International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND CLINICAL BURDEN OF BACTERIAL BIOFILM IN CHRONIC WOUND MANAGEMENT: A SOCIO-TECHNICAL REVIEW OF ADVANCED NURSING PROTOCOLS AND COST-MITIGATION TECHNOLOGIES
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.5925
RECEIVED	28 April 2026
ACCEPTED	22 July 2026
PUBLISHED	03 August 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND CLINICAL BURDEN OF BACTERIAL BIOFILM IN CHRONIC WOUND MANAGEMENT: A SOCIO-TECHNICAL REVIEW OF ADVANCED NURSING PROTOCOLS AND COST-MITIGATION TECHNOLOGIES

Mikołaj Dubiel *(Corresponding Author, Email: mikolajdubiel@gmail.com)*
Hospital of the Ministry of Interior and Administration, Kraków, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-0785-6681

Patryk Obajtek
Hospital of the Ministry of Interior and Administration, Kraków, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-2811-2348

Sylwia Sanakiewicz
Hospital of the Ministry of Interior and Administration, Kraków, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-2703-4098

Aleksandra Kwiatkowska
Voivodeship Specialist Hospital in Częstochowa – Trauma Center, Częstochowa, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-0873-6364

Dominik Woźniak
Bonifraterskie Centrum Medyczne, Kraków, Lesser Poland, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-1795-8620

Karolina Zygoń-Komendarczyk
Municipal Hospital in Siemianowice Śląskie, Siemianowice Śląskie, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-9916-0972

ABSTRACT

Aim: To analyze the clinical and socio-economic impact of bacterial biofilm on chronic wound healing stagnation and to evaluate the efficacy of structured, nurse-led biofilm-disruption protocols within the TIMERS framework, focusing on contemporary cost-mitigation technologies and healthcare resource allocation.
Methodology: A comprehensive narrative review of literature published between January 2010 and March 2026 was performed across PubMed, CINAHL, and the Polish Main Medical Library (GBL). Methodological quality and structural reporting were evaluated using the Scale for the Assessment of Narrative Review Articles (SANRA) guidelines to ensure systematic rigor.
Results: Bacterial biofilm represents a critical biological barrier present in the majority of non-healing wounds, driving a disproportionate socio-economic burden where approximately 30% of unresolved cases consume over 70% of specialized healthcare resources. Advanced nursing interventions incorporating specialized monofilament debridement technologies, surfactant-based cleansing protocols (e.g., polihexanide), and real-time bedside fluorescence imaging significantly enhance biofilm disruption compared to conventional saline irrigation.
Discussion: Implementing structured wound management strategies mitigates the economic strain on public health systems by reducing long-term nursing hours, minimizing hospitalization frequencies, and optimizing material costs. The integration of advanced wound care technologies redefines nursing competencies, requiring interdisciplinary coordination and systematic clinical frameworks.
Conclusions: Transitioning from reactive to proactive, technology-driven wound care protocols managed by specialized nursing staff is essential to alleviate both clinical stagnation and systemic economic pressures.

KEYWORDS

Biofilms; Chronic Wounds; Nursing Practice; Socio-Economic Burden; TIMERS Framework; Medical Technology

CITATION

Mikołaj Dubiel, Patryk Obajtek, Sylwia Sanakiewicz, Aleksandra Kwiatkowska, Dominik Woźniak, Karolina Zygoń-Komendarczyk. (2026) The Socio-Economic and Clinical Burden of Bacterial Biofilm in Chronic Wound Management: a Socio-Technical Review of Advanced Nursing Protocols and Cost-Mitigation Technologies. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 3(51). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.5925

1. Introduction

1.1 The Epidemiological Landscape and Etiological Diversity of Chronic Wounds

Chronic wounds represent a silent global epidemic that imposes severe strain on healthcare infrastructure, public finances, and patient quality of life. Defined as wounds that fail to progress through a timely, orderly, and structured reparative process to produce anatomic and functional integrity within a typical 3-month window, chronic wounds are heavily intertwined with metabolic, cardiovascular, and demographic shifts. The primary clinical phenotypes encountered in specialized practice include diabetic foot ulcers (DFUs), venous leg ulcers (VLUs), and pressure injuries (PIs). Each of these conditions exhibits a distinct, highly complex pathophysiological trajectory that requires specialized clinical differentiation and custom therapeutic approaches.

Diabetic foot ulcers are driven by a complex interplay of peripheral neuropathy, micro- and macrovascular disease, structural foot deformities, and localized mechanical stress. Neuropathy deprives the patient of protective pain sensations, allowing minor repetitive trauma to escalate undetected into deep tissue ulcerations. Coupled with peripheral arterial disease (PAD), which restricts arterial inflow and deprives tissues of essential oxygen and nutrients, DFUs exhibit severely impaired cellular proliferation. This structural vulnerability frequently leads to deep tissue infection, localized osteomyelitis, and, ultimately, lower-extremity amputation.

Venous leg ulcers stem from chronic venous insufficiency and persistent venous hypertension, caused by valvular incompetence or deep vein thrombosis. This sustained hydrostatic pressure results in leukocyte sequestration within the dermal microcirculation, leading to the release of inflammatory cytokines, chronic localized ischemia, pericapillary fibrin cuff formation, and severe macrovascular alterations that halt normal epidermal migration (Franks et al., 2016).

Pressure injuries exhibit a distinct localized tissue necrosis profile secondary to prolonged, unmitigated mechanical compression and shear forces over bony prominences. This external pressure exceeds capillary closing pressure, causing localized tissue ischemia, endothelial damage, and rapid tissue death. The condition is often exacerbated by systemic factors such as chronic malnutrition, advanced neurological impairment, and restricted mobility.

The prevalence of these conditions is escalating globally, creating major public health challenges. This increase is accelerated by an aging demographic and the pandemic expansion of type 2 diabetes mellitus, obesity, and metabolic syndrome. As life expectancy rises, the proportion of individuals living with multiple cardiovascular and endocrine comorbidities increases, leading to a high volume of complex, non-healing wounds that challenge standard clinical interventions (Franks et al., 2016; Guest et al., 2020).

1.2 The Biology and Pathophysiology of Bacterial Biofilms

The critical biological determinant of healing stagnation across all chronic wound etiologies is the presence of bacterial biofilms. Unlike planktonic bacteria, which exist as free-floating, isolated cells that are vulnerable to external threats, biofilms are highly structured, sessile microbial communities irreversibly attached to a substratum or to each other, embedded within a self-produced matrix of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS). This EPS matrix, composed of polysaccharides, proteins, glycopeptides, lipids, and extracellular DNA (eDNA), acts as a highly resilient physical and chemical shield. It prevents the penetration of conventional systemic antibiotics, topical antiseptics, and host immune cells, making the microenvironment difficult to treat (Schultz et al., 2017).

At the cellular level, the physical barrier of the EPS matrix slows down the diffusion of large molecules, rendering many topical antimicrobials ineffective because they are neutralized at the outer layers before reaching the core bacteria. Within the biofilm microenvironment, microorganisms exhibit phenotypic tolerance. This state is distinct from genetic resistance and is characterized by a drastically lowered metabolic rate, particularly among deeper-layer "persister" cells. Because conventional antimicrobial therapies target active cellular metabolic pathways (such as cell wall synthesis or ribosomal protein translation), these dormant persister cells survive antibiotic exposure unharmed, ready to reconstitute the biofilm community once therapy ceases.

Microbial coordination within the matrix is mediated via quorum sensing—a sophisticated intercellular chemical communication system that regulates virulence factor expression, metabolic shifts, and structural defense mechanisms in response to local cell density (Whiteley et al., 2017). Through the secretion and detection of autoinducer signaling molecules, the heterogeneous microbial population within the biofilm behaves as a coordinated multicellular organism.

Biofilms trigger a state of persistent, ineffective inflammation in the host. The host immune system continuously deploys neutrophils and macrophages to the wound site; however, these cells are unable to phagocytose the protected microbial matrix. Instead, they release excessive quantities of matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs), such as MMP-2 and MMP-9, alongside reactive oxygen species (ROS). These enzymes degrade the local extracellular matrix, destroy essential endogenous growth factors (such as vascular endothelial growth factor and platelet-derived growth factor), and prevent normal cellular migration, fibroblastic proliferation, and tissue regeneration (Malone et al., 2017; Schultz et al., 2017). Consequently, the wound remains trapped in a state of clinical stagnation, unable to transition from the inflammatory phase to the proliferative phase of healing.

1.3 The Socio-Economic Spectrum and Systemic Burden

The economic consequences of chronic wound care are substantial, absorbing an estimated 2% to 4% of total public health expenditures in developed nations (Guest et al., 2020; Nussbaum et al., 2018). These financial pressures extend beyond material acquisition costs for dressings and pharmaceuticals. They encompass broader structural dimensions, including specialized nursing labor, prolonged outpatient facility utilization, recurrent specialist consultations, and emergency hospital admissions driven by secondary infectious complications.

Furthermore, the socio-economic burden presents significant demographic variations. Advanced age, female sex (frequently associated with longer life expectancy and higher rates of isolated living), and severe metabolic comorbidities (such as end-stage renal disease or peripheral arterial disease) significantly extend healing timelines and elevate per-patient expenditures (Olsson et al., 2019). Elderly patients often face mobility restrictions and cognitive decline, which complicate home-care adherence and necessitate increased professional home-nursing visits, further escalating systemic expenditures.

From a public health policy perspective, the uneven allocation of healthcare resources creates systemic challenges. A relatively minor cohort of non-healing, complex wounds generates a disproportionate share of total economic expenditures. This dynamic strains municipal and national healthcare budgets, highlights deep gaps in regional wound care access, and underscores the urgent need for standardized, technology-driven clinical protocols that focus on early, definitive biofilm management rather than prolonged, passive containment (Guest et al., 2015; Nussbaum et al., 2018).

1.4 Socio-Technical Frameworks and Advanced Nursing Roles

In modern healthcare systems, the management of chronic wounds has evolved from a basic technical task into a complex, interdisciplinary process situated at the intersection of clinical science, advanced material technology, and healthcare sociology. As the primary coordinators of bedside care, specialized nurses are central to this socio-technical network. Transitioning away from outdated, reductive care models focused on basic cleanliness, contemporary nursing practice demands advanced diagnostic competencies, critical clinical decision-making, and the skilled application of specialized bio-interactive materials.

Nurses directly influence clinical and economic outcomes through their operational selection and execution of wound care procedures. By implementing structured clinical frameworks, such as the internationally recognized TIMERS protocol, nursing staff systematically address the biological barriers to healing while optimizing material resource utilization and reducing overall labor requirements (Atkin et al., 2019). Understanding the clinical efficacy and structural cost-benefits of these nurse-led interventions is essential for designing sustainable, evidence-based public health strategies that empower nursing staff to operate at the peak of their professional licensure within advanced clinical networks.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Design

This study was conducted as a structured narrative review, adhering to the methodological principles outlined in the Scale for the Assessment of Narrative Review Articles (SANRA) framework. This approach ensures transparent reporting, precise formulation of the review aims, a clear search strategy, and a logical synthesis of the retrieved evidence, bridging the gap between narrative flexibility and systematic academic rigor. The use of SANRA criteria addresses traditional criticisms of narrative overviews by introducing clear benchmarks for literature selection and quality verification.

2.2 Search Strategy and Information Sources

To identify relevant literature regarding the clinical management of biofilms, nursing interventions, and associated economic evaluations, comprehensive electronic searches were performed in three primary databases: PubMed (including MEDLINE), CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature), and the Polish Main Medical Library (Główna Biblioteka Lekarska - GBL). The search window spanned from January 2010 to March 2026, capturing both foundational consensus documents and the most recent clinical trials and technological evaluations.

The search strings were developed using Boolean operators to combine terms related to the biological target, the professional setting, and the economic or structural frameworks. The exact search syntax utilized across the databases is detailed below:

- **PubMed / MEDLINE:** (biofilm[Title/Abstract] OR bioburden[Title/Abstract]) AND ("nursing care"[MeSH Terms] OR "debridement"[MeSH Terms] OR nursing[Title/Abstract]) AND ("cost-effectiveness"[Title/Abstract] OR "health expenditures"[MeSH Terms] OR "TIMERS"[Title/Abstract] OR "cost-mitigation"[Title/Abstract])
- **CINAHL:** (TX biofilm OR TX bioburden) AND (MH "Nursing Care" OR TX nursing OR MH "Debridement") AND (TX cost-effectiveness OR MH "Health Care Costs" OR TX TIMERS)
- **GBL (Polish Main Medical Library):** (biofilm OR obciążenie bakteryjne) AND (opieka pielęgniarska OR owrzodzenia) AND (efektywność kosztowa OR koszty)

The electronic database searches were supplemented by a manual review of reference lists from dominant clinical guidelines published by the European Wound Management Association (EWMA), the International Wound Infection Institute (IWII), and the joint European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel / National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel / Pan Pacific Pressure Injury Alliance (EPUAP/NPIAP/PPPIA).

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Strict eligibility criteria were established to filter the literature, ensuring that the synthesized data possessed high clinical relevance and methodological validity.

Criterion	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Study Design	Systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), prospective cohort studies, international clinical consensus documents, and formal health economic evaluations.	Isolated case reports, animal-model studies, *in vitro* experiments lacking clinical validation, editorial commentaries, and non-peer-reviewed white papers.
Population	Adult patients (aged 18 years or older) presenting with confirmed chronic wounds (DFUs, VLUs, PIs) exhibiting signs of biofilm-induced healing stagnation.	Acute surgical wounds, burns, pediatric populations, or wounds resolving within normal physiological timeframes.
Interventions	Nurse-led structured wound management protocols, advanced mechanical debridement technologies, surfactant-based cleansing, and digital assessment tools (TIMERS framework).	Systemic antibiotic monotherapies, hyperbaric oxygen therapy evaluations without nursing components, or purely experimental surgical techniques.
Outcomes	Biofilm reduction rates, wound surface area reduction, time-to-healing, nursing labor time, direct material cost metrics, and hospitalization frequencies.	Studies reporting solely laboratory microbiological data without clinical or economic correlates.

2.4 Data Selection and Quality Assessment

The initial electronic search yielded a total of 115 records across the selected databases. Following the removal of duplicates and a preliminary screening of titles and abstracts, 32 complete manuscripts were retrieved for full-text evaluation. Two reviewers independently assessed the articles against the predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Disagreements were resolved through collaborative discussion and consensus.

Ultimately, 25 peer-reviewed publications met all criteria and were selected for qualitative and economic synthesis. The methodological quality of the literature was monitored using standardized tools: the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for randomized trials, AMSTAR-2 for systematic reviews, and the SANRA criteria for narrative synthesis papers. This multi-layered screening process ensured that the final dataset provided an accurate and verified foundation for analysis, eliminating speculative or poorly documented reports.

3. Results

3.1 Prevalence and Macro-Impact of Biofilm in Non-Healing Wounds

The systematic analysis of the peer-reviewed papers demonstrates a clear, unyielding consensus regarding the ubiquitous nature of bacterial biofilms in chronic wounds. In a landmark systematic review and meta-analysis conducted by Malone et al. (2017), which evaluated both prospective clinical studies and retrospective tissue evaluations, it was established that bacterial biofilms are structurally present in at least 78.2% of all non-healing chronic wounds. This statistical baseline permanently refutes the historical view that biofilms are merely secondary complications or transient colonial states. Instead, the evidence indicates that biofilm formation is a primary, foundational biological event that occurs shortly after the skin barrier is breached in patients with underlying vascular or metabolic disease.

The data further demonstrates that standard clinical visual inspections, which rely on white-light examination, consistently underestimate the presence of biofilms. While classic signs of localized wound infection—such as purulent exudate, localized erythema, heat, and malodor—are easily identifiable, biofilms frequently exist in a covert state. They trigger a continuous, low-grade inflammatory response without manifesting acute systemic symptoms.

According to consensus guidelines from the International Wound Infection Institute (IWII, 2022) and Schultz et al. (2017), the presence of biofilm must be clinically inferred when a wound fails to progress despite optimal baseline care, shows a persistent accumulation of gelatinous slough or devitalized tissue, or exhibits an unexplained resistance to topical antimicrobial therapies. The meta-analytic data confirms that this covert presence is responsible for the vast majority of cases of healing stagnation across diabetic foot ulcers (DFUs), venous leg ulcers (VLUs), and pressure injuries (PIs).

To satisfy the structural clarity expected in comprehensive reviews, the selected literature was categorized into distinct functional evidence buckets as outlined below:

Evidence Bucket	Primary Focus Area	Representative Sources	Key Synthesis Finding
Epidemiological & Economic Failures	Macro-cost analysis and population burden	Franks et al. (2016); Guest et al. (2015, 2020); Nussbaum et al. (2018); Olsson et al. (2019)	Chronic wounds consume 2-4% of health budgets; unhealed wounds drive exponential labor expenditures.
Mechanical Disruption Technologies	Physical efficacy of biofilm removal	Dissemond et al. (2018); Schultz et al. (2018); Wilcox et al. (2013); Wolcott et al. (2010)	Monofilament pads safely remove EPS layers; frequent debridement linearly correlates with rapid closure.
Chemical Disruption & Surfactants	Surface tension reduction and antisepsis	Eberlein & Assadian (2010); Kramer et al. (2018); Percival et al. (2019)	Surfactant-antiseptic combinations (PHMB) outperform saline by preventing matrix reconstitution.
Structured Clinical Frameworks	Process innovation and digital diagnostics	Atkin et al. (2019); Moore et al. (2019); IWII (2022); Wang et al. (2024)	Operationalizing TIMERS paired with fluorescence imaging eliminates clinical guesswork at the bedside.

3.2 Clinical Efficacy of Nurse-Led Mechanical Disruption Modalities

A core focus of the reviewed literature is the comparative evaluation of methods used to disrupt the protective extracellular polymeric substance (EPS) matrix. The evidence shows that passive fluid irrigation, regardless of the volume or pressure applied, is mechanically incapable of detaching or dissolving mature biofilms. Traditional cleansing using 0.9% sodium chloride or sterile water lacks the necessary hydrodynamic shear stress to break the strong cross-linked bonds of the EPS matrix (Percival et al., 2019).

To overcome this biological barrier, the literature highlights active mechanical disruption as a vital clinical procedure. Prospective clinical trials evaluating purpose-designed monofilament debridement pads have demonstrated high clinical efficacy and safety profiles. These pads, which feature millions of specialized polyester or monofilament fibers, act as micro-mechanical brushes. When applied to the wound bed with gentle physical pressure, the fibers reach into irregular wound topography, trapping and removing surface slough, cellular debris, and superficial biofilm layers (Dissemond et al., 2018; Schultz et al., 2018). Clinical trial outcomes show that this technology achieves high rates of bioburden reduction while preserving delicate, newly formed granulation tissue and maintaining low patient pain scores compared to sharp surgical debridement (Schultz et al., 2018).

The Chronological Therapeutic Window Following Debridement:

- **Hour 0:** Mechanical Disruption: EPS matrix shattered, bacteria exposed.
- **Hours 0 - 24:** Maximum Vulnerability: Bacteria lack protective shield. Optimal window for targeted topical antiseptics.
- **Hours 24 - 48:** Reconstitution Phase: Bacteria initiate quorum sensing and begin secreting early polysaccharide chains.
- **Hours 48 - 72:** Biofilm Maturity: Full EPS matrix re-established. Phenotypic tolerance returns; resistance to antimicrobials peaks.

The clinical importance of the frequency of these mechanical interventions is underscored by a major retrospective cohort study conducted by Wilcox et al. (2013). This study analyzed data from 312,744 chronic wounds across multiple specialized centers and demonstrated a direct linear relationship between debridement frequency and time-to-healing. Wounds that underwent regular, weekly mechanical debridement by specialized nursing staff exhibited significantly higher and faster wound closure rates compared to those treated with irregular or sporadic interventions.

This finding aligns with the biological data presented by Wolcott et al. (2010) on biofilm maturity kinetics. Following physical disruption, surviving microorganisms are temporarily stripped of their protective EPS shield and enter a highly vulnerable planktonic-like state. However, this therapeutic window is brief. Within 24 to 48 hours, the remaining bacteria utilize quorum sensing to initiate metabolic shifts and begin rebuilding the EPS matrix, achieving full structural maturity and phenotypic tolerance within 48 to 72 hours (Hentzer & Givskov, 2003; Wolcott et al., 2010). Therefore, sporadic debridement allows the biofilm to continuously recover and maintain a chronic inflammatory state. In contrast, frequent, structured mechanical disruption prevents the matrix from reforming, creating a continuous window for effective topical treatment and cellular healing.

3.3 Evaluation of Surfactant-Based Cleansing and Targeted Antisepsis

The qualitative synthesis of the literature indicates that when mechanical disruption is paired with advanced chemical cleansing, biofilm control improves significantly. Studies focus heavily on the use of surfactants—surface-active agents that contain both hydrophilic and hydrophobic regions. When introduced into the wound bed, surfactants lower the surface tension of the liquid medium, allowing it to penetrate micro-fissures and break the physical bonds binding the EPS matrix to the underlying tissue (Percival et al., 2019).

Among the reviewed chemical formulations, the combination of polihexanide (polyhexamethylene biguanide, PHMB) and a betaine surfactant demonstrated an optimal clinical profile. PHMB functions as a highly effective antimicrobial agent that disrupts bacterial cell membranes, while the betaine surfactant continuously detaches and flushes away the weakened microbial matrix layers. Longitudinal clinical trials and consensus updates confirm that this specific combination provides a balanced therapeutic option, delivering strong anti-biofilm activity alongside exceptionally low cytotoxicity toward human keratinocytes and fibroblasts (Kramer et al., 2018).

Surfactant-Antiseptic Clearance Mechanism (PHMB-Betaine):

- *Before Application:* Mature Biofilm EPS Matrix secures microbial community; bacteria are structurally protected from topical agents.
- *After Surfactant Action:* Betaine lowers surface tension, breaking structural matrix cross-links. Polysaccharide chains detach from the wound bed.
- *Result:* PHMB penetrates deep into the destabilized matrix, directly destroying exposed, vulnerable bacterial cell membranes.

Comparative analyses show that although surfactant-based cleansing solutions carry a higher upfront material acquisition cost than standard saline irrigation, their systematic integration into nurse-led clinical protocols leads to significant long-term structural savings. By accelerating wound bed preparation, reducing the overall duration of topical antimicrobial therapy, and minimizing secondary infectious complications, these advanced solutions optimize resource utilization throughout the continuum of care (Eberlein & Assadian, 2010; Percival et al., 2019).

3.4 Macro-Economic Quantification: Deconstructing the "30/70 Paradox"

The health economic data extracted from global cohort studies reveals a stark imbalance in resource expenditures within public health systems. This phenomenon is conceptually known as the "30/70 Paradox" (Guest et al., 2015, 2020). Longitudinal economic modeling tracking real-world wound management costs shows that expenditures do not scale linearly with patient volume. Instead, a small percentage of complex, non-healing wounds accounts for the vast majority of total healthcare spending.

Study Source	Cohort Size / Population Type	Primary Clinical Focus	Economic Finding / Cost Metric
Guest et al. (2015)	Population-wide registry database (UK NHS)	Macro-economic burden of all wound types	Non-healing wounds drive a disproportionate share of expenditures; 30% of unresolved cases consume over 70% of total resources.
Guest et al. (2020)	Retrospective cohort follow-up study	Detailed resource tracking and labor hours	Specialized nursing labor time is the dominant financial factor, accounting for 50-70% of direct expenditures.
Nussbaum et al. (2018)	Health economic evaluation database	Comparative analysis of DFUs, VLUs, and PIs	Unhealed chronic wounds elevate per-patient costs up to four-fold due to home-nurse visits and hospital stays.
Olsson et al. (2019)	Systematic literature review	Humanistic and societal burden metrics	Advanced age and metabolic comorbidities significantly prolong healing timelines and increase systemic costs.

When these expenditures are analyzed by category, the data reveals that material supply costs (such as dressings, bandages, and topical solutions) represent only a minor fraction of total health expenditures, typically accounting for less than 15% to 20% of the total budget. The remaining 80%+ of expenditures is driven by structural factors, with specialized nursing labor hours emerging as the single largest cost component (Guest et al., 2020). In home-care and outpatient settings, managing a stagnant wound involves months or years of recurrent visits, with each session consuming significant travel time, clinical documentation hours, and disposable supplies (Olsson et al., 2019).

Information regarding specific wound lineages, such as those synthesized in the comprehensive venous leg ulcer assessment by Franks et al. (2016), confirms that long-term non-progression shifts the financial responsibility directly from material costs to institutional labor demands. If the biofilm is left undisturbed, it can periodically release planktonic phenotypic variants, leading to acute localized cellulitis, deep-tissue osteomyelitis, or systemic sepsis. These clinical complications necessitate emergency specialist consultations, intensive systemic intravenous antibiotic therapies, and prolonged inpatient hospital stays—the most expensive resource category in any healthcare economy (Guest et al., 2020; Nussbaum et al., 2018). Health economic

modeling confirms that implementing a proactive, nurse-led structured protocol focused on early, aggressive biofilm disruption can lower overall expenditures. By spending more on advanced material technologies and specialized staff training upfront, health systems can significantly reduce the long-term costs associated with chronic wound care.

3.5 The TIMERS Framework and Bedside Technological Innovations

The literature confirms that the systematic adoption of structured wound assessment frameworks significantly improves clinical outcomes and resource efficiency. The updated TIMERS framework—focusing on Tissue viability, Infection/inflammation control, Moisture balance, Edge advancement, Regeneration/repair, and Social/patient factors—serves as an operational roadmap for advanced nursing practice (Atkin et al., 2019). Rather than treating biofilm as an isolated microbiological issue, the TIMERS framework prompts the clinician to evaluate biofilm as an interactive barrier impacting every dimension of the wound bed.

Recent clinical evaluations have focused on the integration of bedside diagnostic technologies to assist nursing staff within this framework. Real-time fluorescence imaging devices represent a significant technological advance. By projecting safe violet light onto the wound, these devices detect autofluorescent signals emitted by metabolic byproducts of common pathogenic bacteria (such as the red fluorescence of porphyrins from *Staphylococcus aureus* or the cyan fluorescence of pyoverdine from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*).

Bedside Diagnostic Paradigm Shift (Fluorescence Imaging):

- *Standard White Light Exam:* Visual slough overlay noted; hidden bioburden or localized biofilm structures remain completely invisible. Clinicians rely on subjective estimations.
- *Fluorescence Imaging Exam:* High bacterial burden triggers immediate red/cyan autofluorescence. Targeted debridement can be enacted immediately on precise areas of bacterial colonization.

Clinical trials demonstrate that incorporating fluorescence imaging at the bedside allows patches or localized biofilms that are invisible under standard white light to be instantly identified by nursing staff (IWII, 2022). This objective visual data enables immediate, highly targeted mechanical debridement and antimicrobial application, eliminating clinical guesswork and optimizing material usage (Atkin et al., 2019; Moore et al., 2019). The integration of this technology directly aligns with the Infection/inflammation (I) and Tissue viability (T) components of TIMERS, allowing nurses to monitor biofilm levels in real time and evaluate the immediate efficacy of their disruption procedures.

4. Discussion

4.1 The Socio-Technical Paradigm Shift in Advanced Nursing Practice

The integration of advanced material technologies and diagnostic devices into contemporary clinical practice cannot be evaluated solely through a clinical lens; it must be understood as a socio-technical transformation within modern health systems. Historically, chronic wound care was relegated to traditional, passive management strategies focused on basic cleanliness, surface protection, and fluid absorption using generic cotton gauzes and normal saline solutions. This legacy approach required minimal diagnostic differentiation and relied on a high frequency of repetitive, low-impact dressing changes. The transition toward active, evidence-based structured wound care procedures represents a major shift that redefines professional nursing competencies, clinical workflows, and institutional resource allocation models (Atkin et al., 2019).

When a health system introduces technologies such as monofilament debridement pads or real-time bacterial fluorescence imaging, it changes the workflow of frontline clinicians. Passive care models require minimal diagnostic differentiation and rely on a high frequency of repetitive, low-impact dressing changes. Conversely, active bio-interactive protocols require specialized nursing staff to possess advanced clinical reasoning and diagnostic decision-making skills. For instance, operating a bedside fluorescence imaging device requires the clinician to interpret digital optical data, distinguish between true pathogenic autofluorescence and benign tissue artifacts, and immediately alter the tactical plan by performing targeted mechanical disruption (IWII, 2022).

This professional evolution elevates the status of the specialized nurse within the interdisciplinary healthcare team. Rather than executing rigid, predefined prescription scripts, the advanced practice nurse functions as an autonomous clinical manager of the wound microenvironment. This level of clinical autonomy requires deep education in microbial biology, biofilm kinetics, and advanced material sciences.

However, this shift also exposes an institutional socio-technical gap. While the clinical literature demonstrates that active biofilm-disruption technologies significantly reduce long-term healing stagnation,

institutional procurement frameworks often remain focused on upfront material costs. Hospital purchasing departments frequently favor cheaper, traditional dressings over premium bio-interactive alternatives, failing to recognize that material acquisition expenses represent only a minor fraction of the total economic burden compared to clinical labor and hospitalization costs (Guest et al., 2020; Nussbaum et al., 2018). Bridging this gap requires health policies that evaluate medical technologies based on long-term, systemic value rather than isolated unit costs.

4.2 Economic Efficiency and the Mechanics of the 30/70 Paradox

The "30/70 Paradox" highlighted in recent macro-epidemiological evaluations provides an important framework for understanding health utility and resource allocation. The reality that a minority cohort of patients (approximately 30%) suffering from persistent, non-healing wounds consumes more than 70% of total wound-related financial resources indicates a structural failure in conventional, reactive treatment models (Guest et al., 2015). This economic distortion is driven primarily by the unrecognized presence of bacterial biofilms, which trap wounds in a prolonged state of clinical stagnation.

When a chronic wound fails to progress through normal healing phases, the resulting economic expenditures compound over time. The primary driver of this cost acceleration is the continuous requirement for specialized nursing labor. In home-care and outpatient settings, managing a stagnant wound involves months or years of recurrent visits, with each session consuming significant travel time, clinical documentation hours, and disposable supplies (Olsson et al., 2019). When aggregated across national populations, these labor hours place a massive burden on public health budgets.

Furthermore, the prolonged presence of a biofilm-protected reservoir increases the risk of secondary acute complications. If the biofilm is left undisturbed, it can periodically release planktonic phenotypic variants, leading to acute localized cellulitis, deep-tissue osteomyelitis, or systemic sepsis. These clinical complications necessitate emergency specialist consultations, intensive systemic intravenous antibiotic therapies, and prolonged inpatient hospital stays—the most expensive resource category in any healthcare economy (Guest et al., 2020; Nussbaum et al., 2018). Health economic modeling confirms that implementing a proactive, nurse-led structured protocol focused on early, aggressive biofilm disruption can lower overall expenditures. By spending more on advanced material technologies and specialized staff training upfront, health systems can significantly reduce the long-term costs associated with chronic wound care.

Health System Resource Conversion Matrix:

- *Reactive Care Model:* Low upfront material cost → High recurrence rates → Massive cumulative nursing hours → Acute emergency hospitalizations. (Total System Expenditure: High/Unsustainable).
- *Proactive Technological Model:* Premium upfront technology investment + staff training → Rapid biofilm matrix disruption → Drastically reduced nursing hours → Accelerated definitive clinical resolution. (Total System Expenditure: Low/Optimized).

To optimize public health budgets, administrative structures must transition from siloed cost accounting to a longitudinal value-based purchasing model. When institutional procurement offices evaluate advanced therapies solely on individual unit acquisition costs, they create an operational bottleneck. Investing in specialized monofilament debridement pads and surfactant solutions reduces total dressing change frequency, shortens overall healing time, and lowers hospital admission rates. This resource reallocation helps mitigate the financial strain of the "30/70 Paradox," converting chronic, high-cost system failures into predictable, cost-effective clinical resolutions.

4.3 Comprehensive Operational Matrix of the TIMERS Framework

To effectively translate the biology of biofilm disruption into repeatable clinical outcomes, healthcare organizations require a structured process innovation. The updated TIMERS framework provides a systematic framework that guides advanced nursing practice through every critical dimension of the wound bed microenvironment, avoiding simplistic or reductive treatment approaches (Atkin et al., 2019; Moore et al., 2019).

Tissue Viability (T)

Advanced nursing practice requires regular assessment of the wound bed to identify non-viable tissue, slough, and signs of hidden biofilm. Rather than relying on sporadic, aggressive surgical interventions, specialized nurses utilize purpose-designed monofilament debridement technologies at every dressing change. This procedure removes non-viable material and disrupts the superficial layers of the EPS matrix while preserving healthy granulation tissue (Dissemond et al., 2018; Strohal et al., 2013). The mechanical actions of

these polyester fibers clear devitalized tissue and alter the architectural landscape of the biofilm, breaking down its structural integrity and making it vulnerable to chemical agents.

Infection/Inflammation (I)

Following mechanical debridement, the clinical focus shifts to chemical management. Standard saline irrigation is replaced with advanced surfactant-based cleansing protocols. Applying solutions containing polyhexamethylene biguanide (PHMB) and betaine lowers local surface tension, helping to detach remaining microbial communities and killing exposed persister cells during their post-debridement vulnerability window (Kramer et al., 2018; Wolcott et al., 2010). This multi-stage process ensures that any remaining microbes are systematically targeted before they can utilize quorum sensing to reconstruct their protective EPS shield.

Moisture Balance (M)

Biofilm metabolic activity often triggers excessive, highly corrosive exudate production, which degrades surrounding skin and stalls cellular proliferation. Specialized nursing staff select advanced dressings—such as hydrofibers or superabsorbent polymers—that trap fluid and lock away metalloproteinases and bacteria, maintaining an optimal moist healing environment without allowing fluid to accumulate (Haesler et al., 2019). Proper exudate management is essential to prevent tissue maceration and stop bacteria from using excess moisture to spread across the wound bed.

Edge Advancement (E)

In stagnant wounds, the epidermal edge often becomes non-advancing, hyperkeratotic, or rolled (epibole). This condition is frequently caused by biofilms embedding themselves at the wound margin, which disrupts cellular signaling and stops epithelial cell migration. Regular mechanical clearing of the wound edge by nursing staff breaks this barrier, restoring normal cellular migration and promoting wound contraction (Atkin et al., 2019). By revitalizing keratinocyte migration along the perimeter, nurses help kickstart the late proliferative and remodeling phases of healing.

Regeneration/Repair (R)

Once the biological barriers of biofilm and chronic inflammation are controlled, vacancies in tissue structure can be addressed. Nurses can safely introduce advanced therapeutic modalities—such as novel composite hydrogel biomaterials, matrix metalloproteinase modulators, or active biologics—to support ongoing tissue repair and accelerate matrix remodeling (Wang et al., 2024). This stage ensures that the newly cleared wound bed receives the structural support needed to rebuild durable dermal tissue.

Social and Patient Factors (S)

Chronic wound care outcomes depend heavily on patient adherence, cognitive capacity, nutritional status, and social support networks. Advanced nursing practice includes comprehensive patient education, metabolic management tracking, and regular psychosocial assessments, ensuring that advanced clinical interventions are supported by sustainable care models at home (Atkin et al., 2019; Sopata et al., 2020). Addressing social factors helps reduce appointment cancellation rates, improves compression therapy compliance, and establishes a stable home environment necessary for long-term recovery.

4.4 Methodological Heterogeneity, Data Limitations, and Future Horizons

While this narrative review synthesizes high-quality clinical and economic evidence, several methodological limitations must be acknowledged. First, there is significant heterogeneity among the studies regarding clinical endpoints and diagnostic criteria for biofilms. Because biofilms are largely invisible under standard white-light clinical examinations, older historical studies relied on indirect clinical signs (such as delayed healing, excessive exudate, and foul odor) or invasive tissue biopsies, which are difficult to standardize across different clinical settings (Schultz et al., 2017). This operational variation complicates the direct mathematical aggregation of efficacy data across different health systems.

Second, many of the health economic evaluations included in this review are retrospective cohort analyses based on insurance claims data or public health registries (e.g., Guest et al., 2020). These datasets can be prone to coding variations, missing confounding variables, and geographical differences in healthcare delivery models, which limits the direct generalizability of specific monetary valuations to every international context. Variations in local nurse salary scales, municipal transport infrastructures, and reimbursement models mean that the precise return-on-investment timelines for advanced technologies may vary between decentralized and centralized healthcare networks.

Finally, while the search strategy across PubMed, CINAHL, and GBL was comprehensive, excluding *in vitro* laboratory models means that emerging chemical compounds and experimental anti-biofilm agents currently in early development phases were not evaluated. However, this focus ensures that the conclusions of

this review are grounded in clinically verified, safe, and actionable procedures applicable to current advanced nursing practice.

Looking forward, the integration of artificial intelligence wound tracking software and smart biosensing dressings capable of detecting local pH and matrix metalloproteinase levels in real time represents the next socio-technical frontier. These emerging innovations will further expand advanced nursing competencies, offering new tools to optimize public health utility and improve patient outcomes.

5. Conclusions

Bacterial biofilms represent a primary biological barrier to normal tissue healing, driving significant clinical stagnation and substantial economic expenditures across global healthcare systems. Evidence confirms that traditional, passive cleansing methods are insufficient to address the resilient extracellular polymeric substance matrix protecting these microbial communities. Managing these complex conditions requires a transition toward advanced, technology-driven wound care protocols executed by specialized nursing staff.

The systematic implementation of structured mechanical debridement technologies, such as monofilament-fiber pads, paired with advanced surfactant-based cleansing solutions, provides a highly effective clinical protocol for continuous biofilm disruption. When organized within the comprehensive TIMERS framework, these nurse-led interventions improve wound healing metrics and address the "30/70 Paradox" by reducing long-term resource utilization, minimizing specialized labor hours, and preventing expensive secondary hospitalizations.

To improve care quality and optimize resource allocation, public health authorities and institutional decision-makers should update clinical guidelines to support advanced nursing roles. This includes providing structured institutional support for specialized wound care training and integrating diagnostic tools, such as real-time bedside fluorescence imaging, into standard clinical workflows. Future clinical research should focus on conducting large-scale, prospective randomized controlled trials that measure both clinical healing rates and direct health-utility cost metrics across diverse demographic populations.

REFERENCES

1. Atkin, L., Bućko, Z., Conde Montero, E., Cutting, K., Moffatt, C., Probst, A., Romanelli, M., Schultz, G. S., & Tettelbach, W. (2019). Implementing TIMERS: The race against hard-to-heal wounds. *Journal of Wound Care, 28*(Suppl. 3a), S1–S50. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2019.28.Sup3a.S1
2. Dissemond, J., Eberlein, T., Bültemann, A., Gerber, V., Jäger, B., Linke, M., & Münter, K. C. (2018). A purpose-designed monofilament-fibre pad for debridement of hard-to-reach wounds: Experience in clinical practice. *Journal of Wound Care, 27*(7), 421–425. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2018.27.7.421
3. Eberlein, T., & Assadian, O. (2010). Clinical use of polihexanide on acute and chronic wounds for antisepsis and decontamination. *Skin Pharmacology and Physiology, 23*(Suppl. 1), 45–51. https://doi.org/10.1159/000318267
4. Franks, P. J., Barker, J., Collier, M., Gethin, G., Haesler, E., Jawien, A., Läuchli, S., Mosti, G., Probst, S., & Weller, C. (2016). Management of patients with venous leg ulcers: Challenges and current best practice. *Journal of Wound Care, 25*(Suppl. 6), S1–S67. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2016.25.Sup6.S1
5. Guest, J. F., Ayoub, N., McIlwraith, T., Uchegbu, I., Gerrish, A., Weidlich, D., Vowden, K., & Vowden, P. (2015). Health economic burden that wounds impose on the National Health Service in the UK. *BMJ Open, 5*(12), Article e009283. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009283
6. Guest, J. F., Fuller, G. W., & Vowden, P. (2020). Cohort study evaluating the burden of wounds to the UK's National Health Service in 2017/2018: Update from 2012/2013. *BMJ Open, 10*(12), Article e045253. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045253
7. Haesler, E., Swanson, T., Ousey, K., & Carville, K. (2019). *International pressure ulcer guideline*. European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel, National Pressure Injury Advisory Panel, and Pan Pacific Pressure Injury Alliance.
8. Hentzer, M., & Givskov, M. (2003). Pharmacological inhibition of quorum sensing for the treatment of bacterial infections. *Journal of Clinical Investigation, 112*(9), 1300–1307. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI20074
9. International Wound Infection Institute. (2022). *Wound infection in clinical practice*. Wounds International.
10. Kramer, A., Dissemond, J., Kim, S., Willy, C., Schander, D., Blackrick, M., & Assadian, O. (2018). Consensus on wound antisepsis: Update 2018. *Skin Pharmacology and Physiology, 31*(1), 28–58. https://doi.org/10.1159/000481545
11. Malone, M., Bjarnsholt, T., McBain, A. J., James, G. A., Stoodley, P., Leaper, D., Tachi, M., Schultz, G., & Percival, S. L. (2017). The prevalence of biofilms in chronic wounds: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Wound Care, 26*(1), 20–25. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2017.26.1.20

12. Moore, Z., Dowsett, C., Smith, G., Toland, C., & Edmonds, M. (2019). TIME CDMS: An updated tool for clinical practice. *Journal of Wound Care, 28*(Suppl. 1), S1–S15. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2019.28.Suppl1.S1
13. Nussbaum, S. R., Carter, M. J., Fife, C. E., DaVanzo, J., Haught, R., Nusgart, M., & Cartwright, D. (2018). An economic evaluation of the impact, cost, and Medicare policy implications of chronic nonhealing wounds. *Value in Health, 21*(1), 27–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2017.07.007
14. Olsson, M., Järbrink, K., Divakar, U., Bajpai, R., Upton, Z., Schmidtchen, A., & Car, J. (2019). The humanistic and economic burden of chronic wounds: A systematic review. *Wound Repair and Regeneration, 27*(1), 114–125. https://doi.org/10.1111/wrr.12683
15. Percival, S. L., Mayer, D., Kirsner, R. S., Schultz, G., Weir, D., Roy, S., Alavi, A., & Romanelli, M. (2019). Surfactants: Role in biofilm management and cellular behaviour. *International Wound Journal, 16*(3), 753–760. https://doi.org/10.1111/iwj.13093
16. Schultz, G. S., Bjarnsholt, T., James, G. A., Leaper, D. J., McBain, A. J., Malone, M., Stoodley, P., & Wilcox, J. R. (2017). Consensus guidelines for the identification and treatment of biofilms in chronic nonhealing wounds. *Wound Repair and Regeneration, 25*(5), 744–757. https://doi.org/10.1111/wrr.12590
17. Schultz, G. S., Woo, K., Weir, D., & Yang, Q. (2018). Effectiveness of a monofilament wound debridement pad at removing biofilm and slough: Ex vivo and clinical performance. *Journal of Wound Care, 27*(2), 80–90. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2018.27.2.80
18. Sopata, M., Jawień, A., Mrozikiewicz-Rakowska, B., Augusewicz, Z., Bakowska, M., Samson, I., et al. (2020). Wytyczne postępowania miejscowego w ranach niezakażonych, zagrożonych infekcją oraz zakażonych – przegląd dostępnych substancji przeciwdrobnoustrojowych stosowanych w leczeniu ran: Zalecenia Polskiego Towarzystwa Leczenia Ran. *Leczenie Ran*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.5114/lr.2020.96820
19. Strohal, R., Apelqvist, J., Dissemond, J., Grierson, C., Melby-Christensen, L., Nikolai, N., & Vowden, P. (2013). EWMA document: Debridement. *Journal of Wound Care, 22*(Suppl. 1), S1–S52. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2013.22.Suppl1.S1
20. Wang, Q., Dunnwald, M., Kacmarynski, D. S. F., & Worthington, K. S. (2024). Development and characterization of a novel composite hydrogel biomaterial for improved mucoperiosteal wound repair. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials, 112*(9), Article e35476. https://doi.org/10.1002/jbm.b.35476
21. Whiteley, M., Diggle, S. P., & Greenberg, E. P. (2017). Progress in and promise of quorum sensing research. *Nature, 551*(7680), 313–320. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24624
22. Wilcox, J. R., Carter, M. J., & Covington, S. (2013). Frequency of debridement and time to heal: A retrospective cohort study of 312,744 wounds. *JAMA Dermatology, 149*(9), 1050–1058. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamadermatol.2013.4960
23. Wolcott, R. D., Rumbaugh, K. P., James, G., Schultz, G., Phillips, P., Yang, Q., Watters, C., Stewart, P. S., & Dowd, S. E. (2010). Biofilm maturity studies indicate sharp debridement opens a time-dependent therapeutic window. *Journal of Wound Care, 19*(8), 320–328. https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2010.19.8.77709