

# BPA made easy

Wounds International November 2016 [www.woundsinternational.com](http://www.woundsinternational.com)



## Introduction

The mere presence of bacteria in chronic wounds may not indicate active infection or impair wound healing. Contaminated wounds contain bacteria but there may or may not be a host reaction. However, there is a point at which bacteria do begin to inhibit healing, resulting in local and, eventually, systemic infection if left untreated. This point of pathogenicity is when the bacteria begin to secrete proteases. This Made Easy document discusses bacterial protease activity (BPA) as an objective marker of pathogenicity and a means of identifying wounds progressing towards infection.

*Authors: Dr. Thomas Serena, Dr. Paul Chadwick, Prof. Franck Duteille, Prof. Marco Romanelli, Dr. Severin Läubli, Dr. José Luis Lázaro Martínez. Full author details can be found on page 5.*

### Box 1 Host proteases: a review

Increasingly, it is being acknowledged that host and bacterial cells may work synergistically to cause tissue breakdown in the wound bed<sup>1</sup>.

The major protease groups involved in wound healing are matrix metalloproteinases and serine proteases (e.g. human neutrophil elastase). During normal wound healing, proteases break down damaged extracellular matrix proteins and foreign materials, allowing for wound closure<sup>2</sup>.

Evidence has shown that in some chronic wounds proteases are markedly elevated; these excess proteases – produced by the host cells – damage the extracellular matrix, and degrade growth factors and their receptors<sup>2</sup>.

### Box 2 Useful definitions<sup>3</sup>

- **Pathogen:** a microorganism that causes or is able to cause disease
- **Pathogenicity:** the ability of a microorganism to cause disease
- **Virulence:** a quantitative measure of the likelihood that a pathogen will cause disease
- **Virulence factor:** a molecule produced by bacteria to facilitate colonisation, replication and spread within a host

## What are bacterial proteases?

Proteases are enzymes that act on protein molecules, breaking them down into peptides and amino acids. Bacterial proteases are virulence factors known to be secreted by a number of bacteria commonly seen in chronic wounds, including *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Proteus mirabilis* and *Enterococcus faecalis*<sup>4</sup>.

## How do bacterial proteases influence the development of infection?

Bacterial proteases degrade host tissue proteins, impair host immune defenses and promote the local and systemic spread of bacteria. Bacterial proteases hinder immune cell function by suppressing chemotaxis, preventing phagocytosis and impeding immune cell communication (Figure 1)<sup>4-6</sup>. In addition, bacterial proteases can stimulate the production of human/host proteases via immune system activation (Box 1).

## What is the wound infection continuum?

While many wounds heal successfully despite the presence of bacteria, for other wounds, bacteria can cause various complications, such as:

- **Tissue breakdown**
- **Pain**
- **Impedance of the wound's healing ability and delayed healing**
- **Life-threatening complications, such as systemic infection.**

The influence of bacteria in a wound can be described on a continuum of clinical importance (Figure 2), with increasing levels of vigilance or intervention required where the wound is in a period of pathogenicity, local infection or systemic infection. The different stages of clinical importance are determined by bacterial pathogenicity, as well as the host response and signs of inflammation or tissue damage<sup>3</sup>.

## What challenges could be faced when assessing wounds affected by bacteria?


### Lack of clinical signs:

The host response to bacteria and their proteases often includes inflammatory markers such as interleukin-1 beta (IL-1 $\beta$ ) or tumour necrosis factor-alpha (TNF- $\alpha$ ). However, the typical clinical signs of infection may not always be present if the patient's inflammatory response is weakened, such as where comorbidities like diabetes or immunosuppressive conditions are present<sup>7</sup>.

# BPA made easy



**Figure 1: Contribution of bacterial proteases to the development of wound infection and delayed healing (Läuchli et al, 2015)<sup>3</sup>**



Stages of chronic wound infection continuum	Vigilance required		Intervention required	
	Not infected/Contamination	Colonisation	State of pathogenicity	Systemic infection
	The presence of bacteria within a wound without host reaction	Bacteria are present in the wound and may multiply, but do not initiate a host reaction	Bacteria multiply, express proteases that attack tissue, and delay healing; usually associated with an exacerbation of pain; overt host reaction may be absent or present	Bacteria multiply, as for critical colonisation/local infection, but also cause a systemic host response, e.g. pyrexia or hypothermia, tachycardia

Increasing bacterial pathogenicity and clinical problems

**Figure 2: The wound infection continuum in chronic wounds (Adapted from: Siddiqui and Bernstein, 2010; Collier, 2004; Kingsley et al, 2004; WUWHS, 2008)<sup>8-11</sup>**

**Study 1** Serena et al, 2015 – evaluated the relationship between total bioburden and BPA levels in wounds<sup>7</sup>


Duplicate swabs were taken from 186 chronic wounds. One swab was tested on a prototype rapid lateral flow point-of-care bacterial protease test, while the other was extracted for testing in a laboratory protease assay (using casein as substrate, including an inhibitor of HNE [‘iCasein’ assay]), for analysis of cytokines IL-1 $\beta$  and TNF- $\alpha$ , and for culture for quantitative microbiology.

Results showed that mean levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines IL-1 $\beta$  and TNF- $\alpha$  are significantly higher in wounds with a positive BPA test, compared with wounds that tested BPA-negative ( $p < 0.0001$  and  $p = 0.0002$ , respectively). Moreover, when BPA activity was tested against bioburden, a markedly higher number of wounds yielded positive results on a rapid point-of-care BPA test when the total bioburden exceeded  $10^5$  CFU/ml.

**Study 2** Serena et al, 2015 – evaluated the relationship between BPA levels, clinical signs of infection and wound bioburden<sup>7</sup>

Wound fluid swabs were taken from 366 chronic wounds (including pressure ulcers, diabetic foot ulcers (DFU), leg ulcers, and other non-healing wounds). These were extracted for testing in the ‘iCasein’ assay and clinician assessment for clinical signs of infection, based on the ‘NERDS’ acronym (Non-healing, Exudative, Red and bleeding, Debris, Smell - presence of three or more ‘NERDS’ is considered indicative of local infection [Sibbald et al, 2003]). Where an iCasein activity threshold of 125 mUnits/swab was exceeded, the wound was classified as BPA-positive. An additional swab was taken for culture and quantitative microbiology.

Of the tested wounds, 72% had bacterial counts that exceeded  $10^5$  CFU/ml, indicating elevated bioburden. Only a small proportion exhibited three or more clinical signs of infection (18%). In contrast to bioburden and clinical signs, almost half of the wounds swabbed positive for BPA (49%); over three quarters of these wounds (77%) did not exhibit local signs of infection. It is suspected that they were in a pathogenic state, which had not yet progressed to overt infection.



immune defences or if particularly virulent bacteria are involved, whereas other wounds with bacterial bioburden above this threshold may heal without intervention. Moreover, in some instances, microbiological examinations can be difficult to interpret, especially when multiple bacteria are present. As such, culture results should not replace clinical judgement, but can be used to guide choice of antimicrobial therapy, where appropriate<sup>12,13</sup>

**Chronic inflammation versus infection:**

Wounds may be stuck in a perpetual cycle of inflammation partially attributable to bacteria; this damages the extracellular matrix and degrades growth factors, which stimulate release of inflammatory mediators to cause a heightened inflammatory response, further damaging tissue and delaying healing. As such, it is important to differentiate between inflammation and infection<sup>14,15</sup>

**Could bacterial protease activity be a useful marker for pathogenicity?**

Bacteria in chronic wounds can be non-pathogenic or pathogenic in nature. One indication of the pathogenicity of bacteria is expression of enzymatic virulence factors, such as bacterial proteases, which may stimulate excessive inflammation in the host and, eventually, damage wound tissue and hinder immunologic response.

The results of two recent studies conducted by Serena et al (2015)<sup>7</sup> demonstrate that bacterial protease activity (BPA) can be used as a marker for a ‘period of pathogenesis’ in chronic wounds (Study 1 and Study 2). As such, testing wound fluid for BPA could be a useful method to detect pathogenic bacteria that are capable of causing infection prior to the appearance of clinical signs.


**Difficulty interpreting microbiological investigations:**

While a bacterial load of  $>1 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml is typically used for diagnosing

wound infection, this threshold may not be appropriate for all wounds; for example, healing may be delayed below this threshold in patients with impaired

# PRODUCTS FOR PRACTICE

**Figure 3: Pathway for the use of point-of-care test for bacterial protease activity (Adapted from: Lächli et al, 2015)<sup>3</sup>**



**\*Incorporate into management plan:**

- Optimisation of host response: nutrition, hydration, glycaemic control, tissue perfusion
- Reduction of bacterial load: prevent further contamination or cross-contamination, facilitate wound drainage, debride wound, increase dressing change frequency, cleanse wound at every dressing change, manage excess exudate, manage malodour, topical antiseptic +/- systemic antibiotic(s)
- General measures such as management of symptoms, patient and carer education, optimise patient cooperation, ensure psychosocial support (WUWHS, 2008)

\*\*Systemic antibiotics are usually reserved for patients with spreading or systemic infection; avoid use of topical antibiotics (WUWHS, 2008)

‡ If positive for elevated protease activity, consider incorporating protease-modulating interventions into management (Wounds international, 2011; Dissemmond et al, 2013)

NOTE: Some patients with a DFU and bacterial bioburden may not show clinical signs of infection due to neurological, immunological or vascular conditions. It may be beneficial to test earlier than 15 days in such cases.

## What is the WOUNDCHEK™ Bacterial Status test?

WOUNDCHEK™ Bacterial Status\* is an innovative lateral flow test for the qualitative assessment of BPA directly from a swab sample from a chronic wound. WOUNDCHEK™ Bacterial Status is intended for diagnostic use, at the point of care, as an aid in the healthcare professional's assessment of whether a wound may become non-healing due to bacterial pathogenesis as indicated by the presence of BPA.

The WOUNDCHEK™ Bacterial Status test uses chronic wound fluid from the wound, collected using a method known as the Serena Technique®, whereby the cleansed wound is moistened with saline and the surface is swabbed with a rolling action until the entire swab foam tip is coated<sup>15</sup>. A positive result of the test indicates the presence of BPA in the wound. This detection may allow for earlier clinical intervention to prevent the wound from continuing along the infection continuum to more serious clinical infection or sepsis.

## What do results of the WOUNDCHEK™ Bacterial Status test mean in practice?

Since presence of BPA is indicative of impending or active infection, its detection could allow recognition of bacteria behaving pathologically, even without clinical signs of infection, prompting treatment to reduce bacterial burden. A positive result on the BPA test alerts the clinician to the presence of bacteria in a wound behaving pathogenically, allowing them to determine in an objective manner if bacterial burden needs to be addressed when clinical signs may not be immediately apparent, and

intervene prior to the development of an obvious infection.

As seen in the pathway for use of the point-of-care bacterial protease test provided in Figure 3, the test result allows the clinician to improve care of the patient, by:

- **Implementing measures to reduce the wound's bacterial burden, such as optimising host response, preventing further wound contamination, debridement, increasing the frequency of dressing changes or using topical antiseptics like silver or PHMB**
- **Monitoring and reassessing the wound regularly**
- **Continuing standard care, as appropriate.**

If healing is delayed but the result is negative and clinical signs of infection are absent, the clinician is able to choose an alternative approach to care, such as testing for elevated host protease activity or considering protease-modulating interventions.

Bacteria in biofilms can secrete proteases and have been shown to produce them at greater levels than when in the planktonic state<sup>17</sup>. Wounds that test positive on the BPA test may also contain a biofilm on at least some of wound bed<sup>18</sup>. Although it is not known whether the BPA test could be used to indicate biofilm presence, many of the treatments used for a BPA-positive wound are also used for biofilm management, such as barrier dressings, debridement and antiseptics<sup>19-21</sup>

As an adjunct to existing wound assessment techniques, which are generally subjective in nature, use of this test could have a number of benefits, both clinical and economic. In an era of increasing antibiotic

resistance, solutions that could reduce their overuse and support the targeted use of antibiotics are valuable to the wider healthcare system<sup>3</sup>. Indeed, where diagnostic tests are able to successfully guide clinician decisions, this could lead to the ability to monitor progress of the therapy selected, reduction in long-term complications (for example, loss of limb) and improvements in patient quality of life (such as reduction in pain).

\*Not yet available in all countries

The Made Easy has been supported by WOUNDCHEK Laboratories. The views expressed in this Made Easy do not necessarily reflect those of the company.

## Author details

Serena T<sup>1</sup>, Chadwick P<sup>2</sup>, Duteille F<sup>3</sup>, Romanelli M<sup>4</sup>, Läubli S<sup>5</sup>, Martínez J<sup>6</sup>,

1. CEO and Medical Director, SerenaGroup Inc
2. Consultant Podiatrist, Salford Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
3. Chief of Reconstructive and Cosmetic Plastic Surgery – Burn Centre, University Hospital, Nantes
4. Consultant Dermatologist, Wound Research Unit, Department of Dermatology, University of Pisa
5. Chief of Dermatologic Surgery, University Hospital Zürich; President, European Wound Management Association
6. Chief of Diabetic Foot Unit, Universidad Complutense de Madrid

### To cite this publication:

Serena T, Chadwick P, Romanelli M, Läubli S, Martínez. BPA Made Easy Wounds International 2016; 12(4) Available at: <http://www.woundsinternational.com>

## USE OF WOUNDCHECK BACTERIAL STATUS TEST: CASE STUDY

### BACKGROUND

This patient had a diabetic foot ulcer to the right plantar aspect. The wound had no signs of clinical infection when reviewed at Week 1 and Week 4, but tested positive on the test for BPA on both occasions. By Week 5, the patient had a number of signs of infection and had been referred to surgery for amputation. NB: This case was part of a clinical study protocol requiring the treating clinician to be 'blinded' to the BPA test results until study completion.

#### Week 0:


- No clinical signs of infection
- However, the wound tested positive for BPA
- Treatment provided: silicone polyurethane foam dressing and silicone non-adherent contact layer

#### Week 4:


- No clinical signs of infection
- However, the wound tested positive for BPA
- Treatment provided: absorbent gelling fibre dressing

#### Week 5:

- Patient was bedridden with chills and pains
- Foot was swollen and there was increased odour
- Third digit purple with a 9cm x 8cm area of redness on dorsal foot
- Patient referred to surgery for amputation



Week 0



Week 4

## References

1. McCarty S, Cochrane C, Clegg P, et al. The role of endogenous and exogenous enzymes in chronic wounds: A focus on the implications of aberrant levels of both host and bacterial proteases in wound healing. *Wound Repair Regen* 2011; 20: 125–36
2. International consensus. *The role of proteases in wound diagnostics. An expert working group review*. London: Wounds International, 2011
3. Lächli S, Swanson T, Serena T, et al. The use of a point-of-care test for bacterial protease activity in chronic wounds. *Wounds International* 2015; 6(4): 22–8
4. Koziel J, Potempa J. Protease-armed bacteria in the skin. *Cell Tissue Res* 2013; 351: 325–37
5. Finlay BB, Falkow S. Common themes in microbial pathogenicity revisited. *Microbiol Molec Biol Rev* 1997; 61(2): 139–69
6. Wilson JW, Schurr MJ, LeBlanc CL, et al. Mechanisms of bacterial pathogenicity. *Postgrad Med J* 2002; 78: 216–24
7. Serena T, Bayliff S, Brosnan P, et al. *Bacterial proteases: a marker for a 'state of pathogenesis' in chronic wounds*. Poster presented at SAWC, Las Vegas, 2015
8. Siddiqui AR, Bernstein JM. Chronic wound infection: facts and controversies. *Clin Dermatol* 2010; 28: 519–26
9. Collier M. Recognition and management of wound infections. *World Wide Wounds* 2004. Available at: <http://www.worldwidewounds.com/2004/january/Collier/Management-of-Wound-infections.html> (accessed 21.10.16)
10. Kingsley A, White R, Gray D. Applied Wound Management supplement. The Wound Infection Continuum: a revised perspective. *Wounds UK* 2004; 13–8 (Ed: D Gray)
11. World Union of Wound Healing Societies (WUWHS). *Principles of best practice: Wound infection in clinical practice. An international consensus*. London: MEP Ltd, 2008. Available at: <http://www.woundsinternational.com> (accessed 28.10.16)
12. Sibbald RG, Orsted H, Schultz GS et al. Preparing the wound bed 2003; focus on infection and inflammation. *Ostomy Wound Manage* 2003; 49(11): 24–51
13. Healy B, Freedman A. Infections. In: Grey JE, Harding KG (eds). *ABC of Wound Healing*. BMJ Books Blackwell, 2006. 35–8
14. Gardner SE, Frantz RA, Troia C, et al. A tool to assess clinical signs and symptoms of localized infection in chronic wounds: development and reliability. *Ostomy Wound Manage* 2001; 47(1): 40–7
15. Dissemond J, Dowsett C, Schultz G, et al. *Elevated Protease Activity Made Easy*. Wounds International 2013. Available at: [www.woundsinternational.com](http://www.woundsinternational.com) (accessed 21.10.16)
16. Serena TE. Development of a novel technique to detect proteases in chronic wounds. *Adv Wound Care* 2014; 3(12): 729–32
17. Evans E, Brown MRW, Gilbert P. Iron chelator, exopolysaccharide and protease production in *Staphylococcus epidermidis*: a comparative study of the effects of specific growth rate in biofilm and planktonic culture. *Microbiology* 1994; 140: 153–7
18. Attinger C, Wolcott R. Clinically addressing biofilm in chronic wounds. *Adv Wound Care* 2012; 1(3): 127–32
19. Howell-Jones RS, Wilson MJ, Hill KE, et al. A review of the microbiology, antibiotic usage and resistance in chronic wounds. *J Antimicrob Ther* 2005; 55: 143–9
20. Phillips PL, Wolcott RD, Fletcher J, Schultz GS. Biofilms Made Easy. *Wounds International* 2010; 1(3): Available at: <http://www.woundsinternational.com> (accessed 21.10.16)
21. Rhoads DD, Wolcott RD, Percival SL. Biofilms in wounds: management strategies. *J Wound Care* 2008; 17(11): 502–8

## Summary

The presence of bacteria on the surface of a wound may not indicate infection or impaired healing. Indeed, in many instances healing still occurs despite the existence of bacteria. However, when bacteria start to behave pathogenically complications can occur, including local or systemic infection. Recent studies have demonstrated that BPA can be used as an objective marker for bacterial pathogenicity, even when typical clinical indicators of infection are not apparent. The innovative WOUNDCHECK™ Bacterial Status lateral flow test provides qualitative assessment of BPA directly from a chronic wound swab sample. This detection may allow for earlier clinical intervention to prevent wounds from continuing along the infection continuum to more elevated infection status.