

# Medical Policy



## Title: Vacuum Assisted Wound Closure (VAC)

### Professional

Original Effective Date: February 1, 2004  
 Revision Date(s): November 3, 2005;  
 August 3, 2006; February 7, 2007;  
 May 8, 2007; January 30, 2012;  
 January 1, 2015; April 30, 2015;  
 March 2, 2016; February 15, 2017;  
 June 23, 2017; February 15, 2018;  
 February 18, 2019; July 17, 2020;  
 May 7, 2021  
 Current Effective Date: June 23, 2017

### Institutional

Original Effective Date: February 1, 2006  
 Revision Date(s): August 3, 2006;  
 February 7, 2007, May 8, 2007;  
 January 30, 2012; January 1, 2015;  
 April 30, 2015; March 2, 2016;  
 February 15, 2017; June 23, 2017;  
 February 15, 2018; February 18, 2019;  
 July 17, 2020; May 7, 2021  
 Current Effective Date: June 23, 2017

**State and Federal mandates and health plan member contract language, including specific provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. To verify a member's benefits, contact [Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Customer Service](#).**

**The BCBSKS Medical Policies contained herein are for informational purposes and apply only to members who have health insurance through BCBSKS or who are covered by a self-insured group plan administered by BCBSKS. Medical Policy for FEP members is subject to FEP medical policy which may differ from BCBSKS Medical Policy.**

**The medical policies do not constitute medical advice or medical care. Treating health care providers are independent contractors and are neither employees nor agents of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas and are solely responsible for diagnosis, treatment and medical advice.**

**If your patient is covered under a different Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, please refer to the Medical Policies of that plan.**

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard wound care</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Symptoms</li> <li>Change in disease status</li> <li>Morbid events</li> <li>Quality of life</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
<b>Individuals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portable, single-use outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard wound care</li> <li>• Standard negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Change in disease status</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With chronic pressure ulcers</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard wound care</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Change in disease status</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compression therapy</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Change in disease status</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portable, single-use outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard wound care</li> <li>• Standard negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Change in disease status</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With burn wounds</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard wound care</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Change in disease status</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With traumatic or surgical wounds</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard wound care</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Change in disease status</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With any wound type (acute or nonhealing)</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portable single-use outpatient negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard negative pressure wound therapy</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symptoms</li> <li>• Change in disease status</li> <li>• Morbid events</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>

**DESCRIPTION**

Negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) involves the use of a negative pressure or suction device to aspirate and remove fluids, debris, and infectious materials from the wound bed to promote the formation of granulation tissue and wound healing.

**OBJECTIVE**

The objectives of this evidence review are to evaluate whether negative pressure wound therapy improves outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of pressure ulcers, diabetic foot ulcers, venous ulcers, burn wounds, and traumatic or surgical wounds; and to assess the evidence on the use of portable NPWT devices.

**BACKGROUND  
CHRONIC WOUNDS****Management**

The management and treatment of chronic wounds, including decubitus ulcers, is challenging. Most chronic wounds will heal only if the underlying cause (i.e., venous stasis, pressure, infection) is addressed. Also, cleaning the wound to remove nonviable tissue, microorganisms, and foreign bodies is essential to create optimal conditions for either re-epithelialization (i.e., healing by secondary intention) or preparation for wound closure with skin grafts or flaps (i.e., healing by primary intention). Therefore, debridement, irrigation, whirlpool treatments, and wet-to-dry dressings are common components of chronic wound care.

Negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) involves the use of a negative pressure therapy or suction device to aspirate and remove fluids, debris, and infectious materials from the wound bed to promote the formation of granulation tissue. The devices may also be used as an adjunct to surgical therapy or as an alternative to surgery in a debilitated patient. Although the exact mechanism has not been elucidated, it is hypothesized that negative pressure contributes to wound healing by removing excess interstitial fluid, increasing the vascularity of the wound, reducing edema, and/or creating beneficial mechanical forces that lead to cell growth and expansion.

A nonpowered (mechanical) NPWT system has also been developed; the Smart Negative Pressure Wound Care System is portable and lightweight (3 oz) and can be worn underneath clothing. This system consists of a cartridge, dressing, and strap; the cartridge acts as the negative pressure source. The system is reported to generate negative pressure levels similar to other NPWT systems. This system is fully disposable.

The focus of this evidence review is the use of NPWT in the outpatient setting. It is recognized that patients may begin using the device in the inpatient setting as they transition to the outpatient setting.

**REGULATORY STATUS**

Negative pressure therapy or suction devices cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for treating chronic wounds include, but are not limited to: Vacuum-Assisted Closure® Therapy (V.A.C., also known as negative pressure wound therapy; KCI); Versatile 1™ (V1) Wound Vacuum System (Blue Sky Medical), RENASYS™ EZ PLUS (Smith & Nephew), Foryou NPWT NP32 Device (Foryou Medical Electronics), SVED® (Cardinal Health), and PICO Single Use Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System (Smith & Nephew).

Portable systems include the RENASYS™ GO (Smith & Nephew), XLR8 PLUS (Genadyne Biotechnologies), extriCARE® 2400 NPWT System (Devon Medical), the V.A.C. Via™ (KCI), NPWT PRO to GO (Cardinal Health), and the PICO Single Use Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System

(Smith & Nephew). The Prevena™ Incision Management System (KCI) is designed specifically for closed surgical incisions.

A nonpowered NPWT device, the SNaP® Wound Care System (Spiracur, acquired by Acelity in 2015), is a class II device requiring notification to market but not having the FDA premarket approval. In 2009, it was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) pathway (K081406) and is designed to remove small amounts of exudate from chronic, traumatic, dehisced, acute, or subacute wounds and diabetic and pressure ulcers.

NPWT devices with instillation include the V.A.C. VERAFL0™ Therapy device (KCI/Acelity). It was cleared for marketing in 2011 by the FDA through the 510(k) pathway (K103156) and is designed to allow for controlled delivery and drainage of topical antiseptic and antimicrobial wound treatment solutions and suspensions. It is to be used with the V.A.C. Ultra unit, which is commercially marketed for use in the hospital setting. Instillation is also available with Simultaneous Irrigation™ Technology tubing sets (Cardinal Health) for use with Cardinal Health SVED® and PRO NPWT devices, however, its use is not indicated for use in a home care setting (K161418).

No NPWT device has been cleared for use in infants and children.

In November 2009, the FDA issued an alert concerning complications and deaths associated with NPWT systems. An updated alert was issued in February 2011.<sup>1</sup>

FDA product code: OMP.

**POLICY**

Predetermination is strongly encouraged:

- A. Vacuum Assisted Wound Closure (VAC) is considered **medically necessary** in the home setting to promote the closure of chronic wounds when initiated in the home setting, or in the hospital or skilled nursing facility prior to discharge, when **ONE** of the following chronic wound conditions is present:
- Pressure ulcers – Stage III or Stage IV, **OR**
  - Venous or arterial insufficiency ulcers, **OR**
  - Dehisced wounds or wounds with exposed hardware or bone, **OR**
  - Neuropathic ulcers, **OR**
  - Complications of a surgically created (i.e., large incisional hernia with mesh) or traumatic wound or diabetic lower extremity ulcer where accelerated granulation therapy is necessary which cannot be achieved by other available topical wound treatment, **OR**
  - Post sternotomy wound infection or mediastinitis

**AND ALL OF THE FOLLOWING**

- It is used as an adjunct therapy or as an alternative to surgery; **AND**
- There is support to change the device and provide home care for the wound; **AND**
- Patient selection criteria have been met (see Policy Guidelines, below)

NOTE: For VAC to be initiated in the home setting, progressive wound healing has failed following 30 days of conservative wound treatment. (Treatment less than 30 days can be reviewed by a consultant if medical records are provided).

- B. VAC therapy post skin grafting will be considered **medically necessary** for up to 2 weeks. Continuation beyond will be reviewed on a case by case basis.
- C. Post breast reduction surgery, VAC is considered **medically necessary** if the patient's BMI is 40 or more. Approval length: 1 week.
- D. Non-electric vacuum assisted wound therapy (e.g., SNaP™ Wound Care Device) is considered **experimental / investigational** for all conditions.
- E. Portable, battery-powered, single-use (disposable) vacuum assisted wound therapy devices (e.g., the PICO™ Single Use Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System or the V.A.C. Via™ Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System) are considered **experimental / investigational** for all conditions.
- F. Post-surgical VAC placement on new or acute wounds will be reviewed on a case by case basis.
- G. All other applications for VAC therapy are considered **not medically necessary**.

**Policy Guidelines**

Complete healing of a wound would normally be anticipated if all bone, cartilage, tendons, and foreign material were completely covered, healthy granulation were present to within 5 mm of the surface, and the wound edges were reduced to 2 cm in width or diameter.

**Patient Selection Criteria**

1. The criteria listed below, as items a. through f. must be met for all conditions:
  - a. The wound has been débrided and is free of all the following:
    - Nonviable or necrotic tissue (eschar)
    - Macroscopic contamination
    - Non-enteric and unexplored fistulae
    - Malignant or metastatic cells
    - Active bleeding
    - Pressure on wound
  - b. The wound does NOT contain exposed arteries or veins
  - c. The patient is free from active osteomyelitis
  - d. The wound depth is at least 1 mm or greater. Wounds with a depth of <1 mm cannot accommodate the sponge / foam.
  - e. The medical record documents that the patient is NOT nutritionally compromised, or if nutritionally compromised, the medical record documents appropriate interventions have been implemented.
  - f. The medical record documents that the patient is willing and able to comply with using continuous or intermittent VAC application 22 of 24 hours per day.
  - g. The additional criteria listed below must be met for specific wound types and treatment regimens:
    - 1) Neuropathic ulcers:  
The patient has been on a comprehensive management program and evidence of adequate vascularization and appropriate treatment to relieve pressure on a foot ulcer has been rendered.
    - 2) Venous or arterial insufficiency ulcers:  
The patient has had compressive bandages and/or garment and leg elevation consistently applied and/or utilized under physician supervision and ambulation has been encouraged.
  - h. VAC approved may be allowed up to 4 weeks before re-review.

**Continuation of Treatment**

1. For coverage to continue beyond initial approval period, the medical records (progress notes) should indicate the following:
  - a. Weekly assessment of the dimensions and characteristics of the wound(s) by a licensed health care professional
  - b. Documentation of progressive wound healing without intervening complications at least monthly.
  - c. Discontinue VAC if wound shows no progress for 2 weeks.
  - d. Maximum duration of VAC approval, without consultant review, is 4 months.

## RATIONALE

This evidence review has been updated regularly with searches of the PubMed database. The most recent literature update was performed through October 19, 2020.

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are the length of life, quality of life (QOL), and ability to function<sup>3</sup> including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance, and quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The RCT is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

This review was informed by a 2000 TEC Assessment that evaluated negative pressure therapy of pressure ulcers, venous ulcers, and diabetic ulcers.<sup>2</sup> Literature updates for this review have focused on comparative trials with the features described in the 2000 TEC Assessment (e.g., enrollment of patients with wounds refractory to standard treatment, randomization, optimal standard wound care treatment in the control arm, and clinically important endpoints). Also, literature has been sought on the potential benefits of negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) for the healing of acute wounds.

NPWT devices are classified as either powered (i.e., requiring an electrical power source or batteries) or nonpowered (mechanical). Most evidence found in the literature is for electrically powered devices with large canisters (e.g., the Vacuum-Assisted Closure Therapy device [V.A.C. system]), and so the main discussion of evidence refers to this type of device. A number of portable devices have entered the market and are particularly relevant for use in the outpatient setting. Some portable devices are designed specifically for surgical incisions. Evidence on the newer portable devices is discussed following the review of evidence on the larger electrically powered devices.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

## Systematic Reviews

The authors of a systematic review for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (2014) reported that due to insufficient evidence, they were unable to draw conclusions about the efficacy or safety of NPWT in the home setting.<sup>4</sup> There were 3 retrospective cohort studies on diabetic foot ulcers and arterial ulcers, an RCT and 2 retrospective cohort studies on pressure ulcers, and a retrospective cohort on venous ulcers. Six studies used the V.A.C., and the other used the Smart Negative Pressure (SNaP) Wound Care System device. Reviewers found that interpretation of available data was limited by variability in the types of comparator groups, methodologic limitations, and poor reporting of outcomes.<sup>5</sup>

Another Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality assessment was performed to inform the HCPCS coding decisions for NPWT devices. This 2009 assessment found no studies showing a therapeutic distinction between different NPWT devices.<sup>6</sup>

A 2020 Cochrane review update evaluated NPWT compared with standard dressings for surgical wound healing by primary closure.<sup>7</sup> Forty-four RCTs were included for analysis (n=7447). NPWT was associated with a reduced risk of surgical site infection (SSI) (31 studies [n=6204]; RR 0.66; 95% CI, 0.55 to 0.80;  $I^2=23\%$ ). However, subgroup analysis by surgery type did not maintain a significant benefit for orthopedic, abdominal, or mixed/general surgeries. Treatment benefit for SSI was significant in clean and clean-contaminated procedures only. No significant difference was found for the rates of mortality and wound dehiscence. No significant benefit was seen for rates of reoperations or hospital readmissions. Certainty of evidence was deemed low to moderate per GRADE criteria. Studies were generally limited by imprecision and unclear or high-risk of bias in allocation concealment and blinding of outcome assessors. The analysis was also limited by inclusion of studies with mixed or unclear intervention types and no subgroup analysis for traditional or portable, single-use systems.

A systematic review and meta-analysis by Li et al (2019) was conducted comparing the effectiveness and safety of NPWT with standard surgical dressing or conventional therapy for prevention of SSI.<sup>8</sup> A total of 45 RCTs assessing 6624 adult patients were included for analysis. Studies utilized a variety of NPWT devices, including V.A.C., PICO, and Prevena systems. Inclusion criteria did not impose restrictions on SSI grading systems or on surgery types. Surgeries for infected or chronic non-healing wounds including diabetic, venous, and arterial ulcers were excluded. Overall, NPWT was associated with a 40% reduction in SSI risk compared to control, with moderate heterogeneity (RR 0.58; 95% CI, 0.49 to 0.69;  $I^2=19\%$ ;  $p<0.00001$ ). This significant reduction in risk was particularly maintained in high-risk surgical patients (32 RCTs; RR 0.60; 95% CI, 0.50 to 0.73;  $I^2=23\%$ ;  $p<0.00001$ ). There was no significant effect of NPWT on wound dehiscence, hematoma occurrence, hospital admission, or length of hospital stay. The certainty of the evidence, based on GRADE criteria was graded as low to very low due to serious risk of bias stemming from lack of blinding and methodological flaws in SSI assessment and standardization. The authors suggest that further studies are warranted to elucidate the optimal protocol for NPWT utilization.

## **DIABETIC LOWER-EXTREMITY ULCERS AND AMPUTATION WOUNDS**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of diabetic foot ulcers and amputation wounds?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is outpatient NPWT, which is administered in wound clinics and the home care setting. Outpatient NPWT does not include treatment at extended care facilities.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include standard wound care.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Though not completely standardized, follow-up for diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds symptoms would typically occur in the months to years after starting treatment.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

## **Review of Evidence Systematic Reviews**

A 2013 Cochrane review of NPWT for treating foot wounds in patients with diabetes<sup>9</sup>, was updated in 2018 to include 11 RCTs (n=972) with sample sizes ranging from 15 to 341 participants.<sup>10</sup> Two studies addressed post-amputation wounds and all other studies described treatment of diabetic foot ulcers. Only 1 study comparing NPWT and moist dressings for post-amputation wounds reported a follow-up time (n=162), and a statistically significant improvement in the proportion of wounds healed (RR 1.44, 95% CI, 1.03 to 2.01) was demonstrated after a follow-up duration of 16 weeks. The median time to healing was 21 days shorter for the NPWT group (hazard ratio 1.91, 95% CI, 1.21 to 2.99) compared with moist dressings. Data from 3 studies suggest that people with diabetic foot ulcers allocated to NPWT may be at reduced risk of amputation compared to moist dressings (RR 0.33, 95% CI, 0.15 to 0.70,  $I^2=0\%$ ). Reviewers concluded that there was some evidence to suggest that NPWT was more effective than standard care, but the findings were uncertain due to the risk of bias in the unblinded studies. Reviewers recommended further study to reduce uncertainty around decision-making.

A systematic review by Wynn and Freeman (2019) evaluating NPWT for diabetic foot ulcers reported similar benefits in wound healing and the reduction of amputation incidence.<sup>11</sup> However, reviewers emphasized limitations in the present body of evidence, including methodological flaws such as the absence of validated tools for the measurement of wound depth and area, lack of statistical power calculations, and heterogeneity in pressure settings employed during therapy.

## **Randomized Controlled Trials**

The largest study of NPWT for diabetic foot ulcers was a multicenter industry-sponsored RCT by Blume et al (2008) that compared NPWT with advanced moist wound therapy.<sup>12</sup> Included were 342 patients with Wagner grade 2 or grade 3 foot ulcers of at least 2 cm<sup>2</sup>; the chronicity of the ulcers was not described. Based on intention-to-treat analysis, a greater proportion of NPWT-treated foot ulcers achieved the primary endpoint of complete ulcer closure (43.2% vs. 28.9%, p=0.007) within the 112-day active treatment phase. For the 240 (72%) patients who completed the active treatment phase, 60.8% of NPWT-treated ulcers closed compared with 40.0% of ulcers treated with advanced moist wound therapy. NPWT patients also experienced significantly fewer secondary amputations (4.1% vs. 10.2%, p=0.035).

## **Nonrandomized Studies**

Borys et al (2018) conducted a prospective observational study to assess the short-term efficacy, safety, and long-term outcomes of NPWT in treating diabetic foot ulcers. Researchers assigned 75 patients to NPWT (n=53) or standard care (n=22) based on wound size. Analysis after 1-year follow-up showed similar results for both groups, leading researchers to conclude NPWT is a safe alternative to but not necessarily more efficacious than the current standard of care. Limitations include small sample size, the observational design, and nonconsideration of risk factors other than wound size.<sup>13</sup>

## **Section Summary: Diabetic Lower-Extremity Ulcers and Amputation Wounds**

The evidence on NPWT for diabetic lower-extremity ulcers and amputation wounds includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Although there is some uncertainty due to the risk of bias in

the unblinded studies, there were higher rates of wound healing and fewer amputations with NPWT, supporting its use for diabetic lower-extremity ulcers and amputation wounds.

## **PORTABLE, SINGLE-USE THERAPY FOR DIABETIC LOWER-EXTREMITY ULCERS AND AMPUTATION WOUNDS**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of portable, single-use outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does portable, single-use NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of diabetic foot ulcers and amputation wounds?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with nonhealing diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is portable, single-use outpatient NPWT (powered or nonpowered), which is administered in wound clinics and the home care setting. Outpatient NPWT does not include treatment at extended care facilities.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include standard wound care and standard, reusable NPWT devices.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Though not completely standardized, follow-up for diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds symptoms would typically occur in the months to years after starting treatment.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.

- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

## Review of Evidence

### PICO Dressing

PICO is a portable single-use NPWT system that comes with 2 sterile dressings and has a lifespan of 7 to 14 days.

Kirsner et al (2019) published an RCT that allocated 164 patients with venous leg ulcers (VLU; n=104) or diabetic foot ulcers (DFU; n=60) to treatment with PICO single-use NPWT (s-NPWT; N=80) or traditional, reusable NPWT systems (t-NPWT; N=84).<sup>14</sup> Prior to randomization, patients were excluded if a reduction in target ulcer area  $\geq 30\%$  was achieved with compression or offloading during a 2 week run-in period as a way to exclude 'quick healers'. Three patients in the t-NPWT arm were excluded from the intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis. For the per protocol (PP) analysis, 16 (20%) and 30 (37%) patients were excluded from the s-NPWT and t-NPWT arms, respectively. Randomization was stratified by wound type and wound size. The PICO dressing was set to provide -80 mmHg of negative pressure. Choice of traditional, NPWT device manufacturer and pressure setting was at the discretion of the treating physician, with an average pressure of -118.3 mmHg (median, -125 mmHg; SD, 23.4 mmHg) applied.

The study intended to test for noninferiority in the percentage change of target ulcer area with s-NPWT vs t-NPWT over the course of a 12 week treatment period, with a noninferiority margin of 12.5%. The analysis was performed with the PP population to account for dropouts and then repeated on the full analysis set (ITT). Secondary outcomes included wound closure rate, time to wound closure, and quality of life. Participants and investigators were not blinded, and it is unclear if the study utilized blinded assessors. Patients were seen weekly in outpatient wound centers. After adjustment for baseline wound area, pooled study site, wound type, and wound duration at baseline, the mean percentage difference in wound area over 12 weeks was 27% (96.9% vs 69.9%;  $P=0.003$ ) in the PP analysis and 39.1% (90.24% vs 51%;  $P<0.001$ ) in the ITT analysis. This treatment effect was also significant in the DFU subgroup ( $P=0.031$ ). However, confidence intervals were not reported for the primary outcome.

Confirmed wound closure (ITT) was achieved in 54 (33.5%) patients (s-NPWT, 36 [45%]; t-NPWT, 18 [22%]), with an adjusted odds ratio of 0.294 (95% CI, 0.135 to 0.638;  $P=0.002$ ) for all wound types and 0.161 (95% CI, 0.035 to 0.744;  $P=0.020$ ) for DFU. However, the subgroup analysis for DFU patients in the PP population was not significant.

The median estimate of the time to achieve confirmed closure was 77 days for s-NPWT (95% CI, 49 to undefined limit) and could not be calculated for t-NPWT due to the low number of patients achieving this endpoint. No significant differences were noted in health-related quality of life between baseline and exit visits. Fifty-seven treatment-related adverse events were reported, 16 related to s-NPWT in 12 patients and 41 related to t-NPWT in 29 patients. Wound-related adverse events included increase in target ulcer size, inability to tolerate NPWT, and periwound

skin maceration, resulting in study discontinuation by 3 treated with s-NPWT and 9 treated with t-NPWT. While the PICO dressing met noninferiority, change in wound area is not a primary health outcome of interest due to its inherent heterogeneity. Additionally, the chosen treatment duration may have of insufficient duration to accurately assess effects on wound closure. Required use of fillers, a higher level of negative pressure, and utilization of devices from various t-NPWT manufacturers may have impacted findings. Only 20% of patients in the s-NPWT arm were treated with fillers, mainly in those with DFU.

### **SNaP Wound Care System**

The portable, nonpowered (mechanical) gauze-based SNaP Wound Care System became available in 2009. The device is designed to remove small amounts of exudate from chronic, traumatic, dehisced, acute, or subacute wounds and diabetic and pressure ulcers.

Armstrong et al (2011) reported on results of a planned interim analysis of an RCT comparing the SNaP Wound Care System with the V.A.C. Therapy for the treatment of chronic lower-extremity wounds.<sup>15</sup> Final results of this industry-sponsored multicenter noninferiority trial were reported in 2012.<sup>16</sup> The trial enrolled 132 patients with lower-extremity venous or diabetic ulcers with a surface area between 1 cm<sup>2</sup> and 100 cm<sup>2</sup> and diameter less than 10 cm present for more than 30 days despite appropriate care. Approximately 30% of patients in this study had diabetic ulcers, and no subgroup analyses were conducted. Dressings were changed per the manufacturer's direction: 2 times per week in the SNaP group and 3 times per week in the V.A.C. group. Patients were assessed for up to 16 weeks or until complete wound closure; 83 (63%) patients completed the study. Intention-to-treat analysis with the last observation carried forward showed noninferiority in the primary outcome of wound size reduction at 4, 8, 12, and 16 weeks. When adjusted for differences in wound size at baseline, SNaP-treated subjects showed noninferiority to V.A.C.-treated subjects at 4, 12, and 16 weeks. Kaplan-Meier analysis showed no significant difference in complete wound closure between the 2 groups. At the final follow-up, 65.6% of the V.A.C. group and 63.6% of the SNaP group had wound closure. Survey data indicated that dressing changes required less time with the SNaP device and use of the SNaP device interfered less with mobility and activity than the V.A.C. device.

A 2010 retrospective study with historical controls compared NPWT using the SNaP device (n=28) with wound care protocols using Apligraf, Regranex, and skin grafting (n=42) for the treatment of lower-extremity ulcers.<sup>17</sup> Seven (25%) patients in the SNaP-treated group could not tolerate the treatment and were discontinued from the study because of complications; they were considered treatment failures. Between-group estimates of time-to-wound healing by Kaplan-Meier analysis favored the SNaP treatment group. This study is limited by the use of historical controls, multiple modalities to treat controls, and a large number of dropouts. Subgroup analyses for patients with diabetic (50%) and venous (50%) ulcers were not available. The authors noted that patients in the SNaP-treated group might have benefited from being in an experimental environment, particularly because wounds in this group were seen twice per week compared with variable follow-up in historical controls.

### **Section Summary: Portable, Single-Use Therapy for Diabetic Lower-Extremity Ulcers and Amputation Wounds**

The evidence on portable, single-use NPWT for diabetic ulcers and amputation wounds includes an RCT of the PICO device and an RCT of the nonpowered SNaP System. A 2019 RCT compared the PICO device with standard NPWT in outpatients with diabetic and venous ulcers. In this

study, the PICO device demonstrated noninferiority for wound area reduction. A statistically significant benefit in complete wound closure was noted for patients with diabetic ulcers, but was not duplicated in the per protocol population due to a high number of exclusions. Interpretation of this study is limited by variable device settings and short follow-up duration. One study of the SNaP System showed noninferiority to a V.A.C. device for wound size reduction. No significant difference in complete wound closure was reported. Interpretation of this study is limited by a high loss to follow-up. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients powered to detect differences in complete wound closure are needed.

## **CHRONIC PRESSURE ULCERS**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with chronic pressure ulcers.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of chronic pressure ulcers?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with chronic pressure ulcers.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is outpatient NPWT, which is administered in wound clinics and the home care setting. Outpatient NPWT does not include treatment at extended care facilities.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include standard wound care.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Though not completely standardized, follow-up for chronic pressure ulcers would typically occur in the months to years after starting treatment.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- a. To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.

- b. In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- c. To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- d. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- e. Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

## **Review of Evidence**

### **Systematic Reviews**

A 2015 Cochrane review included 4 RCTs of NPWT (total n=149 patients) for treating pressure ulcers in any care setting, although most of the patients were treated in a hospital setting.<sup>9</sup> Three trials were considered to be at high-risk of bias, and all evidence was considered to be of very low-quality. Only 1 trial reported on complete wound healing, which occurred in only 1 of the 12 study participants. Reviewers concluded there is high uncertainty about the potential benefits and/or harms for this indication.

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

One representative trial, from 2003 (noted in the 2015 Cochrane review as “awaiting further information from the authors”), randomized 24 patients with pressure ulcers of the pelvic region to NPWT or standard wound care.<sup>18</sup> All patients with pelvic pressure ulcers were eligible for enrollment and were not required to be refractory to standard treatment. There was no significant group difference for the main outcome measure, time to 50% reduction of wound volume (mean, 27 days in the NPWT group vs. 28 days in the control group). Findings were limited by the small number of patients in the study, the possibility that the control group might not have received optimal wound management, and lack of information on the time to complete wound healing.

### **Section Summary: Chronic Pressure Ulcers**

The evidence on outpatient NPWT for chronic pressure ulcers includes RCTs and systematic reviews. However, all trials were of low-quality and at high-risk of bias. Also, most patients were treated in an inpatient setting.

## **LOWER-EXTREMITY ULCERS DUE TO VENOUS INSUFFICIENCY**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is outpatient NPWT, which is administered in wound clinics and the home care setting. Outpatient NPWT does not include treatment at extended care facilities.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include compression therapy and standard wound care.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Though not completely standardized, follow-up for lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency symptoms would typically occur in the months to years after starting treatment.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- a. To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- b. In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- c. To assess longer-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- d. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- e. Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

### **Review of Evidence**

#### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

A 2015 Cochrane review of NPWT for venous insufficiency identified a single RCT with 60 patients.<sup>19</sup> This trial, published by Vuerstaek et al (2006), was performed in an inpatient setting in conjunction with skin grafts and compared the efficacy of NPWT using the V.A.C. system (n=30) with conventional moist wound care (n=30) in patients hospitalized with chronic venous and/or arterial leg ulcers of greater than 6 months in duration.<sup>20</sup> Full-thickness punch skin grafts from the thigh were applied, followed by 4 days of NPWT or conventional care to assure complete graft adherence. Each group then received standard care with nonadhesive dressings and compression therapy until complete healing (primary outcome) occurred. The median time to complete healing was 29 days in the NPWT group and 45 days in the control group (p=0.001). Ninety percent of ulcers treated with NPWT healed within 43 days, compared with 48% in the control group. These results would suggest that NPWT significantly hastened wound healing, although the use of skin autografts makes it difficult to discern the contribution of NPWT to the primary outcome. The 2015 Cochrane review did not identify any RCT evidence on the

effectiveness of NPWT as a primary treatment for leg ulcers, nor was there any evidence on the use of NPWT in the home setting.

### **Section Summary: Lower-Extremity Ulcers due to Venous Insufficiency**

A single RCT has been identified on use of NPWT for the treatment of lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency in the hospital setting. No evidence was identified on treatment in the home setting.

## **PORTABLE, SINGLE-USE THERAPY FOR LOWER-EXTREMITY ULCERS DUE TO VENOUS INSUFFICIENCY**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of portable, single-use outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does portable, single-use NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with nonhealing lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is portable, single-use outpatient NPWT (powered or nonpowered), which is administered in wound clinics and the home care setting. Outpatient NPWT does not include treatment at extended care facilities.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include compression therapy, standard wound care, and standard, reusable NPWT devices.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Though not completely standardized, follow-up for lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency symptoms would typically occur in the months to years after starting treatment.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- To assess longer-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

### Review of Evidence

#### PICO Dressing

Kirsner et al (2019) published an RCT that allocated 164 patients with venous leg ulcers (VLU; n=104) or diabetic foot ulcers (DFU; n=60) to treatment with PICO single-use NPWT (s-NPWT; N=80) or traditional, reusable NPWT systems (t-NPWT; N=84).<sup>14</sup> Additional study details and limitations are summarized previously in indication 2.

The primary outcome measure, mean percentage difference in wound area over 12 weeks, was 27% (96.9% vs 69.9%; P=0.003) in the per protocol (PP) analysis and 39.1% (90.24% vs 51%; P<0.001) in the intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis. This treatment effect was also significant in the VLU subgroup (P=0.007). However, confidence intervals were not reported. Confirmed wound closure (ITT) was achieved in 54 (33.5%) patients (s-NPWT, 36 [45%]; t-NPWT, 18 [22%]), with an adjusted odds ratio of 0.294 (95% CI, 0.135 to 0.638; P=0.002) for all wound types and 0.398 (95% CI, 0.152 to 1.044; P=0.061) for VLU. The subgroup analysis for VLU patients in the PP population was also not significant.

#### SNaP Wound Care System

Armstrong et al (2011) reported on results of a planned interim analysis of an RCT comparing the SNaP Wound Care System with the V.A.C. Therapy for the treatment of chronic lower-extremity wounds.<sup>15</sup> Final results of this industry-sponsored multicenter noninferiority trial were reported in 2012.<sup>16</sup> Approximately 70% of the study population had venous leg ulcers. Additional study details and limitations are summarized previously in indication 2.

A subgroup analysis (2015) of 40 patients with venous leg ulcers who completed the study showed a significant improvement in the percentage of those with complete wound closure treated with SNaP (57.9%) compared with the V.A.C. system (38.2%; p=0.008).<sup>21</sup> However, this study had a high loss to follow-up and lacked a comparison with standard treatment protocols.

#### Section Summary: Portable, Single-Use Therapy for Lower-Extremity Venous Ulcers

The evidence on portable, single-use NPWT for lower-extremity venous ulcers includes an RCT of the PICO device and an RCT of the nonpowered SNaP System. A 2019 RCT compared the PICO device with standard NPWT in outpatients with diabetic and venous ulcers. In this study, the PICO device demonstrated noninferiority for wound area reduction. No significant benefit in complete wound closure was found in patients with venous ulcers. One study of the SNaP System showed noninferiority to a V.A.C. device for wound size reduction. A subgroup analysis of this study found a significant difference in complete wound closure for patients with venous ulcers.

However, interpretation of this study is limited by a high loss to follow-up and a lack of a control group treated with standard dressings. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients powered to detect differences in complete wound closure are needed.

## **BURN WOUNDS**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with burn wounds.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of burn wounds?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with burn wounds.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is outpatient NPWT, which is administered in wound clinics and the home care setting. Outpatient NPWT does not include treatment at extended care facilities.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include standard wound care.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Follow-up at months to years if of interest to monitor relevant outcomes.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- a. To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- b. In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- c. To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- d. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- e. Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

## Review of Evidence

### Randomized Controlled Trials

A 2014 Cochrane review of NPWT for burn wounds identified an interim report (abstract) of an RCT on NPWT in patients with partial-thickness burns.<sup>22</sup> The abstract did not provide enough evidence to draw any conclusions on the efficacy of NPWT on partial-thickness burn wounds.

Not included in the Cochrane review was a trial by Bloemen et al (2012) on the effect of NPWT on graft take in full-thickness burn wounds.<sup>23</sup> This multicenter, 4-armed RCT enrolled 86 patients and compared a split-skin graft with or without a dermal substitute (MatriDerm), with or without NPWT. Outcome measures included graft take at 4 to 7 days after surgery, the rate of wound epithelialization, and scar parameters at 3 and 12 months postoperatively. Graft take, and wound epithelialization did not differ significantly between groups. Most measures of scar quality also did not differ significantly between groups.

An expert panel convened to develop evidence-based recommendations for the use of NPWT reported that the evidence base in 2011 was strongest for the use of NPWT on skin grafts and weakest as a primary treatment for burns.<sup>24</sup>

### Case Series

A retrospective case series by Ehrl et al (2017) examined outcomes for 51 patients treated for burned hands with topical NPWT at a single-center; of the initial 51 patients, only 30 patients (47 hands) completed follow-up, which was conducted an average of 35 months after injury and included physical examination.<sup>25</sup> Before NPWT therapy, patients received escharotomy or superficial debridement if needed, or split-thickness skin grafts for third-degree burns and the NPWT gloves used allowed caregivers to assess patients' fingertips for perfusion. Ergotherapy was initiated following evidence of epithelialization.

Primary endpoints were a dorsal extension of the fingers and capability of complete active fist closure, with the majority of patients achieving 1 or both outcomes: the first endpoint was reached in 85.1% (n=40) of the cases; the second endpoint was reached in 78.7% of hands (n=37). When evaluated using the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand questionnaire (scoring range, 0-100; with 0=no disability), patients with injuries resulting in hypertrophic scarring had significantly worse scores (28.8) than patients without similar scarring (11.7; p<0.05). Despite a number of limitations, including heterogeneity of burned areas (2.5% to 70% throughout the series), the authors acknowledged NPWT as standard treatment at the institution from which these data were drawn.

### Section Summary: Burn Wounds

The evidence on NPWT as a primary treatment of partial-thickness burns is limited. A retrospective case series reported functional outcomes in most patients treated for hand burns with NPWT. One RCT on NPWT for skin grafts showed no benefit for graft take, wound epithelialization, or scar quality.

## TRAUMATIC AND SURGICAL WOUNDS

### Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

The purpose of outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with traumatic or surgical wounds.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of traumatic or surgical wounds?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with traumatic or surgical wounds.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is outpatient NPWT.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include standard wound care.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Follow-up within weeks to months if of interest for outpatient NPWT to monitor relevant outcomes.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- a. To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- b. In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- c. To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- d. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- e. Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

Identified studies have described various wound types treated over periods ranging from several days to several months. Studies also differed by whether NPWT was used for nonhealing wounds or as a prophylactic treatment for surgical wounds in patients at high-risk for nonhealing.

### **Review of Evidence**

#### **Systematic Reviews**

Selected systematic reviews and meta-analyses evaluating the use of NPWT in surgical and/or traumatic wounds are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Summary of SR-MAs of NPWT versus Standard Therapy in Surgical Wounds**

Review	RC T	Other Studies	Participants <sup>1</sup>	N (Range)	Major Outcomes	Study Quality	Relevance
Cochrane (2014) <sup>26</sup> ,	9	0	Individuals with wounds expected to heal by primary intention (e.g., surgical closure, skin grafts)	785	SSI (NSD) Wound dehiscence (NSD) Reoperation (NSD) Seroma/hematoma (NSD) Skin graft failure (NSD)	Unclear or high risk of bias noted	Unclear; inclusion of “home-made” devices and focus on inpatient therapy
De Vries et al (2016) <sup>27</sup> ,	6	15	Individuals treated with prophylactic NPWT in clean and contaminated surgery	RCT: 277 (13-141) Other: 1099 (23-237)	Surgical site infection (RCT: p=0.04; Other: p<0.00001; NSD for trauma/orthopedic surgery)	Low quality of evidence due to lack of blinding in outcome assessment	Unclear; focus on inpatient therapy
Cochrane (2018) <sup>10</sup> ,	7	0	Individuals with open traumatic wounds (open fractures and other types)	1377 (40-586)	Wound infection (NSD)	Unclear or high risk of bias noted	Limited; focus on inpatient therapy

NPWT: negative pressure wound therapy; NSD: no significant difference; RCT: randomized controlled trial; SR-MA: systematic review and meta-analysis; SSI: surgical site infection.

<sup>1</sup> Key eligibility criteria,

<sup>2</sup> Assessment according to Cochrane risk of bias criteria.

A 2014 Cochrane review evaluated the evidence on NPWT for skin grafts and surgical wounds expected to heal by primary intention.<sup>26</sup> Healing by primary intention occurs when the wound edges are brought together with sutures, staples, tape, or glue, and contrasts with healing by secondary intention, where the wound is left open to heal from the bottom up (e.g., for chronic or infected wounds). Nine randomized trials (total n=785 patients) were included in the review. Three trials involved skin graft patients, 4 included orthopedic patients, and 2 included general surgery and trauma surgery patients. All trials had an unclear or high-risk of bias. There were no differences between standard dressing and NPWT for SSIs, wound dehiscence, reoperation (in incisional wounds), seroma/hematoma, or failed skin grafts. Pain intensity was reported to be lower with “home-made” NPWT compared with commercial devices. Most or all studies appeared to have used short-term application of NPWT in an inpatient setting.

A systematic review and meta-analysis by De Vries et al (2016) included 6 RCTs and 15 observational studies of SSIs after prophylactic NPWT.<sup>27</sup> One study selected used a portable

device (PICO, described below), while the others used a V.A.C. Unlike the 2014 Cochrane review, studies on skin grafts were not included. Meta-analysis of the RCTs showed that use of NPWT reduced the rate of SSIs (odds ratio [OR], 0.56; 95% CI, 0.32 to 0.96;  $p=0.04$ ), and reduced the SSI rate from 140 to 83 per 1000 patients. However, the quality of evidence was rated as low due to high-risk of bias in the nonblinded assessments and imprecision in the estimates. Subgroup meta-analysis of 4 RCTs in orthopedic/trauma surgery did not demonstrate significant benefit in regards to reducing risk of SSI (OR 0.58; 95% CI, 0.32 to 1.07).

A 2018 Cochrane review evaluated the effects of NPWT for open traumatic wounds (e.g., open fractures or soft tissue wounds) managed in any care setting.<sup>10</sup> Seven RCTs were identified for the review with sample sizes ranging from 40 to 586 participants. Four studies ( $n=596$ ) compared NPWT at 125 mmHg with standard care for open fracture wounds. Pooled data revealed no significant difference between groups in the number of participants with healed wounds (RR 0.48, 95% CI 0.81 to 1.27;  $I^2=56\%$ ). Pooled data from 2 studies ( $n=509$ ) utilizing NPWT at 125 mmHg on other open traumatic wounds demonstrated no significant difference in risk of wound infection compared to standard care (RR 0.61, 95% CI, 0.31 to 1.18). One study ( $n=463$ ) assessing NPWT at 75 mmHg against standard care in other open traumatic wounds did not demonstrate a significant difference for wound infection risk (RR 0.44, 95% CI, 0.17 to 1.10). One study comparing NPWT at 125 mmHg against 75 mmHg in other open traumatic wounds also failed to demonstrate a significant difference in wound infection risk (RR 1.04, 95% CI, 0.31 to 3.51). Evidence was deemed low to very low in certainty and quality due to imprecision and risk of bias.

In contrast, a systematic review and meta-analysis by Liu et al (2018) highlighted a significantly lower infection rate, shorter wound coverage time, shorter wound healing time, and shorter hospitalization duration for NPWT versus conventional wound dressings in the treatment of open fractures (all  $p<0.00001$ ).<sup>28</sup> Three of 6 included RCTs overlapped with the Cochrane review and 1 significantly weighted RCT ( $n=460$ ) (see Costa et al [2018]<sup>29</sup>, in Table 2 below) failing to demonstrate a benefit in infection risk for NPWT was missing in the Liu et al (2018) analysis, the only RCT identified by Cochrane to conduct blinded outcome assessment of wound healing and infection. However, the risk of bias in the Liu et al (2018) review was similarly reported as high or unclear. The baseline characteristics of cohort studies included in the analysis suffered from high heterogeneity, with most studies failing to achieve comparable initial injury severity scores based on the Gustilo-Anderson open fracture classification system. Finally, due to the severity of open fracture injuries, the outpatient clinical utility of NPWT for this form of trauma is unclear with most studies focusing on inpatient applications.

Sahebally et al (2018) performed a systematic review with meta-analysis to evaluate the effects of NPWT on SSIs in closed laparotomy incisions.<sup>30</sup> Researchers searched 4 databases through December 31, 2017, and screened bibliographies of retrieved studies to find further studies; 9 unique studies (3 RCTs, 2 prospective studies, and 4 retrospective studies) representing 1266 unique patients were included in the review. The analysis determined that NPWT was associated with a significantly lower rate of SSI compared with standard wound dressing (pooled OR: 0.25; 95% CI: 0.12-0.52;  $p<0.001$ ). The review was limited by including mostly non-randomized studies and use of different NPWT devices.

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

Selected RCTs of NPWT for surgical or traumatic wounds are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. Summary of Key RCTs of NPWT versus Standard Therapy in Surgical Wounds**

<b>Study; Trial</b>	<b>Surgery Received</b>	<b>No. of Participants</b>	<b>Notes on NPWT effectiveness</b>	<b>P-value</b>
Stannard (2012) <sup>31,</sup>	Various, after fractures and other trauma	249	Fewer infections, less discharge than standard closure	0.049
Masden (2012) <sup>32,</sup>	Various	81	NSD in infection or healing	NR
Chio and Agrawal (2010) <sup>33,</sup>	Radial forearm donor site	43	NSD in wound complications or graft failure	NR
Javed (2018) <sup>34,</sup>	Open pancreaticoduodenectomy	123	9.7% of NPWT group developed infections, compared with 31.1% of standard closure group	0.003
Tanaydin (2018) <sup>35,</sup>	Bilateral breast reduction mammoplasty	32	Patients used as own control; NPWT associated with significantly lower risk of complication and improved pain and scarring compared with fixation strips	<0.004
Costa (2018); WOLLF <sup>29,</sup>	Severe open fracture of the lower limb	460	NSD in self-rated disability, number of deep SSI, or QOL scores	Disability: 0.13 SSI: 0.64 QOL: NR
Seidel (2020); SAWHI <sup>36,</sup>	Subcutaneous abdominal wound healing impairment	539 (randomized) 507 (modified ITT) 310 (PP)	Shorter time to wound closure and higher wound closure rate	<0.001

ITT: intention-to-treat; NPWT: negative pressure wound therapy; NR: not reported; NSD: no significant difference; QOL: quality of life; PP: per protocol; RCT: randomized controlled trial; SSI: surgical site infection.

One of the largest studies on prophylactic NPWT for surgical wounds is a report from an investigator-initiated, industry-sponsored multicenter RCT of inpatient NPWT for closed surgical incisions by Stannard et al (2012).<sup>31</sup> (A preliminary report was published in 2006.)<sup>37</sup> Participants included 249 blunt trauma patients with 263 high-risk fractures (tibial plateau, pilon, calcaneus) requiring surgical stabilization. Patients were randomized to NPWT applied to the closed surgical incision or to standard postoperative dressings. All trial participants were maintained as inpatients until wound drainage was minimal, at which time NPWT was discontinued (mean, 59 hours; range, 21-213 hours). Patients in the NPWT group were ready for discharge in 2.5 days compared with 3.0 days for the control group (the difference was not statistically significant). The NPWT group had significantly fewer infections (10% of fractures) than the control group (19% of fractures;  $p=0.049$ ). Wound dehiscence after discharge was observed less frequently in the NPWT group (8.6%) than in the control group (16.5%). These results would support the efficacy of the short-term use of NPWT when used under highly controlled conditions of inpatient care, but not the effectiveness of NPWT in the outpatient setting. A small 2015 RCT ( $n=20$ ) of NPWT in an outpatient setting reported that patients treated with NPWT required significantly fewer dressing changes, reported significantly less pain, and experienced QOL improvements compared with standard wound care.<sup>38</sup>

Other randomized studies have reported no benefit for NPWT for surgical wounds, as reflected in the conclusions of various Cochrane reviews (described above).<sup>26,10</sup> For example, the RCT by Masden et al (2012) examined the use of NPWT for surgical closures at high-risk for nonhealing in 81 patients with comorbidities that included diabetes and peripheral vascular disease.<sup>32</sup> At a mean of 113 days follow-up, there were no significant differences in the proportions of patients with wound infection, time to develop infection or dehiscence between NPWT and dry dressing groups. Chio and Agrawal (2010) published results of a randomized trial of 54 patients comparing NPWT with a static pressure dressing for the healing of the radial forearm free flap donor site.<sup>33</sup> There were no statistically significant differences in wound complications or graft failure (percentage of area for graft failure, 7.2% for negative pressure vs 4.5% for standard dressing). Biter et al (2014) found no significant advantage of 2 weeks of NPWT in 49 patients who underwent surgical excision for pilonidal sinus disease.<sup>39</sup> Complete wound healing was achieved at a median of 84 days in the NPWT group and 93 days in controls.

Javed et al (2018) conducted a single-site RCT to evaluate the efficacy of NPWT for SSI after an open pancreaticoduodenectomy. Researchers randomized 123 patients treated from January 2017 through February 2018 to either NPWT ( $n=62$ ) or standard closure ( $n=61$ ). In the study, 9.7% of patients who received NPWT developed a postoperative infection at the site, compared with 31.1% of patients who received standard closure, an RR of 0.31 (95% CI: 0.13-0.73;  $P=0.003$ ). Limitations of the study included being conducted at a high-volume treatment center and a lack of blinding.<sup>34</sup>

Tanaydin et al (2018) conducted an RCT to compare NPWT to standard wound care after a bilateral breast reduction mammoplasty.<sup>35</sup> In the study, 32 patients were given NPWT on 1 breast and fixation strips on the other, simultaneously serving as study group and control group. Sites treated with NPWT showed a significantly lower rate of complications ( $p<0.004$ ) compared to fixation strips, as well as improved pain and scarring. Limitations included the small sample size and lack of blinding.

The Effect of Negative Pressure Wound Therapy vs Standard Wound Management on 12-Month Disability Among Adults With Severe Open Fracture of the Lower Limb (WOLLF) trial by Costa et al (2018) randomized 460 patients with severe open fracture of the lower limb to NPWT (n=226) or standard wound management (n=234).<sup>29</sup> The primary outcome was the Disability Rating Index score (range, 0 [no disability] to 100 [completely disabled]) at 12 months, with a minimal clinically important difference of 8 points. Secondary outcomes included deep infection and QOL measures based on the EuroQol 5-dimensions questionnaire. Eighty-eight percent of participants completed the trial. There were no statistically significant differences in disability scores (45.5 vs. 42.4;  $p=0.13$ ), in the number of deep infections (16 [7.1%] vs. 19 [8.1%];  $p=0.64$ ), or in quality of life measures in the NPWT and standard wound management groups, respectively.

The Subcutaneous Abdominal Wound Healing Impairment (SAWHI) multicenter clinical trial by Seidel et al (2020) randomized adult patients with SAWHI to treatment with NPWT (V.A.C. Therapy) or conventional wound therapy (CWT).<sup>36</sup> The modified ITT population included 256 and 251 patients assigned to NPWT and CWT, respectively. The primary outcome, mean time to wound closure within 42 days, was significantly shorter in the NPWT group (difference, 3.0 d; 95% CI, 1.6 to 4.4;  $P<0.001$ ) and confirmed via independent, blinded assessors. Additionally, only 35.9% of patients in the NPWT group and 21.5% of patients in the CWT group achieved complete wound closure within 42 days (difference, 14.4%; 95% CI, 6.6% to 22.2%;  $P<0.001$ ). While this met the prespecified non-inferiority margin of 12.5%, the study's statistical model had assumed a complete wound closure rate of 50% in the CWT arm which had not been met within the 42 day treatment period. The benefit of NPWT for these outcomes was sustained in the PP analysis, however, 39% and 31% of patients were excluded from the NPWT and CWT arms, respectively. Primary reasons for exclusion included unauthorized treatment crossovers, insufficient dressing changes, and treatment termination prior to 42 days. More wounds were sutured in the NPWT arm compared to the CWT arm, where more wounds healed by secondary intention. No significant differences were noted for quality of life or pain measures at any time point. The relative risk for adverse events (RR, 1.20; 95% CI, 0.97 to 1.47) and wound-related adverse events (RR, 1.51; 95% CI, 0.99 to 2.35) was higher in the NPWT arm. The most frequently documented wound-related adverse events in the NPWT arm included periwound macerations and local infections with signs of inflammation. Overall, it is unclear if a 3-day difference in time to wound closure represents a clinically meaningful benefit. Time to hospital discharge, readmission rates, and duration of outpatient care were not reported.

### **Section Summary: Traumatic and Surgical Wounds**

The evidence on the use of NPWT for individuals who have traumatic or surgical wounds includes RCTs and systematic reviews. One RCT found no benefit of NPWT on graft take and wound epithelialization in patients with full-thickness burns. Another RCT found a significant decrease in time to wound closure in patients with wound healing impairment following abdominal surgery; however, it is unclear if this difference is clinically meaningful. In other studies, NPWT showed no benefit for the treatment of patients with surgical wounds or skin grafts healing by primary intention, and a systematic review of NPWT for traumatic and surgical wounds found no differences between standard dressing and NPWT for any wound outcome measure. However, a small RCT suggested that prophylactic NPWT might reduce the number of dressing changes and pain when used in an outpatient setting. A small retrospective study reported improved epithelialization in patients free of comorbidities treated with NPWT. Additional study in a larger, outpatient sample is needed to evaluate this outcome measure.

## **PORTABLE, SINGLE-USE THERAPY FOR TRAUMATIC AND SURGICAL WOUNDS**

### **Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose**

The purpose of portable, single-use outpatient NPWT is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies in patients with traumatic and surgical wounds.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does portable, single-use NPWT improve outcomes when used for the outpatient treatment of traumatic or surgical wounds?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### ***Populations***

The relevant population of interest is individuals with traumatic or surgical wounds.

### ***Interventions***

The therapy being considered is portable, single-use outpatient NPWT (powered or nonpowered), which is administered in wound clinics and the home care setting. Outpatient NPWT does not include treatment at extended care facilities.

### ***Comparators***

Comparators of interest include treatment with standard, reusable NPWT devices or standard wound care.

### ***Outcomes***

The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. Follow-up at weeks to months is of interest for portable, single-use outpatient NPWT to monitor relevant outcomes.

The primary endpoints of interest for trials of wound healing are as follows, consistent with guidance from the FDA for the industry in developing products for the treatment of chronic cutaneous ulcer and burn wounds:<sup>3</sup>

- Incidence of complete wound closure
- Time to complete wound closure (reflecting accelerated wound closure)
- Incidence of complete wound closure following surgical wound closure
- Pain control

### **Study Selection Criteria**

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- a. To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
- b. In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
- c. To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
- d. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.
- e. Studies conducted exclusively in the inpatient setting were excluded.

## Review of Evidence

### PICO Dressing

PICO is a portable single-use NPWT system that comes with 2 sterile dressings and has a lifespan of 7 to 14 days. Karlakki et al (2016) reported on an RCT with 220 patients that evaluated the use of the PICO device in a surgical center immediately after hip and knee arthroplasties.<sup>40</sup> The device was left on for 7 days, including the time after the hospital stay. Strengths of the trial included powered intention-to-treat analysis, but evaluators were not blinded. There were trends toward reductions in hospital length of stay (0.9 days; 95% CI, -0.2 to 2.5 days;  $p=0.07$ ) and postoperative surgical wound complications (8.4% control vs. 2.0% PICO,  $p=0.06$ ). However, most of the difference in length of stay was due to wound complications in 2 outliers in the control group (up to 61 days). The level of wound exudate was significantly reduced by the PICO device ( $p=0.007$ ), with 4% of the study group and 16% of the control group having grade 4 (scale grade, 0-4) exudate. Blisters were observed in 11% of patients treated with the PICO system, although the blister occurrence was reported to be reduced when the dressing was stretched less.

### Prevena System

Pauser et al (2016) reported on a small RCT ( $n=21$ ) evaluating Prevena in patients who had hemiarthroplasty for femoral neck fractures.<sup>41</sup> Use of the Prevena System significantly reduced seroma size, days of wound secretion, wound care time, and need for dressing changes.

Murphy et al (2019) published findings from the Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Use to Decrease Surgical Nosocomial Events in Colorectal Resections (NEPTUNE) trial, a single-center, superiority designed prospective randomized open blinded endpoint controlled trial evaluating the use of the Prevena System on closed incisions compared to standard gauze dressings in patients undergoing colorectal resection via laparotomy ( $n=300$ ).<sup>42</sup> There was no significant difference in the incidence of SSI at 30 days post-surgery between the Prevena and control groups (32% vs. 34%;  $p=0.68$ ). No significant difference in length of hospital stay was reported.

Hussamy et al (2019) reported on an open-label RCT evaluating the Prevena System for incisional NPWT following cesarean delivery in women with class III obesity (Body Mass Index  $\geq 40$ ;  $n=222$ ) compared to standard dressings ( $n=219$ ).<sup>43</sup> The overall composite wound morbidity rate was not significantly different between the Prevena and control cohorts (17% vs. 19%; RR 0.9; 95% CI, 0.5 to 1.4).

### Section Summary: Portable, Single-Use Therapy for Traumatic and Surgical Wounds

The evidence on portable single-use NPWT includes an RCT of the PICO device and RCTs of the Prevena Incision Management System. The PICO device was studied in an adequately powered but unblinded RCT of combined in- and outpatient use after total joint arthroplasty. The evidence base for the Prevena System is not sufficiently robust for conclusions on efficacy to be drawn. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients treated in an outpatient setting are needed.

### Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds who receive outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, quality of life (QOL), and

treatment-related morbidity. There was a higher rate of wound healing and fewer amputations with NPWT, although the studies were at risk of bias due to lack of blinding. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have diabetic lower-extremity ulcers or amputation wounds who receive portable, single-use outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. A 2019 RCT compared the PICO device with standard NPWT. In this study, the PICO device demonstrated noninferiority for wound area reduction. A statistically significant benefit in complete wound closure was noted for patients with DFUs, but was not duplicated in the per protocol population due to a high number of exclusions. One study of the Smart Negative Pressure nonpowered Wound Care System (SNaP) showed noninferiority to a V.A.C. device for wound size reduction. No significant difference in complete wound closure was reported. Interpretation of this study is limited by a high loss to follow-up. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients powered to detect differences in complete wound closure are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have chronic pressure ulcers who receive outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. All trials are of low-quality and at high-risk of bias. Also, most study populations were treated in inpatient settings. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency who receive outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes an RCT and a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. A single RCT in patients with nonhealing leg ulcers who were treated with skin grafts found a faster rate of healing with NPWT when used in the inpatient setting. No studies were identified on the effectiveness of NPWT as a primary treatment for leg ulcers or for the use of NPWT in the outpatient setting. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have lower-extremity ulcers due to venous insufficiency who receive portable, single-use outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. A 2019 RCT compared the PICO device with standard NPWT. In this study, the PICO device demonstrated noninferiority for wound area reduction. No significant benefit in complete wound closure was found in patients with venous ulcers. One study of the SNaP System showed noninferiority to a V.A.C. device for wound size reduction. A subgroup analysis of this study found a significant difference in complete wound closure for patients with venous ulcers. However, interpretation of this study is limited by a high loss to follow-up and a lack of a control group treated with standard dressings. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients powered to detect differences in complete wound closure are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have burn wounds who receive outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs, systematic reviews, and case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. An interim report of an RCT evaluating NPWT in partial-thickness burns, summarized in a Cochrane review, did not permit conclusions on the efficacy of NPWT for this indication. A separate RCT comparing NPWT with split-skin grafts in patients with full-thickness burns did not show differences in graft take and wound epithelialization. A retrospective case series reported functional outcomes for most patients who were treated with NPWT at a single-center. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have traumatic or surgical wounds who receive outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. There are limited data on NPWT as a primary treatment of partial-thickness burns. One RCT found no benefit of NPWT on graft take and wound epithelialization in patients with full-thickness burns. Another RCT found a significant decrease in time to wound closure in patients with wound healing impairment following abdominal surgery; however, it is unclear if this difference is clinically meaningful. In other studies, NPWT showed no benefit in the treatment of patients with surgical wounds or skin grafts healing by primary intention, and a systematic review of NPWT for traumatic and surgical wounds found no differences between standard dressing and NPWT for any wound outcome measure. However, a small RCT has suggested that prophylactic NPWT may reduce the number of dressing changes and pain when used in an outpatient setting. A small retrospective study reported improved epithelialization with NPWT in patients free of comorbidities. Additional study in larger, outpatient samples is needed to evaluate this outcome measure. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have traumatic or surgical wounds who receive portable, single-use outpatient NPWT, the evidence includes RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, change in disease status, morbid events, QOL, and treatment-related morbidity. The PICO device was studied in an adequately powered but unblinded RCT of combined in- and outpatient use after total joint arthroplasty. The evidence base for the Prevena System is not sufficiently robust for conclusions on efficacy to be drawn. Well-designed comparative studies with larger numbers of patients treated in an outpatient setting are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

### **Clinical Input From Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers**

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

### **2010 Input**

In response to requests, input was received from 2 physician specialty societies and 3 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2010. The input was near uniform in support of a therapeutic trial of negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) for chronic pressure

ulcers that have failed to heal; for traumatic or surgical wounds that have failed to close when there is exposed bone, cartilage, tendon, or foreign material within the wound; and for nonhealing wounds in patients with underlying clinical conditions known to negatively impact wound healing. Most input affirmed that therapeutic trials of NPWT for other acute or chronic wounds would not be medically necessary.

**Practice Guidelines and Position Statements**

**International Expert Panel on Negative Pressure Wound Therapy**

In 2011, an international expert panel on NPWT provided evidence-based recommendations for the use of NPWT in chronic wounds.<sup>44</sup> The panel made the following recommendations for the use of NPWT (see Table 3).

**Table 3. Recommendations on Use of NPWT in Chronic Wounds**

Condition	Recommendation	Grade <sup>a</sup>
Pressure ulcers, grade 3-4	"NPWT may be used until surgical closure is possible/desirable."	C
	"NPWT should be considered to achieve closure by secondary intention.... to reduce wound dimensions.... [and] to improve the quality of the wound bed."	B
Diabetic foot ulcers	"NPWT must be considered as an advanced wound care therapy.... [and] must be considered to achieve healing by secondary intention."	A
	"NPWT should be considered in an attempt to prevent amputation or reamputation."	B
Ischemic lower-limb wounds	"... NPWT ... may be considered in specialist hands and never as an alternative for revascularisation."	C
	"... NPWT is NOT indicated in acute limb ischemia."	D
Venous leg ulcers	"If first-line therapy (compression) is not efficacious, NPWT should be considered to prepare the wound for surgical closure...."	B

NPWT: negative pressure wound therapy.

<sup>a</sup> Grade A: based on high-quality meta-analyses, systematic reviews of RCTs, or RCTs with very low risk of bias; grade B: based on high-quality systematic reviews of case-control or cohort studies; Grade C: based on well-conducted case-control or cohort studies; Grade D: based on case series or expert opinion.

**International Multidisciplinary Consensus Recommendations**

Willy et al (2017) presented evidence-based consensus guidelines on the use of closed incision negative pressure therapy (ciNPT) following surgery.<sup>45</sup> Among the studies found were 100 randomized controlled studies on ciNPT, most of which found an association between the use of ciNPT and improved outcomes. Based on the evidence, the consensus panel recommended that surgeons evaluate risk in patients before surgery to determine whether patient comorbidities

(i.e., obesity or diabetes) or the nature of the surgery presents an increased danger of infection. In such cases, the panel recommended the use of ciNPWT.

### **Infectious Diseases Society of America and Surgical Infection Society**

In 2011, guidelines for the prevention of infections associated with combat-related injuries were endorsed by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Surgical Infection Society.<sup>46</sup> The guidelines provided an IB recommendation (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence) that NPWT should be used to manage open wounds (excluding central nervous system injuries).

The 2012 guidelines from the Society for the diagnosis and treatment of diabetic foot infections stated that no adjunctive therapy has been proved to improve the resolution of infection, but for select diabetic foot wounds that are slow to heal, clinicians might consider using NPWT (weak recommendation, low-quality evidence).<sup>47</sup>

### **American College of Physicians**

In 2015, the American College of Physicians published guidelines on the treatment of pressure ulcers.<sup>48</sup> The guidelines stated there was low-quality evidence that the overall treatment effect of NPWT did not differ from the standard of care.

### **Association for the Advancement of Wound Care**

In 2010, the Association for the Advancement of Wound Care (AAWC) published guidelines on the care of pressure ulcers. NPWT was included as a potential second-line intervention if first-line treatments did not result in wound healing (level B evidence). The guidelines indicated that patients must be selected carefully for this procedure. The guidelines were updated in 2014 with additional validation.<sup>49</sup>

In 2010, the AAWC published guidelines on the care of venous ulcers.<sup>50</sup> The guidelines listed NPWT as a potential adjunctive therapy if conservative therapy does not work in 30 days. The guidelines noted there is limited evidence for NPWT (level B) compared with other adjunctive therapies.

### **National Institute for Health and Care Excellence**

In 2013, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) issued guidance on NPWT for surgical wounds, concluding that "current evidence on the safety and efficacy of negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT) for the open abdomen is adequate to support the use of this procedure."<sup>51</sup>

A 2015 NICE guidance on diabetic foot problems, updated in October 2019, has recommended consideration of NPWT after surgical debridement for diabetic foot ulcers on the advice of the multidisciplinary foot care service.<sup>52</sup> It was noted that the evidence reviewed for NPWT was limited and of low-quality, and that it would be useful to have more evidence for this commonly used treatment.

In 2014, the NICE issued guidance on the prevention and management of pressure ulcers.<sup>53</sup> The guidance stated, "Do not routinely offer adults negative pressure wound therapy to treat a pressure ulcer, unless it is necessary to reduce the number of dressing changes (for example, in a wound with a large amount of exudate)." Also, the guidance did not recommend NPWT for neonates, infants, or children.

A 2019 NICE guidance recommends the use of the PICO7 negative pressure wound dressing for closed surgical incisions due to their association with fewer surgical site infections and seromas compared to standard wound dressings.<sup>54</sup> The device is considered an option for those who are at high risk for surgical site infections, which may be driven by several factors (e.g., age, underlying illness, obesity, smoking, wound classification, and site and complexity of procedure). The device is recommended for those with low to moderate levels of wound exudate who will require infrequent dressing changes.

### U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

### Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials

Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 4.

**Table 4. Summary of Key Trials**

<b>NCT No.</b>	<b>Trial Name</b>	<b>Planned Enrollment</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
<i>Ongoing</i>			
NCT02664168	A Prospective, Randomized, Comparative Study to Assess the Prevention of Surgical Site Infection (SSI's) in Revision Total Joint Arthroplasty Patients Treated With Single-Use Negative Pressure Wound Therapy (PICO™) or Standard Care Dressings (AQUACEL® Ag SURGICAL Dressing)	NR	Feb 2020 (unknown)
NCT02348034 <sup>9</sup>	A Randomized Controlled Trial Exploring the Ability of Negative Pressure Wound Therapy (NPWT) to Reduce Colorectal Surgical Site Infections (SSI)	398	Jul 2020 (recruiting)
NCT02467998	The Registry of Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for Chronic Wounds and Ulcers (NPWTR)	50,000	Jan 2020 (unknown)
NCT03144726	Single Center Prospective Randomized Control Trial on Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for Incisions Following Major Lower-limb Amputation to Reduce Surgical Site Infection	290	Jul 2020 (unknown)
NCT03716687	Prophylactic Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for High Risk Laparotomy Wounds: A Randomized Prospective Clinical Trial	300	Sep 2020 (recruiting)
NCT02509260	Prevena™ Incisional Negative Pressure Wound Therapy in Re-operative Colorectal Surgery	298	May 2021 (recruiting)
NCT03414762	PICO Negative Pressure Wound Therapy in Obese Women Undergoing Elective Cesarean Delivery	400	Jul 2021 (recruiting)
NCT03948412	Negative Pressure Wound Therapy (PREVENA) Versus Standard Dressings for Incision Management After Renal Transplant (IMPART)	500	Sep 2021 (recruiting)

<b>NCT No.</b>	<b>Trial Name</b>	<b>Planned Enrollment</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
NCT04584957	Prophylactic Negative Pressure Wound Therapy in Gynecologic Oncology: a Prospective Controlled Randomized Trial (GO-VAC)	196	Sep 2021 (ongoing)
NCT03773575 <sup>a</sup>	Evaluation of Closed Incision Negative Pressure Dressing (PREVENA) to Prevent Lower Extremity Amputation Wound Complications (PREVENA-AMP)	440	Dec 2021 (recruiting)
NCT02682316 <sup>a</sup>	A Phase III Randomized Controlled Trial of Negative Pressure Wound Therapy in Post-Operative Incision Management	577	Feb 2022 (ongoing)
NCT04110353	Prophylactic Closed Incision Negative Pressure Wound Therapy on Abdominal Wounds - Clinical and Economic Perspectives (ProNounce)	570	Jun 2022 (not yet recruiting)
NCT04042259	Delayed Primary Closure Using Negative Pressure Wound Therapy	350	Dec 2022 (recruiting)
NCT01821664	Vascular Graft Infections - Epidemiology, Best Treatment Options, Imaging Modalities and Impact of Negative Pressure Wound Therapy	1800	Mar 2023 (recruiting)
NCT01913132	PICO Versus Standard Dressing Above Groin Incisions After Vascular Surgery - A Prospective Randomized Trial	644	Dec 2024 (recruiting)
NCT02813161	A Real World, Observational Registry of Diabetic Foot Ulcers and Quality of Care in Clinical Practice (DFUR)	10,000	Feb 2025 (recruiting)
<b><i>Unpublished</i></b>			
NCT02309944	Negative Pressure Wound Therapy in Obese Gynecologic Oncology Patients	93	June 2020 (completed)
NCT02799667	Randomized Controlled Trial: Do Single Use Negative Pressure Dressings Reduce Wound Complications in Women With a BMI >40 kg/m <sup>2</sup> Undergoing Cesarean Delivery at a Tertiary Medical Center?	110	Terminated
NCT01191567	Negative Pressure Wound Therapy. Therapy Effects and the Impact on the Patient's Quality of Life	200	Terminated
NCT02470806 <sup>a</sup>	A Prospective, Randomized, Comparative Effectiveness Study of a Single-Use, Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System (PICO) Versus a Traditional Negative Pressure Wound Therapy	164	Nov 2017 (completed)

<b>NCT No.</b>	<b>Trial Name</b>	<b>Planned Enrollment</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
	System (tNPWT) in the Treatment of Lower Extremity Ulcers		
NCT02395159	Reduction of Groin Wound Infections After Vascular Surgery in Patients With Risk Factors by the Use a Negative Pressure Wound Incision Management System (KCI Prevena)	204	Oct 2017 (completed)
NCT02739191	Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for Surgical Wounds of the Foot and Ankle	60	Aug 2017 (completed)
NCT02195310 <sup>a</sup>	The Use of Prevena™ Incision Management System on Clean Closed Sternal Midline Incisions in Subjects at High Risk for Surgical Site Occurrences	342	Terminated
NCT02064270 <sup>a</sup>	A Prospective, Randomized, Controlled Clinical Study to Assess the Prevention of Postsurgical Incision Healing Complications in Patients Undergoing Primary or Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA) or Total Hip Arthroplasty (THA), Treated With Either Single-Use Negative Pressure Wound Therapy (NPWT) or Standard Postsurgical Dressings	526	Sep 2017 (completed)
NCT01890720 <sup>a</sup>	Use of Incisional Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for Prevention of Postoperative Infections Following Caesarean Section in Women With BMI ≥30	876	Dec 2016 (completed)

NCT: national clinical trial; NR: not reported.

<sup>a</sup> Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

## **CODING**

**The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.**

### **CPT/HCPCS**

- 97605 Negative pressure wound therapy (e.g., vacuum assisted drainage collection), utilizing durable medical equipment (DME), including topical application(s), wound assessment, and instruction(s) for ongoing care, per session; total wound(s) surface area less than or equal to 50 square centimeters
- 97606 Negative pressure wound therapy (e.g., vacuum assisted drainage collection), utilizing durable medical equipment (DME), including topical application(s), wound assessment, and instruction(s) for ongoing care, per session; total wound(s) surface area greater than 50 square centimeters

- 97607 Negative pressure wound therapy, (e.g., vacuum assisted drainage collection), utilizing disposable, non-durable medical equipment including provision of exudate management collection system, topical application(s), wound assessment, and instructions for ongoing care, per session; total wound(s) surface area less than or equal to 50 square centimeters
- 97608 Negative pressure wound therapy, (e.g., vacuum assisted drainage collection), utilizing disposable, non-durable medical equipment including provision of exudate management collection system, topical application(s), wound assessment, and instructions for ongoing care, per session; total wound(s) surface area greater than 50 square centimeters
- A6550 Wound care set, for negative pressure wound therapy electrical pump, includes all supplies and accessories
- A7000 Canister, disposable, used with suction pump, each
- A9272 Wound suction, disposable, includes dressing, all accessories and components, any type, each
- E2402 Negative pressure wound therapy electrical pump, stationary or portable
- K0743 Suction pump, home model, portable, for use on wounds
- K0744 Absorptive wound dressing for use with suction pump, home model, portable, pad size 16 sq in or less
- K0745 Absorptive wound dressing for use with suction pump, home model, portable, pad size more than 16 sq in but less than or equal to 48 sq in
- K0746 Absorptive wound dressing for use with suction pump, home model, portable, pad size greater than 48 sq in

- The following HCPCS code was developed for a disposable NPWT system (e.g., the SNaP® or PICO™ systems): A9272.
- The following HCPCS codes were developed specific to a NPWT system (such as the Kalypto® system), in which the exudate is collected in the dressing rather than in a canister: K0743, K0744, K0745, K0746.
- There are 2 CPT codes for application of NPWT utilizing durable medical equipment: 97605, 97606.
- The following HCPCS codes describe NPWT using an electrical pump: A6550, E2402.
- There are also CPT codes for application of NPWT utilizing disposable, nondurable equipment: 97607, 97608.

#### DIAGNOSES

An appropriate ICD-10 diagnosis code describing the wound that is being treated should be used when reporting vacuum-assisted wound closure.

**REVISIONS**

August 3, 2006 with effective date of December 1, 2006	In "Policy" 1., 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet, deleted "(i.e., diabetic ulcers with no presence of infection)" and added "or diabetic lower extremity ulcer" at Medical Directors request.
	In "Policy" 2., added new 'g' For patients awaiting hospital discharge, a 5-day 'evaluation period' may be allowed if sufficient records cannot timely be provided to determine medical necessity. The purpose of this 'evaluation period' is to avoid prolonging the hospital stay while awaiting wound vac decision; and new 'h' VAC approved may be allowed up to 4 weeks before re-review at Medical Directors request.
	In "Policy" 3., d., added new statement "Maximum duration of VAC approval is 4 months. Refer to consultant beyond 4 months." at Medical Directors request.
	In "Policy" section added "Negative pressure therapy post skin grafting is considered experimental/investigational" at Medical Directors request.
	In "Policy" section deleted statement "NOTE: The VAC System may be used in certain cases prior to the 30 days of conservative therapy (i.e., large incisional hernia repair with mesh and diabetic ulcers with no presence of infection) and will be reviewed." at Medical Directors request.
	In "Reference" Government Agency; Medical Society; and Other Authoritative Publications section added "Managing Care Managing Claims (MCMC), July 7, 2006, PRA Case Number - 10706101 at Medical Directors request.
February 7, 2007 with effective date of February 7, 2007, posted March 30, 2007	In "Policy" section deleted #4, "Negative pressure therapy post skin grafting is considered experimental/investigational." at Medical Directors request.
	In "Policy" section added new #4 "Negative pressure therapy post skin grafting will be reviewed by a plastic surgeon consultant to determine necessity based on the size and severity of the wound." at Medical Directors request.
	In "Reference" Government Agency; Medical Society; and Other Authoritative Publications section added "BCBSKS Medical Consultant, MCMC, (Reviewer ID R-W090, MCOP ID 1072-0274), October 23, 2006 at Medical Directors request.
	In "Reference" Government Agency; Medical Society; and Other Authoritative Publications section added BCBSKS Medical Consultant, Practicing Board Certified General Surgeon (249), January 4, 2007 at Medical Directors request.
	In "Reference" Government Agency; Medical Society; and Other Authoritative Publications section added BCBSKS Medical Consultant, Practicing Board Certified Pediatric Surgeon (236), February 5, 2007 at Medical Directors request.
May 8, 2007 with effective date June 15, 2007	In "Policy", deleted the sentence under policy guideline section #2, letter g. "For patients awaiting hospital discharge, a 5-day 'evaluation period' may be allowed if sufficient records cannot timely be provided to determine medical necessity. The purpose of this 'evaluation period' is to avoid prolonging the hospital stay while awaiting wound vac decision".
01-30-2012	In the Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added HCPCS code: A9272 (effective 1/1/2012).</li> </ul>
	In the Reference section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removed "Government Agency; Medical Society; and Other Authoritative Publication" and inserted "Other References."</li> </ul>
01-01-2015	Policy posted to the website February 10, 2014.
	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added CPT Codes: 87607, 87608 (Effective January 1, 2015)</li> <li>Added HCPCS Codes: K0743, K0744, K0745, K0746 (coding section correction)</li> <li>Revised CPT Codes: 97605, 97606 (Effective January 1, 2015)</li> <li>Revised HCPCS Codes: A6550, A7272 (coding section correction)</li> </ul>

04-30-2015	Updated Description section.
	In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Added to Item B (was previously Item 4), "... considered medically necessary for up to 2 weeks. Continuation beyond will be reviewed on a case by case basis," and removed "reviewed by a plastic surgeon consultant to determine necessity based on the size and severity of the wound." to read, "VAC therapy post skin grafting will be considered medically necessary for up to 2 weeks. Continuation beyond will be reviewed on a case by case basis."</li> <li>▪ Added Item C, "Post breast reduction surgery, VAC is considered medically necessary if the patient's BMI is 40 or more. Approval length: 1 week."</li> <li>▪ Added Item D, "Post-surgical VAC placement on new or acute wounds will be reviewed on a case by case basis."</li> <li>▪ In Item E, removed "or experimental / investigational in the home setting." to read "All other applications for VAC therapy are considered not medically necessary."</li> <li>▪ In Policy Guidelines, added Item d, "The wound depth is at least 1 mm or greater. Wounds with a depth of &lt;1 mm cannot accommodate the sponge / foam."</li> </ul>
	Added Rationale section.
	In Revision section from date 01-01-2015: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Revision of Added CPT Codes: "87607, 87608;" to read "97607, 97608"</li> <li>▪ Revision of Revised HCPCS Codes: "A7272," to read "A9272"</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.
03-02-2016	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Revised coding bullets.</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.
02-15-2017	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	In Coding section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Updated coding bullets.</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.
06-23-2017	In Policy section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Added new Item D, "Non-electric vacuum assisted wound therapy (eg, SNaP™ Wound Care Device) is considered experimental / investigational for all conditions."</li> <li>▪ Added new Item E, "Portable, battery-powered, single-use (disposable) vacuum assisted wound therapy devices (eg, the PICO™ Single Use Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System or the V.A.C. Via™ Negative Pressure Wound Therapy System) are considered experimental / investigational for all conditions."</li> </ul>
	Updated References section.
02-15-2018	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
02-18-2019	Updated Description section.
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.
07-17-2020	Updated Description section
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.

05-07-2021	Updated Description section
	In Policy Guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added "Complete healing of a wound would normally be anticipated if all bone, cartilage, tendons, and foreign material were completely covered, healthy granulation were present to within 5 mm of the surface, and the wound edges were reduced to 2 cm in width or diameter."</li> </ul>
	Updated Rationale section.
	Updated References section.

## REFERENCES

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. UPDATE on Serious Complications Associated with Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Systems: FDA Safety Communication. 2011 Feb; <http://wayback.archive-it.org/7993/20170722215801/https://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/Safety/AlertsandNotices/ucm244211.htm>. Accessed December 21, 2020.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Vacuum-assisted closure in the treatment of chronic wounds. TEC Assessments. 2000;Volume 15:Tab 23.
3. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Guidance for Industry. Chronic Cutaneous Ulcer and Burn Wounds - Developing Products for Treatment. June 2006; <https://www.fda.gov/media/71278/download>. Accessed December 21, 2020.
4. Rhee SM, Valle MF, Wilson LM, et al. Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Technologies For Chronic Wound Care in the Home Setting. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment (Contract No. 290-201-200007-I) Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2014.
5. Rhee SM, Valle MF, Wilson LM, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy technologies for chronic wound care in the home setting: A systematic review. Wound Repair Regen. Jul-Aug 2015; 23(4): 506-17. PMID 25845268
6. Sullivan N, Snyder DL, Tipton K, et al. Technology assessment: Negative pressure wound therapy devices (Contract No. 290-2007-10063). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2009.
7. Norman G, Goh EL, Dumville JC, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for surgical wounds healing by primary closure. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jun 15 2020; 6: CD009261. PMID 32542647
8. Li HZ, Xu XH, Wang DW, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for surgical site infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Clin Microbiol Infect. Nov 2019; 25(11): 1328-1338. PMID 31220604
9. Dumville JC, Hinchliffe RJ, Cullum N, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for treating foot wounds in people with diabetes mellitus. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Oct 17 2013; (10): CD010318. PMID 24132761
10. Ihezor-Ejiofor Z, Newton K, Dumville JC, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for open traumatic wounds. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jul 03 2018; 7: CD012522. PMID 29969521
11. Wynn M, Freeman S. The efficacy of negative pressure wound therapy for diabetic foot ulcers: A systematised review. J Tissue Viability. Aug 2019; 28(3): 152-160. PMID 31056407
12. Blume PA, Walters J, Payne W, et al. Comparison of negative pressure wound therapy using vacuum-assisted closure with advanced moist wound therapy in the treatment of

- diabetic foot ulcers: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care*. Apr 2008; 31(4): 631-6. PMID 18162494
13. Borys S, Hohendorff J, Koblik T, et al. Negative-pressure wound therapy for management of chronic neuropathic noninfected diabetic foot ulcerations - short-term efficacy and long-term outcomes. *Endocrine*. Dec 2018; 62(3): 611-616. PMID 30099674
  14. Kirsner R, Dove C, Reyzelman A, et al. A prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trial on the efficacy of a single-use negative pressure wound therapy system, compared to traditional negative pressure wound therapy in the treatment of chronic ulcers of the lower extremities. *Wound Repair Regen*. Sep 2019; 27(5): 519-529. PMID 31087729
  15. Armstrong DG, Marston WA, Reyzelman AM, et al. Comparison of negative pressure wound therapy with an ultraportable mechanically powered device vs. traditional electrically powered device for the treatment of chronic lower extremity ulcers: a multicenter randomized-controlled trial. *Wound Repair Regen*. Mar-Apr 2011; 19(2): 173-80. PMID 21362084
  16. Armstrong DG, Marston WA, Reyzelman AM, et al. Comparative effectiveness of mechanically and electrically powered negative pressure wound therapy devices: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Wound Repair Regen*. May-Jun 2012; 20(3): 332-41. PMID 22564228
  17. Lerman B, Oldenbrook L, Eichstadt SL, et al. Evaluation of chronic wound treatment with the SNaP wound care system versus modern dressing protocols. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Oct 2010; 126(4): 1253-1261. PMID 20885246
  18. Wanner MB, Schwarzl F, Strub B, et al. Vacuum-assisted wound closure for cheaper and more comfortable healing of pressure sores: a prospective study. *Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg*. 2003; 37(1): 28-33. PMID 12625392
  19. Dumville JC, Land L, Evans D, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for treating leg ulcers. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jul 14 2015; (7): CD011354. PMID 26171910
  20. Vuerstaek JD, Vainas T, Wuite J, et al. State-of-the-art treatment of chronic leg ulcers: A randomized controlled trial comparing vacuum-assisted closure (V.A.C.) with modern wound dressings. *J Vasc Surg*. Nov 2006; 44(5): 1029-37; discussion 1038. PMID 17000077
  21. Marston WA, Armstrong DG, Reyzelman AM, et al. A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Treatment of Venous Leg Ulcers Using Mechanically Versus Electrically Powered Negative Pressure Wound Therapy. *Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle)*. Feb 01 2015; 4(2): 75-82. PMID 25713749
  22. Dumville JC, Munson C, Christie J. Negative pressure wound therapy for partial-thickness burns. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Dec 15 2014; (12): CD006215. PMID 25500895
  23. Bloemen MC, van der Wal MB, Verhaegen PD, et al. Clinical effectiveness of dermal substitution in burns by topical negative pressure: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Wound Repair Regen*. Nov-Dec 2012; 20(6): 797-805. PMID 23110478
  24. Krug E, Berg L, Lee C, et al. Evidence-based recommendations for the use of Negative Pressure Wound Therapy in traumatic wounds and reconstructive surgery: steps towards an international consensus. *Injury*. Feb 2011; 42 Suppl 1: S1-12. PMID 21316515
  25. Ehrl D, Heidekrueger PI, Broer PN, et al. Topical Negative Pressure Wound Therapy of Burned Hands: Functional Outcomes. *J Burn Care Res*. Jan 01 2018; 39(1): 121-128. PMID 28368916
  26. Webster J, Scuffham P, Stankiewicz M, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for skin grafts and surgical wounds healing by primary intention. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Oct 07 2014; (10): CD009261. PMID 25287701

27. De Vries FEE, Wallert ED, Solomkin JS, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis including GRADE qualification of the risk of surgical site infections after prophylactic negative pressure wound therapy compared with conventional dressings in clean and contaminated surgery. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Sep 2016; 95(36): e4673. PMID 27603360
28. Liu X, Zhang H, Cen S, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy versus conventional wound dressings in treatment of open fractures: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg*. May 2018; 53: 72-79. PMID 29555530
29. Costa ML, Achten J, Bruce J, et al. Effect of Negative Pressure Wound Therapy vs Standard Wound Management on 12-Month Disability Among Adults With Severe Open Fracture of the Lower Limb: The WOLLF Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. Jun 12 2018; 319(22): 2280-2288. PMID 29896626
30. Sahebally SM, McKeivitt K, Stephens I, et al. Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for Closed Laparotomy Incisions in General and Colorectal Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Surg*. Nov 01 2018; 153(11): e183467. PMID 30267040
31. Stannard JP, Volgas DA, McGwin G, et al. Incisional negative pressure wound therapy after high-risk lower extremity fractures. *J Orthop Trauma*. Jan 2012; 26(1): 37-42. PMID 21804414
32. Masden D, Goldstein J, Endara M, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy for at-risk surgical closures in patients with multiple comorbidities: a prospective randomized controlled study. *Ann Surg*. Jun 2012; 255(6): 1043-7. PMID 22549748
33. Chio EG, Agrawal A. A randomized, prospective, controlled study of forearm donor site healing when using a vacuum dressing. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Feb 2010; 142(2): 174-8. PMID 20115970
34. Javed AA, Teinor J, Wright M, et al. Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for Surgical-site Infections: A Randomized Trial. *Ann Surg*. Oct 10 2018. PMID 30308616
35. Tanaydin V, Beugels J, Andriessen A, et al. Randomized Controlled Study Comparing Disposable Negative-Pressure Wound Therapy with Standard Care in Bilateral Breast Reduction Mammoplasty Evaluating Surgical Site Complications and Scar Quality. *Aesthetic Plast Surg*. Aug 2018; 42(4): 927-935. PMID 29442143
36. Seidel D, Diedrich S, Herrle F, et al. Negative Pressure Wound Therapy vs Conventional Wound Treatment in Subcutaneous Abdominal Wound Healing Impairment: The SAWHI Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Surg*. Jun 01 2020; 155(6): 469-478. PMID 32293657
37. Stannard JP, Robinson JT, Anderson ER, et al. Negative pressure wound therapy to treat hematomas and surgical incisions following high-energy trauma. *J Trauma*. Jun 2006; 60(6): 1301-6. PMID 16766975
38. Monsen C, Acosta S, Mani K, et al. A randomised study of NPWT closure versus alginate dressings in peri-vascular groin infections: quality of life, pain and cost. *J Wound Care*. Jun 2015; 24(6): 252, 254-6, 258-0. PMID 26075373
39. Biter LU, Beck GM, Mannaerts GH, et al. The use of negative-pressure wound therapy in pilonidal sinus disease: a randomized controlled trial comparing negative-pressure wound therapy versus standard open wound care after surgical excision. *Dis Colon Rectum*. Dec 2014; 57(12): 1406-11. PMID 25380007
40. Karlakki SL, Hamad AK, Whittall C, et al. Incisional negative pressure wound therapy dressings (iNPWTd) in routine primary hip and knee arthroplasties: A randomised controlled trial. *Bone Joint Res*. Aug 2016; 5(8): 328-37. PMID 27496913
41. Pauser J, Nordmeyer M, Biber R, et al. Incisional negative pressure wound therapy after hemiarthroplasty for femoral neck fractures - reduction of wound complications. *Int Wound J*. Oct 2016; 13(5): 663-7. PMID 25125244

42. Murphy PB, Knowles S, Chadi SA, et al. Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Use to Decrease Surgical Nosocomial Events in Colorectal Resections (NEPTUNE): A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Ann Surg*. Jul 2019; 270(1): 38-42. PMID 30499799
43. Hussamy DJ, Wortman AC, McIntire DD, et al. Closed Incision Negative Pressure Therapy in Morbidly Obese Women Undergoing Cesarean Delivery: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Obstet Gynecol*. Oct 2019; 134(4): 781-789. PMID 31503147
44. Vig S, Dowsett C, Berg L, et al. Evidence-based recommendations for the use of negative pressure wound therapy in chronic wounds: steps towards an international consensus. *J Tissue Viability*. Dec 2011; 20 Suppl 1: S1-18. PMID 22119531
45. Willy C, Agarwal A, Andersen CA, et al. Closed incision negative pressure therapy: international multidisciplinary consensus recommendations. *Int Wound J*. Apr 2017; 14(2): 385-398. PMID 27170231
46. Hospenthal DR, Murray CK, Andersen RC, et al. Guidelines for the prevention of infections associated with combat-related injuries: 2011 update: endorsed by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Surgical Infection Society. *J Trauma*. Aug 2011; 71(2 Suppl 2): S210-34. PMID 21814089
47. Lipsky BA, Berendt AR, Cornia PB, et al. 2012 infectious diseases society of america clinical practice guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of diabetic foot infections. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc*. Jan-Feb 2013; 103(1): 2-7. PMID 23328846
48. Qaseem A, Humphrey LL, Forciea MA, et al. Treatment of pressure ulcers: a clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. Mar 03 2015; 162(5): 370-9. PMID 25732279
49. Association for the Advancement of Wound Care (AAWC). Guideline of Pressure Ulcer Guidelines. 2010; <https://s3.amazonaws.com/aawc-new/memberclicks/AAWCPressureUlcerGuidelineofGuidelinesAug11.pdf>. Accessed December 21, 2020.
50. Association for the Advancement of Wound Care (AAWC). International Consolidated Venous Ulcer Guideline (ICVUG). Update of AAWC Venous Ulcer Guideline, 2005 and 2010. 2015; <https://aawconline.memberclicks.net/assets/appendix%20c%20guideline%20icvug-textformatrecommendations-final%20v42%20changessaved18aug17.pdf>. Accessed December 20, 2020.
51. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Negative Pressure Wound Therapy for the Open Abdomen [IPG467]. 2013; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg467>. Accessed December 13, 2020.
52. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Diabetic Foot Problems: Prevention and Management [NG19]. 2019; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng19/evidence>. Accessed December 19, 2020.
53. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Pressure ulcers: prevention and management [CG179]. 2014; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg179>. Accessed December 14, 2020.
54. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). PICO negative pressure wound dressings for closed surgical incisions [MTG43]. 2019; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/mtg43>. Accessed December 21, 2020.

**Other References**

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Surgery Liaison Committee meeting, August 2002; August 2003; August 17, 2005 (see Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Newsletter, Blue Shield Report. MAC-03-05); August 2008; August 2009.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Medical Advisory Committee meeting, November 3, 2005 (see Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Newsletter, Blue Shield Report. MAC-03-05).
3. BCBSKS Medical Consultant, MCMC, July 7, 2006, PRA Case Number - 10706101.
4. BCBSKS Medical Consultant, MCMC, October 23, 2006 (Reviewer ID R-W090, MCOP ID 1072-0274).
5. BCBSKS Medical Consultant, Practicing Board Certified General Surgeon (249), January 4, 2007.
6. BCBSKS Medical Consultant, Practicing Board Certified Pediatric Surgeon (236), February 5, 2007.
7. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Podiatry Liaison Committee, February 2009; January 2018.
8. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas OB/GYN Liaison Committee, January 2019.
9. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Orthopedic Liaison Committee, May 2019.