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Background

- Chronic wounds affect all medical and surgical disciplines
  - Chronic wound = incomplete healing or lack of treatment response at 6 weeks
  - Annual cost approaches $25 billion in the United States
- New approaches for improving the efficacy of treatment of chronic wounds is an area of significant research
- Surgical debridement reduces bacterial counts, but bacteria regrow from the wound bed interstices
- A nanofilm-based antimicrobial matrix that intimately adheres directly to the wound surface may improve healing in these complex and difficult to heal wounds
Bioresorbable antimicrobial matrix: heals clean wounds faster

• *in vitro* studies demonstrate that the matrix results in $6 \log_{10}$ CFU reduction of *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa* over 72 h

• *in vivo* murine studies demonstrate acceleration of healing in clean wounds
Bioresorbable antimicrobial matrix: expedites closure of contaminated wounds

Mean wound closure: 52%

Full-thickness wounds (8 mm dia) in mice, splinted and inoculated with $10^5$ CFU of *S. aureus* on day of surgery (n=20 wounds/group), harvested after 9 days post-surgery
Data repeated in mice and pigs with a variety of collagen based dressings
Methods

- IRB-approved prospective evaluation of 32 human subjects (35 total wounds)
  - Existing patients of Wound Care Center
  - Chronic wounds previously treated unsuccessfully
- Antimicrobial Matrix applied at wound care visits over study period
  - Wound measurements
  - Photographs
  - Patient satisfaction survey
- Endpoints
  - Primary: Wound Closure at 3 Weeks
  - Secondary: Wound Closure at up to 12 Weeks
“Clinical evaluation of a bioresorbable nanofilm-based antimicrobial matrix in complex chronic wounds.” ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT 03204851

- IRB-approved prospective evaluation
- At the baseline, all wounds were non-healing for avg 40 weeks and had not responded to systemic antibiotics and topical antimicrobial agents
- Treatment: standard of care + matrix on the wound surface with each dressing change (1-3x / week)
Bioresorbable nanofilm-based antimicrobial matrix: expedites closure of chronic wounds in patients

- 72% (23/32) had average 66% wound closure @ 3wks
- 91% (29/32) of all wounds improved with an average wound closure of 73% @ 12 wks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Wound Type</th>
<th>Days Stall</th>
<th>Initial Wound Size (cm²)</th>
<th>Final Wound Size (cm²)</th>
<th>Treatment Days</th>
<th>Application Frequency</th>
<th>Wound Closure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Post-op</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2-3x / wk</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 0**

**Day 95**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Wound Type</th>
<th>Days Stalled</th>
<th>Initial Wound Size (cm²)</th>
<th>Final Wound Size (cm²)</th>
<th>Treatment Days</th>
<th>Application Frequency</th>
<th>Wound Closure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Venous Stasis Ulcer</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1x / wk</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 0**

![Day 0 Image](image1)

**Day 85**

![Day 85 Image](image2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Wound Type</th>
<th>Days Stalled</th>
<th>Initial Wound Size (cm²)</th>
<th>Final Wound Size (cm²)</th>
<th>Treatment Days</th>
<th>Application Frequency</th>
<th>Wound Closure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Diabetic Foot Ulcer</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2-3x / wk</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 0**

**Day 26**
Results/Conclusions

- Average non-healing time prior to trial = 40 weeks
- Average wound closure rate at three weeks was 66%
- Average wound closure rate at 12 weeks was 73%

Novel antimicrobial matrix was efficacious in accelerating the healing of stalled chronic wounds.

Future Directions

- Lidocaine, 0.4 mg/cm$^2$, >80% release in 30 min
- Gallium/silver synergistically disrupt biofilm
- Cerium (0.6 mg/cm$^2$) penetrates deeper into burn eschar at a lower dose
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Table 4: Outcomes for each wound type at primary and secondary endpoints. Total number of wounds = 35. Three wounds were excluded from analysis due to incomplete data set. At 12-weeks, all wounds had shown improved wound closure except for three venous stasis ulcers whose wound surface area had increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wound type</th>
<th>Non-healing Weeks (avg.)</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint Wound closure at the end of 3 weeks</th>
<th>Secondary Endpoint Wound closure over 12 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venous Stasis ulcer</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11 out of 16 venous stasis ulcers improved by an average closure of 60%</td>
<td>13 out of 16 venous stasis ulcers improved by an average closure of 76%. Wound surface area of three wounds had increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic foot ulcer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6 out of 8 diabetic foot ulcers improved by an average closure of 79%. One wound had 94% closure at week 2, and the patient did not return for follow-up</td>
<td>An average wound closure of 79% was achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postop</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2 out of 3 post-op wounds improved by an average wound closure of 58%</td>
<td>An average 42% wound closure was achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 out of 2 trauma wounds improved by 85% at week 2, and this patient did not return for follow-up</td>
<td>An average 59% wound closure was achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure ulcer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The pressure ulcer had 45% wound closure after week 1, and this patient did not return for follow-up</td>
<td>The pressure ulcer had 45% wound closure after week 1, and this patient did not return for follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilonidal cyst</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>The pilonidal cyst had 94% wound closure</td>
<td>Achieved 98% closure in 6 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The burn wound had 38% wound closure</td>
<td>Achieved 100% closure in 9.5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72% (23/32) of wounds improved by an average 66% wound closure</td>
<td>91% (29/32) of wounds had improved with an average wound closure of 73%, and 12 wounds had an average closure &lt;90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>