IODOSORB – Serious about biofilm

Smith&nephew **IODOSORB**^{*}

0.9% Cadexomer Iodine

Biofilms

- Biofilms have been shown to delay wound healing^{1,2}, cause chronic inflammation³ and are present in 60% of chronic wounds⁴.
- Biofilms evade both the host immune system^{5,6}, and most antibiotics/antimicrobials7,8.
- Diagnosis is difficult. Symptoms are not obvious as seen with acute infection, but there are indirect signs and symptoms which link delayed healing with biofilm presence^{1,3,5,6}:
 - Antimicrobial therapy failure
 - Delayed wound healing
 - Recurrent infections
 - Chronic, low level inflammation
 - Microbiological culture negative results (biofilm bacteria grow slowly therefore may be missed)
 - Mechanical intervention/ debridement aids treatment



Antimicrobial dressing efficacy against mature Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilm



Antimicrobial dressing performance after 24 hrs on fully mature

*In some countries IODOSORB dressing is known as IODOFLEX®

The clinical and economic value of IODOSORB

Previous clinical evidence, including the independent Cochrane review of RCTs, indicates that IODOSORB has a significant effect on bioburden in chronic wounds^{9,10}, accompanied by higher healing rates compared to standard care¹¹, and reduced treatment costs and surgical revision requirements^{12,13}.

Such evidence combined with known antibiofilm efficacy in vitro suggests a role for IODOSORB in successful treatment against biofilms in chronic wounds.

References

1. Roche ED, Renick PJ, Tetens SP et al., Increasing the presence of biofilm and healing delay in a porcine model of MRSA infected wounds. Wound Rep Regen. 20:537-54. (2012). 2. Schierle et al., Staphyloccocal biofilms impair wound healing by delaying re epithelialisation in a murine wound model. Wound Rep Regen. 17(3) 354-359. (2009). 3. Bjarnsholt T, Kirketerp-Møller K, Østrup Jensen P *et al.*, Why chronic wounds will not heal: a novel hypothesis. Wound Rep Regen. 16:2-10. (2008). 4. James GA, Swogger E, Wolcott R et al. Biofilms in chronic wounds. Wound Rep Regen. 16: 37-44. (2008. 5. Costerton, J. W., Stewart, P. S. and Greenberg, E. P. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of persistent infections. Science 284, 1318–22 (1999). 6. Cochrane, D. M. et al., Antibody response to Pseudomonas aeruginosa surface protein antigens in a rat model of chronic lung infection. J. Med. Microbiol. 27, 255–61 (1988). 7. Nickel, J. C., Ruseska, I., Wright, J. B. and Costerton, J. W. Tobramycin resistance of Pseudomonas aeruginosa cells growing as a biofilm on urinary catheter material. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 27, 619–24 (1985). 8. Phillips, P. L. et al., Antimicrobial dressing efficacy against mature Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilm on porcine skin explants. Int. Wound J. 1–15 (2013). 9. Schwartz J A, Lantis JC, Gendics C, Fuller AM, Payne W, Ochs D. A prospective, non comparative, multicenter study to investigate the effect of cadexomer iodine on bioburden load and other wound characteristics in diabetic foot ulcers. Int. Wound J.;10(2):193–9 (2013). 10. Skog, E. et al. A randomized trial comparing cadexomer iodine and standard treatment in the out-patient management of chronic venous ulcers. Br. J. Dermatol. 109, 77-83 (1983). 11. O'Meara, S. et al., Antibiotics and antiseptics for venous leguicers. Cochrane database Syst. Rev. 1, CD003557 (2014). 12. Apelqvist, J. and Ragnarson Tennvall, G. Cavity foot ulcers in diabetic patients: a comparative study of cadexomer iodine ointment and standard treatment. An economic analysis alongside a clinical trial. Acta Derm. Venereol. 76, 231–5 (1996). 13. Hansson C; The effects of cadexomer iodine paste in the treatment of venous leg ulcers compared with hydrocolloid dressings and paraffin gauze dressing, Int. J Derm. 1998, 37, 390-396.

Copenhagen University Biofilm Test Facility: New In vitro testing key findings¹⁴

- Thomas Bjarnsholt, Morten Alhede and Anne Kirstine Nielsen (University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Health Sciences) developed the method used in this study to investigate the efficacy of wound dressings. The method is a fast, reliable, *in vitro* assay to investigate topical treatments' action against biofilm.
- The antibiofilm activity of IODOSORB° dressing¹⁵ and Aquacel[™] Ag+ Extra dressings were investigated in this model using both simple and clinically relevant wound simulation media.
- Mature biofilms (72 hour old) of *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* were challenged with the dressings for 24 and 72 hours. Antibiofilm effect was then assessed by replicate plating.

Example result: Wound Simulation Media grown 72 hour biofilm of Staphylococcus aureus.



Overall summary of antibiofilm effect¹⁴

	Media	Treatment (hours)	Dressing	
			Aquacel Ag+ Extra	IODOSORB dressing
P. aeruginosa	Simple ^a	24	No Effect	Good Effect
		72	No/Limited Effect	Good Effect
	Complex ^b	24	No Effect	Limited/Good Effect
		72	No Effect	No Effect
S. aureus	Simple ^c	24	Limited Effect	Good Effect
		72	No Effect	Good Effect
	Complex ^b	24	No Effect	Limited/Good Effect
		72	No Effect	Good Effect

a = Simple media for cultures of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: 2% agar of aerobic glucose minimal medium (ABT) (Panum institute) supplemented with 0.5% glucose.

b = For cultures of *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa*: 2% agar of Bolton Broth (Oxoid) supplemented with 5% defribinated and lysed horse blood (SSI, Denmark) and 45% bovine plasma (Sigma-Aldrich).

c = Simple media for cultures of S. aureus: 2% agar of TSB (BD Diagnostics, Sparks, MD) supplemented with 0.5% glucose.

Although wound proteins provide a higher challenge to topical antimicrobials, activity was more prominently impeded in the silver dressing.

Superior antibiofilm effect *(in vitro)* was observed with the IODOSORB dressing compared to the Aquacel Ag+ Extra in 7/8 test conditions. In 1/8 test conditions, performance was equivalent.

References

14. Alhede, M. Test of wound dressings against biofilm growing bacteria in wound simulation media. Copenhagen University Biofilm Test Facility Report, 2014. 15. IODOSORB dressing is known as IODOFLEX dressing in some regions. Wound Management Smith & Nephew Medical Ltd 101 Hessle Road Hull HU3 2BN

www.smith-nephew.com/wound

°Trademark of Smith & Nephew ™All trademarks acknowledged © Smith & Nephew February 2015 57025

T +44 (0)1482 225181 F +44 (0)1482 328326