**Results**

The results of this integrative review indicate the scarcity of published research on the status of current PIP practice in perioperative settings. All of the included studies were quantitative. Most of the included studies focused mainly on one PIP strategy, and used an interventional approach to examine health professionals’ knowledge and practice, or assessed the effect of support surfaces and positioning aids, thermoregulation or medical devices and/or equipment on reducing the incidence of PI. None of the included studies used direct observation.

**Descriptive findings**

The first search identified 284 articles from seven databases and other resources, as reported in Table 1. Medline and Scopus provided the bulk of the literature based on the search criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Number of articles screened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CINAHL</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medline through EBSCOhost</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest Central</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane Central</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopus</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From student’s supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The titles and abstracts of 188 articles were screened, and 158 were excluded based on non-adherence to the inclusion criteria. Thirty full-text articles were then assessed and a further 20 were excluded, resulting in the inclusion of 10 quantitative articles. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram in Figure 1 illustrates the flow of the search and structured screening process, with the number of publications identified at each stage of the review.

**Data presentation**

The 10 primary studies included in this review were selected according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
Table 2: Characteristics of included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year and country</th>
<th>Design and sampling</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Key measures</th>
<th>Key findings related to the PIP study</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feuchtinger et al. 2006, Germany</td>
<td>randomised controlled trial single hospital site</td>
<td>compare two support surfaces for the effect on the incidence of postoperative PI in cardiac surgery</td>
<td>standard OR table with a heating source a 4-cm viscoelastom foam overlay and a heating source on the OR table outcome: PI stage</td>
<td>patients lying on the 4-cm viscoelastic foam overlay had higher PI rates (17.6%) than patients on the standard OR table without the foam overlay (11.1%) study terminated at the interim analysis because of potential harm; 350 patients were originally needed, and finally 175 patients were randomised in the trial</td>
<td>PI occurrence data collected by nurses were less accurate than data collected by research assistants single site, limiting generalisability possible performance bias (on skin assessment) because of no blinding to data collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewchuk et al. 2006, USA</td>
<td>retrospective chart audit single hospital site</td>
<td>examine occurrence, presentation and timing of PI development on three types of support surfaces in cardiac surgery, based on chart audit</td>
<td>prospectively use three interventions: a standard foam OR bed mattress a fluid, pressure-reducing OR bed mattress a fluid, pressure-reducing mattress after a comprehensive educational program on PIP outcome: the occurrence of PI based on retrospective chart audit</td>
<td>incidence of PI decreased when the fluid, pressure-reducing OR bed mattresses were used with the nurse education program; statistical significance not reported educational invention improved preoperative documentation in relation to PIP</td>
<td>reliance on secondary data that could be inaccurate or incomplete single site, limiting generalisability convenience sampling possibilities of performance bias, as staff were not blinded Hawthorne effect, as documentation improved before educational sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshimura, et al. 2016, Japan</td>
<td>retrospective chart audit single hospital site consecutive sampling</td>
<td>examine risk factors associated with intraoperative PIs in the park-bench surgical position</td>
<td>21 potential risk factors identified outcome: incidence of PI</td>
<td>perspiration, length of surgery and core temperature at completion of surgery over 38.1 degrees was related to length of surgery over six hours, and perspiration was independently related to intraoperative PI development</td>
<td>reliance on secondary data that may be inaccurate or incomplete single site, limiting generalisability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aronovitch 2007, USA</td>
<td>prospective descriptive survey convenient sampling</td>
<td>determine risk factors associated with postoperative PI immediately following a surgery</td>
<td>the weighted index of comorbidity scores the number of comorbidities the number of anaesthesia agents used surgical position blood serum albumin level (for nutrition status) support surfaces used postoperative PI rates</td>
<td>cardiac surgery is one of most common surgeries for surgical patients to develop postoperative PI most PIs were stage 2 use of warming devices and standard OR table mattresses increases the risk of PI development factors that increase patient risk for developing postoperative PI include positioning, use of positioning and thermoregulatory devices, length of surgery, and comorbidities</td>
<td>low survey response rate (3.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grisell and Place 2007, USA</td>
<td>prospective randomised controlled study single hospital site</td>
<td>compare the tissue-pillow interface pressures at the forehead and chin in patients positioned prone for spinal surgery on each of three facial pillow devices</td>
<td>three facial positioners: (1) Dupaco (Dupaco Inc.) pillow; (2) ROHO (The ROHO Group) pillow; (3) OSI (Orthopedica System Inc.) pillow outcome: the incidence of PI</td>
<td>Dupaco positioner created the lowest tissue pressure on forehead and chin in an anaesthetised, prone patient population undergoing spinal surgery patients had no postoperative skin changes placed on ROHO or Dupaco pillows</td>
<td>single site and small sample size, limiting generalisability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year and country</td>
<td>Design and sampling</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Key measures</td>
<td>Key findings related to the PIP study</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilsson 2013, Sweden</td>
<td>prospective cross-sectional single hospital site n = 86 surgical patients supine position and under general anaesthesia</td>
<td>describe risk factors for postoperative positioning pain and PI associated with supine positioning and general anaesthesia</td>
<td>age, gender, preoperative pain, duration of surgery, OR bed surface, positioning of the arms, and number and types of monitoring devices outcome: postoperative pain in relation to intraoperative positioning and PI</td>
<td>no associations between positioning pain or PI and gender, age, duration of surgery, surface of the operation room bed, and number of monitoring devices four patients reported, pain in their heels; of these, two had bilateral Grade I PI routine documentation and follow-up of a patients' intraoperative positioning is emphasised</td>
<td>patients with PI, but without pain were not included in the study single site and small sample size, limiting generalisability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland-Fraser et al. 2012, Australia</td>
<td>prospective pre-and post-intervention study two metropolitan hospitals convenience sampling staff self-reported survey n = 70 perioperative nurses</td>
<td>evaluate effect of educational interventions on perioperative nurses' self-reported knowledge and practice in relation to PIP</td>
<td>PIP educational intervention knowledge of assessment of PI stage, nursing care for patients with Stage 1 and 2 PI practice of PI assessment methods and PIP strategies used in OR</td>
<td>improved practice after intervention, with increased use of a risk assessment tool in conjunction with clinical judgement and verbal handover from OR to PACU, and from PACU to ward no improvements in handover of new PI; incident report completion or repositioning patient no change in use of recommended or non-recommended pressure-relieving strategies in OR after intervention pillows, gel pads and gel overlays were the three most commonly reported devices used for PIP</td>
<td>possible reporting bias because of self-reported survey survey respondents included only perioperative nurses, rather than the full interdisciplinary team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullone et al. 2012, Italy</td>
<td>longitudinal design, 60 days of data collection, and patients were assessed at four time points from preoperative stage to the sixth postoperative day single hospital site consecutive sampling n = 102 patients</td>
<td>assess incidence of intraoperative PI, risk factors and PIP strategies used by nurses from theatre to postoperative day 6</td>
<td>surgical position positioning aids length of surgery type of comorbidity intraoperative used support surfaces outcome: intraoperative and postoperative incidence of PI</td>
<td>83% supine surgical position used intraoperatively 12.1% of patients developed intraoperative stage 1 PI, including the PI location of ear, and over 38% of all PI developed during cardiac surgery patients with a length of surgery over 6.15 hours or on gel mattress (not gel overlays and pad) at greater risk of developing a PI diabetes, cardiac and vascular diseases associated with the occurrence of PI</td>
<td>single site and small sample size, limiting generalisability no control of confounding factors because of clinical variability of the patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin et al. 2011, USA</td>
<td>retrospective review single hospital site n = 86 consecutive operating notes Kraske position in sacrectomy procedure (Andrew OR table) only</td>
<td>evaluate modifications to the standard Kraske positioning to eliminate the risk of facial PI development in patients undergoing sacrectomy by using the Mayfield clamp</td>
<td>using a Mayfield clamp to position head in the Kraske position outcome: postoperative incidence of PI</td>
<td>no facial complications found across 66 sacrectomies the technique of applying a Mayfield clamp in patients positioned in a jackknife position has potential to prevent the development of PI</td>
<td>reliance on secondary data that may be inaccurate or incomplete single site, limiting generalisability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnich et al. 2014, US</td>
<td>quality improvement study pre- and post-intervention</td>
<td>reduce incidence of PI after implementation of process change at this hospital</td>
<td>process changes: early detection, the method of two nurses completing a skin check immediately after surgery, the use of ‘in-the-moment’ root cause analysis outcome: the incidence of PI</td>
<td>identified individual roles in preoperative, intraoperative and postoperative stages in relation to PIP: preoperative – focusing on identifying risks intraoperative – focusing on implementing PIP strategies postoperative – focusing on assessment and reporting if PI acquired incidence of SAPUs declined since program implementation</td>
<td>sample size or sampling methods not reported single site, limiting generalisability selective reporting bias, as no baseline data reported no control group used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: OR = operating room, PACU = Post Anaesthesia Care Unit, PI = pressure injury, PIP = pressure injury prevention, SAPU = surgical acquired pressure ulcer.
Discussion of findings

All selected studies used quantitative methodology. Half (five) of the studies were from the US, and three from Europe. Seven studies used prospective research approaches, and eight studies consecutive sampling methods. The majority (7/10) of the included articles were conducted at a single hospital site.

Three included articles examined support surfaces, and two of these used randomised controlled trial approaches. In this review, operating table mattresses (i.e. foam, gel or water-filled mattresses), various overlays on the mattress (i.e. air, water, gel, foam or a combination of these), and positioning aids (i.e. arm board, facial pillow, pillow, gel pad or heel pad) were used for different surgical positions. However, the effectiveness of these support surfaces and positioning aids varied. In the literature, higher specification foam mattress and/or overlays in the operating room to the standard hospital foam mattress to prevent or reduce the incidence of intraoperative PI is recommended. However, increased incidence of developing PI was reported when support surfaces were in use with other positioning aids or warming devices, for example, the combined use of warming devices and two-inch foam or gel mattress, or the use of gel mattress, or the use of foam overlays on water-filled warming mattress.

Apart from support surfaces, various positioning aids are used for surgical positioning to avoid potential tissue injury, as patients’ weight cannot be evenly distributed on the operating table in certain surgical positions, for example, using facial positioners/ pillows to reduce interface pressure at patients’ forehead and chin in the prone position during spinal surgery, using heel support in prone position on the operating table, or using pillows, blankets, gel pads and foam pads to reduce interface pressure intraoperatively. However, one study reported the use of sheets and blankets to position patients decreased the effectiveness of support surfaces and caused additional interface pressure.

Four included articles focused on risk factors and/or incidence of PI, for example, using warming devices in the preoperative to postoperative phases, an important thermoregulation strategy, to prevent postoperative hypothermia and PI. The commonly referred to warming devices in this review were limited to the Bair Hugger™, warmed blankets and operating bed mattresses. However, the warming devices in combined use with certain support surfaces increased the risk of PI development. These results reflect other findings reported in the literature relative to the association of tissue damage and increased skin temperature, where pressure and time remained constant. More recently, Yoshimura et al. suggested hyperthermia was independently related to intraoperative-origin PI development when the length of surgery was over six hours.

One included article focused on educational interventions to improve perioperative health professionals’ PIP practice, including communication and the use of positioning aids. Effective interprofessional communication, such as routine documentation, is an important PIP strategy. Sutherland-Fraser et al. and Sewchuk et al. suggested all members of perioperative teams, rather than members of just a single discipline, e.g. nursing, should collectively be involved in communication around PIP. This recommendation is echoed in the broader literature. However, there are barriers to effective communication in surgery, including inadequate verbal handover and documentation. In two of the review studies, improvements were noted in verbal communication and documentation following an educational intervention, and in postoperative PI incidence.

One included article focused on the use of medical devices to prevent intraoperative HAPI. The use of medical devices and/or equipment related to PI accounted for approximately 50 per cent of HAPI development, similar to what has been reported elsewhere. Those patients with a medical device were 2.4 times more likely to develop a PI in an atypical place and later during their hospital admission. PI related to medical devices is more likely to occur in certain locations in the body, such as the head, face, neck and ears, which are areas characterised by less subcutaneous tissue, for which PI progression can be rapid. Therefore, the location of PI is one of the significant indicators that differentiates medical device–related PI and non-medical device–related PI in the operating room.

In this review, Nilsson reported no association between the number of monitoring devices on the patients’ arms and the development of PI. However, Goodwin et al. found that using a Mayfield clamp to position patients’ head in jackknife surgical position potentially prevented the development of PI. Further, no other reviewed studies examined medical devices and/or equipment use in relation to PIP. As Apold and Rydych suggested, there is a lack of consensus on best practice for the inspection and management of skin around medical devices in relation to intervals for repositioning devices that can be removed for pressure.
relief purposes and processes for replacing ill-fitting devices.

Minnich et al16 focused on perioperative skin inspection for PIP purposes. Skin inspection, an essential perioperative PIP assessment was not the focus but has been mentioned in other reviewed studies12,20,21. Skin inspection was compromised because of non-adherence to the clinical practice guidelines. This was related to staff’s inadequate knowledge of using the guidelines, negative attitudes towards PIP because of lack of time or nursing staff, lack of awareness of PIP or involvement of practitioners at all levels, as identified in the reviewed studies and the broader literature12,20,34,39–43. In this review, frequent skin inspection as a PIP strategy has been recommended, especially during the intraoperative phase when the patient is positioned according to the surgical procedure, and at each perioperative stage 16,19,20. Two studies found increased use of skin assessment tools in relation to perioperative PIP following educational interventions12,20.

Postoperative PI incidence was measured in most included studies (nine out of ten) at different time points, from following a procedure until 30 days postoperative 9,12–19, as the presentation of PI originating from the intraoperative phase may be delayed13,44. One reviewed quality improvement study16 did not specify the breakdown of location or stage of postoperative PI’s in its sample, and postoperative PI was only reported in general terms following process change. Therefore, it is difficult to accurately ascertain the incidence of perioperative-originated PI.

The most often reported locations of postoperative PI such as the coccyx and/or heel and/or buttock are related to supine surgical position being the most common for surgery12,13,17,18, and the forehead and/or chin in prone or jackknife positions13,45. Patients undergoing cardiac and vascular surgery were identified as being at greater risk of developing PI postoperatively than in other surgical specialties due to associated length of surgery and/or less repositioning during surgery12,13,17,18. A number of studies assessed skin at different postoperative time points for up to seven days following surgery, with stage one or two PI frequently reported12,13,17,18. More studies identified the multiple risk factors associated with postoperative PI, and tested some interventions for postoperative PIP e.g. the use of pressure-redistribution surfaces13,44.

In summary, five key PIP strategies based on modifiable PI risk factors were identified in the review and were also supported in the current clinical practice guidelines8. The frequency of the five PIP strategies reviewed in the selected articles is displayed in Table 2. Support surfaces in relation to surgical position were frequently examined 13–15,17–20, while thermoregulation9 and the use of medical devices and/or equipment were less frequently reported12,20.

All studies had limitations relative to their single-site approach12,13,19, small sample sizes12,13,19, use of convenient sampling methods12,15,18–20, little to no control of confounders12,15 and use of secondary data12,16. There was also possible reporting bias (i.e. self-reported survey was used) in one study16, possible performance bias (i.e. no blinding to data collectors or staff) in two studies12,13 and a lack of representativeness (i.e. the sample obtained was not representative of the population) in two studies12,16.

While the main focus of the selected articles was different, there were some similarities in the selection of PIP risk factors and strategies, as shown in Table 3. Patients undergoing cardiac surgery were the population of interest in four studies12,13,17,18. In addition to other identified risk factors, length of surgery was found to be a risk factor associated with developing PI in three studies12,13,18, while another study found no such association16. Patients’ comorbidities were examined in two studies, with positive associations found with PI development13,18.

**Limitations and strengths**

This review has several limitations related to data searching and study methods and appraisal. Some papers may have been missed, even though the search was systematic.
and the terms used were broad. Some selected studies used secondary data that could have been inaccurate or incomplete. Although there may have been some variability of data appraisal because of individual perceptions, attempts were made to reduce this via the independent assessment by two raters, with adjudication by a third rater when necessary. As such, this method achieved a high ICC. The overall quality of this review was strengthened by the use of a systematic and rigorous approach when undertaking this review. 1,10.

**Conclusion**

This paper has presented a comprehensive review of the literature related to PIP in the perioperative setting. Five key PIP strategies were identified and categorised according to the published literature. Implementation of these key five PIP strategies should be based on consideration of patients, cases-related and environmental factors. This review has identified a lack of research related to the observed PIP practices of health professionals in the perioperative setting. Therefore, a further research study is needed to address this knowledge gap.
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