Skin Graft Donor-Site Morbidity: A Systematic Literature Review

Skin graft donor-site morbidities impose a significant burden on patients and negatively impact their quality of life

uo

ati

σ

Scre

Eligibility

nclude

Significance Statement

• Split-thickness skin grafts (STSGs) are part of the standard treatment for burn, traumatic, and chronic wounds.^{1,2} Despite widespread use, no systematic literature review of donor-site morbidities is readily available.

Data Source and Results

- Literature searches for English-language articles were conducted in PubMed, EMBASE, and Chemical Abstracts from January 1, 2009 to July 16, 2019
- Among 4271 articles identified, 77 studies met criteria for inclusion in data analysis (61 RCTs, 9 nonrandomized clinical trials, 3 observational studies, and 4 QoL/PRO studies)

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram

Records identified through database searching (N = 4,271)

Search terms: "skin graft donor site" paired with "clinical studies," "complications," "management," "financial burden," and "quality of life"

Records after duplicates removed (n = 2,435)

 $\frac{\text{Records excluded:}}{\text{Not outcomes of interest (n = 2,058)}}$ $\frac{\text{Nonhuman articles (n = 11)}}{\text{Nonhuman articles (n = 11)}}$

• Literature search and screening overview are shown in Figure 1

Study outcomes

- Time to epithelialization was reported in 62 (81%) studies
 - Mean time to epithelialization (40 studies): 4.7 (standard deviation: 0.2) to 35.0 days
 - Median time to epithelialization (12 studies): 7 to 26 days
- Pain assessment was reported in 41 (53%) studies; results of mean pain scores using the visual analog scale (0–10 scoring, 0 being no pain and 10 being extreme pain) on postoperative day 3 ranged from 1.24 to 6.38 (Figure 2)
- Scar score was reported in 18 (23%) studies; results of mean scar scores using the Vancouver Scar Scale (0–13 scoring, 0 being normal and 13 being worst scar) at 1-year post-STSG ranged from 0 to 10.9 (Figure 3)

Figure 2. Mean Pain Scores on Postoperative Day 3 (n = 7 studies)

Study	
Angspatt et al. 2011	3.11 (NA) 🔳 📕 3.59 (NA)
Fang et al. 2019	3.70 (0.21) 3.90 (0.16)
Higgins et al. 2012	1.24 (1.39) 🗖 1.39 (1.15)
Ki et al. 2019	2.55 (NA) 🗖 4.33 (NA)
Macharia et al. 2019	1.80 (NA) 4.80 (NA)
Muangman et al. 2011	1.88 (1.20) 6.38 (1.45)
Siritientong et al. 2014	 2.45 (1.50) 6.04 (3.00)
•	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10



Visual analog scale (0–10)

Note: Values are mean (standard deviation) from each treatment arm in that study. For studies with more than 2 treatment arms, only the minimum and maximum data points of all treatment arms are shown. NA = not available.

Figure 3. Mean Scar Scores at 1-Year Post Surgery (n = 3 studies)



Vancouver Scar Scale (0–13)

Note: Values are mean (standard deviation) from each treatment arm in that study. For studies with more than 2 treatment arms, only the minimum and maximum data points of all treatment arms are shown. NA = not available.

- One study reported 28% of patients had hypertrophic scars at the donor sites at 8 years
- Survey data from the European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions and the European Quality of Life visual analog scale showed that patients with STSGs had a significantly lower general health state compared with that of the general population

Lessons Learned

• The literature on quantitative, long-term assessments of skin graft donor-site morbidity is limited



PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses. *Despite limiting searches to include only English-language articles, a small number

*Despite limiting searches to include only English-language articles, a small number of articles in other languages were found. These non–English-language articles were excluded during screening. [†]Reviews of dressings and other interventions.

Limitations

- Only English-language literature was included in this systematic literature review
- The use of different timepoints and scales for assessments of pain and scarring limited the comparison of results across studies
- The methodologic quality of the included studies was not assessed
- Results of this analysis may not be generalizable to clinical outcomes in a real-world setting

Co-Authors and Affiliations

Malachy Asuku,^{a*} Qi Yan,^b Tzy-Chyi Yu,^a Elaine Böing,^a Helen Hahn,^a Sara Hovland,^a Matthias B. Donelan^c

^aMallinckrodt Pharmaceuticals, Bedminster, NJ, USA; ^bOxford PharmaGenesis Inc., Newtown, PA, USA; ^cShriners Hospital for Children-Boston, Harvard Medical School, and Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA ^{*}Presenting author

- The incidence of complications, such as hypertrophic scarring, resulting from skin graft harvesting is unknown and rarely discussed
- There is a need for alternative treatment options to reduce or eliminate STSG harvesting, which causes iatrogenic donor-site wounds and can result in significant morbidities

References

^{1.} Osborne SN, et al. Adv Skin Wound Care. 2016;29(2):57-64. ^{2.} Ogawa R. Burns Trauma. 2019;7:7.

Disclosures

M Asuku, E Böing, H Hahn, and S Hovland are employees of Mallinckrodt Pharmaceuticals, Bedminster, NJ, USA. Q Yan is an employee of Oxford PharmaGenesis Inc., Newtown, PA, USA. T-C Yu is an employee and stockholder of Mallinckrodt Pharmaceuticals, Bedminster, NJ, USA. MB Donelan is Chief of Staff, Emeritus, Shriners Hospital for Children-Boston, Associate Professor of Surgery (pt), Harvard Medical School, and Visiting Surgeon, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA.

This study was funded by Mallinckrodt Pharmaceuticals.

American Burn Association 52nd Annual Meeting | March 17-20, 2020 | Orlando, FL, USA