Overview

The Model of Care for Prevention and Integrated Management of Pressure Injuries in People with Spinal Cord Injury and Spina Bifida, published in March 2014, was developed by the New South Wales Agency for Clinical Innovation’s State Spinal Cord Injury Service.

The Model of Care (MoC) describes an integrated approach to the care of patients with spinal cord injuries (SCI) with the aim of improving pressure injury (PI) outcomes, and of limiting their psychosocial and economic impact. Figure 1 captures its main features. Three key principles that apply to all care settings, and to all aspects of PI prevention and management, are identified: self-management, access to equitable and timely services, and integrated care. The core elements of the MoC are captured in Section B of Figure 1. They reflect five MoC-identified phases of care along the patient’s journey. Specific goals for each phase are described, and optimal strategies for achieving them are outlined.

Figure 1. Model of Care for Prevention and Integrated Management of PI in People with SCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. KEY PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>B. PHASES OF PATIENT CARE</th>
<th>C. IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support self-management</td>
<td>Health promotion</td>
<td>Develop decision support systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and education strategies</td>
<td>Intervention (≤ stage II PI)</td>
<td>to facilitate access to information and expertise on prevention and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention (≥ stage III PI)</td>
<td>Provide timely access to care and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration and rehabilitation</td>
<td>Develop systems and processes that facilitate integrated care with effective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of life maintenance</td>
<td>Create systems and processes that facilitate self-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop multi-layered educational strategies for prevention and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrate clinical information and data management systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PI = pressure injury; SCI = spinal cord injury.
Overall, the objective of this new MoC is to promote an integrated approach to prevention and intervention. It aims to provide tools to improve PI outcomes, limit their harms, and consequently lessen the need for extended hospitalization.

### Clinical Indication

The overall impact of the MoC will depend, in part, on how successfully the recommendations are implemented. The following challenges, observed in smaller SCI and PI prevention and treatment implementation programs, may offer guidance to MoC implementation teams. They include ensuring that health care providers are adequately trained to accurately stage wounds, accommodating the time it takes to record wound injuries, adopting consistent wound injury documentation practices, and identifying materials and strategies that can be efficiently and effectively individualized for the SCI and PI populations.

### Delivery of Care

If the key principles of the MoC can be successfully implemented, it is expected that the development of serious (≥ stage 3) PIs will be reduced, lessening the number of hospitalizations and demand for specialist intervention.

### Health Care Costs

The SCI and PI populations use five times more resources than all other patients. They also have a high level of emergency admissions and readmission. The MoC estimates costs of approximately A$22,000 per hospital episode for the SCI and spina bifida population. As such, it is anticipated that the successful implementation of the MoC will reduce overall health care costs.

### Quality of Life

Some people with SCI have described the experience of a PI as being “as impactful on their lifestyle as was the original spinal cord injury.” Quality of life is expected to improve if the MoC is successfully implemented because the pain, discomfort, and distress associated with PIs are prevented, identified at an earlier stage, or treated more efficiently.

### Clinical Effectiveness

The MoC was developed through broad stakeholder consultation with more than 130 clinicians (surgeons, rehabilitation and occupational therapists, nurses, clinical psychologists, dietitians, and physiotherapists), consumers, and carers in both hospital and community settings in New South Wales. A literature review, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and workshops were also used to develop the MoC. It is currently premature to discuss its effectiveness because it is still being implemented; however, a number of evaluations of long-term outcomes, changes in practice and policy, and cost-effectiveness are anticipated over the next three years.

The 2013 Canadian Best Practice Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Pressure Ulcers in People with Spinal Cord Injury may be of particular interest to an Australian audience, given the similarities between the Canadian and Australian health care systems. Specifically, both are publicly funded models, and both experience challenges relating to the provision of health in rural and remote settings. The core feature of the Canadian guidelines is a series of recommendations supported by “level of evidence” grading that represents the full spectrum of SCI experience. The Australian MoC highlights strategies for managing SCI in five identified phases of care. Whereas each presents its findings differently, both stress an approach to care that brings together “interprofessional team members who address multifactorial issues, consider the social and environmental context, and provide an individualized and effective prevention program and treatment plan.”

### Setting for the Technology Use

Multiple settings throughout the continuum of care — community, in-care, primary, secondary, tertiary, acute care, and rehabilitation.

### Cost

No data were presented on the cost of implementing the MoC; however, in her research, Scovil states that PIs account for up to one-quarter of the total care costs for persons with SCI, but that appropriate prevention strategies may cost less than one-tenth of this estimate.
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Disclaimer
ISCRR is a joint initiative of WorkSafe Victoria, the Transport Accident Commission and Monash University. The accuracy of the content of this publication is the responsibility of the authors. Opinions, conclusion and recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the sponsor organisation of ISCRR. All information in this report is designed to help health care decision makers, patients and clinicians, health system leaders and policymakers make well-informed decision to improve the quality of health care services. The contents of this report should be considered in conjunction with all other relevant information including the context of available resources, current evidence of effectiveness and individual patient circumstances. This report is not intended to be a substitute for the application of clinical judgement.