

Patterns and predictors of burn scar outcome in the first 12 months after burn: The patient's perspective

Rashaan, Z.M.; Kwa, K.A.A.; Wal, B.A. van der; Tuinebreijer, W.E.; Zuijlen, P.P.M. van; Breederveld, R.S.

Citation

Rashaan, Z. M., Kwa, K. A. A., Wal, B. A. van der, Tuinebreijer, W. E., Zuijlen, P. P. M. van, & Breederveld, R. S. (2019). Patterns and predictors of burn scar outcome in the first 12 months after burn: The patient's perspective. *Burns*. doi:10.1016/j.burns.2019.03.025

Version:Not Applicable (or Unknown)License:Leiden University Non-exclusive licenseDownloaded from:https://hdl.handle.net/1887/119915

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

	Journal: JBUR	Please e-mail your responses and any corrections to:
ELSEVIER	Article Number: 5807	E-mail:

Dear Author,

Please check your proof carefully and mark all corrections at the appropriate place in the proof (e.g., by using on-screen annotation in the PDF file) or compile them in a separate list. Note: if you opt to annotate the file with software other than Adobe Reader then please also highlight the appropriate place in the PDF file. To ensure fast publication of your paper please return your corrections within 48 hours.

For correction or revision of any artwork, please consult http://www.elsevier.com/artworkinstructions.

Any queries or remarks that have arisen during the processing of your manuscript are listed below and highlighted by flags in the proof. Click on the 'Q' link to go to the location in the proof.

Location in	Query / Remark: click on the Q link to go
article	Please insert your reply or correction at the corresponding line in the proof
Q1	Please check the presentation of all the tables, and correct if necessary.
Q2	se provide the significance of bold values in Table 3.
Q3	article is registered as a regular item and is being processed for inclusion in a regular issue of ournal. If this is NOT correct and your article belongs to a Special Issue/Collection please contact e.wileman@elsevier.com immediately prior to returning your corrections.
Q4	se confirm that the provided email is the correct address for official communication, else provide an alternate e-mail address to replace the existing one, because private e-mail addresses should not be used in articles as the address for communication.
Q5	author names have been tagged as given names and surnames (surnames are highlighted in teal cover). Please confirm if they have been identified correctly.
Q6	hights must be provided as 3-5 bullet points, each bullet point having a maximum of 125 characters.
Q7	Piecese check the hierarchy of section headings, and correct if necessary.
Q8	e provide the volume, issue or page range for Ref. [11].
	Please check this box or indicate your approval if you have no corrections to make to the PDF file

Thank you for your assistance.

JBUR 5807 1

ARTICLE IN PRESS

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/burns

Highlights

1

Q6

Patterns and predictors of burn scar outcome in the first 12 months post-burn: The Burns xxx (2019) xxx-xxx patient's perspective

Z.M. Rashaan*, K.A.A. Kwa, M.B.A. van der Wal, W.E. Tuinebreijer, P.P.M. van Zuijlen, R.S. Breederveld

- The POSAS patient total and individual item scores showed a statistically significant improvement of the scar quality in the first 12 months post-burn, except for relief.
- Sex, age, depth of the wound, percentage of TBSA and flame burns were predictors of various POSAS patient items at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn.
- The effect of the predictors was not the same on the individual POSAS patient items.

JBUR 5807 1–8

ARTICLE IN PRESS

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/burns

Patterns and predictors of burn scar outcome in the first 12 months post-burn: The patient's perspective

³Q^s Z.M. Rashaan^{a,b,*}, K.A.A. Kwa^{a,b}, M.B.A. van der Wal^e, ⁴ W.E. Tuinebreijer^b, P.P.M. van Zuijlen^{c,d}, R.S. Breederveld^{a,b}

⁵ ^a Department of Surgery, Leiden University Medical Centre, Albinusdreef 2, 2333 ZA Leiden, Leiden, The Netherlands

⁶ ^b Burn Centre and Department of Surgery, Red Cross Hospital, Vondellaan 13, 1942 LE, Beverwijk, The Netherlands

^c Burn Centre and Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Red Cross Hospital, Vondellaan 13, 1942 LE,

⁸ Beverwijk, The Netherlands

⁹ ^d Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery and MOVE Research Institute, VU University of Amsterdam, Van

¹⁰ der Boechorststraat 7, 1081 BT, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

¹¹ ^e Association of Dutch Burn Centres, Zeestraat 27-29, 1941 AJ, Beverwijk, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Accepted 26 March 2019 Available online xxx

- 12 Keywords:
- ¹³ Burn wounds
- ¹⁴ Burn scars
- ¹⁵ POSAS
- ¹⁶ Scar quality
- 17 Predictors and patterns

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study aimed to provide insight into the patterns and factors that predict burn scar outcomes at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn.

Methods: The Patient and Observer Scar Assessment Scale (POSAS) was used to assess the scar formation of each patient. Structural equation modelling was used. The predictor variables used in this study were sex, three age categories, TBSA, depth of the wound and cause of the burn. *Results*: The POSAS patient total and individual item scores demonstrated a statistically significant decrease in the first 12 months post-burn, except for the relief item. Male patients had a lower total and items scores (better scar quality) for pain and pruritus compared with female patients. Full thickness burns had a higher scores for pruritus, pliability, thickness and relief compared to the partial-thickness burns. Ages younger than 5 years, higher TBSA values and flame burns were predictors of various POSAS items at 3 and 6 months post-burn. *Conclusion*: The POSAS patient total and individual item scores demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in the scar quality in the first 12 months post-burn, except for the relief. Sex, age, depth of the wound, the percentage of TBSA and flame burns were predictors of various POSAS patient items at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn.

© 2019 Elsevier Ltd and ISBI. All rights reserved.

¹⁸ **1.** Introduction

Burn scars have extensive impacts on burn patients in terms of
 quality of life, functional impairment and physiological

problems [1–3]. Thus, the optimal management of burn scars requires more insight into the factors that influence the severity of burn scars.

25

To date, sex, age, skin type, location, bacterial colonisation, time to wound healing, type of graft, multiple surgical

0305-4179/© 2019 Elsevier Ltd and ISBI. All rights reserved.



Abbreviations: CFI, comparative fit index; POSAS, the Patient and Observer Scar Assessment Scale; SEM, structural equation modelling; LGM, latent growth curve model; RMSEA, the root mean square error of approximation.

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: z.rashaan@vumc.nl (Z.M. Rashaan), kkwa@rkz.nl (K.A.A. Kwa), mbavdwal@hotmail.com (M.B.A. van der Wal), wetuineb@knmg.nl (W.E. Tuinebreijer), pvanzuijlen@rkz.nl (P.P.M. van Zuijlen), rbreederveld@rkz.nl (R.S. Breederveld). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2019.03.025

ARTICLE IN PRESS

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX

26 procedures, burn severity and the skin being subjected to 27 stretching have been found to be risk factors for hypertrophic 28 scarring [4-8]. The impacts of burn scars not only entail the 29 appearance of the scar but also involve of its accompanying 30 symptoms. Up to 47% of patients experience pain that is 31 associated with their burn scars [9]. In addition, pruritus was 32 found to still be present in 67% of the burn patients at two years 33 post-burn [10]. It should be noted that different burn scar 34 assessment strategies were used in these studies, and these 35 studies were often limited by the lack of an appropriate tool for 36 evaluating scar outcomes.

37 Currently, the Patient and Observer Scar Assessment Scale 38 (POSAS) is widely used to assess scar quality [11]. The POSAS 39 consists of observer and patient components and has been 40 found to be a reliable and valid instrument for the assessment 41 of burn scars [12,13]. The POSAS patient scale by Draaijers et al. 42 (version 1.0) incorporates scores for the following six items by 43 using a 10-point rating scale: pain, itch, color, pliability, 44 thickness and relief [12,14]. A high score indicates a worse scar 45 quality. There is a paucity of research investigating the 46 changes in the POSAS scores after burns [15]. Van der Wal 47 et al. described that full thickness wounds and a higher 48 percentage of TBSA were significant predictors of a higher 49 POSAS score, whereas the aetiology and age of the patient had 50 no influence on the scar quality [16]. In addition, POSAS 51 assessment a three months post-burn found to be predictive of 52 final scar quality at twelve months post-burn [17].

The purpose of the present study was to describe the
 influence of predictors on changes in POSAS patient scores at
 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn.

⁵⁶ 2. Materials and methods

⁵⁷ 2.1. Recruitment and study population

58 This retrospective study was performed at the burn centre 59 outpatient clinic at the Red Cross Hospital, Beverwijk in the 60 Netherlands between June 2004 and December 2009. This 61 study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards 62 of the institutional and/or national research committee and 63 with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or 64 comparable ethical standards. The POSAS questionnaire is a 65 standard part of each routine follow-up visit of each of the burn 66 patients in the outpatient clinic at 3, 6 and 12 months at our 67 specialized burn centre. The data of the patients who were 68 admitted to the burn centre and who were subsequently seen 69 at the outpatient clinic at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn were 70 included in the analysis. In this consecutive sample, the 71 patients who participated in clinical trials for wound or scar 72 treatments were excluded from the study. The parents or 73 caregivers were asked to fill in the POSAS patient component 74 for patients who were under the age of 5 years. Baseline 75 characteristics such as sex, age at the time of burn, the 76 percentage of total body surface area (TBSA), burn depth 77 (partial or full thickness) and the cause of the burn wound 78 (flame or scald) were collected. At our institution, patients with 79 full-thickness burns were operated (skin grafting). Mixed 80 burns (partial and full-thickness) were conservatively treated 81 for approximately 10-14 days. Burn wounds of $>3 \text{ cm}^2$ that

82 were not yet healed, were considered for skin grafting 83 procedures. Partial-thickness burns were treated with topical 84 antiseptics or hydrofibre dressings. This treatment algorithm 85 was chosen because wound healing that takes more than three 86 weeks to complete, is considered to be a risk factor for 87 hypertrophic scar formation [18]. Patients were categorized 88 into the following three age-groups: <5 years, 5-18 years and 89 >18 years. The cut-off value of 5 years was chosen because of 90 two reasons. First, the epidemiology of burn wounds tends to 91 be different between children <5 years and older children. In 92 general, scald burns were more common in children who were 93 younger than 5 years compared with older children [19,20]. 94 Second, the POSAS patient scores of this age category were 95 completed by the caregivers, which may influence the 96 outcomes compared with older children who completed the 97 POSAS patient scores on their own. The study location at three 98 months post-burn was defined as the most apparent part of 99 the scar according to the patient. Standard treatment 100 consisted of silicones or pressure garments depending on 101 the location and scar activity. If there was a significant 102 functional impairment during ADL, then there was an 103 indication of reconstruction surgery during the first 12 months 104 post-burn. After 12 months post-burn, an operation was 105 indicated for both functional impairment and esthetical reasons. 106

2.2. The POSAS

108 To the best of our knowledge, there is conflicting data in the 109 literature concerning the analysis of the POSAS patient scores. 110 Van der Wal et al. found that the POSAS patient questionnaire 111 was unidimensional. Therefore, the individual and sum of the 112 items of the POSAS patient scores could be used for statistical 113 analysis [21]. Conversely, de Jong et al. found that the POSAS 114 patient questionnaire was multidimensional. Therefore, the 115 only individual POSAS patients scores could be used for 116 statistical analysis [13]. In this study, we used both the 117 individual and sum of the POSAS patient scores for statistical 118 analysis. If the patient was unable to answer the question-119 naire, e.g. in the case of children <5 years or in the case of 120 mentally impaired patients, then the caretaker was asked to 121 score the items.

107

122

2.3. Study model and statistical analyses

123 Structural equation modelling (SEM) was performed using the IBM SPSS statistical package AMOS^{TL} 24 [22]. We applied a 124 125 latent growth curve model (LGM), which was a special 126 application of the SEM with several advantages. Latent growth 127 curve modelling in AMOS was able to accommodate irregularly 128 spaced measurements at the three time points (3, 6 and 129 12 months post-burn) in our dat [12]. In addition, the use of 130 LGM made it possible to assess the state of the model to the data 131 and to effectively compute the maximum likelihood estimates 132 in our dataset, which was not completed at all three of the time 133 points (Appendix B). The Inter-individual differences in the 134 changes over time were assessed, and group-level statistics 135 such as the mean change rates and mean intercepts were 136 provided. The LGM accounts for the of change (slope curve 137 analysis) at the individual level (patient) and at the group level

ARTICLE IN PRESS

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX

201

215

(for instance, the depth of the burn wound, sex, etc.). The fit of
 the LGM was tested. The absolute and comparative fit indices
 were calculated.

141 The following predictor variables were entered into the 142 models: sex, age <5 years, age 5-18 years and age >18 years, the 143 percentage of TBSA, depth of the wound and cause of the burn. 144 Our model was based on our earlier study that used the POSAS 145 patient scale to study the influence of time-invariant predictors 146 (such as sex, the percentage of TBSA, wound depth and age 147 categories) on the POSAS scale in the same group of patients 148 [16]. The three different intercept estimates represented the 149 patients' total scores at 3, 6 or 12 months. The time moment of 150 the intercept was dependent on how the time values were coded 151 (0, 1, 3; -1, 0, 2 or -3, -2, 0). The slope estimates represented the 152 patients' rates of change between 3,6 and 12 months post-burn. 153 Positive intercepts indicated higher POSAS scores at 3, 6 and 154 12 months post-burn, which thus indicated a worse scar quality 155 compared to that of the reference group. Significant negative 156 slopes in the POSAS scores indicated a slower rate of change in 157 the presented predictor category compared to that in the 158 reference category (for example, flame burns compared to the 159 reference category scald burns).

The correlations between the intercepts and slopes were
calculated. A positive value indicated a high initial score at
3 months post-burn with a greater rate of change, whereas a
negative correlation indicated a high initial score at 3 months
post-burn with a lower rate of change.

165 The LGM was investigated in a model for the total score and 166 was individually investigated in a model for the six items that 167 were incorporated in the POSAS patient scale, both with and 168 without predictors. The intercept estimate can be interpreted as 169 the influence of the predictors on the POSAS patient scores at 3, 170 6 and 12 months post-burn. The positive intercepts implied 171 higher POSAS scores compared to the reference category. The 172 slope estimate can be interpreted as the influence of the 173 predictors on the changes in the POSAS scores over time. Positive 174 slopes indicate higher degree of change over time compared to 175 the reference category. An detailed description of the study 176 model and statistical analyses can be found in Appendix D.

¹⁷⁷ **3. Results**

¹⁷⁸ **3.1.** Baseline characteristics

179 A total of 284 children and 190 adult patients were included in this 180 study. The patients' characteristics are shown in Table 1. There 181 were no statistically significant differences in the total TBSA 182 (p=0.99, independent t-test), full-thickness burns (p=0.30, inde-183 pendent t-test), or surgeries on the evaluated scars (p=0.53, chi-184 square test) that were observed between the groups of patients 185 who completed all three evaluations (n = 157) and the patients 186 who completed one or two of the evaluations moments (n = 317).

¹⁸⁷ 3.2. The fit indices for the different models

The fit indices for the different models are presented in
 Appendix B. The fit indices for the model with the total score
 and the six predictors (Appendix A) revealed the following
 results: The minimum discrepancy (CMIN) was 6.751 with

Table 1 - Patient characteristics.

Characteristic	<18 years	\geq 18 years
Number of patients (%)	284 (60)	190 (40)
Sex, n (%)		
- Male	186 (64.5)	103 (54.2)
- <mark>Fem</mark> ale	98 (34.5)	87 (45.8)
Age at burn, median in years (range)	2.5 <mark>(0.7–17.8)</mark>	43.2 (18.6-85.6)
TBSA, median (range)	•	
- Total	7 (0.5–76)	7.3 (0.5–85)
- Full thickness	1 (0.5–75)	3 (0.5–60)
Cause of the burn (%)	-	
- <mark>Sca</mark> ld	172 (60.6)	26 (13.7)
- <mark>(Flash)flame</mark>	70 (24.6)	115 (60.5)
- Contact	19 (6.7)	15 (7.9)
- Oil/ fat	20 (7.0)	27 (14.2)
- Chemical	0 (0)	6 (3.2)
- Electricity	3 (1.1)	0 (0)
- Other	0 (0)	1 (0.5)
Treatment of evaluated scar		
- Conservative treatment, n (%)	86 (30.3)	31 (16.3)
- Surgery (skin grafting), n (%)	198 (69.7)	159 (83.7)
Evaluated, n (%)		
- At 3 months post burn	224 (78.9)	135 (71.1)
- At 6 months post burn	205 (72.2)	122 (64.2)
- At 12 months post burn	156 (55.3)	76 (40.0)
Total evaluations, n (%)		
- One evaluation completed	76 (26.8)	81 (42.6)
- Two evaluations completed	101 (35.6)	71 (37.4)
- Three evaluations completed	97 (34.2)	38 (20.0)
TRSA: total body surface area		

TBSA: total body surface area.

192 7 degrees of freedom (df) and a p-value of 0.455. The comparative 193 fit index (CFI) was 1.00. The root mean square error of 194 approximation (RMSEA) was 0.0001 with a confidence interval 195 of 0.0001-0.055. These values of the fit indices agree with a good-196 to-perfect fit with the total score and the six predictors. All of the 197 models that evaluated the six individual items had a perfect fit. 198 The model with the total score without the six predictors had a 199 moderate fit, and the models with the items of thickness or 200 relief and without the six predictors had a poor fit.

3.3. Patterns of change in the POSAS patient scores

202 The parameter estimates for the intercept and slopes of the 203 model that evaluated the separate total POSAS patient scale 204 scores and the separate 6 items without the 6 predictors are 205 shown in Table 2. The parameter estimates for the total POSAS 206 scores obtained from the predictor models are presented in 207 Table 2 and Appendix A. Pain had the lowest separate intercept 208 score, which implied that pain had the lowest item score out of 209 the six items in the POSAS at 3 months post-burn. The total 210 score and all of the items (except relief) had significant 211 negative slopes, which implied that the rates of change in the 212 scores showed a decreasing trend. The covariances between 213 the predictor variables of the total POSAS patient scale scors 214 are shown in Appendix C.

3.4. Sex

Male patients had lower total POSAS patient scores at 3, 6 and21612 months post-burn, with no significant difference in the rate217

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX

Table 2 – Estimates of the intercepts, slopes and covariances between intercepts and slopes of the total scores and items pain, pruritus, color, pliability, thickness and relief without predictors.

POSAS patient scale			Inter	cept			Sloj	ре		C	lovaria	nces	
		Estimate	SE	CR	Р	Estimate	SE	CR	р	Estimate	SE	CR	р
Total score	3 months	29.18	0.55	53.25	< 0.001	-2.02	0.25	-8.25	<0.001	-2.86	4.56	-0.63	0.531
	6 months	27.16	0.47	57.75	< 0.001					-1.13	2.94	-0.38	0.701
	12 months	23.12	0.65	35.60	< 0.001					2.34	8.83	0.26	0.791
Items:													
Pain	3 months	2.38	0.10	22.45	< 0.001	-0.17	0.04	-4.26	< 0.001	-0.07	0.14	-0.47	0.637
^	6 months	2.21	0.09	<mark>2</mark> 5.01	< 0.001					0.01	0.09	0.07	0.942
	12 months	1.87	0.11	16.75	< 0.001					0.15	0.27	0.55	0.581
Pruritus	3 months	4.54	0.13	33.81	< 0.001	-0.49	0.06	-8.09	< 0.001	-0.67	0.26	-2.55	0.011
	6 months	4.05	0.11	<mark>3</mark> 6.05	< 0.001					-0.10	0.18	-0.54	0.592
	12 months	3.07	0.15	19.92	< 0.001					1.05	0.51	2.06	0.039
Color	<mark>3 m</mark> onths	6.94	0.11	64.43	< 0.001	-0.54	0.06	-9.56	< 0.001	-0.52	0.21	-2.52	0.012
	6 months	6.40	0.09	7 4.02	< 0.001					-0.17	0.14	-1.27	0.204
	12 months	5.32	0.14	39.26	< 0.001					0.52	0.39	1.32	0.187
Pliability	<mark>3 m</mark> onths	5.79	0.13	44.66	< 0.001	-0.47	0.07	-7.07	< 0.001	-0.40	0.30	-1.37	0.172
	6 months	5.33	0.11	<mark>5</mark> 0.73	< 0.001					-0.10	0.19	-0.52	0.600
	12 months	4.40	0.16	27.59	< 0.001					0.50	0.58	0.87	0.383
Thickness	<mark>3 m</mark> onths	5.26	0.13	39.84	< 0.001	-0.31	0.06	-5.06	< 0.001	0.08	0.28	0.29	0.770
	<mark>6 m</mark> onths	4.96	0.11	43.61	< 0.001					0.10	0.18	0.52	0.601
	12 months	4.34	0.16	26.80	< 0.001					0.12	0.57	0.21	0.832
Relief	3 months	5.08	0.13	39.10	< 0.001	-0.09	0.06	-1.34	0.179	-0.35	0.29	-1.19	0.236
	6 months	5.00	0.11	<mark>4</mark> 7.33	< 0.001					-0.07	0.19	-0.37	0.715
	12 months	4.82	0.16	30.83	< 0.001					0.48	0.57	0.85	0.397
SE, standard error; CR, critical ratio.													

218 of change when compared to female patients.(Table 3), The 219 male patients had lower pain scores at 3 and 6 months post-220 burn, with an equal rate of change compared to females. Men 221 tended to have lower itch scores at 3 and 6 months post-burn. 222 Nevertheless, the changes in the scores over time were 223 comparable.(Table 4A) Male patients had higher POSAS scores 224 for relief at 3 and 6 months post-burn, with lower pliability 225 scores at 6 and 12 months post-burn. However, the changes in 226 the scores were comparable to those observed in female 227 patients (Table 4B).

228 3.5. Wound depth

229 Patients with full thickness burns had higher POSAS patient 230 total scores at 3 months post-burn and a lower rate of change 231 during the first 12 months post-burn compared to patients with 232 partial thickness burns. The total POSAS scores for full 233 thickness and partial thickness burns showed no difference 234 at 12 months post-burn (Table 3). Pruritus scores at 3 months 235 were significantly higher in patients with full thickness burns 236 than those in patients with partial thickness burns. The rate of 237 change in the pruritus scores was significantly lower in patients 238 with full thickness burns (Table 4A). Finally, patients with full 239 thickness burns had significantly higher POSAS scores for 240 pliability, thickness and relief at 3 and 6 months post-burn 241 compared with patients with partial thickness burns (Table 4B).

242 3.6. Age

243 There was no significant difference in the total POSAS scores 244 between younger patients or patients who were older than 5 years. However, patients who were younger than 5 years had significantly lower pruritus scores at 12 months post-burn and lower rates of change compared to older patients.(Table 4A) Patients aged below 5 years had higher scar color, pliability and thickness scores at 3 and 6 months post-burn, while patients older than 18 years had a higher scar color scores at 12 months post-burn and a greater change in scores than the younger patients (Table 4B). Patients older than 18 years had higher pain scores at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn than younger patients, but groups of patients had equal rates of change.(Table 4A)

3.7. Aetiology and percentage of TBSA

Q7 256 The covariances between the predictor variables of the total POSAS patient score are shown in Appendix A and Appendix C. No effects of the percentage of TBSA or cause of burn were found on the total POSAS patient scale.(Table 3), Patients with flame burns generally had significantly higher color scores at 3 and 6 months post-burn.(Table 4A) Patients with a higher percentage of TBSA had higher POSAS score for relief at 3 and 6 months postburn.(Table 4B) Pruritus scores at 6 and 12 months post-burn were higher in patients with a higher percentage of TBSA values.

Discussion 4.

The change in the POSAS patient scale scores was studied 267 between 3 and 6 months post-burn and between 6 and 268 12 months post-burn. The POSAS patient total score and all of 269 the item scores showed a statistically significant decline in 270 these two time periods, except for the relief item. The greatest

245

250

251 252

253 254

255

257

260 261 262

263 264

266

265

ARTICLE IN PRESS

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

Table 3 – Regression weights and *p*-values of the POSAS patient scores and the predictors TBSA, burn depth, age category, sex and cause of burn.

POSAS patient scale total s	core	Estimate	SE	CR	р
Predictors					
Sex: male	Intercept at 3 months	-3.327	1.138	-2.922	0.003
	Intercept at 6 months	-3.204	0.973	-3.292	<0.001
	Intercept at 12 months	-2.959	1.332	-2.222	0.026
	Slope	0.122	0.504	0.243	0.808
Depth: full thickness	Intercept at 3 months	3.543	1.283	2.762	0.006
	Intercept at 6 months	1.997	1.097	1.820	0.069
	Intercept at 12 months	-1.095	1.501	-0.730	0.466
	Slope	-1.546	0.568	-2.722	0.006
Age < 5 years	Intercept at 3 months	3.130	1.664	1.881	0.060
	Intercept at 6 months	1.673	1.423	1.176	0.240
	Intercept at 12 months	-1.242	1.942	-0.640	0.522
	Slope	-1.458	0.735	-1.984	0.047
Age > 18 years	Intercept at 3 months	0.649	1.443	0.450	0.653
	Intercept at 6 months	1.229	1.234	0.996	0.319
	Intercept at 12 months	2.388	1.689	1.414	0.157
	Slope	0.580	0.639	0.907	0.364
Cause: flame burns	Intercept at 3 months	1.006	1.490	0.675	0.499
	Intercept at 6 months	0.840	1.272	0.661	0.509
	Intercept at 12 months	0.509	1.719	0.296	0.767
	Slope	0.166	0.651	-0.255	0.799
TBSA	Intercept at 3 months	0.024	0.044	0.552	0.581
	Intercept at 6 months	0.041	0.037	1.107	0.268
	Intercept at 12 months	0.076	0.051	1.486	0.137
	Slope	0.017	0.019	0.893	0.372

SE, standard error; CR, critical ratio. Reference categories were female sex, partial thickness burns, age 5–18 years, scald burns. TBSA was a continuous variable in the model.

271 decline was observed during the longer time period between 272 6 and 12 months post-burn. The pain item scale presented the 273 lowest decline score, and the color item exhibited the highest 274 decline score. Therefore, the pain and color items had the 275 lowest and highest influences on the total POSAS score, 276 respectively. The low pain scores could be the result of 277 effective medication for pain and/or the result of real low pain 278 values in patients after 3 months post-burn. The high color 279 values represent the importance of color for the patient 280 assessment of his or her scars. Patients with the highest total 281 and item scores presented the lowest changes during the 3 and 282 6 months post-burn, thus leading to the lowest decline in the 283 total score.

284 In our study, a strong effect of sex was observed on the total 285 POSAS patient score. Male patients had a better scar quality, 286 which was caused by lower score of pruritus and pain, as well 287 as a better score for pliability and relief compared to the scar 288 quality in female patients. Various studies have demonstrated 289 higher pain-related symptoms in women compared with men 290 [26-28]. Sex role beliefs, pain coping strategies, pain-related 291 expectations and even hormonal factors may possibly explain 292 the difference in pain experience between males and females 293 [29]. In line with our study, two studies observed higher itch 294 intensity scores in women compared to men, although this 295 phenomenon is not well understood [10,30]. Higher pliability

and relief scores in the female group in our study could possibly be explained by the differences in body images between males and females. In general, women have a more negative body image compared to men [31–33]. Dyer et al. observed that women with scars that resulted from accidents or surgeries reported a more negative body image [33].

Patients with full thickness burns had higher total POSAS scores, which were caused by higher scores for the pruritus, pliability, thickness and relief items. Other studies have also described higher itching scores for full thickness burns and grafted wounds [10,30,34]. An increase in both mediators and neuronal damage are thought to contribute to pruritus symptoms in full thickness burns [35]. In our study, pruritus diminished after 3 months post-burn; a finding that has been previously described in other studies [10,16]. Higher POSAS scores for pliability, thickness and relief are explained by the loss of epidermal and dermal structures.

313 Previous studies have found that the age of the patient does 314 not influence scar behavior [6,16,36]. Our results are consistent 315 with these reports when considering the total POSAS score. 316 However, this is not the case when looking at the separate 317 items. Patients who were aged below 5 years had significantly 318 higher scores for color, pliability and thickness at 3 and 319 6 months post-burn, and these patients also had significantly 320 less pruritus at 12 months post-burn. The fact that caretakers

ARTICLE IN PRESS

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX

Table 4A – Regression weights and *p*-values of the items pain, pruritus and color of the POSAS patient scale from the predictors TBSA, burn depth, age category, sex and cause of burn.

Items POSAS patient s	cale	Pair	n	Prurit	us	Color		
Predictors		Estimate	р	Estimate	р	Estimate	р	
Sex: male	Intercept 3 months	-0.730	< 0.001	-0.676	0.015	-0.181	0.419	
	Intercept 6 months	-0.598	< 0.001	-0.614	0.009	-0.039	0.830	
	Intercept 12 months	-0.335	0.124	-0.489	0.118	0.246	0.375	
	Slope	0.132	0.117	0.062	0.611	0.143	0.217	
Depth: full thickness	Intercept 3 months	0.125	0.572	0.756	0.016	0.249	0.324	
	Intercept 6 months	0.090	0.631	0.374	0.156	0.100	0.624	
	Intercept 12 months	0.019	0.939	-0.392	0.266	-0.200	0.524	
	Slope	-0.035	0.708	-0.383	0.005	-0.150	0.250	
Age < 5 years	Intercept 3 months	-0.070	0.807	0.069	0.866	1.031	0.002	
0 ,	Intercept 6 months	-0.071	0.771	-0.316	0.355	0.660	0.012	
	Intercept 12 months	-0.072	0.822	-1.084	0.017	-0.082	0.839	
	Slope	0.000	0.997	-0.384	0.031	-0.371	0.027	
Age > 18 years	Intercept 3 months	1.282	< 0.001	-0.480	0.175	0.008	0.978	
0	Intercept 6 months	1.330	< 0.001	-0.311	0.294	0.360	0.115	
	Intercept 12 months	1.427	< 0.001	-0.009	0.983	1.065	0.003	
	Slope	0.049	0.648	0.169	0.275	0.352	0.016	
Cause: flame burns	Intercept 3 months	0.303	0.240	-0.065	0.858	0.951	0.001	
	Intercept 6 months	0.313	0.150	-0.027	0.929	0.527	0.025	
	Intercept 12 months	0.333	0.236	0.049	0.903	-0.320	0.371	
	Slope	-0.010	0.926	0.038	0.810	-0.424	0.004	
TBSA	Intercept 3 months	0.001	0.854	0.020	0.067	0.001	0.900	
	Intercept 6 months	0.002	0.801	0.023	0.011	0.005	0.491	
	Intercept 12 months	0.002	0.808	0.029	0.016	0.012	0.254	
	Slope	0.000	0.948	0.003	0.506	0.004	0.405	

Reference categories were female sex, partial thickness burns, age 5-18 years, scald burns. TBSA was a continuous variable in the model.

completed the questionnaires for the patients under 5 years
 old may have contributed to the differences in the outcomes
 between the age groups. We did not find any studies that
 reported the influence of age on color change in burn scars.

325 Furthermore, it should be noted that different studies have 326 described a negative association between age and hypertro-327 phic scar formation [37]. This finding is supported by the 328 decreased proliferation, reepithelization and inflammatory 329 responses that are observed during wound healing, as well as 330 the slower epidermal turnover and the different remodeling 331 phase that are observed in aged individuals [7,37,38]. However, 332 the present study did not investigate hypertrophic scar 333 formation. Finally, patients who were above 18 years had 334 higher pain scores at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn compared 335 to patients who were below 18 years.

336 The percentage of TBSA was a predictor for the pruritus, 337 thickness and relief item scores. The effect of the percentage 338 of TBSA on pruritus has been well described in various 339 studies. However, there are conflicting data on the effect of 340 the percentage of TBSA on the duration of pruritus. Van Loey 341 et al. described a higher TBSA to be a risk factor for pruritus at 342 3 months post-burn [10]. The scar tissue modulation and 343 nerve density which are thought to be highest in the first 344 6 months post-burn could explain this effect. However, in 345 line with other studies, we found the effect of the percentage

of TBSA to be significant even at 12 months post-burn [30,39]. Furthermore, the effect of full thickness burns and the percentage of TBSA on itching is different than the effect of full thickness burns on pain. Pain scores were observed to be the lowest of all the scored items on the POSAS patient scale. This could be caused by a different mechanism or by a better treatment for pain.

Scald injuries are more often observed in patients who are under 5 years, whereas fire/flame burns are observed more often in older patients. Additionally, more males than females are admitted to burn centres. Full thickness burns and burns with a higher percentage of TBSA tend to occur more often in patients who are older than 18 years. Flame burns are more often deep dermal or full-thickness burns. Overall, our data are corroborated by the findings of various epidemiological studies [19,40].

Our study had several limitations. First, the age-related findings of the patients who were under 5 years should be interpreted with caution, given that the care givers completed the questionnaires. Second, no sample size calculation was performed, given the large number of included patients and given that the data were retrospectively collected. However, a sample size calculation could still be relevant, based on the amount of missing data. Third, the extent of the influence of the excluded patients on the results of the current study is

369

370

346

347

ARTICLE IN PRESS

BURNSXXX (2019) XXX-XXX

Items POSAS patient s	scale	Pliabi	lity	Thickn	ess	Relief	
Predictors		Estimate	р	Estimate	р	Estimate	р
Sex: male	Intercept 3 months	-0.393	0.138	-0.136	0.617	-0.520	0.051
	Intercept 6 months	-0.545	0.012	-0.269	0.252	-0.435	0.045
	Intercept 12 months	-0.847	0.011	-0.537	0.114	-0.264	0.421
	Slope	-0.151	0.262	-0.134	0.294	0.085	0.528
Depth: full thickness	Intercept 3 months	1.151	<0.001	0.797	0.009	1.076	<0.001
	Intercept 6 months	0.682	0.005	0.463	0.080	0.863	< 0.001
	Intercept 12 months	-0.254	0.497	-0.204	0.595	0.438	0.238
	Slope	-0.468	0.002	-0.334	0.020	-0.213	0.162
Age < 5 years	Intercept 3 months	1.333	<0.001	0.953	0.016	0.574	0.141
	Intercept 6 months	0.799	0.012	0.787	0.022	0.453	0.153
	Intercept 12 months	-0.267	0.580	0.453	0.360	0.209	0.662
	Slope	-0.533	0.007	-0.167	0.369	-0.122	0.536
Age > 18 years	Intercept 3 months	0.492	0.143	0.026	0.940	-0.031	0.928
	Intercept 6 months	0.307	0.264	0.018	0.951	0.147	0.592
	Intercept 12 months	-0.062	0.882	0.004	0.993	0.503	0.228
	Slope	-0.185	0.280	-0.007	0.964	0.178	0.299
Cause: flame burns	Intercept 3 months	0.277	0.425	-0.514	0.147	-0.025	0.942
	Intercept 6 months	0.318	0.262	-0.302	0.325	-0.153	0.589
	Intercept 12 months	0.400	0.349	0.123	0.780	-0.408	0.336
	Slope	0.041	0.813	0.212	0.196	-0.127	0.465
TBSA	Intercept 3 months	0.004	0.667	0.021	0.042	0.026	0.010
	Intercept 6 months	0.006	0.508	0.015	0.094	0.023	0.006
	Intercept 12 months	0.008	0.541	0.003	0.821	0.016	0.200
	Slope	0.001	0.827	-0.006	0.212	-0.003	0.517

Reference categories were female sex, partial thickness burns, age 5-18 years, scald burns. TBSA was a continuous variable in the model.

371 unknown, because no data of the excluded patients were 372 recorded. Fourth, there are conflicting data on whether the 373 POSAS score is a unidimensional instrument. Therefore, the 374 scores of the individual items could be summed into a total 375 score [13,21]. In theory, the POSAS patient questionnaire is 376 based on a formative model in which the individual items of 377 the POSAS patient score are causal indicators of the scar 378 quality. A formative questionnaire could consist of more than 379 one dimension. Thus the individual items could be summed to 380 a final score, for example as is done for the Apgar score. Finally, 381 the included study predictors were obtained from the available 382 literature, whereas no systematic search was performed. As a 383 result, there may be predictors that are not included in the 384 current study, which may be relevant in the context of changes 385 in the POSAS scores at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn.

³⁸⁶ 5. Conclusion

This retrospective study, the POSAS patient total and
 individual item scores demonstrated a statistically significant
 improvement in the first 12 months post-burn, except for the
 relief item. Furthermore, sex, age, depth of the wound,
 percentage of TBSA and flame burns were predictors of

various POSAS patient items at 3, 6 and 12 months post-burn.392However, the effect of these predictors was not the same for
the individual POSAS patient items.393

Source of funding395This work was conducted without external financial support.396Conflict of interest397None of the authors have any potential conflicts of interest to
disclose.398Uncerted references400[24,25].401

Acknowledgements

BURNS XXX (2019) XXX-XXX

404 Appendix A. Supplementary data

405 Supplementary material related to this article can be 406 found, in the online version, at doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j. 407 burns.2019.03.025.

4

0.8			[21]	van der Wal B, Tuinebreijer WE, Bloemen MC Middelkoop E, van Zuijlen PP. Rasch analysis o
409	[1]	Stourou Majorman O Taccone A Zilinghul Hallowey C Doud		Observer Scar Assessment Scale (POSAS) in b
	[1]	Stavrou, weissman O, ressone A, Zinnsky I, Holloway S, Boyd		Life Res 2012;21(1):13-23.
410		of the literature Burne 2014/40(5):788.06	[22]	Arbuckle. AMOSTM 22 user's guide. IBM; 201
411	[0]	of the interature. Burns 2014;40(5):788-96.	[23]	Byrne M. Structural equation modeling with
412	[2]	Faider, Browne A, Edgar D, Staples E, Fong J, Rea S, et al. Core		concepts, applications, and programming. The
		outcomes for adult burn survivors: a clinical overview. Burns		& London: Taylor & Francis Group; 2016.
113	[0]	2009;35(5):618-41.	[24]	DiLalla F. A structural equation modeling over
114	[3]	van Baar E, Essink-Bot ML, Oen IM, Dokter J, Boxma H, van		researchers. J Dev Behav Pediatr 2008;29(1):52
		Beeck EF. Functional outcome after burns: a review. Burns	[25]	Byrne M, Lam WW, Fielding R. Measuring patte
115		2006;32(1):1–9.		personality assessments: an annotated appli
116	[4]	Gangemi N, Gregori D, Berchialla P, Zingarelli E, Cairo M,		growth curve modeling. J Pers Assess 2008;90
117		Bollero D, et al. Epidemiology and risk factors for pathologic	[26]	Andersson I, Ejlertsson G, Leden I, Rosenberg
±17 110		scarring after burn wounds. Arch Facial Plast Surg 2008;10		in a geographically defined general population
110		(2):93-102.		differences in age, gender, social class, and pa
115	[5]	Bombaro M, Engrav LH, Carrougher GJ, Wiechman SA, Faucher		Clin J Pain 1993;9(3):174-82.
120		L, Costa BA, et al. What is the prevalence of hypertrophic	[27]	Forgays G, Rzewnicki R, Ober AJ, Forgays DK.
121		scarring following burns? Burns 2003;29(4):299–302.		college students: a comparison of four popula
±21 122	[6]	Deitch A, Wheelahan TM, Rose MP, Clothier J, Cotter J.		1993;33(4):182-90.
ŧZZ		Hypertrophic burn scars: analysis of variables. J Trauma	[28]	Sternbach A. Pain and' hassles' in the United
172		1983;23(10):895–8.		of the Nuprin pain report. Pain 1986;27(1):69-
420	[7]	Butzelaar, Ulrich MM, Mink van der Molen AB, Niessen B, Beelen	[29]	Fillingim B. Sex, gender, and pain: women an
124		RH. Currently known risk factors for hypertrophic skin scarring:		different. Curr Rev Pain 2000;4(1):24-30.
124 125		a review. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 2016;69(2):163–9.	[30]	Carrougher J, Martinez EM, McMullen KS, Fau
420 120	[8]	Lawrence W, Mason ST, Schomer K, Klein MB. Epidemiology		Holavanahalli RK, Herndon DN, et al. Pruritu
420 127		and impact of scarring after burn injury: a systematic review of		survivors: postburn prevalence and risk facto
+27 120		the literature. J Burn Care Res 2012;33(1):136-46.		with increased intensity. J Burn Care Res 201
128 120	[9]	Li-Tsang W, Lau JC, Chan CC. Prevalence of hypertrophic scar	[31]	Cash F, Morrow JA, Hrabosky JI, Perry AA. How
120		formation and its characteristics among the Chinese		changed? A cross-sectional investigation of col
400 401		population. Burns 2005;31(5):610-6.		men from 1983 to 2001. J Consult Clin Psychol 2
131	[10]	Van Loey E, Bremer M, Faber AW, Middelkoop E, Nieuwenhuis	[32]	Smith E, Thompson JK, Raczynski JM, Hilner
122		MK. Itching following burns: epidemiology and predictors. Br J		among men and women in a biracial cohort:
+3Z 122		Dermatol 2008;158(1):95-100.		Study. Int J Eat Disord 1999;25(1):71-82.
124	[11]	Mundy R, Miller HC, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, Pusic AL. Patient-	[33]	Dyer, Mayer-Eckhard L, White AJ, Alpers GW.
134 125		reported outcome instruments for surgical and traumatic		origin in shaping men's body image. Am J Me
130		scars: a systematic review of their development, content, and		(2):115-23.
430 Q8		psychometric validation. Aesthetic Plast Surg 2016.	[34]	Kuipers C, Bremer M, Braem L, Goemanne AS
437	[12]	Draaijers J, Tempelman FR, Botman YA, Tuinebreijer WE,		van Loev NE. Itch in burn areas after skin tra
438		Middelkoop E, Kreis RW, et al. The patient and observer scar		patient characteristics, influencing factors an
439		assessment scale: a reliable and feasible tool for scar evaluation.		Derm Venereol 2015;95(4):451–6.
14 0		Plast Reconstr Surg 2004;113(7)1960-5 discussion 6-7.	[35]	Goutos , Dziewulski P. Richardson PM. Prurit
141 142	[13]	DeJong M, Phillips M, Edgar DW, Wood FM. Patient opinion of		review article. J Burn Care Res 2009;30(2):221-
14Z		scarring is multidimensional: an investigation of the POSAS	[36]	Schwanholt A, Ridgway CL, Greenhalgh DG, S
443		with confirmatory factor analysis. Burns 2017;43(1):58-68.		Gaboury TJ, Morress CS, et al. A prospective st
144	[14]	The patient and observer scar assessment scale (POSAS)		maturation in pediatrics: does age matter? J Bi
145	[15]	Tyack , Wasiak J, Spinks A, Kimble R, Simons M. A guide to		1994:15(5):416-20.
146		choosing a burn scar rating scale for clinical or research use.	[37]	Mahdavian Delavary , van der Veer M. Ferreir
1 47		Burns 2013;39(7):1341–50.	1. 1	Formation of hypertrophic scars: evolution an
148	[16]	van der Wal B, Vloemans JF, Tuinebreijer WE, van de Ven P, van		J Plast Surg Hand Surg 2012:46(2):95–101.
149		Unen E, van Zuijlen PP, et al. Outcome after burns: an	[38]	Stevenson , Thornton I. Effect of estrogens of
150		observational study on burn scar maturation and predictors	[]	and the potential role of SERMs. Clin Interv
151		for severe scarring. Wound Repair Regen 2012;20(5):676-87.		(3):283-97.
152	[17]	Goei , van der Vlies CH, Tuinebreijer WE, van Zuijlen PPM,	[39]	Willebrand . Low A. Dyster-Aas I. Kildal M. A
453		Middelkoop E, van Baar ME. Predictive validity of short term	[00]	Ekselius I. et al. Pruritus, personality traits and
454		scar quality on final burn scar outcome using the Patient and		term follow-up of burn-injured patients Acta
155		Observer Scar Assessment Scale in patients with minor to		2004:84(5):375–80.
156		moderate burn severity. Burns 2017;43(4):715-23.	[40]	Smolle, Cambiaso-Daniel I. Forbes A. Wurzer
157		Cubison C, Pape SA, Parkhouse N. Evidence for the link	[10]	G. Branski I.K. et al. Recent trends in hum en
458		between healing time and the development of hypertrophic		worldwide: a systematic review. Burns 2016.

[18]	scars (HTS) in paediatric burns due to scald injury. Burns	459
[10]	Dekter Vleemans AF Beerthuizen CL van der Vlies CH	460
[19]	Dokter, vioenians Ar, beerthuizen Gi, van der vies CH,	461
	Boxma H, Breederveid R, et al. Epidemiology and trends in	462
	severe burns in the Netherlands. Burns 2014;40(/):1406-14.	402
[20]	Vloemans F, Dokter J, van Baar ME, Nijhuis I, Beerthuizen GI,	405
	Nieuwenhuis MK, et al. Epidemiology of children admitted to	464
	the Dutch burn centres. Changes in referral influence	465
	admittance rates in burn centres. Burns 2011;37(7):1161–7.	466
[21]	van der Wal B, Tuinebreijer WE, Bloemen MC, Verhaegen PD,	467
	Middelkoop E, van Zuijlen PP. Rasch analysis of the Patient and	468
	Observer Scar Assessment Scale (POSAS) in burn scars. Qual	469
	Life Res 2012;21(1):13-23.	470
[22]	Arbuckle. AMOSTM 22 user's guide. IBM; 2013.	471
[23]	Byrne M. Structural equation modeling with AMOS. Basic	472
	concepts, applications, and programming. Third ed. New York	473
	& London: Taylor & Francis Group; 2016.	
[24]	DiLalla F. A structural equation modeling overview for medical	474
[]	researchers. J Dev Behav Pediatr 2008:29(1):51–4.	475
[25]	Byrne M Lam WW Fielding R Measuring natterns of change in	476
[23]	personality assessments: an annotated application of latent	477
	growth curve modeling L Pers Assess 2008:90(6):536-46	478
[26]	Andersson I Filerteson G Leden I Rosenberg C Chronic pain	479
[20]	in a geographically defined general population: studies of	480
	differences in age, gender, ageial class, and nain localization	481
	Clin L Drin 1002:0(2):174.82	482
[07]	CIIII) Palli 1995,9(5).17462.	483
[27]	Forgays G, Rzewnicki R, Ober AJ, Forgays DK. Headache in	484
	college students: a comparison of four populations. Headache	101
10.01	1993;33(4):182–90.	485
[28]	Sternbach A. Pain and hassles in the United States: findings	405
	of the Nuprin pain report. Pain 1986;27(1):69–80.	400
[29]	Fillingim B. Sex, gender, and pain: women and men really are	407
	different. Curr Rev Pain 2000;4(1):24-30.	400
[30]	Carrougher J, Martinez EM, McMullen KS, Fauerbach JA,	489
	Holavanahalli RK, Herndon DN, et al. Pruritus in adult burn	490
	survivors: postburn prevalence and risk factors associated	491
	with increased intensity. J Burn Care Res 2013;34(1):94-101.	492
[31]	Cash F, Morrow JA, Hrabosky JI, Perry AA. How has body image	493
	changed? A cross-sectional investigation of college women and	494
	men from 1983 to 2001. J Consult Clin Psychol 2004;72(6):1081–9.	495
[32]	Smith E, Thompson JK, Raczynski JM, Hilner JE. Body image	496
	among men and women in a biracial cohort: the CARDIA	497
	Study. Int J Eat Disord 1999;25(1):71–82.	498
[33]	Dyer, Mayer-Eckhard L, White AJ, Alpers GW. The role of scar	499
	origin in shaping men's body image. Am J Mens Health 2015;9	500
	(2):115-23.	501
[34]	Kuipers C. Bremer M. Braem L. Goemanne AS. Middelkoop E.	502
r. 1	van Loev NE. Itch in burn areas after skin transplantation:	503
	nation that characteristics influencing factors and therapy. Acta	504
	Derm Venereol 2015:95(4):451–6	505
[35]	Goutos Dziewulski P. Richardson PM. Pruritus in hurns:	506
[55]	review article I Burn Care Res 2009:30(2):221_8	507
[26]	Schwanholt A Pidgway CL Creenhalgh DC Staley MI	508
[30]	Caboury TI Morross CS at al A prospective study of burn scar	509
	Gaboury 1), Morress C3, et al. A prospective study of burn scar	510
[07]	1994;15(5):410-20.	511
[37]	Mandavian Delavary , van der veer M, Ferreira JA, Niessen FB.	512
	Formation of hypertrophic scars: evolution and susceptibility.	512
[0.5]	J Plast Surg Hand Surg 2012;46(2):95–101.	51/
[38]	Stevenson , Thornton J. Effect of estrogens on skin aging	514
	and the potential role of SERMs. Clin Interv Aging 2007;2	515
-	(3):283–97.	510
[39]	Willebrand , Low A, Dyster-Aas J, Kildal M, Andersson G,	517
	Ekselius L, et al. Pruritus, personality traits and coping in long-	518
	term follow-up of burn-injured patients. Acta Derm Venereol	519
	2004;84(5):375–80.	520
[40]	Smolle , Cambiaso-Daniel J, Forbes A, Wurzer P, Hundeshagen	520
	G, Branski LK, et al. Recent trends in burn epidemiology	

459

521