Health Quality Ontario

Let's make our health system healthier

Electrical Stimulation for Pressure Injuries: OHTAC Recommendation

ONTARIO HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

• The Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee recommends against publicly funding electrical stimulation for pressure injuries

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

The committee concluded that there was too much uncertainty about the clinical benefit of adding electrical stimulation to high-quality standard wound care. This was largely due to a small body of evidence and to variation in how electrical stimulation and standard wound care were administered in the studies.¹ Given this uncertainty, the committee concluded that publicly funding electrical stimulation would not be a wise use of resources.



Public Comment: Held July 21 to August 11, 2017.

Decision Criteria	Subcriteria	Decision Determinants Considerations
Overall clinical benefit How likely is the health technology/intervention to result in high, moderate, or low overall benefit?	Effectiveness How effective is the health technology/intervention likely to be (taking into account any variability)?	We are uncertain whether electrical stimulation improved healing rates, average time to heal, or rate of healing per day
	Safety How safe is the health technology/intervention likely to be?	Minor complications associated with electrical stimulation include skin irritation, uncomfortable sensations, and excessive granulation
	Burden of illness What is the likely size of the burden of illness pertaining to this health technology/intervention?	Estimated 2013 prevalence (and incidence) of patients with pressure injuries in Ontario is 8.3% (4.0%). Breakdown of pressure injuries in each health care setting is as follows: 10.2% (4.3%) in acute care, 3.2% (1.6%) in home care, 8.4% (4.1%) in long-term care, and 22.5% (7.2%) in complex continuing care
	Need How large is the need for this health technology/intervention?	Experts and guidelines state that electrical stimulation can be used for recalcitrant stage II-IV pressure injuries
Consistency with expected societal and ethical values ^a How likely is adoption of the health technology/intervention to be congruent with societal and ethical values?	Societal values How likely is adoption of the health technology/intervention to be congruent with expected societal values? Ethical values How likely is adoption of the health technology/intervention to be congruent with expected ethical values?	People with lived experience of pressure injuries perceive the cost and availability of electrical stimulation as limiting access. Adoption would likely be congruent with societal and ethical values if the intervention were effective
Value for money How efficient is the health technology/intervention likely to be?	Economic evaluation How efficient is the health technology/intervention likely to be?	Limited evidence is available on clinical outcomes and resource use for electrical stimulation and pressure injuries in general. Therefore, cost-effectiveness of electrical stimulation for pressure injuries could not be determined
Feasibility of adoption into health system How feasible is it to adopt the health technology/intervention into the Ontario health care system?	Economic feasibility How economically feasible is the health technology/intervention?	Public funding of electrical stimulation for pressure injuries could require additional costs of \$0.77–\$3.85 million yearly for the next 5 years
	Organizational feasibility How organizationally feasible is it to implement the health technology/intervention?	Currently, few patients receive electrical stimulation for pressure injuries in Ontario. Treatment is provided by some Community Care Access Centres, complex continuing care, and rehabilitation facilities. Few health care professionals have received training on electrical stimulation, but training is available

Decision Determinants for Electrical Stimulation for Pressure Injuries

^aThe anticipated or assumed common ethical and societal values held in regard to the target condition, target population, and/or treatment options. Unless there is evidence from scientific sources to corroborate the true nature of the ethical and societal values, the expected values are considered.

REFERENCE

 Health Quality Ontario. Electrical stimulation for pressure injuries: a health technology assessment. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser [Internet]. 2017 Nov;17(14):1-107. Available from: <u>http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence-to-improve-care/journal-ontario-health-technologyassessment-series</u>

Disclaimer

About Health Quality Ontario

About OHTAC

How to Obtain OHTAC Recommendation Reports From Health Quality Ontario

Health Quality Ontario 130 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5S 1N5 Tel: 416-323-6868 Toll Free: 1-866-623-6868 Fax: 416-323-9261 Email: <u>EvidenceInfo@hqontario.ca</u> www.hqontario.ca

© Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2017

Citation

Health Quality Ontario. Electrical stimulation for pressure injuries: OHTAC recommendation [Internet]. Toronto (ON): Queen's Printer for Ontario; 2017 November. 3 p. Available from: <u>http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence-to-improve-care/recommendations-and-reports/OHTAC/electrical-stimulation</u>