Reviewer ID: Carlos L. Cano, Elsa Sun

Last updated: May 6th, 2024

Research Summary – Stirling's Pressure Ulcer Severity Scale – Skin

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
Wellard & Lo 2000 Retrospective medical history audit Spinal Unit in Australia	N=60 Mean age 43±18yrs (range 17-82yrs) Of the 60 cases examined, the pressure ulcer admission rate to the hospital was: 46.7% had 1 admission 18.3% had 2 admissions 16.7% had 3-4 admissions 18.3% had >5 admissions Average (SD) length of stay in the hospital: 91 (98) days	*Descriptions in the patients' histories were used to retrospectively apply scores according to Stirling's pressure ulcer severity scale, and the Norton, Braden and Waterlow tools. Four histories had insufficient data, leaving N=56.* **Spearman correlation coefficients.** When the scales were treated as continuous variables: There were significant correlations between the Spirling scores and both the Norton scores (ρ=-0.28; P=.039) and the Waterlow scores (ρ=0.38; P=.004), but		Distribution of pressure ulcers using the Stirling wound classification See table 1 below

Reviewer ID: Carlos L. Cano, Elsa Sun

Last updated: May 6th, 2024

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		not the Braden scores (ρ=0.03; P=.813). When the scales were treated as categorical variables (e.g. at risk, high risk, very high risk): Only the Waterlow scores were significantly correlated to the Stirling scores (ρ=0.32; P=.017). (Norton, ρ=0.14, P=.311; Braden, ρ=-0.08, P=.569.) Assessing the correlations between the three retrospectively applied tools: The Norton scores were significantly correlated to both the Waterlow scores (ρ=-0.50 or 0.56*; P<.001)		

Reviewer ID: Carlos L. Cano, Elsa Sun

Last updated: May 6th, 2024

<table>
<tr><th>Author Year
Country
Research Design
Setting</th><th>Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample</th><th>Validity</th><th>Reliability</th><th>Responsiveness
Interpretability</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td></td><td>and the Braden scores (ρ=0.48 or 0.49*; P<.001).
*Indicates discrepancy in the article text.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Table 1
<table><tr><th></th><th>Frequency (%)</th></tr><tr><td>Stage 1 – intact skin</td><td>3 (5.4)</td></tr><tr><td>Stage 2 – partial-thickness skin loss or epidermal and/or dermal damage</td><td>12 (21.4)</td></tr><tr><td>Stage 3 – Full-thickness skin loss with damage or necrosis of subcutaneous tissue, not bone, tendon or joint capsule</td><td>37 (66.1)</td></tr><tr><td>Stage 4 – Extensive tissue destruction extending to bone, tendon or joint capsule</td><td>4 (7.1)</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>