



WOCN[®] Wound, Ostomy, and
Contenance Nurses Society[®]

WOCN SOCIETY POSITION PAPER:

AVOIDABLE VERSUS UNAVOIDABLE PRESSURE
ULCERS (INJURIES)





WOCN[®]

Wound, Ostomy, and
Continence Nurses Society[®]

The Wound, Ostomy, and Continence Nurses Society[™] (WOCN[®]) suggests the following format for bibliographic citations:

Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society. (2017). *WOCN Society position paper: Avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers (injuries)*. Mt. Laurel, NJ: Author.

Copyright© 2017 by the Wound, Ostomy, and Continence Nurses Society[™] (WOCN[®]). Date of Publication: February 22, 2017. No part of this publication may be reproduced, photocopied, or republished in any form, in whole or in part, without written permission of the WOCN Society.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	3
Statement of Position.....	4
Purpose (Rationale for Position).....	4
Definitions.....	4
1. Avoidable and unavoidable pressure ulcers.....	4
2. Alternative definitions.....	5
Previous Statement.....	5
History.....	5
Regulatory changes.....	7
Supportive Statements (Relevant Research or Published Expert Opinions).....	8
1. Avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers: Associated risks and comorbidities.....	8
2. Medical device-related pressure ulcers.....	10
3. End-of-life changes.....	11
4. Prevention strategies.....	12
5. Role of documentation.....	13
6. Quality improvement programs for prevention.....	14
7. Education.....	14
Recommendations.....	15
Conclusion.....	17
References.....	18
Appendix.....	28
42CFR 483.25.c F314 Definitions: Avoidable/Unavoidable Pressure Ulcers.....	28

Acknowledgments

WOCN Society Position Paper: Avoidable versus Unavoidable Pressure Ulcers (Injuries)

Originated By:

Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society's (WOCN®) Public Policy Committee and the Wound Subcommittee (WOCN, 2009)

Updated/Revised By:

WOCN Society's Task Force on Avoidable versus Unavoidable Pressure Ulcers. The document was developed by the task force between September 2015 – March 2016.

Contributing Authors:

Task Force Chair

Shawneen Schmitt, MSN, MS, RN, CWOCN, CFCN, FACCWS
Nurse Specialist
Froedtert Health – CHD – Community Memorial Hospital
Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin

Task Force Members

Marti K. Andries, MSN, ANP-BC, FNP-BC, CWON-AP
Nurse Practitioner
Central Control, Inc.
Pineville, Louisiana

Patti M. Ashmore, BSN, RN, CWOCN
Wound, Ostomy, Continence Care Nurse Consultant and
Educator Evans, Georgia

Glenda Brunette, MSN, RN, CWON
Wound & Ostomy Nurse
Medical University of South Carolina
Charleston, South Carolina

Kathleen Judge, MSN, RN, APN-C, NP-C, NEA-BC, ACNS-BC, CWON-AP, CCCN
Director of Wound Program and Enterostomal/WOC Services
Virtua Health
Voorhees, New Jersey

Date Submitted:

March 9, 2016

Date Approved by the WOCN Board of Directors: February 21, 2017

WOCN Society Position Paper: Avoidable versus Unavoidable Pressure Ulcers (Injuries)

Statement of Position

Given the clinical complexities and constellation of comorbidities commonly encountered in today's healthcare environment, it is reasonable to state that not all pressure ulcers are avoidable or preventable. The skin is the largest organ of the body; and its integrity is impacted by age, medications, microclimate, optimal functioning of other organs, and concomitant diseases/illnesses. The development of pressure ulcers is impacted by numerous risk factors, which are commonly seen in patients. While there has been progress in reducing the incidence of pressure ulcers, an incidence of zero may not be an attainable goal (Edsberg, Langemo, Baharestani, Posthauer, & Goldberg, 2014). *Note:* Recently, the National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel (NPUAP) changed the term for pressure ulcer to pressure injury (NPUAP, 2016). The change in terminology has not yet been universally adopted and may take time for assimilation into the literature. Hereafter, in this document, the term pressure ulcer reflects the terminology used in the literature that is cited and is considered equivalent/interchangeable with the term pressure injury.

Purpose (Rationale for Position)

The purpose of this position paper is to lend support to the theory that some pressure ulcers are unavoidable and provide supporting evidence and/or expert opinion. This document updates a previous position statement developed by the Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society™ (WOCN®): *Position statement: Avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers* (WOCN, 2009).

Definitions

- 1. Avoidable and unavoidable pressure ulcers.** In the original position statement, the WOCN Society (2009) included definitions of avoidable and unavoidable pressure ulcers (See Appendix) that were developed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) for long-term care (LTC) standards (CMS, 2004, 2016). In 2010, the NPUAP provided broader definitions of these terms, which could be applied to all clinical practice settings versus only LTC settings (Black et al., 2011):
 - **Avoidable pressure ulcer.** An avoidable pressure ulcer can develop when the provider did not do one or more of the following: evaluate the individual's clinical condition and pressure ulcer risk factors; define and implement interventions consistent with individual needs, individual goals, and recognized standards of practice; monitor and evaluate the impact of the interventions; or revise the interventions as appropriate (p. 30).
 - **Unavoidable pressure ulcer.** An unavoidable pressure ulcer can develop even though the provider evaluated the individual's clinical condition and pressure ulcer risk factors; defined and implemented interventions consistent with individual needs, goals, and recognized standards of practice; monitored and evaluated the impact of the interventions; and revised the approaches as appropriate (p. 30).

2. **Alternative definitions.** Other terms used to describe clinical events or circumstances related to adverse events/patient harm, such as pressure ulcers that occur in hospitalized patients, include preventable, not preventable, and unable to be determined (Levinson, 2010):
- **Preventable.** Patient harm could have been avoided through improved assessment or alternative actions;
 - **Not preventable.** Patient harm could not have been avoided given the complexity of the patient's condition or the care required; and
 - **Unable to determine.** Physicians were unable to determine preventability because of incomplete documentation or case complexity (p. 22).

Previous Statement

In the previous position statement on avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers, the WOCN Society (2009) recommended further research to:

- Examine the extent to which comorbidities and intrinsic factors contribute to pressure ulcer development and determine the corresponding implications for clinical practice.
- Develop an expanded list of risk factors that would be more predictive of pressure ulcer development.
- Provide greater scientific evidence to support pressure ulcer preventive measures and guide decision making when modifications are needed to accommodate conflicting priorities related to goals of care.

In addition, the recommendations included developing reliable processes to assure consistent implementation of evidence-based, preventive interventions in all care settings and palliative care guidelines to address patient management for terminal patients that included patient comfort measures and family support. Also, it was recommended that preventive measures used for risk reduction should be accurately documented, and the documentation should include any clinical contraindications to preventive care so the rationale would be evident if a pressure ulcer was determined to be unavoidable.

History

There are many complexities involved in the etiology, prevention, and management of pressure ulcers. Recorded history suggests the presence of pressure ulcers since ancient times; they have been found in human mummies that were more than 5,000 years old (Agrawal & Chauhan, 2012; Bansal, Scott, Stewart, & Cockerell, 2005). Early publications proposed that the occurrence of a pressure ulcer signaled impending death (Levine, 2005). However, the study of pressure ulcer prevention is a relatively new phenomenon, and the knowledge base is still being researched and developed.

Since the early 1960s, a variety of pressure ulcer risk assessment tools have been developed for adults, including the Braden, Gosnell, Norton, and Waterlow scales (Bergstrom & Braden, 1992; Braden & Bergstrom, 1988; Gosnell, 1989a, 1989b; Norton, McLaren, & Exton-Smith, 1962, n.d.; Waterlow, 1985, 2005). Tools designed specifically for risk assessment of pediatric patients have also been developed such as the Braden Q Scale (Curley, Rasmus, Roberts, & Wypij, 2003; Quigley & Curley, 1996).

It is well established that the development of pressure ulcers is a complex process involving multiple, often non-modifiable, intrinsic risk factors, which are not fully measured by pressure ulcer risk assessment tools (Berlowitz & Brienza, 2007; Edsberg et al., 2014; Lyder, 2003;

Registered Nurses Association of Ontario [RNAO], 2011). More than 100 potential risk factors have been identified (Anderson et al., 2015). The volume and diversity of risk factors present challenges to the caregiver to choose and implement appropriate preventive interventions in a timely manner. Although the process is not completely understood, it seems logical that the greater number of risk factors present, the more difficult it will be to prevent the development and/or deterioration of pressure ulcers (Lyder et al., 2012).

In 1990 there was a government-sponsored effort to develop a standardized/consistent approach to pressure ulcer prevention and treatment. At that time, several healthcare disciplines from different organizations collaborated to develop clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) for prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers. In May 1992, the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (AHCPR), part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), published a CPG for the prediction and prevention of pressure ulcers in adults (Bergstrom et al., 1992). In that guideline, Bergstrom et al. stated, “Even the most vigilant nursing care may not prevent the development and worsening of ulcers in some very high risk individuals” (p. 2). Two years later, AHCPR published a companion CPG for the treatment of pressure ulcers in adults in which they reaffirmed their previous position: “Unfortunately, not all pressure ulcers will be prevented and those that do develop may become chronic” (Bergstrom et al., 1994, p.1). The AHCPR guidelines were based on published, scientific literature that was available at the time. When scientific evidence was limited or inconsistent, recommendations were based on the consensus of expert opinion. Those CPGs were made available to the public and became landmark documents and key resources for the prevention and management of pressure ulcers in adults.

Since that time, multiple organizations have developed and updated best practice guidelines or CPGs for prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers. In 2003, the WOCN Society published a CPG for prevention and management of pressure ulcers, which was revised in 2010 and 2016 to keep it current. The purpose of the CPG is to provide up-to-date, evidence-based recommendations to guide and support wound, ostomy, and continence care nurses and other healthcare providers in the preventive care and management of patients with complex needs who have/or are at risk for pressure ulcers (WOCN, 2003, 2010, 2016a). Additionally, the WOCN Society published a guideline in 2008 that was updated in 2016 to facilitate the evaluation and documentation of pressure ulcers in a variety of clinical settings (WOCN, 2003, 2016b).

In 2007, the RNAO published a best practice guideline for risk assessment and prevention of pressure ulcers, which was updated in 2011 (Keast, Parslow, Houghton, Norton, & Fraser, 2007; RNAO, 2011). Also in 2007, the NPUAP’s pressure ulcer staging system was expanded to include suspected deep tissue injury (sDTI) and unstageable pressure ulcers (Black et al., 2007). The staging system is based on changes to the skin and tissue, many of which are not visible until irreversible damage has occurred (Black et al., 2007; Doughty et al., 2006; Langemo & Brown, 2006). It may take hours to days before the clinical findings of a pressure-related tissue injury are evident (WOCN, 2009). Therefore, “when a patient develops a rapidly deteriorating pressure ulcer within several days of hospitalization, it is possible the damage may have occurred prior to hospitalization” (WOCN, 2009, p.3).

In 2009, an international CPG for the prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers was published in which the pressure ulcer classification system was refined, and friction was removed from the definition of a pressure ulcer (NPUAP & European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel [EPUAP], 2009). According to the NPUAP (Antokal et al., 2012; Brienza et al., 2015), the rationale for removing friction from the definition was that friction alone can cause superficial

injuries, but it is not considered to be a direct cause of the deeper tissue injuries found in most full-thickness pressure ulcers.

In 2014, from a collaborative effort between the NPUAP, EPUAP, and the Pan Pacific Pressure Injury Alliance (PPPIA), an updated international CPG was released for the prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers. The document provides guidelines for all disciplines across all settings and includes specific recommendations for high risk populations, including pediatrics, geriatrics, bariatrics, spinal cord injured patients; and individuals in palliative care, critical care, and the operating room (NPUAP, EPUAP, & PPPIA, 2014).

Over the last 16 years, the NPUAP has published multiple educational materials, white papers, and position statements on a wide array of topics related to pressure ulcers: avoidable/unavoidable pressure ulcers, deep tissue injury, mucosal pressure ulcers, pressure ulcer pain, pediatric pressure ulcers, pressure ulcers in palliative care patients, pressure ulcer staging, friction versus pressure-related injuries, staging ulcers with exposed cartilage, prevention points, and nutrition. Following a consensus conference in April 2016, the NPUAP revised the terminology for pressure ulcer to pressure injury and updated their staging system (NPUAP, 2016). These documents and the new staging terminology and definitions are available on NPUAP's website (www.npuap.org).

Despite educational efforts from multiple organizations, robust, scientific evidence that supports specific interventions for prevention of pressure ulcers is lacking (NPUAP et al., 2014). Often current research does not address the multiple medical and clinical situations that may affect a patient's risk and vulnerability for developing pressure ulcers.

Regulatory changes. In the 2004 regulations and guidance for surveyors of LTC facilities, CMS acknowledged some pressure ulcers are unavoidable (CMS, 2004, 2016). LTC facilities are required to evaluate a resident's risk factors for pressure ulcers and implement preventive interventions consistent with the resident's needs and goals. A pressure ulcer is determined to be unavoidable if it develops in spite of the facility's efforts to prevent it. (See the Appendix).

In 2006, CMS identified pressure ulcer prevention as a nursing quality indicator and full-thickness pressure ulcers were deemed "never events" (CMS, 2008). CMS (2008) defined never events as preventable medical errors that result in serious consequences for the patient (i.e., injury or death) and unnecessary treatment costs. While pressure ulcer prevention is considered a quality of care indicator for nursing, many contributing factors are beyond the purview of nursing. Pressure ulcer occurrence can signal a patient's overall decline medically (Langemo & Brown, 2006; Witkowski & Parish, 2000). There are times when preventive measures may be contraindicated or inconsistent with the goals of care, particularly in the palliative care population (Brink, Smith, & Linkewich, 2006; Reifsnyder & Magee, 2005). Another issue in providing preventive care is that a patient may refuse care, despite education about the need for the care (American Hospital Association, 2003; Langemo & Brown, 2006; Peterson & Rogers, 2012). In such cases, the development of a pressure ulcer would likely be considered unavoidable.

In 2008, CMS issued a regulation (Inpatient Prospective Payment System Fiscal Year [IPPS FY] 2009 Final Rule) that withheld reimbursement for the care of selected hospital-acquired conditions, which were determined to be reasonably preventable (e.g., stage 3 and 4, hospital-acquired pressure ulcers [HAPUs]) through the application of evidence-based guidelines (CMS, 2008, 2009; Stokowski, 2010). The IPPS FY 2009 Final Rule does not specifically state that pressure ulcers are always or entirely preventable—only that they are reasonably preventable; however, there is no recourse for hospitals to receive additional reimbursement for the treatment of HAPUs, even if clinicians consider them unavoidable (Stokowski, 2010).

The IPPS FY 2009 Final Rule resulted in controversy and opposing points of view. In contrast to CMS's ruling, many clinicians believe that pressure ulcers will occur, in certain patients, even if the best guidelines and most up-to-date preventive interventions and skin protection are utilized (Stokowski, 2010). As previously mentioned, CMS has acknowledged that not all pressure ulcers are preventable as indicated by their guidance to state and federal surveyors for LTC facilities. In their guidance, CMS stated, "A resident who enters the facility without pressure sores does not develop pressure sores unless the individual's clinical condition demonstrates that they were unavoidable" (CMS, 2004, p.132; CMS, 2016, p. 234). CMS has not applied this same standard in other healthcare settings. When the CMS rules regarding payment were revised, equivalent exemptions were not made for acute care HAPUs. This led some clinicians to suggest the policy was confusing and inconsistent for a pressure ulcer to be considered avoidable in one setting but not in another; particularly, when caring for similar patients with the same conditions and comorbidities, and when individuals in hospitals are more acutely ill (Stokowski, 2010).

Supportive Statements (Relevant Research or Published Expert Opinions)

Based on evidence from research, literature reviews, and expert opinions, the following supportive statements can be made regarding avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers:

1. Avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers: Associated risks and comorbidities

- Based on a retrospective study of 20 patients who developed HAPUs (i.e., stage 3, 4, or unstageable), despite appropriate risk assessment and provision of preventive measures, Levine, Humphrey, Lebovits, and Fogel (2009) identified 10 physiological comorbidities that were most commonly present when the ulcers were identified: hypoalbuminemia, respiratory failure with intubation, severe anemia, hypoxia with sedation or chemical paralysis, hypotension, infection or sepsis, malignancy, diabetes mellitus, renal failure (acute or chronic), and/or congestive heart failure. In addition, 30% of the patients had a major surgical procedure prior to discovery of the pressure ulcer, and most were in an intensive care unit (ICU) and immobile due to a variety of comorbid factors. On average, HAPUs developed within 12.1 days (range 3 to 23 days). Levine et al. concluded, "There is a subset of patients where skin breakdown is unavoidable with current prevention technologies" (p. 1).
- Accurate identification of risk factors is a prerequisite for determining appropriate strategies to prevent pressure ulcers, and according to Cox (2011), better risk assessment tools are needed for critical care patients. Cox conducted a retrospective study of medical-surgical ICU patients ($N = 347$) and found 65 patients (18.7%) who developed a pressure ulcer. The most predictive variables for pressure ulcer development were age, length of stay (LOS), mobility, friction/shear, use of norepinephrine, and cardiovascular disease. Cox reported that adequate prevention of pressure ulcers in critically ill patients with multiple risk factors can be difficult; particularly, when prevention strategies (e.g., turning an individual who is hemodynamically unstable) may be medically contraindicated. Cox concluded that even with consistent and ongoing skin assessment, early identification of skin changes, and implementation of appropriate prevention strategies to minimize damage; skin and tissue damage can occur in critically ill patients.
- Based on a secondary analysis of data from 51,842 Medicare patient hospital discharges in 2006 and 2007, Lyder et al. (2012) reported the nationwide incidence rate for HAPUs

was 4.5%. The prevalence of pressure ulcers on admission was 5.8%, and 16.7% ($n = 502$) of the 2,999 individuals admitted with a pressure ulcer, developed at least one new ulcer in a different location during hospitalization. Patients with HAPUs had significantly higher rates ($p < .001$) of in-hospital mortality (11.2%), mortality within 30 days of discharge (15.3%), readmission to the hospital within 30 days of discharge, and longer hospital LOS, compared to those without HAPUs. Individuals who developed HAPUs had significantly higher rates of chronic diseases (i.e., congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cerebrovascular disease, and diabetes mellitus [$p < .001$]). Individuals with HAPUs also had higher rates of obesity ($p < .003$), which can impair systemic perfusion and cause an inadequate blood supply to the fatty tissue, resulting in chronic skin and wound problems. Additionally, corticosteroid use was higher in patients with HAPUs ($p < .003$). The chronic conditions and use of corticosteroids might have increased the individuals' vulnerability for HAPUs. Therefore, the investigators stated that individuals who enter the hospital with a constellation of these conditions should be identified at admission as being at a very high risk for developing a HAPU, and preventive care should be promptly implemented. Lyder et al. acknowledged that HAPUs may develop, despite the provision of appropriate care; therefore, some HAPUs may be unavoidable.

- Other experts have also reported that pressure ulcers are most likely to occur in patients who are malnourished, elderly, dehydrated and/or obese, and in those with underlying medical conditions (McIntyre, May, & Marks-Maran, 2012).
- Pressure ulcer development is a multi-causal event (Edsberg et al., 2014). In the vast majority of cases, appropriate identification and mitigation of risk factors can prevent or minimize the formation of pressure ulcers. However, in some cases, pressure ulcers are unavoidable because the magnitude and severity of risk are overwhelmingly high, or preventive measures are contraindicated or inadequate. In 2014, the NPUAP conducted a multidisciplinary consensus conference to explore the unavoidability of pressure ulcers using an organ system framework that considered a variety of nonmodifiable intrinsic and extrinsic risk factors. Consensus (i.e., 80% agreement of the participants) was reached on several areas, which were considered to increase the likelihood of the development of an unavoidable pressure ulcer (i.e., cardiopulmonary status, hemodynamic stability, impact of head-of-bed elevation, septic shock, body edema, burns, immobility, medical devices, spinal cord injury, terminal illness, and nutrition). The group concluded that “unavoidable pressure ulcers *do* occur” (Edsberg et al., 2014, p. 328).
- Critical care patients are at high risk for unavoidable pressure ulcers (Cox & Roche, 2015). Cox and Roche conducted a retrospective study of 306 patients in a medical-surgical ICU and a cardiovascular ICU. The investigators found that although 92% of patients had documentation of compliance with an evidence-based, prevention protocol, 13% ($n = 41$) developed a HAPU. Several variables were significant predictors of HAPUs: a cardiac diagnosis at the time of admission to the ICU ($p = .03$); cardiac arrest ($p = .05$); mechanical ventilation longer than 72 hours ($p < .001$); number of hours the mean arterial pressure was less than 60 mmHg during treatment with vasopressors ($p = .01$); and administration of vasopressin ($p = .004$). Norepinephrine and vasopressin were significantly associated with the development of pressure ulcers, and the use of vasopressin increased the risk almost five times. The peripheral vasoconstriction induced by vasopressors shunts blood away from the skin and underlying structures and may further contribute to deep-tissue injury, especially, in the already susceptible anatomical

areas of the sacrococcygeal region. The addition of vasopressin administered concomitantly with a first-line agent (often norepinephrine) may represent the point at which the risk for pressure ulcers escalates and may be an early warning to heighten strategies to prevent pressure ulcers. Because vasopressors cannot be terminated to avert development of pressure ulcers, these findings may add to the body of knowledge about factors that potentially contribute to the development of unavoidable pressure ulcers (Cox & Roche, 2015).

- Levine and Zulkowski (2015) completed a secondary analysis of pressure ulcer data from two studies (Levinson, 2010, 2014), which were conducted by the DHHS, Office of Inspector General (OIG) on adverse events among Medicare beneficiaries in acute care hospitals and LTC/skilled nursing facilities (SNF). In the OIG studies, the terms avoidable and unavoidable were not used. Instead, the OIG defined harm as preventable if it could have been avoided by improved assessment or alternative actions. Harm was not preventable if it could not have been avoided due to the complexity of the patient's condition or care that was required. While the OIG did not use the terms avoidable or unavoidable, Levine and Zulkowski considered the terms preventable and not preventable interchangeable with avoidable and unavoidable, respectively. In the OIG studies, a panel of physicians classified the level of harm and determined the preventability/avoidability by using a decision algorithm that was specifically developed for the study of adverse events in hospitals. To determine preventability/avoidability, the OIG reviewers used information in the medical records, clinical experience, published research, and group discussion. The OIG reviewers rated preventability using a 5-point scale (i.e., clearly preventable, likely preventable, likely not preventable, clearly not preventable, unable to determine). The incidence of pressure ulcers in the hospitals was 2.9% and 3.4% in the LTC/SNF. Based on the OIG data, 39.1% of HAPUs and 40.9% of pressure ulcers in LTC/SNF were unavoidable leading Levine and Zulkowski to question the reliability and validity of pressure ulcers as a quality indicator with such a high rate of unavoidability. Levine and Zulkowski concluded that while the structured algorithm/decision process used by the OIG to assess preventability was a strength of their studies, they did not identify any stage 4, and only a few unstageable or sDTI; therefore, their analysis might have underestimated the level of harm from facility-acquired pressure ulcers. Levine and Zulkowski recommended further studies to establish validity and reliability for the algorithm.
- Pittman et al. (2016) conducted a retrospective study of 31 hospitalized patients with HAPUs. The most common clinical characteristics were identified in the 12 patients who developed unavoidable HAPUs and included the following: critical care, mechanical ventilation, chemical sedation, pressor agents, hemoglobin less than 7 mg/dL, febrile, cancer, nothing by mouth, fecal incontinence, and LOS greater than 5 days.

2. Medical device-related pressure ulcers

- Medical devices cause pressure ulcers in patients across the lifespan primarily in acute and critical care settings, but injuries can also occur in LTC settings and home care (Holden-Mount & Sieggreen, 2015; Murray, Noonan, Quigley, & Curley, 2013; Pittman, Beeson, Kitterman, Lancaster, & Shelly, 2015). In a device-related injury, the tissue injury mimics the outline of the device. Tissue intolerance has been noted by many experts as the key to development of pressure ulcers, which may affect a patient's vulnerability to developing device-related injuries. The anatomical location of device-

related ulcers differs from nondevice-related ulcers. Most device-related ulcers occur in areas without adipose tissue and tend to progress to a higher stage more quickly than nondevice-related ulcers (Apold & Rydrych, 2012; Baharestani, 2013). In addition to pressure induced ischemia on the underlying skin from a medical device; heat, humidity/moisture, and edema may develop under the device, which can further impair the skin's tolerance to pressure (Baharestani, 2013; Black et al., 2010; Murray et al., 2013). While most device-related pressure ulcers are avoidable, not all are avoidable (Baharestani, 2013).

- Black et al. (2010) reported that although most pressure ulcers develop over bony prominences, pressure ulcers can occur on any tissue under pressure; therefore, pressure injuries can develop beneath medical devices. Based on a secondary analysis of data from hospitalized patients ($n = 2,079$), Black et al. found the overall HAPU rate was 5.4% ($n = 113$), and 34.5% ($n = 39$) of those were related to medical devices. Black et al. concluded that if a patient had a medical device, they were 2.4 times more likely to develop a pressure ulcer of any kind. The study confirms that device-related pressure ulcers are significant problems for the healthcare industry, which warrant more intensive efforts for prevention, early identification, and intervention.
- Based on an integrative review of 32 data-based articles and clinical reviews regarding medical device-related pressure ulcers in pediatric patients, Murray et al. (2013), found instances of medical device-related injuries, which could have been prevented with appropriate preventive interventions.
- In a review of HAPUs, Apold and Rydrych (2012) found that 29% of the pressure ulcers were device-related, and 70% of the device-related pressure ulcers were located on the head, face, and neck; whereas, 84% of nondevice-related pressure ulcers were located on the sacrum and coccyx/buttocks. Apold and Rydrych reported there was often no documentation of a skin inspection under or around the device until an ulcer was found. Three-quarters (74%) of the device-related pressure ulcers were not identified until they were stage 3, 4, or unstageable; compared to 54% of nondevice-related pressure ulcers. In some cases, there were orders from a physician that the device could not be removed. However, the investigators reported the most common problems were an apparent lack of awareness of the need to periodically remove or reposition the device to maintain skin integrity, and a lack of guidance on when and how to remove or reposition devices. Also, in several instances, the devices did not fit well.
- The NPUAP 2014 consensus panel indicated that a device-related pressure ulcer may be deemed unavoidable when it is medically contraindicated to adjust or move the device, when a medical device prevents turning/repositioning of the patient, and when there is tissue edema or moisture under a device that could compromise tissue tolerance and increase the risk for pressure/shear forces (Edsberg et al., 2014).
- It is important for healthcare providers to recognize that the use of any medical device puts a patient at higher risk for a pressure ulcer, and implementation of preventive interventions is an essential part of the plan of care (Apold & Rydrych, 2012; Black et al., 2010; Murray et al., 2013).

3. End-of-life changes

- Many healthcare providers believe that pressure ulcers, which occur at the end of life are often not preventable due to multiple risk factors, comorbid conditions, and the frail

condition of the patient (Langemo, Black, & NPUAP, 2010; Langemo & Brown, 2006; Langemo, Haesler, Naylor, Tippett, & Young, 2015).

- Physiologic changes that occur as a result of the dying process, over days to weeks, may affect the skin and soft tissues and manifest as observable (objective) changes in the skin's color, turgor, or integrity; or as subjective symptoms such as localized pain. These changes can be unavoidable and may occur even with the application of appropriate interventions that meet or exceed the standard of care (Krasner, 2015). This recognition has resulted in a focus on a palliative care approach for patients with unavoidable pressure ulcers, instead of a typical curative methodology (Langemo et al., 2010; Worley, 2007). Therefore, patients must be properly assessed and appropriate prevention and treatment implemented with a realistic understanding of the achievable results, and the patient's response to all interventions should be clearly documented (Ayello et al., 2009; Langemo et al., 2010; Worley, 2007).

4. Prevention strategies

- Facilities are expected to meet standards of care to reduce or relieve pressure to patients with/or at risk of a pressure ulcer. Facilities should implement comprehensive programs to prevent and manage pressure ulcers; and they should carefully evaluate and determine if their scope and standards of care, policies, procedures, and wound care practices are consistent with evidence-based, best practices and nationally recognized CPGs (Peterson & Rogers, 2012). This includes implementation of pressure ulcer prevention protocols in at-risk patients (e.g., incontinence protocol), in addition to implementation of protocols for patient assessment and treatment (Peterson & Rogers, 2012).
- An evidence-based, pressure ulcer prevention protocol that has been endorsed by the NPUAP and Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality consists of the following key elements: risk stratification; patient turning and repositioning; management of moisture, incontinence, and nutrition; use of modern support surfaces (e.g., beds and overlays); and ongoing clinician education about prevention (Padula, Mishra, Makic, & Valuck, 2014; Padula, Makic, et al., 2015; Padula, Valuck, Makic, & Wald, 2015).
- Based on a systematic review of 26 studies on using multicomponent strategies to prevent pressure ulcers, Sullivan and Schoelles (2013) reported that the integration of several core components was effective in improving the processes of care and reducing pressure ulcer rates. The key strategies included simplification and standardization of specific interventions and documentation for pressure ulcers, engaging multidisciplinary teams and leadership, use of designated skin champions, ongoing staff education, and ongoing audit and feedback.
- Prophylactic dressings.
 - Based on a systematic review of 21 studies, Clark et al. (2014), reported that early preventive initiatives such as applying prophylactic-type dressings to vulnerable sites may offer an alternative approach to help reduce the incidence of superficial pressure ulcers by modifying the effects of mechanical loads applied to the skin and soft tissues, and/or affecting the microclimate. Clark et al. found the pressure ulcer incidence was lower in patients (0%–8.5%) who had prophylactic dressings applied to the sacrum, heels, nose (under medical devices), and trochanter; compared to individuals without dressings (0%–40%).
 - In a randomized controlled trial ($N = 440$). Santamaria et al. (2015) compared the effectiveness of a silicone foam dressing applied to the sacrum and heels in

trauma and critically ill patients to a control group without dressings ($n = 221$). The investigators found there were significantly fewer patients overall that developed pressure ulcers in the intervention group compared to controls (7 vs. 27, $p = .002$), fewer sacral ulcers (2 vs. 8, $p = .05$), and fewer heel ulcers (5 vs. 19, $p = .002$).

- Another recent study investigated if the application of a silicone foam dressing was associated with decreased interface pressures (Miller, Sharma, Aberegg, Blasiole, & Fulton, 2015). The investigators measured interface pressures on the heels in 50 healthy volunteers and reported that the application of a dressing was associated with a significant decrease in interface pressures compared to no dressing (40.14 mmHg vs. 50.43 mmHg, $p < .001$).
- Experts have recommended that prophylactic dressings at the sacrum, buttocks, heels, and under medical devices should be considered for pressure ulcer prevention in patients who are at high risk for pressure, friction, and/or shear injury; particularly, immobile and critically ill patients in the Emergency Department, ICU, cardiac care unit, and operating room (Black, Alves, et al., 2015; Black, Clark, et al., 2015; Holden-Mount & Sieggreen, 2015; Santamaria et al., 2015).

5. Role of documentation

- Accurate and thorough documentation is essential for effective prevention and management of pressure ulcers. “Good documentation must be comprehensive, consistent, concise, chronological, continuing and also reasonably complete” (Ayello et al., 2009).
- According to Dahlstrom et al. (2011), initiation of appropriate treatment of pressure ulcers is dependent on the identification and complete documentation of the ulcer (i.e., location, stage, size), and ongoing measurements and descriptions are necessary to monitor the progression of the wound and effectiveness of interventions. However, based on a retrospective chart review, Dahlstrom et al. found documentation of the characteristics of pressure ulcers was frequently missing key descriptors, such as the stage, location, and size; and therefore, was not meeting quality guidelines. The investigators suggested that the first step to improving pressure ulcer care is to improve the identification and documentation of the ulcer, which is necessary for treatment, communication within the healthcare team, and reimbursement.
- Documentation should be in place regarding pain assessment and intervention, treatment effectiveness, consultations/referrals, nutritional assessment, use of formal pressure ulcer risk assessment tools (e.g., Braden scale, Norton scale) and prevention protocols; and should include the emotional status of the patient regarding the success of treatment (Peterson & Rogers, 2012).
- Other experts concur that documentation provides essential feedback to healthcare providers and other stakeholders regarding the interventions the patient received and their effects (i.e., assessment, prevention, treatments), and if a HAPU occurs, provides verification that evidence-based care was delivered to support that the HAPU was unavoidable (Jacobson, Thompson, Halvorson, & Zeitler, 2016). For example, after implementation of a quality improvement initiative to improve documentation of evidence-based interventions to prevent pressure ulcers, Jacobson et al. reported a 67% decrease in reportable, full-thickness HAPUs that were deemed avoidable.
- The importance and value of documentation is further validated because CMS (2004, 2009, 2016) has recognized that some pressure ulcers are unavoidable under certain

circumstances, such as when the ulcers develop despite the provision of appropriate and accurate assessment and interventions. Therefore, for a pressure ulcer to be deemed unavoidable, there must be clear, complete, and consistent documentation of the prevention and treatment interventions provided to the patient (Dahlstrom et al., 2011; Jacobson et al., 2016; Pittman et al., 2016; Worley, 2007). Additionally, the accuracy and quality of documentation plays a key role in any litigation that might result from the development of pressure ulcers (Ayello et al., 2009).

6. Quality improvement programs for prevention

- Multiple internal and external factors influence the adoption of hospital quality improvement programs that are designed to implement evidence-based practices to prevent HAPUs (Padula et al., 2014; Padula, Valuck, et al., 2015). While factors such as high rates of HAPUs and nursing turnover affect quality improvement initiatives, based on the majority of survey responses from 55 hospitals; Padula, Valuck, et al. found the most influential internal factors were the availability of nurse specialists for wound consultation, existence of hospital prevention campaigns, and the level of preventive knowledge. The key external factors were financial concerns, application for Magnet recognition, data sharing with peer institutions, and regulatory issues.
- It is important to recognize and address the barriers to achieving expected outcomes when implementing quality improvement programs. For example, Peterson et al. (2015) reported their initial quality improvement efforts to recognize, prevent, and treat pressure ulcers in pediatric patients in their children's hospital were insufficient. By re-evaluating and revising their performance improvement plan, they were able to identify gaps and deficiencies needing correction. Through extensive collaboration, interprofessional efforts, and organizational changes led by the clinical nurse specialists; there was a significant and sustained reduction in the incidence of pressure ulcers. From year 2010 to 2013, there was a 32% decrease in the incidence of pressure ulcers from 155 to 105. The investigators concluded that reducing the incidence of pressure ulcers is achievable through collaboration, creativity, and engagement of multiple disciplines.

7. Education

- Education about pressure ulcer prevention and healing should be provided to the patient and/or family/caregiver(s) when possible (Peterson & Rogers, 2012). If care is refused or patients and/or family/caregiver(s) are nonadherent to the plan of care, the basis for refusal/nonadherence should be assessed and documented along with any instructions that were provided about alternatives (Peterson & Rogers, 2012; Selde, 2015).
- To effectively prevent pressure ulcers, ongoing education is necessary for healthcare providers to attain and maintain current knowledge about pressure ulcer risk, prevention, staging, and treatment (Mackintosh, Gwilliam, & Williams, 2014; Pieper & Zulkowski, 2014). There are several nationally recognized, evidenced-based, pressure ulcer guidelines available; yet, prevention strategies are not consistently performed and pressure ulcers remain a significant problem, particularly, in acute and LTC settings (Waugh, 2014). Although pressure ulcer educational programs have been shown to increase knowledge, and in one older study improved care; overall, improved knowledge has not been linked consistently with improved care, particularly prevention (Pieper & Zulkowski, 2014). Several research studies have shown low levels of knowledge about pressure ulcer prevention and low application of preventive care (Pieper & Zulkowski,

2014; Waugh, 2014). Based on a review of seven studies, Waugh (2014) reported even when pressure ulcer knowledge was adequate, preventive interventions were not consistently performed and were often delegated to other staff (e.g., licensed practical nurses, nurse assistants, and nursing students). While preventive care may be provided by others, it is important for registered nurses to recognize they remain responsible for ensuring patients receive effective interventions to prevent pressure ulcers (Waugh, 2014). Therefore, frequent and ongoing education regarding pressure ulcers is important for nurses to have the necessary confidence and skill required to recognize, assess, stage, document, and implement appropriate interventions to prevent and treat pressure ulcers (Mackintosh et al., 2014). Additionally, other healthcare providers should have education about pressure ulcers according to their role in the delivery of patient care (Mackintosh et al., 2014).

Recommendations

Experts have identified many unmet needs and gaps in prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers. There is a need to expand the science for determining avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers and validate best practices to reduce the incidence of avoidable pressure ulcers. Additional robust/rigorous research and/or development and testing are warranted in the following areas:

- Establish standardized approaches for measuring and reporting prevalence and incidence data to facilitate national and international benchmarks (NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Establish standardized methods for measuring and reporting wound healing data (NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Determine the effectiveness of evidence-based, pressure ulcer prevention and management strategies and the support systems that are designed to meet the unique needs of pediatric/neonatal patients (Peterson et al., 2015; Schindler et al., 2013).
- Develop and validate skin risk assessment tools that include risks of medical devices for pediatric/neonatal patients (Peterson et al., 2015; Schumacher, Askew, & Otten, 2013).
- Determine/compare the effectiveness of preventive and treatment interventions, including prophylactic dressings; and develop strategies for sustaining effective programs (Black, Clark, et al., 2015; Clark et al., 2014; Cox, 2011; NPUAP et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2013; Sullivan & Schoelles, 2013).
- Examine the interrelationships between etiological factors and the prevention and development of pressure ulcers, including the following: microclimate, pressure and shearing, tolerance of adipose tissue, role of lymph vessel blockage, incontinence and incontinence-associated dermatitis, and skin failure (Beeckman, Van Lancker, Van Hecke, & Verhaeghe, 2014; Brunner, Droegemueller, Rivers, & Deuser, 2012; Gray, McNichol, & Nix, 2016; NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Investigate device-related pressure ulcers across the lifespan in all healthcare settings. Conduct studies to describe device-related injuries and determine the risk factors as a basis for developing risk assessment tools, best practices, quality improvement initiatives, and safer materials to prevent the injuries (Apold & Rydrych, 2012; Black et al., 2010; Black, Alves, et al., 2015; Holden-Mount & Sieggreen, 2015; Murray et al., 2013; Pittman et al., 2015).
- Develop risk-adjusted models to determine which specific risk factors or combination(s) of risks are most predictive of pressure ulcer development to increase the

efficiency/effectiveness of risk assessment, and facilitate determining which pressure ulcers are unavoidable (Anderson et al., 2015; Levine et al., 2009).

- Create risk assessment tools utilizing advanced technology for the screening and detection of early pressure damage, especially in critical care (Cox, 2011; NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Examine the impact of nutrition (including nutritional screening tools and interventions), hydration, and supplements on prevention and healing of wounds due to pressure for critically ill patients (Cox & Rasmussen, 2014; McIntyre et al., 2012; NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Determine the most effective pain management strategies, and develop protocols and algorithms to guide healthcare professionals in managing pressure ulcer-related pain in all care settings (Langemo et al., 2015; NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Determine the effectiveness of modalities such as phototherapy, electrical stimulation, laser therapy, hyperbaric oxygen therapy, and traditional, culturally-based interventions for prevention and/or treatment of pressure ulcers (NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Compare support surfaces for supine and seated pressure redistribution to determine which are most effective for prevention and treatment of full-thickness pressure ulcers, and develop improved products (Chou et al., 2013; McInnes et al., 2015; NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Examine the effectiveness of repositioning for prevention of pressure ulcers, including the heels, and determine the most effective regimens (Krapfl & Gray, 2008; NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Identify and validate risk factors for development of heel pressure ulcers, and determine the effectiveness of prevention strategies, including heel elevation (Delmore, Lebovits, Suggs, Rolnitzky, & Ayello, 2015; Krapfl & Gray, 2008; NPUAP et al., 2014).
- Validate the essential components of accurate and appropriate assessment and documentation for pressure ulcer prevention and management (i.e., skin assessment, description of skin integrity, identification of extrinsic and intrinsic risk factors for pressure ulcer development [including hemodynamics and comorbidities], wound assessment/staging and monitoring, interventions); and determine the role of validated instruments, computer-based algorithms, digital technology, ultrasound, and other modalities for assessment and documentation (Alvey, Hennen, & Heard, 2012; NPUAP et al., 2014; Pittman et al., 2016).
- Examine the skin care needs/issues for palliative care patients to identify the characteristics of individuals with avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers and the factors related to healing versus nonhealing as a basis for developing a CPG that can address skin/wound issues and help determine the value of healing versus nonhealing in patients at the end of life (Langemo et al., 2010, 2015).
- Investigate quality improvement initiatives in healthcare systems to identify the elements that are necessary for effectively implementing and sustaining evidence-based practices to reduce avoidable pressure ulcers (e.g., organizational leadership and support, resources/tools), and address barriers to implementation and maintenance of the initiatives (Levine & Zulkowski, 2015; Padula et al., 2014; Padula, Makic, et al., 2015).
- Design internal incidence tracking systems, and develop and test instruments and algorithms that can be used in process improvement programs (applicable to all healthcare settings) to identify HAPUs, distinguish avoidable from unavoidable HAPUs, and improve clinical decision making for determining proper preventive and treatment

interventions (Jankowski & Nadzam, 2011; Pittman et al., 2016; Sharkey, Hudak, Horn, & Spector, 2011; Zaratkiewicz et al., 2010).

- Explore the relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic risk factors to the development of unavoidable HAPUs (Pittman et al., 2016).
- Identify and validate gaps in healthcare providers' knowledge about prevention and management of pressure ulcers, including educational barriers, as a basis for developing strategies to meet the educational needs using formal education and informal methods such as mentoring/coaching, and peer-to-peer collaboration (Beinlich & Meehan, 2014; Cox, Roche, & Gandhi, 2013; Jankowski & Nadzam, 2011; Levine, Ayello, Zulkowski, & Fogel, 2012; Pieper & Zulkowski, 2014). Such gaps may include inadequate knowledge of the following areas: risks and causative factors, assessment, differentiation of pressure ulcers from other types of injuries and wounds, staging, use and scoring of risk assessment tools [Braden scale], and evidence-based prevention and treatment strategies.
- Evaluate the attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge of healthcare providers (e.g., physicians, nurses, nurse assistants, other disciplines) about the value and importance of assessment, documentation, prevention, and proper management of pressure ulcers; and determine if these factors affect the prevention and treatment delivered by healthcare providers (Cox et al., 2013; Sharkey et al., 2011; Waugh, 2014).

Conclusion

The WOCN Society supports the following measures to prevent pressure ulcers in all care settings for individuals:

- An initial (within 24 hours of admission) and ongoing pressure ulcer risk assessment and skin assessment.
- Utilization of evidence-based, preventive interventions, which are consistent with the individual's goals and needs.
- Evaluation of the effectiveness of the interventions and their expected outcomes.
- Accurate, thorough, and complete documentation; including documentation of the following: risk and skin assessments, preventive interventions, the individual's response(s), and effectiveness of the interventions in meeting the expected outcomes.

The WOCN Society acknowledges that at times, despite provision of the best preventive efforts across the continuum of care, pressure ulcers occur and may be deemed unavoidable. The WOCN Society encourages and supports ongoing research and quality improvement initiatives to expand the science and knowledge base in the following areas:

- Differentiation of avoidable and unavoidable pressure ulcers.
- Identification of factors and conditions that lead to an unavoidable pressure ulcer.
- Validation of best practices for prevention of pressure ulcers.

References

- Agrawal, K., & Chauhan, N. (2012). Pressure ulcers: Back to the basics. *Indian Journal of Plastic Surgery*, 45(2), 244–254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0970-0358.101287>
- Alvey, B., Hennen, N., & Heard, H. (2012). Improving accuracy of pressure ulcer staging and documentation using a computerized clinical decision support system. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 39(6), 607–612. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0b013e31826a4b5c>
- American Hospital Association. (2003). *The patient care partnership. Understanding expectations, rights and responsibilities*. Retrieved April 26, 2016, from http://www.aha.org/content/00-10/pcp_english_030730.pdf
- Anderson, M., Finch Guthrie, P., Kraft, W., Reicks, P., Skay, C., & Beal, A. L. (2015). Universal pressure ulcer prevention bundle with WOC nurse support. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 42(3), 217–225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.000000000000109>
- Antokal, S., Brienza, D., Bryan, N., Herbe, L., Logan, S., Maguire, J., . . . Siddiqui, A. (2012). *Friction induced skin injuries—Are they pressure ulcers? A National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel white paper*. Retrieved April 11, 2016, from <http://www.npuap.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/NPUAP-Friction-White-Paper.pdf>
- Apold, J., & Rydrych, D. (2012). Preventing device-related pressure ulcers: Using data to guide statewide change. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 27(1), 28–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NCQ.0b013e31822b1fd9>
- Ayello, E. A., Capitulo, K. L., Fife, C. E., Fowler, E., Krasner, D. L., Mulder, G., . . . Yankowsky, K. W. (2009). Legal issues in the care of pressure ulcer patients: Key concepts for healthcare providers: A consensus paper from the International Expert Wound Care Advisory Panel. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*, 12(11), 995–1008. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2009.9939>
- Baharestani, M. (2013). *Medical device related pressure ulcers: The hidden epidemic across the lifespan*. Presented at the 13th NPUAP National Biennial Conference: DTI: The State of the Science in Houston, Texas. Retrieved January 15, 2016, from <http://www.npuap.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/7-Final-Baharestani-Medical-Device-Related-Pressure-Ulcers-1The-Hidden-Epidemic-Across-the-Lifespan.pptx.pdf>
- Bansal, C., Scott, R., Stewart, D., & Cockerell, C. J. (2005). Decubitus ulcers: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Dermatology*, 44(10), 805–810. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-4632.2005.02636.x>
- Beeckman, D., Van Lancker, A., Van Hecke, A., & Verhaeghe, S. (2014). A systematic review and meta-analysis of incontinence-associated dermatitis, incontinence, and moisture as risk factors for pressure ulcer development. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 37(3), 204–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/nur.21593>

- Beinlich, N., & Meehan, A. (2014). Resource nurse program: A nurse-initiated, evidence-based program to eliminate hospital-acquired pressure ulcers. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 41(2), 136–141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000001>
- Bergstrom, N., Allman, R. M., Alvarez, O., Bennett, M. A., Carlson, C. E., Frantz, R. A., . . . Yarkony, G. M. (1994). *Treatment of pressure ulcers. Clinical practice guideline*, Number 15. Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. AHCPR Publication No. 95-0652. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Bergstrom, N., Allman, R. M., Carlson, C. E., Eaglstein, W., Frantz, R. A., Garber, S. L., . . . Xakellis, G. C. (1992). *Pressure ulcers in adults: Prediction and prevention. Clinical practice guideline*, Number 3. Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. AHCPR Publication No. 92-0047. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Bergstrom, N., & Braden, B. (1992). A prospective study of pressure sore risk among institutionalized elderly. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 40(8), 747–758. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1992.tb01845.x>
- Berlowitz, D. R., & Brienza, D. M. (2007). Are all pressure ulcers the result of deep tissue injury? A review of the literature. *Ostomy Wound Management*, 53(10), 34–38.
- Black, J., Alves, P., Brindle, C. T., Dealey, C., Santamaria, N., Call, E., & Clark, M. (2015). Use of wound dressings to enhance prevention of pressure ulcers caused by medical devices. *International Wound Journal*, 12(3), 322–327. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/iwj.12111>
- Black, J., Baharestani, M., Cuddigan, J., Dorner, B., Edsberg, L., Langemo, D., . . . National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel. (2007). National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel's updated pressure ulcer staging system. *Urologic Nursing*, 27(2), 144–150, 156.
- Black, J., Clark, M., Dealey, C., Brindle, C. T., Alves, P., Santamaria, N., & Call, E. (2015). Dressings as an adjunct to pressure ulcer prevention: Consensus panel recommendations. *International Wound Journal*, 12(4), 484–488. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/iwj.12197>
- Black, J. M., Cuddigan, J. E., Walko, M. A., Didier, L. A., Lander, M. J., & Kelpie, M. R. (2010). Medical device related pressure ulcers in hospitalized patients. *International Wound Journal*, 7(5), 358–365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-481X.2010.00699.x>
- Black, J. M., Edsberg, L. E., Baharestani, M. M., Langemo, D., Goldberg, M., McNichol, L., . . . National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel. (2011). Pressure ulcers: Avoidable or unavoidable? Results of the National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel Consensus Conference. *Ostomy Wound Management*, 52(2), 24–37.
- Braden, B., & Bergstrom, N. (1988). *Braden Scale for Predicting Pressure Sore Risk*. Retrieved April 12, 2016, from <http://www.bradenscale.com/images/bradenscale.pdf>

- Brienza, D., Antokal, S., Herbe, L., Logan, S., Maguire, J., Van Ranst, J., & Siddiqui, A. (2015). Friction-induced skin injuries—Are they pressure ulcers? An updated NPUAP white paper. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 42(1), 62–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.000000000000102>
- Brink, P., Smith, T. F., & Linkewich, B. (2006). Factors associated with pressure ulcers in palliative home care. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*, 9(6), 1369–1375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2006.9.1369>
- Brunner, M., Droegemueller, C., Rivers, S., & Deuser, W. E. (2012). Prevention of incontinence-related skin breakdown for acute and critical care patients: Comparison of two products. *Urologic Nursing*, 32(4), 214–219.
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2004). Revisions to Appendix P (Survey protocols for long term care facilities) and Appendix PP (Guidance to surveyors for long term care facilities). *CMS Manual System Department of Health & Human Services (DHHS). Pub. 100-07 State Operations Provider Certification*. Retrieved April 10, 2016, from <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Transmittals/downloads/r5som.pdf>
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2008). *Medicare and Medicaid move aggressively to encourage greater patient safety in hospitals and reduce never events*. Press release. Retrieved April 10, 2016, from <https://www.cms.gov/Newsroom/MediaReleaseDatabase/Press-releases/2008-Press-releases-items/2008-07-313.html>
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2009). 42 CFR Parts 412, 413, 415, 485, and 489. Medicare program; changes to the hospital inpatient prospective payments systems for acute care hospitals and fiscal year 2010 rates; and changes to the long term care hospital prospective payment system and rate years 2010 and 2009 rates; final rule. *Federal Register*, 74(165), 43753–44236. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved May 19, 2016, from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2009-08-27/pdf/E9-18663.pdf>
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2016). *State Operations Manual. Appendix PP - Guidance to surveyors for long term care facilities. Rev 157, 06-10-16*. Retrieved July 23, 2016, from https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/downloads/som107ap_pp_guidelines_ltcf.pdf
- Chou, R., Dana, T., Bougatsos, C., Blazina, I., Starmer, A. J., Reitel, K., & Buckley, D. I. (2013). Pressure ulcer risk assessment and prevention: A systematic comparative effectiveness review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 159(1), 28–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-159-1-201307020-00006>
- Clark, M., Black, J., Alves, P., Brindle, C., Call, E., Dealey, C., & Santamaria, N. (2014). Systematic review of the use of prophylactic dressings in the prevention of pressure ulcers. *International Wound Journal*, 11(5), 460–471. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/iwj.12212>

- Cox, J. (2011). Predictors of pressure ulcers in adult critical care patients. *American Journal of Critical Care*, 20(5), 364–375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2011934>
- Cox, J., & Rasmussen, L. (2014). Enteral nutrition in the prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers in adult critical care patients. *Critical Care Nurse*, 34(6), 15–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4037/ccn2014950>
- Cox, J., & Roche, S. (2015). Vasopressors and development of pressure ulcers in adult critical care patients. *American Journal of Critical Care*, 24(6), 501–510. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2015123>
- Cox, J., Roche, S., & Gandhi, N. (2013). Critical care physicians: Attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge about pressure ulcers. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care*, 26(4), 168–176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000428863.34294.9d>
- Curley, M. A., Razmus, I. S., Roberts, K. E., & Wypij, D. (2003). Predicting pressure ulcer risk in pediatric patients. The Braden Q Scale. *Nursing Research*, 52(1), 22–33. Retrieved April 26, 2016, from http://www.marthaacurley.com/uploads/8/9/8/6/8986925/nr_bq_article.pdf
- Dahlstrom, M., Best, T., Baker, C., Doeing, D., Davis, A., Doty, J., & Arora, V. M. (2011). Improving identification and documentation of pressure ulcers at an urban academic hospital. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 37(3), 123–130.
- Delmore, B., Lebovits, S., Suggs, B., Rolnitzky, L., & Ayello, E. A. (2015). Risk factors associated with heel pressure ulcers in hospitalized patients. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 42(3), 242–248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000134>
- Doughty, D., Ramundo, J., Bonham, P., Beitz, J., Erwin-Toth, P., Anderson, R., & Rolstad, B. S. (2006). Issues and challenges in staging of pressure ulcers. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 33(2), 125–130.
- Edsberg, L. E., Langemo, D., Baharestani, M. M., Posthauer, M. E., & Goldberg, M. (2014). Unavoidable pressure injury: State of the science and consensus outcomes. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 41(4), 313–334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000050>
- Gosnell, D. J. (1989a). Pressure sore risk assessment: A critique. Part I. The Gosnell Scale. *Decubitus*, 2(3), 32–38.
- Gosnell, D. J. (1989b). *Gosnell scale for predicting risk of pressure ulcer*. Retrieved April 26, 2016, from Medal The Medical Algorithms Company website: <http://www.medicalalgorithms.com>
- Gray, M., McNichol, L., & Nix, D. (2016). Incontinence-associated dermatitis. Progress, promises, and ongoing challenges. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 43(2), 188–192. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000217>

- Holden-Mount, S., & Sieggreen, M. (2015). *Medical device-related pressure ulcers: Pediatrics & adults*. Presented February 20, 2015, at the 2015 NPUAP National Biennial Conference, Orlando, Florida. Retrieved January 15, 2016, from <http://www.npuap.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/5.-Medical-Devices-S-Holden-Mount-and-M-Sieggreen1.pdf>
- Jacobson, T. M., Thompson, S. L., Halvorson, A. M., & Zeitler, K. (2016). Enhancing documentation of pressure ulcer prevention interventions: A quality improvement strategy to reduce pressure ulcers. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality, 31*(3), 207–214.
- Jankowski, I. M., & Nadzam, D. M. (2011). Identifying gaps, barriers, and solutions in implementing pressure ulcer prevention programs. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety, 37*(6), 253–264.
- Keast, D. H., Parslow, N., Houghton, P. E., Norton, L., & Fraser, C. (2007). Best practice recommendations for the prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers: Update 2006. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care, 20*(8), 447–460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000284922.69932.c5>
- Krapfl, L. A., & Gray, M. (2008). Does regular repositioning prevent pressure ulcers? *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing, 35*(6), 571–577. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.WON.0000341469.33567.61>
- Krasner, D. (2015). *The unavoidable pressure ulcer*. Presented at the American Geriatrics Society Annual Meeting, National Harbor, Maryland, May 15, 2015. Retrieved April 26, 2016, from <http://www.dianekrasner.com/AGS%20Spring%202015%20Krasner%20FINAL%2011may2015.pdf>
- Langemo, D. K., Black, J., & National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel. (2010). Pressure ulcers in individuals receiving palliative care: A National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel white paper. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care, 23*(2), 59–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000363502.84737.c8>
- Langemo, D. K., & Brown, G. (2006). Skin fails too: Acute, chronic, and end stage skin failure. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care, 19*(4), 206–211.
- Langemo, D., Haesler, E., Naylor, W., Tippett, A., & Young, T. (2015). Evidence-based guidelines for pressure ulcer management at the end of life. *International Journal of Palliative Nursing, 21*(5), 225–232. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12968/ijpn.2015.21.5.225>
- Levine, J. M. (2005). Historical perspective on pressure ulcers: The decubitus ominusus of Jean- Martin Charcot. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 53*(7), 1248–1251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53358.x>
- Levine, J. M., Ayello, E. A., Zulkowski, K. M., & Fogel, J. (2012). Pressure ulcer knowledge in medical residents: An opportunity for improvement. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care, 25*(3), 115–117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000412908.43335.46>

- Levine, J. M., Humphrey, S., Lebovits, S., & Fogel, J. (2009). The unavoidable pressure ulcer: A retrospective case series. *Journal of Clinical Outcomes Management*, 16(8), 1–5. Retrieved October 28, 2015, from <http://jmlevinemd.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Unavoidable-Case-Series.pdf>
- Levine, J. M., & Zulkowski, K. M. (2015). Secondary analysis of Office of Inspector General's pressure ulcer data: Incidence, avoidability, and level of harm. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care*, 28(9), 420–428. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000470070.23694.f3>
- Levinson, D. R. (2010). *Department of Health and Human Services. Office of Inspector General. Adverse events in hospitals: National incidence among Medicare beneficiaries*. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from <http://oig.hhs.gov/oei/reports/oei-06-09-00090.pdf>
- Levinson, D. R. (2014). *Adverse events in skilled nursing facilities: National incidence among Medicare beneficiaries*. Retrieved April 26, 2016, from <http://oig.hhs.gov/oei/reports/oei-06-11-00370.pdf>
- Lyder C. H. (2003). Pressure ulcer prevention and management. *JAMA*, 289(2), 223–226.
- Lyder, C. H., Wang, Y., Metersky, M., Curry, M., Kliman, R., Verzier, N. R., & Hunt, D. R. (2012). Hospital-acquired pressure ulcers: Results from the national Medicare Patient Safety Monitoring System Study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 60(9), 1603–1608. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04106.x>
- Mackintosh, R., Gwilliam, A., & Williams, M. (2014). Teaching the fruits of pressure ulcer staging. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 41(4), 381–387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000049>
- McInnes, E., Jammali-Blasi, A., Bell-Syer, S. E., Dumville, J. C., Middleton, V., & Cullum, N. (2015). Support surfaces for pressure ulcer prevention. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 9. Art. No.: CD001735. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001735.pub5>
- McIntyre, L., May, R., & Marks-Maran, D. (2012). A strategy to reduce avoidable pressure ulcers. *Nursing Times*, 108(29), 14–17. Retrieved April 17, 2016, from <http://www.nursingtimes.net/a-strategy-to-reduce-avoidable-pressure-ulcers/5047062.fullarticle>
- Miller, S. K., Sharma, N., Aberegg, L. C., Blasiolo, K. N., & Fulton, J. A. (2015). Analysis of the pressure distribution qualities of a silicone border foam dressing. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 42(4), 346–351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000130>
- Murray, J. S., Noonan, C., Quigley, S., & Curley, M. A. (2013). Medical device-related hospital-acquired pressure ulcers in children: An integrative review. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 28(6), 585–595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2013.05.004>

- National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel. (2016). *NPUAP pressure injury stages*. Retrieved April 28, 2016, from <http://www.npuap.org/resources/educational-and-clinical-resources/npuap-pressure-injury-stages>
- National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel, & European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel. (2009). *Prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers: Clinical practice guideline*. Washington, D.C.: National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel.
- National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel, European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel, & Pan Pacific Pressure Injury Alliance. (2014). *Prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers: Clinical practice guideline*. Emily Haesler (Ed.). Osborne Park, Western Australia: Cambridge Media.
- Norton, D., McLaren, R., & Exton-Smith, A. N. (1962). *An investigation of geriatric nursing problems in hospital*. London: National Corporation for the Care of Old People (now Centre for Policy on Ageing). Retrieved April 20, 2008, from <http://www.woundcarehelpline.com/NortonScale.pdf>
- Norton, D., McLaren, R., & Exton-Smith, A. N. (n.d.). *Norton Pressure Sore Risk Assessment Scale Scoring System*. Retrieved April 12, 2016, from http://www.health.vic.gov.au/_data/assets/file/0010/233668/Norton-scale.pdf
- Padula, W. V., Makic, M. B., Mishra, M. K., Campbell, J. D., Nair, K. V., Wald, H. L., & Valuck, R. J. (2015). Comparative effectiveness of quality improvement interventions for pressure ulcer prevention in academic medical centers in the United States. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 41(6), 246–256.
- Padula, W. V., Mishra, M. K., Makic, M. B., & Valuck, R. J. (2014). A framework of quality improvement interventions to implement evidenced-based practices for pressure ulcer prevention. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care*, 27(6), 280–284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000450703.87099.5b>
- Padula, W. V., Valuck, R. J., Makic M. B., & Wald, H. L. (2015). Factors influencing adoption of hospital-acquired pressure ulcer prevention programs in US academic medical centers. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 42(4), 327–330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000145>
- Peterson, J., Adlard, K., Walti, B. I., Hayakawa, J., McLean, E., & Feidner, S. C. (2015). Clinical nurse specialist collaboration to recognize, prevent, and treat pediatric pressure ulcers. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, 29(5), 276–282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NUR.0000000000000135>
- Peterson, A. M., & Rogers, B. (2012). Pressure ulcers: Is it a case of negligence? *Journal of Legal Nurse Consulting*, 23(1), 32–34. Retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.aalnc.org/d/do/302>

- Pieper, B., & Zulkowski, K. (2014). The Pieper-Zulkowski Pressure Ulcer Knowledge Test. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care*, 27(9), 413–419. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000453210.21330.00>
- Pittman, J., Beeson, T., Kitterman, J., Lancaster, S., & Shelly, A. (2015). Medical device–related hospital-acquired pressure ulcers: Development of an evidence-based position statement. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 42(2), 151–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000113>
- Pittman, J., Beeson, T., Terry, C., Dillon, J., Hampton, C., Kerley, D., . . . Tucker, J. (2016). Unavoidable pressure ulcers: Development and testing of the Indiana University Health Pressure Ulcer Prevention Inventory. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 43(1), 32–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0000000000000191>
- Quigley, S. M., & Curley, M. A. (1996). Skin integrity in the pediatric population: Preventing and managing pressure ulcers. *Journal of the Society of Pediatric Nurses*, 1(1), 7–18. Retrieved May 25, 2016, from http://www.marthaaqcurley.com/uploads/8/9/8/6/8986925/jspn-_skin_integrity.pdf
- Registered Nurses Association of Ontario. (2011). *Risk assessment and prevention of pressure ulcers. Nursing best practice guideline*. Retrieved May 18, 2016, from http://rnao.ca/sites/rnao-ca/files/Risk_Assessment_and_Prevention_of_Pressure_Ulcers.pdf
- Reifsnnyder, J., & Magee, H. S. (2005). Development of pressure ulcers in patients receiving home hospice care. *Wounds*, 17(4), 74–79. Retrieved April 28, 2016, from <http://www.woundsresearch.com/article/3948>
- Santamaria, N., Gerdtz, M., Sage, S., McCann, J., Freeman, A., Vassiliou, T., . . . Knott, J. (2015). A randomised controlled trial of the effectiveness of soft silicone multi-layered foam dressings in the prevention of sacral and heel pressure ulcers in trauma and critically ill patients: The border trial. *International Wound Journal*, 12(3), 302–308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/iwj.12101>
- Schindler, C. A., Mikhailov, T. A., Cashin, S. E., Malin, S., Christensen, M., & Winters, J. M. (2013). Under pressure: Preventing pressure ulcers in critically ill infants. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing*, 18(4), 329–341. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jspn.12043>
- Schumacher, B., Askew, M., & Otten, K. (2013). Development of a pressure ulcer trigger tool for the neonatal population. *Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing*, 40(1), 46–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WON.0b013e31826a4d99>
- Selde, W. (2015). Know when and how your patient can legally refuse care. *Journal of Emergency Medical Services*, 1-8. Retrieved May 18, 2016, from <http://www.jems.com/articles/print/volume-40/issue-3/features/know-when-and-how-your-patient-can-legal.html>

- Sharkey, S., Hudak, S., Horn, S. D., & Spector, W. (2011). Leveraging certified nursing assistant documentation and knowledge to improve clinical decision-making: The on-time quality improvement program to prevent pressure ulcers. *Advances in Skin & Wound Care*, 24(4), 182–188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.ASW.0000396244.65415.7f>
- Smith, M. E., Totten, A., Hickam, D. H., Fu, R., Wasson, N., Rahman, B., . . . Saha, S. (2013). Pressure ulcer treatment strategies: A systematic comparative effectiveness review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 159(1), 39–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-159-1-201307020-00007>
- Stokowski, L. A. (2010). In this corner: The unavoidable pressure ulcer. *Medscape*. Retrieved February 15, 2016, from <http://www.medscape.org/viewarticle/717896>
- Sullivan, N., & Schoelles, K. M. (2013). Preventing in-facility pressure ulcers as a patient safety strategy: A systematic review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 158(Suppl. 5, Part 2), 410–416. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-158-5-201303051-00008>
- Waterlow, J. (1985). Pressure sores: A risk assessment card. *Nursing Times*, 81(48), 49–55.
- Waterlow, J. (2005). *Waterlow score-risk assessment card*. Retrieved February 9, 2017, from <http://www.mayflower-medical.co.uk/downloads.html>
- Wagh, S. M. (2014). Attitudes of nurses toward pressure ulcer prevention: A literature review. *MedSurg Nursing*, 23(5), 350–357.
- Witkowski, J. A., & Parish, L. C. (2000). The decubitus ulcer: Skin failure and destructive behavior. *International Journal of Dermatology*, 39(12), 894–896.
- Worley, C. A. (2007). Skin failure: The permissible pressure ulcer? *Dermatology Nursing*, 19(4), 384–385.
- Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society. (2003). *Guideline for prevention and management of pressure ulcers. WOCN Clinical practice guideline series 2*. Glenview, IL: Author.
- Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society. (2008). *Pressure ulcer evaluation. Best practice for clinicians*. Mt. Laurel, NJ: Author.
- Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society. (2009). *Position statement: Avoidable versus unavoidable pressure ulcers*. Retrieved April 28, 2016, from <http://www.wocn.org/?page=AvoidUnavoidPU>
- Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society. (2010). *Guideline for prevention and management of pressure ulcers. WOCN Clinical practice guideline series 2*. Mt. Laurel, NJ: Author.

Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society. (2016a). *Guideline for prevention and management of pressure ulcers (injuries)*. WOCN Clinical practice guideline series 2. Mt. Laurel, NJ: Author.

Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society. (2016b). *Pressure ulcer evaluation: Clinical resource guide*. Mt. Laurel, NJ: Author. Retrieved May 28, 2016, from <http://www.wocn.org/page/PUEvaluationCRG>

Zaratkiewicz, S., Whitney, J. D., Lowe, J. R., Taylor, S., O'Donnell, F., & Minton-Folz, P. (2010). Development and implementation of a hospital-acquired pressure ulcer incidence tracking system and algorithm. *Journal for Healthcare Quality*, 32(6), 44–51. Retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2957315/pdf/nihms204984.pdf>

Appendix

42CFR 483.25.c F314 Definitions: Avoidable/Unavoidable Pressure Ulcers

(CMS, 2004, 2016)

“Avoidable” means that the resident developed a pressure ulcer and that the facility did not do one or more of the following: evaluate the resident’s clinical condition and pressure ulcer risk factors; define and implement interventions that are consistent with resident needs, resident goals, and recognized standards of practice; monitor and evaluate the impact of the interventions; or revise the interventions as appropriate (CMS, 2004, p. 133; CMS, 2016, p. 235).

“Unavoidable” means that the resident developed a pressure ulcer even though the facility had evaluated the resident’s clinical condition and pressure ulcer risk factors; defined and implemented interventions that are consistent with resident needs, goals, and recognized standards of practice; monitored and evaluated the impact of the interventions; and revised the approaches as appropriate (CMS, 2004, p. 133; CMS, 2016, p. 235).