Figure 521: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 300²g/g alternated with placebo



Figure 522: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 300²g/g alternated with placebo versus 300²g/g – proportion of patients with sepsis

VCIDA	versus soomer/g proportion of patients with sepsis												
	PDGF-BB/pla	cebo	PDGF-BB	300		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio						
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI						
Rees 1999	1	32	0	30	100.0%	6.94 [0.14, 350.54]							
Total (95% CI)		32		30	100.0%	6.94 [0.14, 350.54]							
Total events	1		0										
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable												
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 0.97 (P = 0	1.33)					Favours PDGF-BB/placebo Favours PDGF-BB 300						

Figure 523: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 300¹/₂g/g alternated with placebo versus 300¹/₂g/g – proportion of patients with adverse events other than osteomyelitis, infection and sensis

inieu	LION and S	sepsis					
	PDGF-BB/pla	cebo	PDGF-BB	300		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Rees 1999	3	32	2	30	100.0%	1.41 [0.25, 7.84]	
Total (95% CI)		32		30	100.0%	1.41 [0.25, 7.84]	
Total events	3		2				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.39 (P = 0).70)					Favours PDGF-BB/placebo Favours PDGF-BB 300

Figure 524: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 300 g/g alternated with placebo

versu	is soome/g										
	PDGF-BB/pla	PDGF-B	B 300	Peto Odds Ratio			Peto Odds Ratio				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl		Peto, Fix	ed, 95% Cl		
Rees 1999	0	32	0	30		Not estimable					
Total (95% CI)		32		30		Not estimable					
Total events	0		0								
Heterogeneity: Not applicable							0.01	0.1	1 1	0	100
Test for overall effect: Not applicable						Favo	urs rPDG	F-BB/placebo	Favours pla	acebo	,

I.2.7.41 Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (300 g/g) versus placebo

Figure 525: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (300⊡g/g) versus placebo – proportion of patients completely healed

· · · · ·									
	PDGF-BB	300	Place	bo		Peto Odds Ratio	lds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI	Peto, Fix	ed, 95% CI	
Rees 1999	1	30	0	31	100.0%	7.64 [0.15, 385.21]			
Total (95% CI)		30		31	100.0%	7.64 [0.15, 385.21]			
Total events	1		0						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable				0.001 0.1	10	1000		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.02 (F	P = 0.31)				Favours placebo	Favours PE	OGF-BB 300

Figure 526: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (300⊡g/g) versus placebo – proportion of patients ≥ 90% healed

	PDGF-BB 300		Placebo		Risk Ratio		Risk		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% CI	
Rees 1999	12	30	9	31	100.0%	1.38 [0.68, 2.78]	-	-	
Total (95% CI)		30		31	100.0%	1.38 [0.68, 2.78]	-		
Total events	12		9						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						0.01 0.1	1 1	0 100
Test for overall effect)				Favours placebo	Favours P	DGF-BB 300		

Figure 527: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (300⊡g/g) versus placebo – proportion of patients with osteomyelitis



Figure 528: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (300⊡g/g) versus placebo – proportion of patients with an infection

	PDGF-BB 300		Placebo		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Rees 1999	1	30	1	31	100.0%	1.03 [0.07, 15.78]	
Total (95% CI)		30		31	100.0%	1.03 [0.07, 15.78]	
Total events	1		1				
Heterogeneity: Not as	oplicable						
Test for overall effect	P = 0.98)			1	Favours PDGF-BB 300 Favours placebo	

Figure 529: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (300¹/₂g/g) versus placebo – proportion of patients with sepsis

	PDGF-BB 300		Placebo		Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl
Rees 1999	0	30	0	31		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		30		31		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not app							
Test for overall effect: Not applicable						Fa	vours rPDGF-BB 300 Favours placebo

Figure 530: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (3002g/g) versus placebo – proportion of patients with adverse events other than osteomyelitis, infection and sepsis

	•										
		PDGF-BB	300	Placebo		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio			
	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI			
	Rees 1999	2	30	2	31	100.0%	1.03 [0.16, 6.87]				
	Total (95% CI)		30		31	100.0%	1.03 [0.16, 6.87]				
	Total events	2		2							
	Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable									
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.03 (P = 0.97)								Favours PDGF-BB 300 Favours placebo			

Figure 531: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (300²g/g) versus placebo –mortality

	PDGF-BB/placebo		Placebo		Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Od	ds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
Rees 1999	0	32	0	31		Not estimable			
Total (95% CI)		32		31		Not estimable			
Total events	0		0						
Heterogeneity: Not app								100	
Test for overall effect: Not applicable						Fav	ours rPDGF/placebo	Favours place	bo

I.2.7.42 Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.0 g/g versus placebo

Figure 532: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.02g/g versus placebo – proportion of people completely healed

	PDGF-BB 1.0		PDGF-BB 1.0 Placebo			Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	7		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		4		7		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not app							
Test for overall effect: N	Not applica	ble					Favours placebo Favours PDGF-BB 1.0

Figure 533: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.02g/g versus placebo – proportion of people with infection

	PDGF-BB 1.0		Placebo		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	7		Not estimable				
Total (95% CI)		4		7		Not estimable				
Total events	0		0							
Heterogeneity: Not applicable							0.01	0.1	1 10	100
Test for overall effect. Not applicable						Fa	avours F	PDGF-BB 1.0	Favours pla	acebo

Figure 534: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.02g/g versus placebo – mortality

	PDGF-BB 1.0		Placebo		Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	7		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		4		7		Not estimable		
Total events	0		0					
Heterogeneity: Not app							4	
Test for overall effect: Not applicable						Fa	vours rPDGF-BB 1.0 Favours placebo	

1.2.7.43 Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (1.02g/g) vs. recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.02g/g)

Figure 535: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (1.02g/g) vs. recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.02g/g) – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

	PDGF-B	B 1.0	PDGF-B	PDGF-BB 10.0		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	4		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		4		4		Not estimable		
Total events	0		0					
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Not applicable							0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours PDGF-BB 10.0 Favours PDGF-BB 1.0	

Figure 536: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (1.02g/g) vs. recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.02g/g) – proportion of people with an infection

platen		Ca Pi	reion of people with an intection							
	PDGF-B	B 1.0	PDGF-B	PDGF-BB 10.0 Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl		
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	4		Not estimable				
Total (95% CI)		4		4		Not estimable				
Total events	0		0							
Heterogeneity: Not app						0.01 0.1 1	10	100		
Test for overall effect: I	ble					Favours PDGF-BB 1.0	Favours PDGF-	BB 10.0		

Figure 537: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (1.02g/g) vs. recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.02g/g) - mortality

	PDGF-B	B 1.0	PDGF-BB 10.0		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio						
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		М-Н,	Fixed,	95% CI				
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	4		Not estimable								
Total (95% CI)		4		4		Not estimable								
Total events	0		0											
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	ble					0.01 Favours	0.1 PDGF-BB	1 1.0 Fa	1 avours Pl	0 DGF·	100 BB 10.0			

I.2.7.44 Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.02g/g versus 100.02g/g

Figure 538: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.02g/g versus 100.02g/g – proportion of patients completely healed



Figure 539: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.02g/g versus 100.02g/g – proportion of patients with infection

	PDGF-B	B 1.0	PDGF-BB 100.0			Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Odds Ratio				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl		Peto, Fix	ed, 95% Cl			
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	5		Not estimable						
Total (95% CI)		4		5		Not estimable						
Total events	0		0									
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Not applica	ıble					0.01 0 Favours rPl). 1 DGF-BB 1.0	1 1 Favours rP	0 DGF-E	100 3B 100	

Figure 540: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 1.02g/g versus 100.02g/g – mortality

	PDGF-B	B 1.0	PDGF-BB 100.0			Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Od	ds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl		Peto, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	5		Not estimable				
Total (95% CI)		4		5		Not estimable				
Total events	0		0							
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	t applicable ect: Not applicable						0.01 0 Favours rPE	.1)GF-BB 1.0	10 Favours rPD	100 GF-BB 100

1.2.7.45 Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.02g/g) versus placebo

Figure 541: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.0⊡g/g) versus placebo – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

proportion of people with pressure dicers completely neared													
	PDGF-BB 10.0			bo		Peto Odds Ratio							
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI						
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	7		Not estimable							
Total (95% CI)		4		7		Not estimable							
Total events	0		0										
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	ble				Fa	0.01 0.1 1 10 100 vours rPDGF-BB 10.0 Favours placebo							

Figure 542: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.0⊡g/g) versus placebo – proportion of people with infection

	PDGF-BE	3 10.0	Placel	00		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI	
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	7		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		4		7		Not estimable		
Total events	0		0					
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	eterogeneity: Not applicable est for overall effect: Not applicable					Fa	0.01 0.1 1 10 vours rPDGF-BB 10.0 Favours pla	100 cebo

Figure 543: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor-BB (10.02g/g) versus placebo – mortality

	PDGF-BE	3 10.0	Placel	00		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	7		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		4		7		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Not applicable						Fav	0.01 0.1 1 10 100 /ours rPDGF-BB 10.0 Favours placebo

I.2.7.46 Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 10.02g/g versus 100.02g/g

Figure 544: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 10.02g/g versus 100.02g/g – proportion of patients completely healed

			•		•					
		PDGF-BB 10.0		0.0 PDGF-BB 100.0			Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Od	lds Ratio	
_	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI	Peto, Fixe	ed, 95% CI	
	Robson 1992b	0	4	2	5	100.0%	0.13 [0.01, 2.52]		-	
	Total (95% CI)		4		5	100.0%	0.13 [0.01, 2.52]		-	
	Total events	0		2						
	Heterogeneity: Not ap	ogeneity: Not applicable						0.002 0.1	10	500
	Test for overall effect:	r overall effect: Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18)						Favours PDGF-BB 100.0	Favours PDGF-	BB 10.0

Figure 545: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 10.02g/g versus 100.02g/g – proportion of patients with infection

piopo		ιματισ						
	PDGF-BE	DGF-BB 10.0 PDGF-BB 100.0			Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	5		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		4		5		Not estimable		
Total events	0		0					
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: I	olicable Not applical	ole					0.01 0.1 Favours PDGF-BB 10.0	1 10 100 Favours PDGF-BB 100.0

Figure 546: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor: 10.02g/g versus 100.02g/g –

morta	ality										
	PDGF-BB 10.0		PDGF-BB 100.0		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	I	M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl		
Robson 1992b	0	4	0	5		Not estimable					
Total (95% CI)		4		5		Not estimable					
Total events	0		0								
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								1 1	H	100
Test for overall effect: Not applicable							Favours PDG	F-BB 10.0	Favours PD	GF-BB	100.0

Figure 547: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (100.02g/g) versus placebo – proportion of patients completely healed

	PDGF-BB 100.0		Placebo		Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Od	ds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI	Peto, Fixe	ed, 95% CI	
Robson 1992b	2	5	0	7	100.0%	14.01 [0.73, 267.29]	-		
Total (95% CI)		5		7	100.0%	14.01 [0.73, 267.29]	-		
Total events	2		0						
Heterogeneity: Not ap						0.002 0.1	10 500		
Test for overall effect Z = 1.75 (P = 0.08)		= 0.08)					Eavours placebo	Favours PDGE-BB 100	
-									

Figure 548: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (100.02g/g) versus placebo – mean percentage reduction in ulcer depth

	PDGF	-BB 10	0.0	P	acebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Robson 1992b	85.9	14.8	5	65.1	13.4	7	100.0%	20.80 [4.47, 37.13]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Z = 2.50	(P = 0	5 .01)			7	100.0%	20.80 [4.47, 37.13]	-100 -50 0 50 100 Favours placebo Favours PDGF-BB 100.

Figure 549: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (100.0⊡g/g) versus placebo – mean percentage reduction in ulcer depth

						•			
	PDGF-B	BB 10	0.0	Pla	acebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Robson 1992b	93.6	8	5	78.2	11.2	7	100.0%	15.40 [4.54, 26.26]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: .	plicable Z = 2.78 (I	P = 0.	5 005)			7	100.0%	15.40 [4.54, 26.26]	-50 -25 0 25 50 Favours placebo Favours PDGF-BB 100.

Figure 550: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (100.0₂g/g) versus placebo – proportion of people with infection

	PDGF-BB	100.0	Placel	00		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed	. 95% CI
Robson 1992b	Û	5	٥	7		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		5		7		Notestimable		
Total events	Û		Û					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							10 100
Test for overall effect i	Vot applicabl	8					ours rPDGF-88 100 F	nours placebo

Figure 551: Recombinant platelet-derived growth factor (100.0⊡g/g) versus placebo – mortality

	PDGF-BB	100.0	Place	bo		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1992b	0	5	0	7		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		5		7		Not estimable		
Total events	0 Dlicable		0					
Test for overall effect:	Not applicabl	le				Fa	0.01 0.1 1 10 1 vours rPDGF-BB 100 Favours placebo	00

1.2.7.47 Basic fibroblast growth factor (different schedules and doses) versus placebo

Figure 552: Basic fibroblast growth factor (different schedules and doses) versus placebo – proportion of patients > 70% healed

	BFG	F	Place	bo		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Robson 1992a	21	35	4	14	100.0%	2.10 [0.88, 5.02]	+∎-
Total (95% CI)		35		14	100.0%	2.10 [0.88, 5.02]	◆
Total events	21		4				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.67	(P = 0.1	0)				Favours placebo Favours BFGF

Figure 553: Basic fibroblast growth factor (different schedules and doses) versus placebo – mortality

	BFG	F	Placel	oo		Peto Odds Ratio		Peto O	dds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl		Peto, Fi	xed, 95% (CI	
Robson 1992a	0	35	0	15		Not estimable					
Total (95% CI)		35		15		Not estimable					
Total events	0		0								
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: I	olicable Not applica	able					0.01 Favo	0.1 ours BFGI	1 10 Favours	0 pla	100 cebo

I.2.7.48 Interleukin 1-beta (0.01ug/cm²) vs. placebo

Figure 554: Interleukin 1-beta (0.01²/₂g/cm²) vs. placebo – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

	IL-1beta	0.01	Place	bo		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% C	1	
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable					
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable					
Total events	0		0								
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Not applica	able					0.01 (Favours).1 IL-1beta	1 10 Favours) plac	100 cebo

Figure 555: Interleukin 1-beta (0.012g/cm²) vs. placebo – mortality

	IL-1beta	0.01	Placel	00		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Od	lds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	Peto, Fix	ed, 95% Cl
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable		
Total events	0		0					
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable							
Test for overall effect:	Not applica	able					Favours rIL-1beta	Favours placebo

I.2.7.49 Interleukin 1-beta (0.012g/cm²) versus interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²)

Figure 556: Interleukin 1-beta (0.012g/cm²) versus interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²) – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

	IL-1beta	0.01	IL-1beta	a 0.1		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Not applica	ıble					0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours IL-1beta 0.01 Favours IL-1beta 0.1

Figure 557: Interleukin 1-beta (0.012g/cm²) versus interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²) – mortality

	IL-1beta	0.01	IL-1beta	a 0.1		Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Od	lds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	I	Peto, Fix	ed, 95% Cl		
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable					
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable					
Total events	0		0								
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Not applica	ıble					I 0.01 Favours rIL	0.1 -1beta 0.01	l 1 1 1 Favours rlL	0 1beta	100 0.1

1.2.7.50 Interleukin 1-beta (0.01¹/₂g/cm²) vs. interleukin 1-beta (1.0¹/₂g/cm²) –

Figure 558: Interleukin 1-beta (0.012g/cm²) vs. interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²) – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

	•				•	•			
	IL-1beta	0.01	IL-1beta	a 1.0		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable			
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable			
Total events	0		0						
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable								100
Test for overall effect: I	Not applica	ble					Favours IL-1beta 0.01	Favours IL-1beta	1.0

Figure 559: Interleukin 1-beta (0.012g/cm²) vs. interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²) – mortality

	IL-1beta 0.01 IL-1beta 1.0					Peto Odds Ratio Peto O			lds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	1		Peto, Fix	ed, 95% Cl		
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable						
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable						
Total events	0		0									
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Not applica	ble					0.01 Favou	0. rs rIL-	. 1 1beta 0.01	1 1 Favours rl	l 0 L-1be	100 eta 1.0

I.2.7.51 Interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²) vs. placebo

Figure 560: Interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²) vs. placebo – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

	IL-1beta 0.1		Placebo		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% (CI M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable						
Test for overall effect: I	able					Favours IL-1beta 0.1 Favours placebo	

Figure 561: Interleukin 1-beta (0.1[®]g/cm²) vs. placebo – mortality

	IL-1beta 0.1		Placebo		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable	9			
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable	•			
Total events	0		0							
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Not applicable							0.01 Favours	0.1 IL-1beta 0.1	1 10 Favours plac	100 cebo

I.2.7.52 Interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²) vs. interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²)

Figure 562: Interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²) vs. interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²) – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

	•				•	-					
	IL-1beta 0.1		IL-1beta	a 1.0		Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl		Peto, Fi	xed, 95% C	I	
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable					
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable					
Total events	0		0								
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: N	licable Not applica	ble					0.01 Favour	0.1 rs IL-1beta 0.1	1 1 Favours I	+ 10 L-1bet	100 a 1.0

Figure 563: Interleukin 1-beta (0.12g/cm²) vs. interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²) – mortality

	IL-1beta 0.1		IL-1beta 1.0			Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Ode	ds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl	
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable			
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable			
Total events	0		0						
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Not applica	able					0.01 0.1 1 Favours IL-1beta 0.1	10 Favours IL-1b	100 eta 1.0

I.2.7.53 Interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²) vs. placebo

Figure 564: Interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²) vs. placebo – proportion of people with pressure ulcers completely healed

	IL-1beta 1.0		Placebo		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I M-H, Fixe	∋d, 95% Cl
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable		
Total events	0		0					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: N	lble					Favours IL-1beta 1.0	Favours placebo	

Figure 565: Interleukin 1-beta (1.02g/cm²) vs. placebo – mortality

-			-	-			-
	IL-1beta	ı 1.0	Place	bo		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% (M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Robson 1994	0	6	0	6		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		6		6		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Not applica	able					0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours IL-1beta 1.0 Favours placebo

1.2.7.54 Chlorinated lime solution versus dextranomer

Figure 566: Chlorinated lime solution versus dextranomer – Time to healing (defined as granulation and < 25% of original ulcer area) (days)

	-			_						
		Chlor	inated li	ime	Dex	tranom	er		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Ĩ	Nasar 1982	61.8	13.86	5	39.3	17.67	6	100.0%	22.50 [3.86, 41.14]	
	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable		5			6	100.0%	22.50 [3.86, 41.14]	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.37$ (P = 0.02)										-100 -50 0 50 100
								Favours chlorinated lime Favours dextranomer		

Figure 567: Chlorinated lime solution versus dextranomer – mortality

	Chlorinated	Dextrance	omer		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl
Nasar, 1982	0	8	1	8	100.0%	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]	
Total (95% CI)		8		8	100.0%	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]	
Total events	0		1				
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	plicable $Z = 1.00 (P = 0)$	0.32)				F	0.01 0.1 1 10 100 avours chlorinated lime Favours dextranomer

I.2.8 Dressings

Figure 568: Figure 2. Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of patients completely healed

patient	's comb	ietery	neared				
	Hydrocol	lloid	Gauz	е		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 General populat	ion						
Kim 1996	21	26	14	18	34.8%	1.04 [0.76, 1.42]	_
Matzen 1999	5	17	0	15	3.2%	9.78 [0.59, 163.33]	
Xakellis 1992	16	18	18	21	36.5%	1.04 [0.82, 1.32]	- e
Subtotal (95% CI)		61		54	74.6%	1.07 [0.77, 1.48]	-
Total events	42		32				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.04; Chi ²	= 3.84,	df = 2 (P	= 0.15); l² = 48%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.40 (P	P = 0.69)				
1.1.2 Patients with sp	inal cord i	injury					
Hollisaz 2004	20	28	8	27	25.4%	2.41 [1.29, 4.51]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		28		27	25.4%	2.41 [1.29, 4.51]	
Total events	20		8				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.75 (P	e = 0.00	6)				
T-4-1 (05% OB					400.00	4 00 10 04 0 051	
Total (95% CI)		89		81	100.0%	1.38 [0.81, 2.35]	
Total events	62		40				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.18; Chi ²	= 14.93	3, df = 3 (P = 0.0	02); I ² = 8	0%	0.2 0.5 1 2 5
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.20 (P	P = 0.23)				Favours gauze Favours hydrocolloid
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: C	∶hi² = 5.	10, df = 1	(P = 0	.02), I ^z = 8	30.4%	

Figure 569:	Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of ulcers completely
hea	led (all stages – all sites)

nealeu	ι ιαπ σταε	563 - 6	in sites	1			
	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	ze		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.2.1 General popula	tion						
Colwell 1993	11	48	1	49	4.2%	11.23 [1.51, 83.64]	
Kordestani 2008	14	16	4	12	19.6%	2.63 [1.15, 5.97]	_
Neill 1989	13	42	10	45	41.4%	1.39 [0.69, 2.83]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		106		106	65.2%	2.40 [1.44, 4.02]	●
Total events	38		15				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.58, df =	2 (P = 0).10); I² =	56%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.35 (F	P = 0.00	008)				
1.2.2 Patients with a	spinal cor	d injury	,				
Hollisaz 2004	23	31	8	30	34.8%	2.78 [1.48, 5.22]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		30	34.8%	2.78 [1.48, 5.22]	◆
Total events	23		8				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	oplicable						
Test for overall effect	Z= 3.19 (I	° = 0.00)1)				
Total (95% CI)		137		136	100.0%	2.53 [1.70, 3.78]	•
Total events	61		23				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.94, df=	3 (P = 0).18); I ² =	39%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.58 (F	P < 0.00	0001)				U.U1 U.1 1 10 100
Test for subgroup diff	ferences: C	chi² = 0.	.13, df = 1	I (P = 0	.72), I² = I	0%	Favours gauze Favours hydrocollo

Figure 570: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of ulcers completely healed (stage II – all sites)

	(0	-						
	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl
1.5.1 Patients with a	spinal cor	d injury						
Hollisaz 2004 Subtotal (95% CI)	12	18 18	3	19 19	40.2% 40.2%	4.22 [1.42, 12.54] 4.22 [1.42, 12.54]		
Total events Heterogeneity: Not ap	12 plicable		3					
lest for overall effect:	Z = 2.59 (H	' = U.U1	U)					
1.5.2 General populat	tion							
Neill 1989 Subtotal (95% Cl)	11	25 25	9	34 34	59.8% 59.8%	1.66 [0.81, 3.39] 1.66 [0.81, 3.39]	-	
Total events	11		9					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.40 (F	° = 0.16)					
Total (95% CI)		43		53	100.0%	2.42 [0.97, 6.00]		
Total events	23		12					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.23; Chi²	= 2.03,	df = 1 (P	= 0.15); I ^z = 51%	6		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.90 (F	P = 0.06)				Eavours dauze	Eavours hydrocolloid
Test for subgroup diff	erences: C	;hi ² = 1.	97, df = 1	(P = 0)	.16), I ² = 4	19.2%	i aroaro gauzo	i aroaro nyaroconora

.

Figure 571: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing - proportion of ulcers completely healed (stage III – all sites)

nearea	(01000						
	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.5.1 Gauze							
Neill 1989	2	17	1	11	100.0%	1.29 [0.13, 12.62]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		17		11	100.0%	1.29 [0.13, 12.62]	
Total events	2		1				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.22 (F	P = 0.82	0				
							Favours gauze Favours hydrocolloid
Toot for oubgroup diffs	aranaa. h	lot oppl	iaabla				-

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 572: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing - proportion of ulcers completely healed (all stages - sacral)



Figure 573: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing - proportion of ulcers improved

0						U I I		•
	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl
1.7.1 Gauze								
Hollisaz 2004	27	31	29	60	100.0%	1.80 [1.34, 2.42]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		60	100.0%	1.80 [1.34, 2.42]		-
Total events	27		29					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.92 (F	P < 0.00	101)					

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Favours gauze Favours hydrocolloid

stages							
	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	I M-H, Random, 95% CI
1.9.1 Patients with a	spinal cor	d injury	1				
Hollisaz 2004 Subtotal (95% CI)	2	31	9	30	41.0%	0.22 [0.05, 0.91	
Total events	2	51	q	50	41.0%	0.22 [0.03, 0.51	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable		0				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.08 (F	P = 0.04)				
1.9.2 General populat	tion						
Neill 1989	14	42	15	45	59.0%	1.00 (0.55, 1.81]
Subtotal (95% CI)		42		45	59.0%	1.00 [0.55, 1.81	1 🔶
Total events	14		15				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.00 (F	^o = 1.00	Ŋ				
Total (95% CI)		73		75	100.0%	0.53 [0.12, 2.46	
Total events	16		24				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.94; Chi ²	² = 3.95,	df = 1 (P	= 0.05); I ^z = 759	6	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.81 (F	P = 0.42)				Eavours hydrocolloid Eavours dauze
Test for subgroup diff	erences: C	Chi ² = 3.	70, df = 1	(P = 0	.05), I ² = 7	73.0%	ravours nyuroconora i ravours gauze

Figure 574: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of ulcers worsened (all stages)

Figure 575: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of ulcers worsened (stage II)

(56686)	···/								
	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I M-I	H, Fixed, 95% CI	
1.9.1 Gauze									
Neill 1989	7	25	11	34	100.0%	0.87 [0.39, 1.92]	I —		
Subtotal (95% CI)		25		34	100.0%	0.87 [0.39, 1.92]			
Total events	7		11						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.36 (ł	^o = 0.72	9						
									<u></u>
							_ 0.2 0.0		5
							Favours hydroc	olloid Favours o	auze

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 576: Figure 10. Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of ulcers worsened (stage III)

	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.10.1 Gauze							
Neill 1989	7	17	4	11	100.0%	1.13 [0.43, 2.98]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		17		11	100.0%	1.13 [0.43, 2.98]	
Total events	7		4				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.25 (F	P = 0.80	ŋ				
						F	avours hydrocolloid Eavours dauze
The state of the second second state		1 - 4 1	1 I-I -				arouro nyaroconora i arouro gauzo

Figure 577:	Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – mean percentage reduction in ulcer
are	3

	uicu									
		Hyo	Irocolloi	d		Gauze			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
	1.11.1 Gauze									
	Chang 1998	34	102.45	17	-9	102.45	17	4.8%	43.00 [-25.87, 111.87]	- <u>+</u>
	Mulder 1993	3.3	32.7	21	5.1	14.8	20	95.2%	-1.80 [-17.22, 13.62]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			38			37	100.0%	0.34 [-14.71, 15.38]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	1.55, df	= 1 (P = I	0.21); P	'= 35%					
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.04	(P = 0.9)	6)						
										Favours gauze Favours hydrocolloid
	Test for subgroup diffe	erences	: Not app	licable						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Figure 578: Figure 12. Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – mean percentage reduction in ulcer volume



Figure 579: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – mean healing speed (mm²/day)

	Hydr	ocollo	bid	G	auze			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.19.1 Gauze									
Kim 1996	9.1	5.4	26	7.9	4.7	18	100.0%	1.20 [-1.80, 4.20]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			26			18	100.0%	1.20 [-1.80, 4.20]	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect	Z = 0.79	$(\mathbf{P} = 0)$	1.43)						
									Favours gauze Favours hydrocolloid

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 580: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of patients with an infection



Figure 581:	Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of patients with
hvi	pergranulation

iiypeig	ianulau	UII						
	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI	
1.23.1 Gauze								
Kim 1996	3	26	0	18	100.0%	5.90 [0.56, 62.29		_
Subtotal (95% CI)		26		18	100.0%	5.90 [0.56, 62.29]		-
Total events	3		0					
Heterogeneity: Not app	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.48 (F	^o = 0.14	9					
								100
							Favours hydrocolloid Favours gauze	.00
To at fay and swarm diffe		let en un la	lia a la la					

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable



	Hydroco	lloid	Gauz	e		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto O	lds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	I Peto, Fix	ed, 95% CI	
1.25.1 Gauze									
Neill 1989	0	50	9	50	100.0%	0.11 [0.03, 0.44] — —		
Subtotal (95% CI)		50		50	100.0%	0.11 [0.03, 0.44	i 🔶		
Total events	0		9						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z= 3.13 (I	^o = 0.00	12)						
			-						
							0.005 0.1	1 10	200
							Favours hydrocolloid	Favours gau	Ize

Figure 583: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of patients with pain at dressing removal



Figure 584: Figure 18. Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – proportion of patients with discomfort



145

	Hydroco	olloid	Gauz	e		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% (CI M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Kordestani 2008	0	33	10	52	65.6%	0.07 [0.00, 1.23]	3] ←
Matzen 1999	2	17	1	15	8.5%	1.76 [0.18, 17.56	5]
Xakellis 1992	0	18	3	21	25.9%	0.17 [0.01, 3.00]	
Total (95% CI)		68		88	100.0%	0.24 [0.07, 0.89]	
Total events	2		14				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	3.62, df = 2	(P = 0.	16); l² = 4	5%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.13 (F	9 = 0.03))			F	Favours hydrocolloid Favours gauze

Figure 585: Hydrocolloid dressing versus gauze dressing – mortality

Figure 586: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing – proportion of patients completely

nealed							
	Hydroco	lloid	Foar	n		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
2.1.2 Foam							
Bale 2005	5	9	7	12	25.0%	0.95 [0.45, 2.03]	
Seeley 1999	8	20	8	20	33.3%	1.00 [0.47, 2.14]	+
Thomas 1997	16	48	10	48	41.7%	1.60 [0.81, 3.16]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		77		80	100.0%	1.24 [0.81, 1.90]	
Total events	29		25				
Heterogeneity: Chi*= "	1.31, df =	2 (P = 0	.52); lª =	0%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.98 ()	P = 0.33	()				
							05 07 1 15 2

Favours foam Favours hydrocolloid

Favours hydrocolloid Favours foam

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 587: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing – proportion of patients improved

	Hvdroco	lloid	Foar	n		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
2.2.1 Foam									
Thomas 1997 Subtotal (95% CI)	39	48 <mark>48</mark>	39	48 48	100.0% 100.0%	1.00 [0.83, 1.21] 1.00 [0.83, 1.21]		-	
Total events Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	39 plicable Z = 0.00 (f	°=1.00	39 I)						
							0.5	0.7 1 1.5	2

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 588: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing – proportion of patients not changed



0 /									
	Hydroco	lloid	Foar	n		Risk Ratio	R	ísk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, I	Fixed, 95% CI	
2.4.1 Foam									
Bale1997	2	31	1	29	17.1%	1.87 [0.18, 19.55]	· -	_	_
Thomas 1997	7	48	5	48	82.9%	1.40 [0.48, 4.10]			
Subtotal (95% CI)		79		77	100.0%	1.48 [0.56, 3.94]		-	
Total events	9		6						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.05, df = 1	1 (P = 0	.83); I ^z =	0%					
Test for overall effect	Z=0.79 (F	∍ = 0.43	0						
									100
							0.01 0.1	aid Equation fo	100
						r	-avours nyurocon	olu Favours lo	am

Figure 589: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing – proportion of patients worsened

Figure 590: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing – mean reduction in ulcer area

		Hydr	ocollo	id	F	oam			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
	2.5.2 Foam									
	Seeley 1999	52	6.06	19	50	6.06	20	100.0%	2.00 [-1.81, 5.81]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			19			20	100.0%	2.00 [-1.81, 5.81]	
	Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
	Test for overall effect.	Z=1.03	(P=0	1.30)						
										-4 -2 U Z 4
	- 1.2 I II.22									Favours toarn Favours hydrocolloic

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 591: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing – proportion of patients with bleeding

atio
5% CI
10 200
ours foam

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

_

Figure 592: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing – proportion of patients with maceration

matera								
	Hydroco	lloid	Foar	n		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto O	dds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fix	ed, 95% Cl
2.8.1 Foam								
Thomas 1997	4	49	0	50	100.0%	8.04 [1.10, 58.85]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		49		50	100.0%	8.04 [1.10, 58.85]		
Total events	4		0					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.05 ()	P = 0.04	9					
							O.OT O.T	L Equation for the
		1 - 4				1	-avours nydrocolloid	ravours ioam

Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing - proportion of patients with Figure 593: inflammation or maceration

		Hydroco	lloid	Foar	n		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
_	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	2.9.1 Foam							
	Seeley 1999	6	19	12	20	100.0%	0.53 [0.25, 1.12]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)		19		20	100.0%	0.53 [0.25, 1.12]	◆
	Total events	6		12				
	Heterogeneity: Not app	plicable						
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.67 (F	P = 0.09	n)				
	To at fair and annound diff.						F	avours hydrocolloid Favours foam
	LOOTION OUR OWNER OUT							

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable





Figure 595: Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing - mean odour score at end of



Hydrocolloid dressing versus foam dressing - proportion of patients with adverse Figure 596: events (unknown if dressing related)

	Hydroco	lloid	Foar	n		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Bale1997	2	31	3	29	38.3%	0.62 [0.11, 3.47]	
Seeley 1999	3	20	5	20	61.7%	0.60 [0.17, 2.18]	
Total (95% CI)		51		49	100.0%	0.61 [0.22, 1.71]	
Total events	5		8				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.00, df =	1 (P = 0	.97); I² =				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.94 (F	P = 0.35	6	-			
	(-		,	E.	avours hydrocolloid Favours foam		

Figure 597: <Insert graphic title here>

<Click here and insert picture with the Graphic tools on the Toolbar Ribbon>

Figure 598:	Hydrocolloid	dressing versus	foam dressing-	mortality
-------------	--------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------

	Hydroco	olloid	Foan	n		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95	% CI
Bale1997	2	31	6	29	100.0%	0.31 [0.07, 1.42]		
Total (95% CI)		31		29	100.0%	0.31 [0.07, 1.42]		
Total events	2		6					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable	0.10					0.01 0.1 1	10 100
rest for overall effect: 2	∠ = 1.50 (P	= 0.13)				F	avours hydrocolloid Favo	urs foam

Figure 599: Hydrocolloid dressing versus polyurethane dressing – proportion of patients completely healed

compi	cicity in	cuica					
	Hydroco	lloid	Polyuret	hane		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
3.1.3 Polyurethane							
Banks 1994a	11	12	10	10	27.0%	0.93 [0.73, 1.17]	
Banks 1994b	10	10	12	18	21.8%	1.45 [1.02, 2.06]	
Brown-Etris 2008	22	37	21	35	51.2%	0.99 [0.68, 1.45]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		59		63	100.0%	1.07 [0.87, 1.33]	-
Total events	43		43				
Heterogeneity: Chi*= -	4.54, ci = :	2 (P = 0	.10); P= 5	16%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.65 (F	° = 0.52	9				
							0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2
							Favours polyurethane Favours hydrocolloid

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 600: Hydrocolloid dressing versus polyurethane dressing – proportion of patients improved

		Hydroco	lloid	Polyuret	hane		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study	or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
3.2.3	Polyurethane							
Banks	s 1994b	10	10	18	18	100.0%	1.00 [0.86, 1.16]	
Subto	tal (95% CI)		10		18	100.0%	1.00 [0.86, 1.16]	-
Total e	events	10		18				
Hetero	ogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test fo	or overall effect: .	Z = 0.00 (ł	P = 1.00))				
								Favours hydrocolloid Favours polyurethane

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 601: Hydrocolloid dressing versus polyurethane dressing – linear healing rate



Figure 602: Hydrocolloid dressing versus polyurethane dressing - mean odour score Hydrocolloid Polyurethane Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Fixed, 95% CI IV, Fixed, 95% CI 3.6.1 Polyurethane 35 100.0% -0.20 [-0.33, -0.07] 35 100.0% -0.20 [-0.33, -0.07] Brown-Etris 2008 4.8 0.39 5 0.14 37 Subtotal (95% CI) 37 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 2.93 (P = 0.003) -0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours polyurethane Favours hydrocolloid Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Hydrocolloid dressing versus polyurethane dressing - mean comfort score Figure 603:

0					•				0
	Hydr	ocollo	bid	Poly	uretha	ne		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
3.7.1 Polyurethane									_
Brown-Etris 2008	4.4	0.66	37	4.8	0.34	35	100.0%	-0.40 [-0.64, -0.16]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			37			35	100.0%	-0.40 [-0.64, -0.16]	
Haterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect.	Z = 3.28	(P=(1.001)						
									Favours polyurethane Favours hydrocolloid
Test for subaroun diffe	erences	 Not a 	nnlical	ale					

est for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 604: Hydrocolloid dressing versus polyurethane dressing - mortality

	Hydroco	lloid	Polyuret	hane		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Banks 1994b	2	20	1	20	100.0%	2.00 [0.20, 20.33]	
Total (95% CI)		20		20	100.0%	2.00 [0.20, 20.33]	
Total events	2		1				
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable						
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.59 (P	= 0.56)					Favours hydrocolloid Favours polyurethane

Figure 605: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagenase ointment - proportion of patients completely healed

compre	cicity ne	aicu					
	Hydroco	lloid	Collag	en		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
4.1.1 All sites							
Burgos 2000a Subtotal (95% CI)	3	19 19	3	18 18	22.7% 22.7%	0.95 [0.22, 4.10] 0.95 [0.22, 4.10]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Not ap	3 plicable		3				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.07 (I	P = 0.94)				
4.1.4 Heel ulcers							_ [
Müller 2001	7	11	11	12	77.3%	0.69 [0.43, 1.12]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		11		12	77.3%	0.69 [0.43, 1.12]	
Total events	7		11				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.60 ()	P = 0.13	0				
Total (95% CI)		30		30	100.0%	0.75 [0.45, 1.26]	
Total events	10		14				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.20, df=	1 (P = 0	.65); I² =	0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.09 (i	P = 0.28)				Favours collagen Favours hydrocolloid
Test for subaroup diff	erences: (Chi² = 0.	16. df = 1	(P = 0)	.69), I ^z = ()%	. arears consign. I arours njarooonora

Figure 606: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagenase ointment – mean percentage reduction



Figure 607: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagenase ointment – mean cm² reduction in ulcer



Figure 608: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagenase ointment – mean time to healing (weeks)

•	Hydrocolloid			Collagen			•	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Müller 2001	14	4.6	11	10	4.6	12	100.0%	4.00 [0.24, 7.76]	
<mark>Total (95% CI)</mark> Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	oplicable : Z = 2.08	(P = (11 0.04)			12	100.0%	4.00 [0.24, 7.76]	-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours hydrocolloid Favours collagen

Figure 609: Figure 39. Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagenase ointment – proportion of patients with adverse events

	Hydroco	Collag	en		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Burgos 2000a	2	19	1	18	100.0%	1.89 [0.19, 19.13]	
Total (95% CI)		19		18	100.0%	1.89 [0.19, 19.13]	
Total events	2		1				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.54 (F	P = 0.59)				Favours hydrocolloid Favours collagen

Hydrocolloid Collagen **Risk Ratio Risk Ratio** Events Total Events Total Weight M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Study or Subgroup M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Burgos 2000a 18 100.0% 1 19 3 0.32 [0.04, 2.76] Total (95% CI) 19 18 100.0% 0.32 [0.04, 2.76] Total events 3 1 Heterogeneity: Not applicable 0.01 0.1 10 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 1.04 (P = 0.30) Favours hydrocolloid Favours collagenase

Figure 610: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagenase ointment –mortality

Figure 611: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagen dressing – proportion of patients completely healed

	Hydrocolloid		Collag	en		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Graumlich 2003	15	30	18	35	100.0%	0.97 [0.60, 1.57]	
Total (95% CI)		30		35	100.0%	0.97 [0.60, 1.57]	
Total events	15		18				
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Z = 0.11 (i	^o = 0.91)				0.2 0.5 1 2 5
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	15 15 oplicable Z = 0.11 (I	30 30 P = 0.91	18	35 35	100.0%	0.97 [0.60, 1.57]	0.2 0.5 1 2 Favours collagen Favours hydrocolly

Figure 612: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagen dressing – mean percentage reduction in

ulter	area										
	Hydrocolloid			Collagen				Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
Graumlich 2003	9	73.98	30	33	73.98	35	100.0%	-24.00 [-60.08, 12.08]		-	
Total (95% CI)			30			35	100.0%	-24.00 [-60.08, 12.08]		÷ .	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								-100 -50	n sc	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.30	(P = 0.	19)						Favours collagen	Favours hy	drocolloid

Figure 613: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagen dressing – mean speed of healing (mm²/day)

-	•			-			-	•	
	Hydro	ocollo	bid	Col	lagei	n		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Graumlich 2003	6	16	35	6	19	35	100.0%	0.00 [-8.23, 8.23]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Z = 0.00	(P = 1	35 1.00)			35	100.0%	0.00 [-8.23, 8.23]	-20 -10 0 10 20 Favours collagen Favours hydrocolloid

Figure 614: Figure 43. Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagen dressing – mean time to

healii	ng (we	eeks							
	Hydrocolloid		Collagen				Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	ubgroup Mean SD Total		Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
Graumlich 2003	6	2.68	30	5	2.91	35	100.0%	1.00 [-0.36, 2.36]	-
Total (95% CI)			30			35	100.0%	1.00 [-0.36, 2.36]	•
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable	(P - 1	115)						-4 -2 0 2 4
restion overall effect.	2 - 1.44	J. 1 J)						Eavours hydrocolloid Eavours collagen	

Figure 615: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagen dressing – proportion of people with adverse events

	Hydrocolloid		Collagen		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl	
Graumlich 2003	0	30	0	35		Not estimable				
Total (95% CI)		30		35		Not estimable				
Total events	0		0							
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: I	olicable Not applica	ble				F	0.002 avours hy	0.1 drocolloid	1 10 Favours col	500 lagen

Figure 616: Hydrocolloid dressing versus collagen dressing – mortality

	Hydroco	lloid	Collag	en		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% (M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Graumlich 2003	2	30	3	35	100.0%	0.78 [0.14, 4.35]	
Total (95% CI)		30		35	100.0%	0.78 [0.14, 4.35]	
Total events	2		3				
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable						
Test for overall effect: 2					Favours hydrocolloid Favours collagen		

Figure 617: Figure 44. Hydrocolloid dressing versus hydrogel dressing – proportion of patients completely healed

-	Hydroco	lloid	Hydro	gel		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
5.1.5 Hydrogel							
Motta 1999	2	5	2	5	100.0%	1.00 [0.22, 4.56]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		5		5	100.0%	1.00 [0.22, 4.56]	
Total events	2		2				
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable						
Test for overall effect: Z	Z = 0.00 (P	= 1.00)					
							Favours nydrogel Favours hydrocolloid

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 618: Hydrocolloid dressing versus hydrogel dressing – proportion of ulcers completely healed

	Hydroco	lloid	Hydro	gel		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
5.2.2 Hydrogel										
Darkovich 1990	12	67	24	62	100.0%	0.46 [0.25, 0.84]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		67		62	100.0%	0.46 [0.25, 0.84]		\bullet		
Total events	12		24							
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable									
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.51 (P	= 0.01)								
							1 00			
							0.02	0.1	1 10	50
							Fav	ours hydrogel	Favours hyd	Irocolloid

	Hydroco	olloid	Hydro	gel		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% (CI M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	
5.3.1 Hydrogel								
Darkovich 1990	8	67	5	62	100.0%	1.48 [0.51, 4.28]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		67		62	100.0%	1.48 [0.51, 4.28]	\bullet	
Total events	8		5					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: Z	Z = 0.72 (P	= 0.47)						
								H
							0.01 0.1 I I I0 I0	0
T 1 () 1 () ((ravours nyuroconoid Favours nyuroger	

Figure 619: Hydrocolloid dressing versus hydrogel dressing – proportion of ulcers not changed

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 620: Hydrocolloid dressing versus hydrogel dressing – proportion of ulcers worsened

	Hydrocolloid Hydrogel		gel		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95%	CI M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
5.4.2 Hydrogel									
Darkovich 1990	7	67	1	62	100.0%	6.48 [0.82, 51.16]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		67		62	100.0%	6.48 [0.82, 51.16]			
Total events	7		1						
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable								
Test for overall effect: 2	<u>7</u> = 1.77 (P	= 0.08)							
							0.01 0.1	1 10	100
							Favours hydrocolloid	Favours hydr	ogel

Figure 621: Hydrocolloid dressing versus hydrogel dressing – mean percentage reduction in ulcer area (stage II)

	Hyd	rocoll	oid	Hy	droge	el		Mean Difference		Mean Di	fference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	I	IV, Fixed	d, 95% Cl	
5.6.1 Hydrogel												
Darkovich 1990 Subtotal (95% CI)	34	47.7	36 36	64	47.7	35 35	100.0% 1 00.0 %	-30.00 [-52.19, -7.81] -30.00 [-52.19, -7.81]		\bullet		
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Z = 2.65	(P = 0	0.008)									
									-100	-50 () 50	100

Favours hydrogel Favours hydrocolloid

Figure 622: Hydrocolloid dressing versus hydrogel dressing – mean healing rate (cm/day)

	Hyd	rocollo	bid	Hy	droge	el		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
5.8.1 Hydrogel									
Motta 1999	0.35	0.43	5	0.15	0.22	5	100.0%	0.20 [-0.22, 0.62]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			5			5	100.0%	0.20 [-0.22, 0.62]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable								
Test for overall effect: 2	<u>7</u> = 0.93	(P = 0	.35)						
									Favours hydrogel Favours hydrocolloid

	,		0				
	Hydrocolloid Hydrogel					Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% 0	CI Peto, Fixed, 95% CI
Motta 1999	0	5	0	5		Not estimable	e
Total (95% CI)		5		5		Not estimable	e
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Not applica	able					0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours hydrocolloid Favours hydrogel

Figure 623: Hydrocolloid dressing versus hydrogel dressing – mortality (all-cause)

Figure 624: Hydrocolloid dressing versus impregnated gauze dressing - proportion of patients completely healed

	Hydroco	lloid	Impregnated g	gauze		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
6.1.6 Impregnated gau	Jze						
Winter 1990 Subtotal (95% CI)	5	6 6	3	5 5	100.0% 100.0%	1.39 [0.62, 3.09] 1.39 [0.62, 3.09]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2	5 Iicable Z = 0.80 (P	= 0.42)	3				
Test for subgroup differ	rences: No	t applica	able			Fa	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

Figure 625: Hydrocolloid dressing versus impregnated gauze dressing - proportion of patients improved

•	Hydroco	olloid	Impregnated	gauze		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
6.2.2 Impregnated ga	uze						
Winter 1990 Subtotal (95% CI)	6	6 6	5	5 5	100.0% 100.0%	1.00 [0.73, 1.37] 1.00 [0.73, 1.37]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2	6 blicable Z = 0.00 (P	9 = 1.00)	5				
Toot for subgroup diffs	ronoco: No	t opplig	abla				0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Favours hydrocolloid Favours impregnated gauze

lest for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 626: Hydrocolloid dressing versus poly-hema dressing - proportion of patients completely healed

	,									
	Hydroco	lloid	Poly-he	ema		Risk Ratio		Risk I	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
7.1.7 Poly-hema										
Brod 1990	10	16	14	27	100.0%	1.21 [0.71, 2.04]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		16		27	100.0%	1.21 [0.71, 2.04]				
Total events	10		14							
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable									
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.70 (P	= 0.49)								
							0.2	0.5 1	2	
- . /							Favours p	oly-hema	Favours hydr	ocolloid

Figure 627:	Hydrocolloid dressing versus poly-hema dressing – absolute rate of healing
(cm ²	/week)

		·/							
	Нус	Hydrocolloid Poly-hema						Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
7.3.1 Poly-hema									
Brod 1990	0.1	0.085	16	0.18	0.085	27	100.0%	-0.08 [-0.13, -0.03]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			16			27	100.0%	-0.08 [-0.13, -0.03]	\bullet
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.98	(P = 0.	003)						
									-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Tast for subgroup diffo	roncos.	Not and	licabla						Favours poly-nema Favours hydrocollolu

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Hydrocolloid dressing versus poly-hema dressing - proportion of patients with Figure 628: adverse events

	Hydroco	lloid	Poly-he	ma		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl
7.4.1 Poly-hema							
Brod 1990 Subtotal (95% CI)	1	16 16	0	27 27	100.0% 100.0%	14.69 [0.25, 847.55] 14.69 [0.25, 847.55]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2	1 blicable Z = 1.30 (P	= 0.19)	0				
							I I I 0.002 0.1 1 10 500 Favours hydrocolloid Favours poly-hema

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 629: Hydrocolloid dressing versus poly-hema dressing – mortality

	Hydrocolloid Poly			ema		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		
Brod 1990	1	16	2	27	100.0%	0.84 [0.08, 8.58]			
Total (95% CI)		16		27	100.0%	0.84 [0.08, 8.58]			
Total events	1		2						
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2	olicable Z = 0.14 (P	9 = 0.89))				0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours hydrocolloid Favours poly-hema		

Figure 630: Hydrocolloid dressing versus co-polymer (amino acid) dressing - proportion of patients completely healed

Hydrocolloid Co-polymer Risk Ratio Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight MH Eived 05% Cl MH Eived 05% Cl	
Sludy of Subgroup Events rotal Events rotal weight M-H, Fixed, 95% Ci M-H, Fixed, 95% Ci	
8.1.8 Copolymer (amino acid)	
Hondé 1994 23 88 31 80 100.0% 0.67 [0.43, 1.05]	
Subtotal (95% Cl) 88 80 100.0% 0.67 [0.43, 1.05]	
Total events 23 31	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.73 (P = 0.08)	
5.2 0.5 1 2 Favours co-polymer Favours hydrocolic	bic

Hydrocolloid dressing versus co-polymer (amino acid) dressing - proportion of Figure 631: patients with an infection

•	Hydroco	lloid	Co-poly	mer		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
8.3.3 Copolymer (ami	no acid)						
Hondé 1994	6	88	6	80	100.0%	0.91 [0.31, 2.70]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		88		80	100.0%	0.91 [0.31, 2.70]	\bullet
Total events	6		6				
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable						
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.17 (P	= 0.86)					
							0.01 0.1 1 10 100
							Favours hydrocolloid Favours co-polymer

Figure 632: Hydrocolloid dressing versus phenytoin cream - proportion of patients completely healed

	Hydroco	lloid	Pheny	toin		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
9.1.9 Phenytoin creat	m						
Hollisaz 2004 Subtotal (95% CI)	20	28 28	8	27 27	100.0% 100.0%	2.41 [1.29, 4.51] 2.41 [1.29, 4.51]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	20 plicable Z = 2.75 (F	° = 0.00	8				
Test for subgroup diff	erences: N	lot appl	licable				0.2 0.5 1 2 5 Favours phenytoin Favours hydrocolloid

Figure 633: Hydrocolloid dressing versus phenytoin cream – proportion of ulcers completely healed (all stages – all sites)

	(0		-				
	Hydroco	lloid	Pheny	toin		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	
9.2.3 Phenytoin crean	n							
Hollisaz 2004	23	31	12	30	100.0%	1.85 [1.14, 3.01]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		30	100.0%	1.85 [1.14, 3.01]	◆	
Total events	23		12					
Heterogeneity: Not app	plicable							
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.50 (F	° = 0.01)					
							Eavours phenytoin Eavours hydrocolloid	
Toot for outparoup diffs	ronoo: h	lot oppl	licoblo				r avours prienytoin i r avours nyuroconoru	

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 634: Hydrocolloid dressing versus phenytoin cream – proportion of ulcers improved

	Experim	ental	Contr	rol		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl
9.6.3 Phenytoin creat	m							
Hollisaz 2004 Subtotal (95% CI)	27	31 31	16	30 <mark>30</mark>	100.0% 100.0%	1.63 [1.14, 2.34] 1.63 [1.14, 2.34]		-
Total events Heterogeneity: Not ap	27 plicable 7 = 2 66 (6	P = 0 00	16 8)					
Testion overall effect.	z – 2.00 (i	- 0.00	0)				0.5 0.7	1.5 2
Test for subgroup diff	erences: N	lot appl	icable				Favours control	Favours experimental

Figure 635:	nyarocoi	ioia a	ressing	s vers	us prier	iytoin cream –	proporti	on of ulce	ers worsen	ea
	Hydroco	lloid	Pheyn	toin		Risk Ratio		Risk I	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	b Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fixe	d, 95% CI	
9.7.3 Phenytoin cr	eam								_	
Hollisaz 2004	2	31	2	30	100.0%	0.97 [0.15, 6.44]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		30	100.0%	0.97 [0.15, 6.44]				
Total events	2		2							
Heterogeneity: Not	applicable									
Test for overall effe	ect: Z = 0.03 (F	P = 0.97	")							
										- 400
							0.01	0.1 1	10	100

Figure 635: Hydrocolloid dressing versus phenytoin cream – proportion of ulcers worsened

Favours hydrocolloid Favours phenytoin

Figure 636: Hydrocolloid dressing versus phenytoin cream – mortality (all-cause)

	Hydroco	lloid	Contr	ol		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	CI Peto, Fixed, 95% CI
Hollisaz 2004	0	28	0	28		Not estimable	•
Total (95% CI)		28		28		Not estimable	•
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	olicable Not applica	ble					0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours hydrocolloid Favours phenytoin

Figure 637: Hydrocolloid dressing versus alginate dressing – proportion of patients 40% healed

	Hydroco	lloid	Algina	ate		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
10.1.1 Alginate							
Belmin 2002	31	53	43	57	100.0%	0.78 [0.59, 1.02]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		53		57	100.0%	0.78 [0.59, 1.02]	\bullet
Total events	31		43				
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable						
Test for overall effect: 2	<u>Z</u> = 1.84 (P	= 0.07)					
Total (95% CI)		53		57	100.0%	0.78 [0.59, 1.02]	•
Total events	31		43				
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable						
Test for overall effect: 2	<u>Z</u> = 1.84 (P	= 0.07)					Eavours alginate Eavours hydrocolloid
Test for subgroup differ	rences: No	t applica	able				

Figure 638: Hydrocolloid dressing versus alginate dressing – mean percentage reduction in



Figure 639:	пуагос	0110	ia are	essing	; ve	rsus a	aiginat	e aressing – mea	an cm ² reduction in ulcer area
	Hydi	ocoll	oid	Al	ginat	e		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	o Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
10.3.2 Alginate									
Belmin 2002	5.2	7.2	53	9.7	7.1	57	100.0%	-4.50 [-7.17, -1.83]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			53			57	100.0%	-4.50 [-7.17, -1.83]	\bullet
Heterogeneity: Not	applicable								
Test for overall effect	ct: Z = 3.30	(P = 0).0010)						
								-	-10 -5 0 5 10
-									Favours alginate Favours hydrocolloid

Figure 639: Hydrocolloid dressing versus alginate dressing – mean cm² reduction in ulcer area

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 640: Hydrocolloid dressing versus alginate dressing – proportion of patients with an infection

	Hydroco	lloid	Algina	ate		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% C	I Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl
10.4.2 Alginate							
Belmin 2002	0	53	1	57	100.0%	0.15 [0.00, 7.34]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		53		57	100.0%	0.15 [0.00, 7.34]	
Total events	0		1				
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable						
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.96 (P	= 0.33)					
							0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
Test for subgroup differ	rences: No	t applica	able				Favours hydrocolloid Favours alginate

Figure 641: Hydrocolloid dressing versus alginate dressing – proportion of patients with skin irritation

iiiitati							
	Hydroco	bloid	Algina	ate		Peto Odds Ratio	Peto Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI
10.5.2 Alginate							
Belmin 2002	0	53	2	57	100.0%	0.14 [0.01, 2.31]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		53		57	100.0%	0.14 [0.01, 2.31]	
Total events	0		2				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.37 ()	P = 0.17	")				
							0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
							Favours hydrocolloid Favours alginate

Figure 642: Hydrocolloid dressing versus alginate dressing – proportion of patients with hypergranulation

	Hydrocolloid		Alginate		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95%	CI	M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl	
10.6.3 Alginate										
Belmin 2002	5	53	1	57	100.0%	5.38 [0.65, 44.54	4]	_		
Subtotal (95% CI)		53		57	100.0%	5.38 [0.65, 44.54	l]	_		
Total events	5		1							
Heterogeneity: Not applicable										
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.56$ (P = 0.12)										
							0.01	0.1	1 10	100
							Favours	Favours hydrocolloid Favours alginate		