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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of natural sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers in adults with impaired mobility?

2. What is the cost-effectiveness of natural sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers in adults with impaired mobility?

3. What are the evidence-based guidelines regarding the use of natural sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers in adults with impaired mobility?

KEY FINDINGS

One health technology assessment report and two systematic reviews regarding the clinical effectiveness of natural sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers in adults with impaired mobility were identified.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2014, Issue 8), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2009 and August 19, 2014. Internet links were provided, where available.

The summary of findings was prepared from the abstracts of the relevant information. Please note that data contained in abstracts may not always be an accurate reflection of the data contained within the full article.
SELECTION CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Designs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations, and evidence-based guidelines.

One health technology assessment report and two systematic reviews regarding the clinical effectiveness of natural sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers in adults with impaired mobility were identified. No relevant randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations, or evidence-based guidelines were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

One health technology assessment report\(^1\) and two systematic reviews\(^2,3\) regarding the clinical effectiveness of natural sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers in adults with impaired mobility were identified.

Poor acceptability of sheepskins due to general discomfort\(^1\) and heat discomfort\(^2\) was reported. One systematic review\(^2\) reported that sheepskin used under legs reduced redness, based on the results from one small study. Overall, there is insufficient evidence to support the clinical effectiveness of sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers, and some evidence of poor acceptability.\(^1,2\)

No relevant literature was found regarding the cost-effectiveness of natural sheepskins for the treatment of pressure ulcers and no evidence-based guidelines were identified, therefore no summary can be provided.
REFERENCES SUMMARIZED

Health Technology Assessments


Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

   See : Table A : Summary of Evidence, page 10,13; Discussion : Key Findings and Strength of Evidence, page 15


Randomized Controlled Trials
No literature identified.

Non-Randomized Studies
No literature identified.

Economic Evaluations
No literature identified.

Guidelines and Recommendations
No literature identified.
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Systematic Review – No results provided in the abstract


Guidelines and Recommendations – Methodology not systematic

See: Standard 8 Criterion: Managing Pressure Injuries, page 25