

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

A Cohort Study of Diagnostic Delay in the Clinical Pathway of Patients with Chronic Wounds in the Primary Care Setting

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062673
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Mar-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Ahmajärvi, Kirsti; Helsinki University Central Hospital, Doctoral Programme in Populational Health and Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care Isoherranen, K; Helsinki University Central Hospital, Dermatological Department Venermo, M; Helsinki University Central Hospital, Vascular surgery Department
Keywords:	WOUND MANAGEMENT, VASCULAR SURGERY, Diabetic foot < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PRIMARY CARE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 Title page
4
5
6

7 A Cohort Study of Diagnostic Delay in the Clinical Pathway of Patients with Chronic Wounds in the
8 Primary Care Setting
9

10 Authors:
11

- 12 1. Kirsti Ahmajärvi, MD, PhD Student, Specialist in General Practice, Special Competence in
13 Wound Management
- 14 2. Kirsi Isoherranen, MD, PhD, Specialist in Dermatology and Allergology, Special Competence
15 in Wound Management
- 16 3. Maarit Venermo, MD, PhD, Professor of Vascular Surgery
17
18

19 Address and position of each author:
20

21 University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 4, 00014 University of Helsinki
22

23
24 1. K Ahmajärvi, MD, PhD Student, Specialist in General Practice, University of Helsinki, Doctoral
25 Programme in Populational Health and Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care,
26 University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland. Helsinki University
27 Hospital, P.O. Box 250, 00029 Helsinki
28

29
30 2. K Isoherranen, MD, PhD, Specialist of Dermatology and Allergology, Skin and Allergy Hospital,
31 Meilahdentie 2, 00029 HUS, Finland.
32

33 3. M Venermo, MD, PhD, Vascular Surgeon, Professor of Vascular Surgery, Head of the
34 Department, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
35

36 Affiliations:
37

38 1. K Ahmajärvi, MD, PhD Student, University of Helsinki, Doctoral Programme in Populational
39 Health and Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care, University of Helsinki and
40 Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
41

42 2. K Isoherranen, MD, PhD, Department of Dermatology and allergology, University of Helsinki
43 and Inflammation center, Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
44

45 3. M Venermo, MD, PhD, Vascular Surgeon, Professor of Vascular Surgery, Head of the
46 Department, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
47

48 Corresponding Author: Kirsti Ahmajärvi
49

50 Correspondence to: kirsti.ahmajarvi@helsinki.fi
51

52 ORCID: Kirsti Ahmajärvi: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0253-2567>
53

54 ORCID: Kirsi Isoherranen: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0253-2567>
55

56 ORCID: Maarit Venermo: <https://orcid.org/>
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kirsti Ahmajärvi is the responsible guarantor of content and has contributed to the planning,
4 conduct, and reporting of the work described in the article.
5

6 Kirsi Isoherranen has contributed to the planning and reporting of the work described in this
7 article.
8

9 Maarit Venermo has contributed to the following parts in this study: Design of the study, data
10 analysis and interpretation, revisions to scientific content of the manuscript, review and editing of
11 the final manuscript.
12
13

14 The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no
15 others meeting the criteria have been omitted.
16

17 Authors disclose these three types of information:
18

19
20 *Associations with commercial entities that provided support for the work reported in the submitted*
21 *manuscript (the timeframe for disclosure in this section of the form is the lifespan of the work*
22 *being reported):*
23

24 *Kirsti Ahmajärvi: Nothing to disclose*

25 *Kirsi Isoherranen: Nothing to disclose*

26 *Maarit Venermo: Nothing to disclose*

27 *Associations with commercial entities that could be viewed as having an interest in the general*
28 *area of the submitted manuscript (in the three years before submission of the manuscript):*
29

30 *Kirsti Ahmajärvi: Nothing to disclose*

31 *Kirsi Isoherranen: Nothing to disclose*

32 *Maarit Venermo: Nothing to disclose*

33 *Non-financial associations that may be relevant or seen as relevant to the submitted manuscript:*
34

35 *Kirsti Ahmajärvi: Nothing to disclose*

36 *Kirsi Isoherranen: Nothing to disclose*

37 *Maarit Venermo: Nothing to disclose*
38
39

40 **No competing interests:** "All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form
41 at Helsinki and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial
42 relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the
43 previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the
44 submitted work."
45

46 "The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf
47 of all authors to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media
48 (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and
49 store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations,
50 reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the
51 Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all
52 subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to
53 third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all
54 of the above."
55
56
57

58 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-
59 for-profit sectors
60

1
2
3 **Ethics:** Not applicable/No human participants included. This is a registry-based study, and we did
4 not seek ethics committee approval.
5

6 **Keywords:** chronic wound, leg ulcer, foot ulcer, wound management, wound aetiology, primary
7 care, diagnostic process, diagnostic delay, clinical pathway
8

9 **Words** 4632
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Abstract

Objectives: Exact wound diagnosis is essential for successful wound management and a holistic care of the patient suffering from a wound. Wound management has been traditionally seen as a nursing area, but this can lead to considerable delays in wound diagnostics. A diagnostic delay has been recognised as an element of diagnostic error, which, in turn, affects patient safety. The aim of this cohort study was to examine diagnostic delays of chronic wound within primary care.

Setting: A specialised diagnostic unit, a wound care team, was established in the primary health care with the objective of reducing diagnostic and treatment delays in primary care.

Participants: The data consists of 197 consecutive patients attending their first appointment with the wound care team in 2016. The collected data included basic demographics, information about the clinical pathway, including doctor's appointments in primary and specialised care, as well as the ICD-10 diagnostic codes.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: The diagnostic delays were calculated in days and divided into three groups: 1) patient-related delay, 2) diagnostic delay and 3) organisational delay.

Results: The median duration of a patient-related delay was two days (IQR 0-14), whereas a physician's first evaluation was performed at a median of 8 (1-32) days from wound appearance and the correct diagnosis by the wound care team was established in a median of 57 (33-100) days. The organisational delay from first contact to diagnosis was a median of 41 (22-80) days. Only one in three patients had a diagnostic delay of less than 4 weeks.

Conclusions: According to this study, the diagnostic delay occurs within primary care, as an organisational delay from first contact to correct diagnosis. It is possible to arrange an optimal pathway of care in which a holistic wound care process starts within primary care.

A COHORT STUDY OF DIAGNOSTIC DELAY IN THE CLINICAL PATHWAY OF PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC WOUNDS IN THE PRIMARY CARE SETTING

Introduction

Chronic wounds pose a significant burden to health care, constituting roughly 2%–6% of all health care costs (1-3). According to a recent study in the UK, the annual prevalence of wounds increased by 71% between 2012/2013 and 2017/2018 and patient management costs increased by 48% in real terms (4). In addition to costs, chronic wounds cause substantial suffering at the individual level, leading to an impaired quality of life, social isolation and mental health problems (5-7). Wound management can be successful only when the wound is correctly diagnosed and treated accordingly (8,9). Wound care has been traditionally viewed as measures related to the assessment of the wound bed, which can obscure the importance of the holistic care of the patient (10).

In many European countries, wound patients are first seen in primary care by general practitioners (GPs) or nurses (11). This poses a significant challenge to primary care: wound patients should receive a timely evaluation by a qualified health care professional who can make the correct diagnosis, plan holistic treatment and make the necessary referrals (12). This process should aim to avoid diagnostic error, which has been recognised by the World Health Organization (WHO) as a global challenge to patient safety (13). Diagnostic error includes an incorrect or delayed diagnosis, which leads to patient harm or to inappropriate or delayed treatment. The diagnostic errors mainly occur within primary care or at the emergency department, where physicians lack the appropriate tools and sufficient time to make accurate decisions (14, 15).

In 2013, a special wound care team was established in the primary health care system of the Helsinki area. The wound care team consists of a wound care nurse and a general practitioner specialised in wound care. This team has the possibility to consult a podiatrist and/or vascular surgeon. Patients are referred to a wound care team consultation from all primary care units: health centres, home care units and nursing homes. The instructions for the primary care personnel were to react early and refer patients suffering from a non-healing wound within (2–)4 weeks of wound appearance in order to have the wound appropriately diagnosed. The main focus of the wound care team was to discover the correct diagnosis as early as possible and, thereafter, to initiate proper treatment accordingly.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the delay in the diagnostic process in the clinical pathway of wound patients who were referred for a consultation by the wound care team during 2016. The delays were divided into system-related and patient-related delays.

Material and methods

1
2
3 This prospective cohort study analysed the characteristics and medical history of 197 consecutive
4 patients who visited the wound care team in primary health care during 2016. The information
5 was collected at the first wound care team appointment.
6

7
8 Data were collected from electronic patient records. The collected data consisted of patients'
9 background factors (sex, age, comorbidities, medication, previous wounds, state of mobility and
10 living standards, need of home care, smoking, blood sugar levels and lipids), as well as the date of
11 wound appearance, the date of the patient's first contact with a primary care unit and physician's
12 appointment, the date of consulting the wound care team, and the date of admission to a
13 specialist care unit if needed. In order to analyse the diagnostic process, additional information
14 was collected on signs of infection and bacterial swab results, on whether the ankle brachial index
15 (ABI) was measured or pulse palpation occurred, or whether neuropathy was detected with a
16 monofilament test. Observations of oedema and any blood test analyses regarding the wound
17 were also recorded. Furthermore, information was gathered from radiological examinations, if
18 performed, as well as any further investigations within specialist care, such as toe pressure and
19 angiography results. The treatment plan was evaluated and compared to the diagnostic methods
20 and the ICD-10 code. (Supplementary Table 1)
21
22
23
24

25
26 Delays were calculated at different points of the care pathway, starting from wound appearance.
27 The different types of delays included: 1) patient-related delay (time from wound appearance to
28 the patient's first contact with health care providers), 2) diagnostic delay (time from the onset of
29 the wound to the first physician's appointment where the initial diagnosis was made), and 3)
30 organisational delays within primary care in arriving at the correct diagnosis and treatment (from
31 the first contact with the primary health care unit to the wound care team consultation). Some
32 patients needed a referral to a specialist consultation, and this delay was also considered.
33
34

35
36 Diagnostic codes were collected as ICD-10 codes and we compared to the diagnoses made by the
37 primary care physician, by the wound care team physician and by the specialist. As the number of
38 different diagnostic codes was high, we categorised the diagnoses into ten groups (Table 1, Figures
39 1a and 1b). In the grouping process, we also included, in addition to the diagnostic code,
40 information on how the wound had appeared and which diagnostic tools had been used to arrive
41 at the specific conclusion and treatment plan.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Categorisation and diagnostic variation in the clinical pathway of a patient with a wound.

Diagnostic categories	Primary care physician (n = 129)	Wound care team physician (n = 197)	Specialist care physician (n = 110)
No diagnosis*	26	2	1
Arterial wound	4	16	26
Venous or oedematous ulcer	15	57	17
Diabetic foot ulcer	4	24	15
Pressure ulcer	12	29	9
Post-traumatic wound	16	23	3
Atypical wound	0	8	7
Mixed-aetiology ulcer	0	7	3
Infectious wound	42	11	10
Foot malformation or pressure ulcer	0	7	1
Wound of unspecified aetiology	36	13	19

*The category was defined as 'no diagnosis' when a patient had been seen by a physician but there was no ICD-10-coded diagnosis in the patient records.

1
2
3
4
5 In order to avoid bias caused by outliers, 16 patients whose wound had persisted for over 365
6 days prior to the wound team consultation were excluded from the delay analysis.
7

8 *Patient and public Involvement*

9

10 No patient or public involvement has been occurred in planning, managing, designing or carrying
11 out this research.
12
13

14 **Results**

15

16 A total of 197 patients were included in the study. The mean age was 71 years, and 106 (53,5%)
17 patients were female. The basic demographics and risk factors of the patients are reported in
18 Tables 2-3.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Basic demographics.

	Female(n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%
Sex	106	53.8	91	46.2	197	100
Age (y)						
Mean	78	39.6	69	33.7	147	36.0
Median	80	40.6	73	37.1	153	20.8
Mobility (n)						
walking	38	19.3	56	28.4	94	47.7
walking with assistance device	33	16.8	20	10.2	53	26.9
walking with device only indoors	16	8.1	5	2.5	21	10.7
wheelchair	11	5.6	8	4.1	19	9.6
bedridden	8	4.1	2	1.0	10	5.1
Residence (n)						
home	57	28.9	73	37.1	130	66.0
home with home care	30	15.2	12	6.1	42	21.3
assisted living facility	14	7.1	5	2.5	19	9.6
24/7 care nursing home	5	2.5	1	0.5	6	3.0

Table 3 Description of the sample (n = 197, % of total) in individuals; comorbidities and risk factors.

Comorbidities	Female (n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%	p-value*
Hypertension	60	30.5	50	25.4	110	55.8	
Heart failure	25	12.7	11	5.6	36	18.3	p = 0.044
Ischaemic heart disease	13	6.6	10	5.1	23	11.7	
Atrial fibrillation	37	18.8	24	12.2	61	31.0	
Respiratory condition	27	13.7	11	5.6	38	19.3	
Cancer	14	7.1	14	7.1	28	14.2	
Mental Health condition	9	4.6	9	4.6	18	9.1	
Dementia/memory disorder	25	12.7	9	4.6	34	17.3	p = 0.013
Diabetes	30	15.2	47	23.9	77	39.1	p < 0.001
Peripheral arterial disease	16	8.1	24	12.2	40	20.3	p = 0.042
Kidney malfunction	12	6.1	15	7.6	27	13.7	
Rheumatoid arthritis	15	7.6	6	3.0	21	10.7	p = 0.091
Liver malfunction	0	0.0	6	3.0	6	3.0	p = 0.007
Spinal stenosis	5	2.5	3	1.5	8	4.1	
Gout	3	1.5	8	4.1	11	5.6	p = 0.064
Haematological condition	5	2.5	6	3.0	11	5.6	
Chronic pain disorder	2	1.0	0	0.0	2	1.0	
Urinary condition	4	2.0	10	5.1	14	7.1	p = 0.045
Cerebrovascular disorder	15	7.6	13	6.6	28	14.2	
Dermatological disease	3	1.5	2	1.0	5	2.5	
Musculoskeletal disorder	21	10.7	7	3.6	28	14.2	p = 0.018
No comorbidities	3	1.5	4	2.0	7	3.6	
Risk factors	Female (n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%	p-value*
Previous wounds	46	23.4	50	25.4	96	48.7	
Previous DVT	9	4.6	1	0.5	10	5.1	p = 0.020
venous insufficiency	9	4.6	7	3.6	16	8.1	
chronic oedema	3	1.5	2	1.0	5	2.5	
chronic cellulitis	10	5.1	5	2.5	15	7.6	
previous amputation	4	2.0	1	0.5	5	2.5	
Smoking (n)	13	6.6	28	14.2	41	20.8	p = 0.001
Drug abuse	2	1.0	5	2.5	7	3.6	p = 0.010
Alcohol abuse	3	1.5	11	5.6	14	7.1	
Overweight (BMI 24–30)	59	29.9	62	31.5	121	61.4	
Obesity (BMI over 30)	26	13.2	29	14.7	55	27.9	
High cholesterol (diagnosis)	22	11.2	23	11.7	45	22.8	
LDL over 3.0	23	11.7	19	9.6	42	21.3	
Joint malformation	8	4.1	3	1.5	11	5.6	p = 0.010
Neuropathy (diagnostic coded)	8	4.1	18	9.1	26	13.2	p < 0.001
Neuropathy (monofilament test posit.)	32	16.2	54	27.4	86	43.7	
MRSA	2	1.0	6	3.0	8	4.1	p = 0.048

1						
2						
3	hemiplegia	2	1.0	2	1.0	4 2.0
4	HbA1c(n=153)					
5	Mean (SD)	43 (12.9)		49 (16.8)		46(15.1) p = 0.018~
6	Median (IQR)	40		43		41(37 - 52)
7	BMI(n=178)					
8	Mean(SD)	27.4 (8.2)		29.0 (6.2)		28 (7.4)
9	Median	26		28		26 (23 - 32)
10	fP-Kol-LDL(n=169)					
11	Mean(SD)	2.5 (0.83)		2.4 (0.86)		2.5 (0.84)
12	Median	2.4		2.3		2.4 (1.8-3.0)
13	fP-Gluk(n=193)					
14	Mean(SD)	6.0 (1.8)		7.3 (3.4)		6.6 (2.7) p = 00.1~
15	Median	5.8		6.7		5.9 (5.3-6.9)

*Pearsons chi-squared, difference between female and male patients

~One-way ANOVA test

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The majority of the patients were living at home (n = 172; 86.9%) either without any support (n = 130) or with home care (n = 42). The patients' living status is presented in Table 2. Almost half of the patients had had wounds earlier (48.7%). As regards comorbidities, 39.1% had diabetes, 11.7% ischemic heart disease, 17.3% memory disorders and 9.1% a mental health condition. Only 3.6% had no comorbidities. Overweight (61.4%), obesity (27.9%) and neuropathy (43.4%) were relatively common. Venous insufficiency or a previous deep venous thrombosis had been diagnosed in only 13.2%. As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4, the patients had several co-morbidities and heterogenous medications. Almost half of the patients used analgesics (44.7% NSAIDs or paracetamol and 15.2% opioids), whereas different psychopharmaceuticals were used by 11.7%–17.8% of the patients.

For peer review only

Table 4. Description of the sample (n = 197) in individuals; medication.

Medication	Female (n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%	chi-square
Cardiac and vessel medicine							
Anticoagulant	41	20.8	26	13.2	67	34.0	p = 0.164
Antithrombotic	29	14.7	28	14.2	57	28.9	
b-blocker	57	28.9	41	20.8	98	49.7	p = 0.018
Diuretic	45	22.8	32	16.2	77	39.1	
Ca-blocker	27	13.7	31	15.7	58	29.4	
ACE-blocker	38	19.3	47	23.9	85	43.1	
Statin	40	20.3	35	17.8	75	38.1	
Diabetes medicine							
Oral diabetes medicine	16	8.1	21	10.7	37	18.8	p = 0.134
Insulin	12	6.1	30	15.2	42	21.3	p < 0.001
Psychopharmaceuticals							
Dementia medicine	16	8.1	6	3.0	22	11.2	p = 0.066
Antidepressant	14	7.1	11	5.6	25	12.7	
Benzodiazepine	13	6.6	10	5.1	23	11.7	p = 0.135
Sleeping pills	23	11.7	12	6.1	35	17.8	
Analgesia(mild)	57	28.9	31	15.7	88	44.7	p = 0.008
Opiates	18	9.1	12	6.1	30	15.2	
Immune system medicine							
Cancer medicine	2	1.0	3	1.5	5	2.5	p = 0.124
Immunosuppressive	11	5.6	4	2.0	15	7.6	
Cortisone per oral	12	6.1	4	2.0	16	8.1	p = 0.083
Cortisone cream	4	2.0	0	0.0	4	2.0	p = 0.064
Supplements							
Thyroxin	16	8.1	3	1.5	19	9.6	p = 0.006
Ca-supplement	46	23.4	16	8.1	62	31.5	p < 0.001
Folic acid	7	3.6	3	1.5	10	5.1	
B12-supplement	11	5.6	12	6.1	23	11.7	p = 0.013
Vitamin D suppl.	44	22.3	22	11.2	66	33.5	
Nutrition suppl.	6	3.0	2	1.0	8	4.1	
Mg suppl.	7	3.6	4	2.0	11	5.6	
K suppl.	11	5.6	9	4.6	20	10.2	
Other							
Inhaler/nebulizer	26	13.2	16	8.1	42	21.3	p = 0.030
Proton pump inhibitor	39	19.8	20	10.2	59	29.9	
Urine medicine	8	4.1	12	6.1	20	10.2	p = 0.190
Skin cream	19	9.6	10	5.1	20	10.2	

Diagnostics

Forty-two (21.3%) patients were not seen by a primary care physician before they visited the wound care team, meaning that the diagnostic process was not even started before this visit. Of the 155 patients who had been seen by a physician prior to the wound care team, 129 (83.2%) had a recorded diagnosis code (ICD-10), while 26 (16.8%) patients remained undiagnosed. Thus, 34.5% of the patients (n = 68) received their first diagnosis by the wound care team.

Out of the patients who were seen by a primary care physician, 85 (58.8%) had no delay (median 0 days), meaning that the patients visited an emergency room and were seen by a physician immediately. The diagnoses for these patients mainly comprised infectious wounds (n = 30, 35.3%) and wounds with no specific cause (n = 21, 24.7%), while a diagnostic code was not recorded for 10.6% (n = 9). Hence, 15 patients had traumatic wounds and saw the physician at an acute appointment.

Of those patients who saw a primary care physician (n = 155), 36.2% (n = 56) had clinical signs of infection according to the patient records. However, as many as 94 (60.6%) patients were treated with antibiotics, and 82 (52.9%) had a bacterial swab taken.

Of the 129 patients who had a diagnosis before the first appointment with the wound care team, the same diagnosis was made by the team and the primary care physician in 59 (45.7%) of the cases. The concordant diagnoses most often entailed pressure ulcers, infectious ulcers, as well as venous and post-traumatic ulcers. Specialist care was received by 111(%) patients. The same diagnosis (ICD-10) was made by all three points in the clinical pathway in only 24 (12.2%) cases, and the majority of these comprised infectious ulcers, followed by a venous aetiology and wounds without a specific diagnosis. (Table 5.)

Table 5. Differentiation of the diagnoses when they remained unchanged or were revised over the clinical pathway.

Categorised diagnostic groups	Diagnoses that remained unchanged...			Diagnoses that were revised.	
	within primary care	throughout the entire clinical pathway	by wound care team and specialist care	Primary care physician's diagnosis	Wound care team physician's diagnosis
Arterial wound	0	0	16	4	7
Venous or oedematous ulcer	13	5	17	2	24
Diabetic foot ulcer	2	1	13	2	11
Pressure ulcer	11	3	9	1	8
Post-traumatic wound	15	3	3	0	2
Atypical wound	0	0	7	0	4
Mixed-aetiology wound	0	0	2	0	3
Infectious wound	10	8	9	32	1
Foot malformation or pressure ulcer	0	0	1	0	5
Wound of unspecified aetiology	8	4	6	27	3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Of the patients who visited a specialist, the same diagnosis was made by the wound care team physician and the specialist in 75.5% of the cases (Table 5 and 6). The concordant diagnoses most often comprised diabetic foot ulcers (20.5%), arterial ulcers (19.3%) and venous or oedematous ulcers (15.7%). In the remaining 24.6% (n = 27) of the patients, the diagnosis made by the wound care team was revised in specialist care, mostly comprising arterial ulcers (40.7%) that were usually referred for further investigations with a suspicion of an arterial wound. The ulcers that turned out to be arterial wounds were diagnosed by the wound care team as diabetic foot ulcers (14.8%), wounds of mixed aetiology (18.5%), foot malformations (14.8%) and oedematous ulcers (37.0%).

Post-traumatic wounds were categorised into one category. In the primary care setting, there were 16 post-traumatic ulcers, 15 of which were assessed in the emergency room (ER).

Table 6. Diagnostic differentiation through the treatment pathway.

	The same diagnosis~ throughout entire treatment pathway	The same diagnosis within primary care~~	The same diagnosis by wound care team and specialist
1 = the same	24	60	83
0 = different	47	67	27
total	71	127	110
% of diagnosed*^ patients	21,8	47,6	75,5
% of 197 (whole sample)	12,2	30,5	42,1

~ treatment pathway: primary care physician, wound care team (physician) and specialist care.

~~primary care physician and wound care team (physician)

*155 patients visited a doctor in primary care before the appointment with the wound care team, but only 126 patients were diagnosed.

^110 patients were diagnosed in specialist care.

Delays

The median time from wound appearance to the first health care contact was 2 days (IQR 0–14 days, range 0–351 days) and from wound appearance to the first evaluation by a physician 8 days (IQR 1–32 days, range 0–314 days). The majority of the patients had their first health care contact at the emergency department where a physician also examined the patient, or at the district nurse's office at a health centre with the possibility of an immediate physician's consultation. The median time from the onset of the wound to the first wound care team appointment was 57 days (IQR 33–100 days, range 2–358 days). The median time between the first health care contact and the wound care team appointment was 41 days (IQR 22–80 days: range 1–484 days). Only one in three patients (n = 61) had an organisational delay of less than 4 weeks between the first contact with health services and the appointment with the wound care team.

Half of the patients (n = 113, 57.4%) were referred to a secondary health care unit to be seen by a specialist, most often by a vascular surgeon (n = 67), followed by a plastic surgeon (n = 43) and a dermatologist (n = 13). Twenty-one (18.6%) patients were referred to two or more specialists. The median delay from the first appointment with the wound care team to the appointment with the secondary health care specialist was 21 days (IQR 8–55, min–max -58–235; range 293 days).

The median time from the appearance of the wound to the final diagnosis was 57 days (IQR 33–101; min–max 2–358; range 356 days).

The delays in different the subgroups are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Delays in different subgroups. Figures are presented as medians (IQR; Min–Max; Range)

Delays are calculated and analysed with the inclusion criterion 'wound appearance within 365 days prior to wound care team appointment'.

	n	Wound appearance - first contact to health care	Wound appearance to first physician evaluation	Wound appearance to wound care team	Delay from first contact to wound care team (organizational delay within primary care)	Delay Wound care team to specialist care	Mann-Whitney-U
All patients	182	2 (0–14;0–351;351)	8(1–32;0–314;314)	57(33–101;2–358;356)	42(22–80;1–484;483)	21(7–52;-58–252;414)	
Male	81	3 (0–24;0–351;351)	9(1–37;0–314;314)	69(37–111;2–358;356)*	44(23–85;2–484;482)	23(3–48;-58–235;293)	*p = 0.058
Female	101	1 (0–8;0–295;295)	8(1–24;0–295;295)	54(30–96;2–306;304)*	41(22–76;1–264;263)	20(8–58;0–176;176)	
Age under 65 y (1)	46	6 (1–27;0–298;298)*	9(3–30;0–142;142)	62(36–100;11–320;309)	37(22–76;6–382;376)	28(14–48;1–182;181)	*1 vs 2; p = 0.005
Age 65–80 y (2)	62	0 (0–14;0–258;258)*	10(0–38;0–314;314)	61(41–106;10–337;327)	49(25–88;4–264;260)	16(2–50;0–235;235)	*1 vs 3; p = 0.003
Age over 80 y (3)	74	1 (0–8;0–351;351)*	7(1–32;0–295;295)	53,5(30–98;2–358;356)	40(22–78;1–484;483)	16(6–56;-58–167;225)	
DM+	72	1 (0–15;0–142;142)	10(1–37;0–142;142)	59(36–102;2–324;322)	45(26–75;2–245;243)	14(3–48;0–235;235)	no statistical difference
DM-	110	2 (0–13;0–351;351)	7(1–32;0–314;314)	56(31–101;4–358;354)	40(22–84;1–482;483)	26(8–56;-58–167;225)	
Living at home	160	2 (0–15;0–351;351)	9(1–33;0–314;314)	57(33–102;2–358;356)	42(22–83;1–382;381)	20(5–48;0–235;235)*	*p = 0.010
Living in institution	22	1 (0–8;0–295;295)	3(0–14;0–295;295)	55(34–86;7–306;299)	43(24–72;7–484;477)	56(16–143;-58–176;234)*	
Walking; outdoors	134	3 (0–15;0–351;351)*	8(1–27;0–246;246)	56(33–97;4–358;354)	40(22–76;1–382;381)	22(6–56;-58–235;293)	*p = 0.047
Not-walking; staying indoors	48	0 (0–5;0–298;298)	9(1–55;0–314;314)	71(33–108;2–337;335)	54(24–94;2–484;482)	16(7–46;0–182;182)	
Delay before wound care team under 28 days	61	6 (0–20;0–351;351)*	7(3–24;0–295;295)	26(19–41;2–358;356)*	18(12–22;1–28;27)	22(4–42;0–167;167)	*p < 0.001
Delay before wound care team over 28 days	121	0 (0–8;0–258;258)	9(0–34;0–314;314)	73(51–112;29–337;308)	70(42–101;29–484;455)	20(7–55;-58–235;293)	
Unchanged diagnosis (PC–WT–spec.)	20	3 (2–12;0–246;246)	7(3–19;0–246;246)	51(32–80;5–267;262)	35(20–74;2–186;184)	23(8–45;0–89;89)	
Different diagnosis	43	1 (0–17;0–258;258)	8(0–42;0–314;314)	71(37–111;4–337;333)	57(30–89;1–245;244)	18(7–98;0–235;235)	
The same DG within primary care	55	2 (0–7;0–246;246)	3(1–18;0–246;246)	52(31–78;5–267;262)*	40(20–71;2–186;184)	33(9–56;0–176;176)	*p=0.042
Different DG	61	1 (0–24;0–258;258)	17(1–56;0–314;314)	73(37–126;4–337;333)	53(31–98;1–245;244)	15(7–64;0–235;235)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Discussion

It is well-known that an early diagnosis of the underlying cause of a chronic wound is essential for wound healing and for avoiding amputations (8, 16, 17). However, there are only a few studies

1
2
3 describing the importance of wound diagnosis and the deleterious effects of diagnostic delays (18-
4 20). In the current study, we investigated the diagnostic processes and delays in wound care in the
5 Helsinki area. The patients' first contact with health care services after wound appearance was
6 prompt, the median delay being only 2 days. In stark contrast, it took 57 days from the appearance
7 of the wound before the patient was seen by the wound care team for the first time. In our
8 material, only 31.0% of the patients visited the wound care team within 4 weeks of the first health
9 care appointment. This caused a significant delay in reaching the correct diagnosis of the wound.
10 We also discovered that only 65.5% of all patients had a recorded wound diagnosis before the first
11 wound care team appointment and that this diagnosis matched the final diagnosis in
12 approximately 50% of the cases. Accordingly, in European countries, the delay in diagnosing
13 diabetic foot ulcers (DFU) was over 3 weeks in 21%–34% of the patients. The shortest average
14 time from event to diagnosis was 10 days in the UK, 14 days in Spain and France, and 20 days in
15 Germany. (12)

16
17
18
19
20
21 In Finland, wound patients are evaluated and treated mainly during primary care appointments,
22 including home care and nursery homes (21). In the mentioned European countries, the health
23 care professionals who participate in the diagnostic process vary considerably. In the UK, only 6%
24 of GPs completely agreed that the care and management of DFUs is the GP's responsibility, and
25 22% did not diagnose DFUs. Instead, in 27% of the cases, district nurses made the diagnosis. In the
26 UK, the approach seems more often to be multidisciplinary, as 49% of the GPs referred patients to
27 a podiatrist if needed. In all four countries, GPs were able to refer DFU patients to specialised
28 multidisciplinary clinics. (22)

29
30
31
32 In the UK, DFUs were diagnosed by a GP in only 45% of the cases, and most of the wounds were
33 diagnosed by a district nurse or practice nurse (12).

34
35
36
37
38
39 The optimal treatment pathways for wound patients include patient surveillance and an early
40 detection of wound healing problems. Errors in the pathway may lead to delays and,
41 consequently, even fatal errors, such as amputations, in some patients. (17)

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 We took a closer look at the ICD-10 codes assessed by the primary care physicians, wound care
57 team physician and specialists and found that they differed from each other significantly. This
58 highlights the complexity of wound diagnostics. Surprisingly, only 12.2% of the patients had the
59 same diagnosis throughout the whole pathway of care, and these mostly comprised infectious
60 wounds. Based on our data, we assume that there was a significant overdiagnosis of infections in
primary care, since an infectious wound was diagnosed in 32.6% of the cases and antibiotics were
prescribed for 63.2% of the patients in the primary care setting. Similar results have been obtained
in Sweden, where the use of a national wound register diminished the use of antibiotics (24).
Evidence of difficulties in the diagnostics of wound infections is also found in a study of GPs
recognising and treating wound infections – according to the results, GPs mostly desired further
knowledge about when to start or stop treatment (81%–82%), about topical antimicrobials (80%–
68%) and about when to prescribe antibiotics (82%–95%) (24).

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 when an ischaemic wound was suspected. This problem is also detected in a multi-centre study
4 performed in four European countries. The researchers found that, even though GPs described
5 neuropathy and peripheral arterial disease as cofactors in the DFU development, they investigated
6 DFUs with additional tests in only half of the cases; this entailed monofilament tests in 21%–43%
7 and, more often, pulse palpation or the measurement of the ankle brachial index in 78%–90% of
8 the cases, but diabetic foot infection (DFI) was tested in only 7%–20% of the investigated cases.
9
10
11 (11)

12
13 Our main finding was that there was an organisational delay in reaching a timely diagnosis. The
14 time between wound appearance and the first contact with a physician was adequate, the median
15 being 8 days, and two-thirds (58.8%, n = 85) of the patients had their first evaluation at the first
16 contact with health services. This means that a physician's examination was mostly available at the
17 emergency room or as a rapid consultation during a nurse's appointment at the health centre.
18 However, our study shows that, among these patients, the initial physician's evaluation very
19 seldom leads to a correct diagnosis and treatment.
20
21
22

23 Regarding wound patients, emergency room assessment should include the three most important
24 and acute aetiologies, such as infection, ischaemia and diabetes (25), but otherwise the
25 emergency room might not be the optimal setting for diagnosing wounds.
26
27

28 Post-traumatic ulcers could be a subgroup of oedematous leg ulcers due to the same management
29 approach, namely compression therapy, which should be assessed immediately after
30 vascular/arterial causes have been ruled out. Hence, according to the present data, oedematous
31 and post-traumatic ulcers accounted for 40.6% of all the ulcers and were treated with
32 compression.
33
34

35 We found that the wound diagnostic process was good enough in the wound care team, as the
36 diagnosis did not change for 75.5% of the patients who were referred by the team to specialist
37 care. In the remaining 24.5%, in whom the diagnosis made by a specialist differed from the
38 diagnosis made by the wound care team, the final diagnosis was confirmed using diagnostic tools
39 that were not available in the health centre. In these cases, however, the wound care team often
40 had a default diagnosis to base the referral on, and specialist care then responded to this idea,
41 most often leading to the correct treatment. Indeed, the referral was very useful for these
42 patients.
43
44
45

46 On the other hand, there were ordinary delays in receiving a specialist evaluation, as the median
47 delay was 21 days, where the largest differences were between the subgroups of patients living in
48 institutions and those living at home. This might be explained by the advance care planning among
49 nursing home residents. However, previous studies propose delays of less than two weeks in
50 diagnosing arterial ulcers and DFUs to avoid leg losses (17).
51
52

53 Previous studies suggest that diagnostic errors are often preceded by common symptoms,
54 followed by common diagnoses (26, 27). Studies have shown that the most frequent error is
55 "premature closure", meaning 'the tendency to stop considering other possibilities after reaching
56 a diagnosis' (28, 29). In the UK, diagnosis- and assessment-related incidents were the highest
57 causes of patient harm (26). As a conclusion, the ability to utilise differential diagnostic methods is
58
59
60

1
2
3 key when diagnosing wound aetiologies. There is always a danger of diagnosing a wound
4 incorrectly, if possibilities to perform differential diagnostics are lacking (19, 27).
5

6
7 As a solution, a broader range of differential diagnostic possibilities as regards the origin of the
8 wound would probably help in the first evaluation and in avoiding diagnostic error and delay in the
9 treatment (30-31). One practical tool to tackle these diagnostic challenges could be the use of
10 checklists (32-34). It has been determined in other contexts that there are tools for avoiding fatal
11 errors in differential diagnostics, such as existing guidelines and, to be regarded with a grain of
12 salt, electronic aids in decision making (35-37)
13
14

15 **Limitations**

16
17 The limitations of this study are related to the variety of aetiologies behind chronic wounds. There
18 are no generally agreed-upon diagnostic codes to be used for chronic wounds, and the
19 differentiation potential is enormous. Most often wounds are coded as merely a wound of
20 unspecified aetiology (L97, L98), or they are S-coded, which refers to a traumatic wound.
21 Therefore, it is difficult to define when a diagnosis is correct or not.
22
23

24
25 Outliers also constituted a limitation of the study, as we could not include them in the data
26 analysis. Some patients in the material had suffered from a wound for several years. Despite this,
27 they were referred to the wound care team when it was established in 2013. In our delay analyses,
28 we tried to avoid this bias by selecting patients whose wounds had appeared less than one year
29 prior to the appointment with the wound care team.
30

31 **Conclusion**

32
33 It seems that the diagnostic delay of wound patients occurs within primary care. It is an
34 organisational delay and causes patient harm, as the patients are not receiving a timely and
35 correct diagnosis and treatment. Infectious wounds seem to be easy to detect, but there is a risk
36 of overdiagnosis, leading to an overuse of antibiotics. However, primary care physicians seem to
37 pay little attention to distinguishing arterial insufficiency or diabetic foot ulcers (DFU).
38
39

40
41 The delay before seeing a primary care physician was not substantial, but the physicians'
42 differential diagnostic approaches did not cover peripheral arterial disease or diabetic foot ulcers.
43 Consequently, the delay before being seen by the wound care team was over one month, which is
44 a long time when treating diabetic foot ulcers, especially those of vascular origin.
45

46
47 Based on our results, we propose that it is possible to arrange an optimal treatment pathway
48 within a primary care setting, where a holistic wound care process is initiated, provided that there
49 is organisational support, knowledge, skills and a multidisciplinary team available. It has been
50 demonstrated that such an approach does not even require any additional resources, but rather a
51 rearrangement of the patient care (16, 38). We also suggest that the specialist care clinics could
52 play a supportive role in the treatment of complex wounds, while the primary care system could
53 take responsibility for the holistic wound care.
54
55

56
57 **Ethics:** Not applicable/No human participants included.

58
59 **Contributorship statement:**
60

1
2
3 Kirsti Ahmajärvi is the responsible guarantor of content and has contributed to the planning,
4 conduct, and reporting of the work described in the article.
5

6 Kirsi Isoherranen has contributed to the planning and reporting of the work described in this
7 article.
8

9 Maarit Venermo has contributed to the following parts in this study: Design of the study, data
10 analysis and interpretation, revisions to scientific content of the manuscript, review and editing of
11 the final manuscript.
12
13

14 The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no
15 others meeting the criteria have been omitted.
16

17 **Competing interest:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form
18 at Helsinki and declare: Kirsi Isoherranen and Maarit Venermo has no support from any
19 organisation for the submitted work, Kirsti Ahmajärvi has received a working grant from the
20 University of Helsinki, The Finnish Wound Association and The Finnish Association for General
21 Practice. ; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the
22 submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear
23 to have influenced the submitted work.
24
25
26
27

28 **Funding:** Kirsti Ahmajärvi has received a personal working grant from the University of Helsinki,
29 The Finnish Wound Association and The Finnish Association for General Practice. This research
30 received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit
31 sectors.
32
33

34 **Data sharing statement:** Data is not available in any system for data sharing.
35
36
37

38 **References:**


- 39 1. Lindholm C, Searle R. Wound management for the 21st century: combining effectiveness
40 and efficiency. *Int Wound J.* 2016;13:5-15.
- 41 2. Phillips CJ, Humphreys I, Fletcher J et al. Estimating the costs associated with the
42 management of patients with chronic wounds using linked routine data. *Int Wound*
43 *J.* 2016;13(6):1193-7.
- 44 3. Guest JF, Ayoub N, McIlwraith T et al. Health economic burden that different wound types
45 impose on the UK's National Health Service. *Int Wound J.* 2017;14(2):322-30.
- 46 4. Guest JF, Fuller GW, Vowden P. Cohort study evaluating the burden of wounds to the UK's
47 National Health Service in 2017/2018: update from 2012/2013. *BMJ open.* 2020;10(12):e045253-e.
- 48 5. Sen CK. Human Wound and Its Burden: Updated 2020 Compendium of Estimates. *Adv*
49 *Wound Care (New Rochelle).* 2021;10(5):281-92.
- 50 6. Herber OR, Schnepf W, Rieger MA. A systematic review on the impact of leg ulceration on
51 patients' quality of life. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2007;5:44.
- 52 7. Green J, Jester R, McKinley R et al. The impact of chronic venous leg ulcers: a systematic
53 review. *J Wound Care.* 2014;23(12):601-12.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
8. Mooij MC, Huisman LC. Chronic leg ulcer: does a patient always get a correct diagnosis and adequate treatment? *Phlebology*. 2016;31(1 Suppl):68-73.
9. Dean S. Leg ulcers - causes and management. *Aust Fam Physician*. 2006;35(7):480-4.
10. Atkin L, Bućko Z, Conde Montero E et al. Implementing TIMERS: the race against hard-to-heal wounds. *J Wound Care*. 2019;23(Sup3a):S1-s50.
11. Garcia-Klepzig JL, Sánchez-Ríos JP, Manu C et al. Perception of diabetic foot ulcers among general practitioners in four European countries: knowledge, skills and urgency. *J Wound Care*. 2018;27(5):310-9.
12. Sánchez-Ríos JP, García-Klepzig JL, Manu C et al. Referral of patients with diabetic foot ulcers in four European countries: patient follow-up after first GP visit. *J Wound Care*. 2019;28(Sup8):S4-s14.
13. Sheikh A, Donaldson L, Dhingra-Kumar N et al. Diagnostic Errors: *Technical Series on Safer Primary Care*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO2016.
14. Kostopoulou O, Delaney BC, Munro CW. Diagnostic difficulty and error in primary care--a systematic review. *Fam Pract*. 2008;25(6):400-13.
15. Irving G, Neves AL, Dambha-Miller H et al. International variations in primary care physician consultation time: a systematic review of 67 countries. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(10):e017902.
16. Laakso M, Honkasalo M, Kiiski J et al. Re-organizing inpatient care saves legs in patients with diabetic foot infections. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*. 2017;125:39-46.
17. Noronen K, Saarinen E, Albäck A et al. Analysis of the Elective Treatment Process for Critical Limb Ischaemia with Tissue Loss: Diabetic Patients Require Rapid Revascularisation. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2017;53(2):206-13.
18. Walker CM, Bunch FT, Cavros NG et al. Multidisciplinary approach to the diagnosis and management of patients with peripheral arterial disease. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2015;10:1147-53.
19. Eliassen A, Vandy F, McHugh J et al. Marjolin's ulcer in a patient with chronic venous stasis. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2013;27(8):1182.e5-8.
20. Janowska A, Oranges T, Chiricozzi A et al. Synergism of Therapies After Postoperative Autograft Failure in a Patient With Melanoma of the Foot Misdiagnosed as a Pressure Ulcer. *Wounds*. 2018;30(4):E41-e3.
21. Ahmajärvi KM, Isoherranen KM, Mäkelä A et al. A change in the prevalence and the etiological factors of chronic wounds in Helsinki metropolitan area during 2008-2016. *Int Wound J*. 2019;16(2):522-6.
22. Manu C, Lacopi E, Bouillet B et al. Delayed referral of patients with diabetic foot ulcers across Europe: patterns between primary care and specialised units. *J Wound Care*. 2018;27(3):186-92.
23. Oien RF, Forssell HW. Ulcer healing time and antibiotic treatment before and after the introduction of the Registry of Ulcer Treatment: an improvement project in a national quality registry in Sweden. *BMJ open*. 2013;3(8):e003091-e.
24. Woo KY. Physicians' knowledge and attitudes in the management of wound infection. *Int Wound J*. 2016;13(5):600-4.
25. Salava A, Isoherranen K. Rule of three I's: a mnemonic aid in undergraduate teaching of lower limb wounds. *J Wound Care*. 2021;30(12):1030.
26. Carson-Stevens A, Hibbert P, Williams H, Evans HP, Cooper A, Rees P, et al. Health Services and Delivery Research. Characterising the nature of primary care patient safety incident reports in the England and Wales National Reporting and Learning System: a mixed-methods agenda-setting study for general practice. Southampton (UK): *NIHR Journals Library*.2016.

- 1
2
3 27. Ely JW, Kaldjian LC, D'Alessandro DM. Diagnostic errors in primary care: lessons learned. *J*
4 *Am Board Fam Med*. 2012;25(1):87-97.
5 28. Norman GR, Eva KW. Diagnostic error and clinical reasoning. *Med Educ*. 2010;44(1):94-100.
6 29. Graber ML, Franklin N, Gordon R. Diagnostic error in internal medicine. *Arch Intern Med*.
7 2005;165(13):1493-9.
8 30. Schiff GD, Hasan O, Kim S et al. Diagnostic error in medicine: analysis of 583 physician-
9 reported errors. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169(20):1881-7.
10 31. Maude J. Differential diagnosis: the key to reducing diagnosis error, measuring diagnosis
11 and a mechanism to reduce healthcare costs. *Diagnosis (Berl)*. 2014;1(1):107-9.
12 32. Snyder RJ, Jensen J, Applewhite AJ et al. A Standardized Approach to Evaluating Lower
13 Extremity Chronic Wounds Using a Checklist. *Wounds*. 2019;31(5 Suppl):S29-s44.
14 33. Kapp S, Santamaria N. The "self-treatment of wounds for venous leg ulcers checklist"
15 (STOW-V Checklist V1.0): Part 1-Development, pilot and refinement of the checklist. *Int Wound J*.
16 2022;19(3):705-713.
17 34. Wiseman JT, Fernandes-Taylor S, Gunter R et al. Inter-rater agreement and checklist
18 validation for postoperative wound assessment using smartphone images in vascular surgery. *J*
19 *Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2016;4(3):320-8.e2.
20 35. Bond WF, Schwartz LM, Weaver KR et al. Differential diagnosis generators: an evaluation of
21 currently available computer programs. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2012;27(2):213-9.
22 36. Riches N, Panagioti M, Alam R et al. The Effectiveness of Electronic Differential Diagnoses
23 (DDX) Generators: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(3):e0148991.
24 37. El-Kareh R, Hasan O, Schiff GD. Use of health information technology to reduce diagnostic
25 errors. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2013;22 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):ii40-ii51.
26 38. Sanders AP, Stoeldraaijers LG, Pero MW et al. Patient and professional delay in the referral
27 trajectory of patients with diabetic foot ulcers. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2013;102(2):105-11.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Figure 1

Diagnoses by the primary care physician



N = 155 patients visited primary care physician

Diagnoses by the wound care team physician



N = 197 patients visited the wound care team physician

Supplementary Table 1. Diagnostic codes included in the 10 chosen diagnostic categories.

Category	no.	ICD-10 codes
Arterial wound	1	I70.2, L97, E10.4, E11, E11.7, E11.5, E11.4, M10, R60, S91.1, S81.8
Venous or oedematous ulcer	2	S81.8, S81.2, R60, R60.9, L97, I83, I83.0, I83.2, I87.2, I89.0, I88.0, R66+R60+L97
Diabetic ulcer	3	E11 + L97, E11.7+L97, E11.5, M20.2, M20.4, S92.5, E11.4+L97, E11.8+L97+I70.2, E11.7+S91.3, E11.5+L97, E11+G30.1, E10.7+L97, E10.6+M14.2+L97, N08.39*E11.2+L97, E10+L97, E10.6+R02+L07, E11.2+L97, E10.4+L97
Pressure ulcer	4	L89, G58.7 + L97, I69.3+L89+L97
Post-traumatic wound	5	S80, T22, S81, S81.1, T24.4, T24.0, S81.8, S81.0, S81.8, T93.0, S91.0, S51.9, S01.1
Atypical wound	6	C44.75, C44.72, S01.3, D23.2, L90.5, T95.2, L88, K42.9, S31.3, T09.1
Mixed aetiology	7	I70.2+L97+I83, I70.2+R60+L97, T33.5+M86, T33.4+M86, I87.2+I70.2+E11.7+L97
Infectious wound	8	L02.4, L02, L02.3, L02.9, L03, L05.0, A46, L08.8, L08, L08.9, L05, L05.0, L05.9, L00, T79.3, A49.9, M86.6+L89, L30, L72, L72.0, L72.1, K61.0, K60.3, K60
Foot malformation/pressure	9	L97, L89, I70.2 +L97, L97+M10, M05.9+L89
Wound of unspecified aetiology	10	S71.0, S82.3, S91.3, S91.0, S91, S81.3, S81, S81.9, L97, S86.0, M71.1, S41.1, T13.1, L98.4, T93.0, T81.4, T81.3

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No.	Recommendation	Page No.	Relevant text from manuscript
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	5	A cohort study
Introduction				
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5	Chronic wounds pose a significant burden to health care, both to the patients and to the system. Diagnostic process begins from primary care, and there should be timely diagnostic processes for patients suffering from a wound
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5	We analysed delay in the treatment of patients with chronic wounds and analyzed also the diagnostic process among wound patients. Furthermore, we evaluated the impact of a special wound care team within primary care on this process
Methods				
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6	A cohort was collected
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6	A cohort was collected in April-September 2016, in Helsinki health care centre at first visit to a wound care team and included

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

				197 consecutive patients. The patient records were analysed both backwards and onwards for data collection. Data collection included onset of the wound until endpoint which was healing. Diagnostic delays were recorded by collecting the dates of first visit in the health services, wound care team and specialist care and by collecting the diagnosis found from the patient record.
Participants	6	<p>(a) <i>Cohort study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls</p> <p><i>Cross-sectional study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants</p>	6	<p>Criteria: Patients suffering for a chronic wound and sent to a wound care team consultation within primary care at their first visit there. Follow-up from patient records as well as gathering the data backwards from the patient records until the onset of the wound. Additionally, demographic data, the number of visits to health care and earlier examinations were collected. The diagnoses set at the first visit, at the wound care team and at the specialist care visit were compared.</p>
		<p>(b) <i>Cohort study</i>—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed</p>		

<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case				
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6	For delay article we examined the dates and diagnostic codes of each visit for a physician in the health care system throughout the clinical treatment path. We examined how the ICD-codes differentiated between physicians' and which diagnostic procedures and tests or treatment was used to determine the correct diagnosis.
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6	Data collected from the patient records.
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8	Potential bias is the variation of the diagnostic codes, ICD-10, as the diagnostic procedures varied remarkably. We have explained in the article how we decided the date of the correct diagnosis. Also outliers constitute a possible bias. Some had been suffering from a wound for years and/or the wound never healed.
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6	We collected 197 patients: No power estimates have been done.

Continued on next page

1					
2	Quantitative	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which	6	We removed patients who had
3	variables		groupings were chosen and why		wounds over 365 days prior the
4					wound care team visit from the
5					delay analyses, but included them
6					in the descriptive analyses for basic
7					demography.
8					
9	Statistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	11,19	We were using SPSS for statistical
10	methods				analysis. Descriptives and
11					Frequencies, Explore, Means were
12					used. Two-Independent Samples
13					Test were used.
14					
15					
16			(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	11,19	Two-Independent Samples Test
17					were used, (Mann-Whitney-U test)
18					when comparing the subgroups and
19					differences in delays between them
20					and Pearsons chii-square and
21					ANOVA-tests when comparing
22					subgroups of male and female in
23					background descriptives
24					
25					
26			(c) Explain how missing data were addressed		Not much missing data. We
27					analysed the groups and removed
28					the outliers from delay analyses.
29					
30			(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed		No loss to follow-up
31			Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed		
32			Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling		
33			strategy		
34					
35			(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses		
36					
37	Results				
38	Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined	8	197 patients included in the study
39			for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed		182 patients in the delay analyses
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					

		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6	Excluded from the delay analyses patients which had onset of the wound over 365 days prior the wound care team visit.
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram		
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-11,13	Characteristic are found in the table 1–3
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	11	Missing data: fP-Gluk n=4, HbA1c n=44, LDL n=28, BMI n=19, ABI primary care n=179, ABI wound care team n=86
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)		Follow-up from the first visit in the wound care team for until wound healing or 365days.
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	18,19	Delays are presented in Median days (IQR;Min-Max;Range) Patient-related delay 2(0-14;0-351;351), From onset of the wound to first physician evaluation 8(1-32;0-314;314), From onset of the wound to wound care team(diagnostic delay) 57(33-101;2-358;356), From the first contact to wound care team(organizational delay) 42(22-80;1-484;483) wound care team to specialist 21(7-52;-58-252;414)
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure		
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	18,19	Median patient-related delay was 2 days (IQR 0-14), physicians' first evaluation 8 days(1-32), wound care team 57days (33-101) Organizational delay from first contact to health services to diagnosis was 42 days(22-80)
<hr/>				
<i>(b)</i> Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized				
<hr/>				
<i>(c)</i> If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period				
<hr/>				

Continued on next page

1				
2	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	14
3				
4				21.3% out of 197 were not seen by
5				primary care physician. Of those
6				who met the physician, the
7				diagnosis was recorded in 129
8				cases. The diagnosis was consistent
9				with the diagnosis of the wound
10				care team was in 59 cases.
11	Discussion			
12	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	21
13				Key results are: the delay for
14				correct diagnosis is median 57 days
15				from the onset of the wound,
16				whereas optimate wound diagnosis
17				should occur in 14 days.
18				The delay is organizational (and
19				diagnostical) since the first
20				physician contact is median 8 days
21				from the onset of the wound and
22				there was a minimum patient-
23				related delay.
24				
25				
26	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	23
27				The same as in Bias- section.
28				Also one limitation might be
29				selection bias, when all patients are
30				sent to a consultation. Additionally,
31				there was not a comparison group
32				(patients with chronic wounds and
33				not possibilities for a wound care
34				team consultation/before the
35				establishment of the team).
36				
37	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	23
38				This study describes the diagnostic
39				processes and delays of patients
40				with wounds in Helsinki
41				
42				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

				metropolitan area. Our conclusion and suggestion is, that it is beneficial to organize wound care teams in the firstline in the primary care to detect as soon as possible the wounds and to start optimal care for these patients. Avoiding delays and erroneous diagnosis is essential in avoiding patient harm and costs.
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	23	This study provides a model for the primary care; how to make wound care safer for the patients with a little effort, team education, re-organization and support from the specialist care. Similar teams could be arranged anywhere in primary care.
Other information				
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	24	Funding is for Kirsti Ahmajärvi , responsible author, from the University of Helsinki to work some months as PhD Student(“out-of office”-vacations for studies) Also Grants for a couple of months from non-profital organizations to support the PhD work (“out-of office”-vacations supports) The Finnish Wound Association and The Finnish Association for General Practice

1
2 *Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.
3

4 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE
5 checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
6 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

For peer review only

BMJ Open

A Cohort Study of Diagnostic Delay in the Clinical Pathway of Patients with Chronic Wounds in the Primary Care Setting

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062673.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Aug-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Ahmajärvi, Kirsti; Helsinki University Central Hospital, Doctoral Programme in Populational Health and Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care Isoherranen, K; Helsinki University Central Hospital, Dermatological Department Venermo, M; Helsinki University Central Hospital, Vascular surgery Department
Primary Subject Heading:	Diagnostics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Diabetes and endocrinology, Dermatology, General practice / Family practice, Medical education and training, Surgery
Keywords:	WOUND MANAGEMENT, VASCULAR SURGERY, Diabetic foot < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PRIMARY CARE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 Title page
4
5
6

7 A Cohort Study of Diagnostic Delay in the Clinical Pathway of Patients with Chronic Wounds in the
8 Primary Care Setting
9

10 Authors:
11

- 12 1. Kirsti Ahmajärvi, MD, PhD Student, Specialist in General Practice, Special Competence in
13 Wound Management
- 14 2. Kirsi Isoherranen, MD, PhD, Specialist in Dermatology and Allergology, Special Competence
15 in Wound Management
- 16 3. Maarit Venermo, MD, PhD, Professor of Vascular Surgery
17
18

19 Address and position of each author:
20

21 University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 4, 00014 University of Helsinki
22

23
24 1. K Ahmajärvi, MD, PhD Student, Specialist in General Practice, University of Helsinki, Doctoral
25 Programme in Populational Health and Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care,
26 University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland. Helsinki University
27 Hospital, P.O. Box 250, 00029 Helsinki
28

29
30 2. K Isoherranen, MD, PhD, Specialist of Dermatology and Allergology, Skin and Allergy Hospital,
31 Meilahdentie 2, 00029 HUS, Finland.
32

33
34 3. M Venermo, MD, PhD, Vascular Surgeon, Professor of Vascular Surgery, Head of the
35 Department, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Haartmaninkatu 4, 00290
36 Helsinki, Finland
37

38 Affiliations:
39

40 1. K Ahmajärvi, MD, PhD Student, University of Helsinki, Doctoral Programme in Populational
41 Health and Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care, University of Helsinki and
42 Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
43

44
45 2. K Isoherranen, MD, PhD, Department of Dermatology and allergology, University of Helsinki
46 and Inflammation Center, Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
47

48
49 3. M Venermo, MD, PhD, Vascular Surgeon, Professor of Vascular Surgery, Head of the
50 Department, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
51

52 Corresponding Author: Kirsti Ahmajärvi
53

54 Correspondence to: kirsti.ahmajarvi@helsinki.fi
55

56 ORCID: Kirsti Ahmajärvi: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9106-5915>
57

58 ORCID: Kirsi Isoherranen: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0253-2567>
59

60 ORCID: Maarit Venermo: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8814-0988>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Kirsti Ahmajärvi is the responsible guarantor of content and has contributed to the designing the study, conducting, collecting and analyzing the data, and reporting of the work described in the article.

Kirsi Isoherranen has contributed to the following parts of the study: design of the study, reporting and review and editing of the final manuscript.

Maarit Venermo has contributed to the following parts in this study: Design of the study, data analysis and interpretation, revisions to scientific content of the manuscript, review and editing of the final manuscript.

The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Authors disclose these three types of information:

Associations with commercial entities that provided support for the work reported in the submitted manuscript (the timeframe for disclosure in this section of the form is the lifespan of the work being reported):

Kirsti Ahmajärvi: Nothing to disclose

Kirsi Isoherranen: Nothing to disclose

Maarit Venermo: Nothing to disclose

Associations with commercial entities that could be viewed as having an interest in the general area of the submitted manuscript (in the three years before submission of the manuscript):

Kirsti Ahmajärvi: Nothing to disclose

Kirsi Isoherranen: Nothing to disclose

Maarit Venermo: Nothing to disclose

Non-financial associations that may be relevant or seen as relevant to the submitted manuscript:

Kirsti Ahmajärvi: Nothing to disclose

Kirsi Isoherranen: Nothing to disclose

Maarit Venermo: Nothing to disclose

No competing interests: "All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at Helsinki and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work."

"The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above."

1
2
3
4 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-
5 for-profit sectors
6

7
8 **Ethics:** This is a retrospective registry-based study. Data were anonymised before the authors
9 assessed them for the purpose of the study. As no data was collected directly from the patients,
10 according to Finnish regulations no ethical approval was needed. The study and data
11 collection was approved in the IRB of Abdominal center, Helsinki University Hospital and in the IRB
12 of City of Helsinki.
13

14
15 **Keywords:** chronic wound, leg ulcer, foot ulcer, wound management, wound aetiology, primary
16 care, diagnostic process, diagnostic delay, clinical pathway
17

18 **Words** 4632
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objectives: Exact wound diagnosis is essential for successful wound management and a holistic care of the patient suffering from a wound. Wound management has been traditionally seen as a nursing area, but this can lead to considerable delays in wound diagnostics. A diagnostic delay has been recognised as an element of diagnostic error, which, in turn, affects patient safety. The aim of this cohort study was to examine diagnostic delays of chronic wound within primary care.

Setting: A specialised diagnostic unit, a wound care team, was established in the primary health care with the objective of reducing diagnostic and treatment delays in primary care.

Participants: The data consists of 197 consecutive patients attending their first appointment with the wound care team in 2016. The collected data included basic demographics, information about the clinical pathway, including doctor's appointments in primary and specialised care, as well as the ICD-10 diagnostic codes.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: The diagnostic delays were calculated in days and divided into three groups: 1) patient-related delay, 2) diagnostic delay and 3) organisational delay.

Results: The median duration of a patient-related delay was two days (IQR 0-14), whereas a physician's first evaluation was performed at a median of 8 (1-32) days from wound appearance and the correct diagnosis by the wound care team was established in a median of 57 (33-100) days. The organisational delay from first contact to diagnosis was a median of 41 (22-80) days. Only one in three patients had a diagnostic delay of less than 4 weeks.

Conclusions: According to this study, the diagnostic delay occurs within primary care, as an organisational delay from first contact to correct diagnosis. It is possible to arrange an optimal pathway of care in which a holistic wound care process starts within primary care.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Bullet points of the study:**
8

9 **Strengths and limitations of this study:**
10

11 Strengths of the study include a unique data which contain primary care patients suffering from
12 chronic wounds.
13

14 Strengths include also systematic and detailed data review and collection.
15

16 Limitations include the possibility of interpretation bias.
17

18 Limitations include also the possibility of error in defining the moment of “the right diagnosis”.
19

20 There is not input for Patient and Public Involvement in the study design, which could be seen as a
21 limitation.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A COHORT STUDY OF DIAGNOSTIC DELAY IN THE CLINICAL PATHWAY OF PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC WOUNDS IN THE PRIMARY CARE SETTING

Introduction

Chronic wounds pose a significant burden to health care, constituting roughly 2%–6% of all health care costs (1-3). According to a recent study in the UK, the annual prevalence of wounds increased by 71% between 2012/2013 and 2017/2018 and patient management costs increased by 48% in real terms (4). In addition to costs, chronic wounds cause substantial suffering at the individual level, leading to an impaired quality of life, social isolation and mental health problems (5-7). Wound management can be successful only when the wound is correctly diagnosed and treated accordingly (8,9). Wound care has been traditionally viewed as measures related to the assessment of the wound bed, which can obscure the importance of the holistic care of the patient (10).

In many European countries, wound patients are first seen in primary care by general practitioners (GPs) or nurses (11). This poses a significant challenge to primary care: wound patients should receive a timely evaluation by a qualified health care professional who can make the correct diagnosis, plan holistic treatment and make the necessary referrals (12). This process should aim to avoid diagnostic error, which has been recognised by the World Health Organization (WHO) as a global challenge to patient safety (13). Diagnostic error includes an incorrect or delayed diagnosis, which leads to patient harm or to inappropriate or delayed treatment. The diagnostic errors mainly occur within primary care or at the emergency department, where physicians lack the appropriate tools and sufficient time to make accurate decisions (14, 15).

In 2013, a special wound care team was established in the primary health care system of the Helsinki area. The wound care team consists of a wound care nurse and a general practitioner specialised in wound care. This team has the possibility to consult a podiatrist and/or vascular surgeon. Patients are referred to a wound care team consultation from all primary care units: health centres, home care units and nursing homes. The instructions for the primary care personnel were to react early and refer patients suffering from a non-healing wound within (2–)4 weeks of wound appearance in order to have the wound appropriately diagnosed. The main focus of the wound care team was to discover the correct diagnosis as early as possible and, thereafter, to initiate proper treatment accordingly.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the delay in the diagnostic process in the clinical pathway of wound patients who were referred for a consultation by the wound care team during 2016. The delays were divided into system-related and patient-related delays.

Material and methods

1
2
3 This prospective cohort study analysed the characteristics and medical history of 197 consecutive
4 patients who visited the wound care team in primary health care during 2016. The information
5 was collected at the first wound care team appointment.
6

7
8 Data were collected from electronic patient records. The collected data consisted of patients'
9 background factors (sex, age, comorbidities, medication, previous wounds, state of mobility and
10 living standards, need of home care, smoking, blood sugar levels and lipids), as well as the date of
11 wound appearance, the date of the patient's first contact with a primary care unit and physician's
12 appointment, the date of consulting the wound care team, and the date of admission to a
13 specialist care unit if needed. In order to analyse the diagnostic process, additional information
14 was collected on signs of infection and bacterial swab results, on whether the ankle brachial index
15 (ABI) was measured, or pulse palpation occurred, or whether neuropathy was detected with a
16 monofilament test. Observations of oedema and any blood test analyses regarding the wound
17 were also recorded. Furthermore, information was gathered from radiological examinations, if
18 performed, as well as any further investigations within specialist care, such as toe pressure and
19 angiography results. The treatment plan was evaluated and compared to the diagnostic methods
20 and the ICD-10 code. (Supplementary Table 1)
21
22
23
24

25
26 Delays were calculated at different points of the care pathway, starting from wound appearance.
27 The different types of delays included: 1) patient-related delay (time from wound appearance to
28 the patient's first contact with health care providers), 2) diagnostic delay (time from the onset of
29 the wound to the first physician's appointment where the initial diagnosis was made), and 3)
30 organisational delays within primary care in arriving at the correct diagnosis and treatment (from
31 the first contact with the primary health care unit to the wound care team consultation). Some
32 patients needed a referral to a specialist consultation, his delay was also considered.
33
34

35
36 Diagnostic codes were collected as ICD-10 codes and we compared to the diagnoses made by the
37 primary care physician, by the wound care team physician and by the specialist. As the number of
38 different diagnostic codes was high, we categorised the diagnoses into ten groups (Table 1, Figures
39 1a and 1b). In the grouping process, we also included, in addition to the diagnostic code,
40 information on how the wound had appeared and which diagnostic tools had been used to arrive
41 at the specific conclusion and treatment plan.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Categorisation and diagnostic variation in the clinical pathway of a patient with a wound.

Diagnostic categories	Primary care physician (n = 155)	Wound care team physician (n = 197)	Specialist care physician (n = 111)
No diagnosis*	26	2	1
Arterial wound	4	16	26
Venous or oedematous ulcer	15	57	17
Diabetic foot ulcer	4	24	15
Pressure ulcer	12	29	9
Post-traumatic wound	16	23	3
Atypical wound	0	8	7
Mixed-aetiology ulcer	0	7	3
Infectious wound	42	11	10
Foot malformation or pressure ulcer	0	7	1
Wound of unspecified aetiology	36	13	19

*The category was defined as 'no diagnosis' when a patient had been seen by a physician but there was no ICD-10-coded diagnosis in the patient records.

1
2
3
4
5 In order to avoid bias caused by outliers, 16 patients whose wound had persisted for over 365
6 days prior to the wound team consultation were excluded from the delay analysis.
7

8 *Patient and public Involvement*

9

10 No patient or public involvement has been occurred in planning, managing, designing or carrying
11 out this research.
12
13

14 **Results**

15

16 A total of 197 patients were included in the study. The mean age was 71 years, and 106 (53,5%)
17 patients were female. The basic demographics and risk factors of the patients are reported in
18 Tables 2-3.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Basic demographics.

	Female(n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%
Sex	106	53.8	91	46.2	197	100
Age (y)						
Mean	78	39.6	69	34.0	147	36.0
Median	80	40.6	73	37.1	153	40.8
Mobility (n)						
walking	38	19.3	56	28.4	94	47.7
walking with assistance device	33	16.8	20	10.2	53	26.9
walking with device only indoors	16	8.1	5	2.5	21	10.7
wheelchair	11	5.6	8	4.1	19	9.6
bedridden	8	4.1	2	1.0	10	5.1
Residence (n)						
home	57	28.9	73	37.1	130	66.0
home with home care	30	15.2	12	6.1	42	21.3
assisted living facility	14	7.1	5	2.5	19	9.6
24/7 care nursing home	5	2.5	1	0.5	6	3.0

Table 3 Description of the sample (n = 197, % of total) in individuals; comorbidities and risk factors.

Comorbidities	Female (n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%	p-value*
Hypertension	60	30.5	50	25.4	110	55.8	
Heart failure	25	12.7	11	5.6	36	18.3	p = 0.044
Ischaemic heart disease	13	6.6	10	5.1	23	11.7	
Atrial fibrillation	37	18.8	24	12.2	61	31.0	
Respiratory condition	27	13.7	11	5.6	38	19.3	
Cancer	14	7.1	14	7.1	28	14.2	
Mental Health condition	9	4.6	9	4.6	18	9.1	
Dementia/memory disorder	25	12.7	9	4.6	34	17.3	p = 0.013
Diabetes	30	15.2	47	23.9	77	39.1	p < 0.001
Peripheral arterial disease	16	8.1	24	12.2	40	20.3	p = 0.042
Kidney malfunction	12	6.1	15	7.6	27	13.7	
Rheumatoid arthritis	15	7.6	6	3.0	21	10.7	p = 0.091
Liver malfunction	0	0.0	6	3.0	6	3.0	p = 0.007
Spinal stenosis	5	2.5	3	1.5	8	4.1	
Gout	3	1.5	8	4.1	11	5.6	p = 0.064
Haematological condition	5	2.5	6	3.0	11	5.6	
Chronic pain disorder	2	1.0	0	0.0	2	1.0	
Urinary condition	4	2.0	10	5.1	14	7.1	p = 0.045
Cerebrovascular disorder	15	7.6	13	6.6	28	14.2	
Dermatological disease	3	1.5	2	1.0	5	2.5	
Musculoskeletal disorder	21	10.7	7	3.6	28	14.2	p = 0.018
No comorbidities	3	1.5	4	2.0	7	3.6	
Risk factors	Female (n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%	p-value*
Previous wounds	46	23.4	50	25.4	96	48.7	
Previous DVT	9	4.6	1	0.5	10	5.1	p = 0.020
venous insufficiency	9	4.6	7	3.6	16	8.1	
chronic oedema	3	1.5	2	1.0	5	2.5	
chronic cellulitis	10	5.1	5	2.5	15	7.6	
previous amputation	4	2.0	1	0.5	5	2.5	
Smoking (n)	13	6.6	28	14.2	41	20.8	p = 0.001
Drug abuse	2	1.0	5	2.5	7	3.6	p = 0.010
Alcohol abuse	3	1.5	11	5.6	14	7.1	
Overweight (BMI 24–30)	59	29.9	62	31.5	121	61.4	
Obesity (BMI over 30)	26	13.2	29	14.7	55	27.9	
High cholesterol (diagnosis)	22	11.2	23	11.7	45	22.8	
LDL over 3.0	23	11.7	19	9.6	42	21.3	
Joint malformation	8	4.1	3	1.5	11	5.6	p = 0.010
Neuropathy (diagnostic coded)	8	4.1	18	9.1	26	13.2	p < 0.001
Neuropathy (monofilament test posit.)	32	16.2	54	27.4	86	43.7	
MRSA	2	1.0	6	3.0	8	4.1	p = 0.048

1						
2						
3	hemiplegia	2	1.0	2	1.0	4 2.0
4	HbA1c(n=153)					
5	Mean (SD)	43 (12.9)		49 (16.8)		46(15.1) p = 0.018~
6	Median (IQR)	40		43		41(37 - 52)
7	BMI(n=178)					
8	Mean(SD)	27.4 (8.2)		29.0 (6.2)		28 (7.4)
9	Median	26		28		26 (23 - 32)
10	fP-Kol-LDL(n=169)					
11	Mean(SD)	2.5 (0.83)		2.4 (0.86)		2.5 (0.84)
12	Median	2.4		2.3		2.4 (1.8-3.0)
13	fP-Gluk(n=173)					
14	Mean(SD)	6.0 (1.8)		7.3 (3.4)		6.6 (2.7) p = 0.002~
15	Median	5.8		6.7		5.9 (5.3-6.9)

*Pearsons chi-squared, difference between female and male patients

~One-way ANOVA test

1
2
3 The majority of the patients were living at home (n = 172; 86.9%) either without any support
4 (n = 130) or with home care (n = 42). The patients' living status is presented in Table 2. Almost half
5 of the patients had had wounds earlier (48.7%). As regards comorbidities, 39.1% had diabetes,
6 11.7% ischemic heart disease, 17.3% memory disorders and 9.1% a mental health condition. Only
7 3.6% had no comorbidities. Overweight (61.4%), obesity (27.9%) and neuropathy (43.4%) were
8 relatively common. Venous insufficiency or a previous deep venous thrombosis had been
9 diagnosed in only 13.2%. As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4, the patients had several co-morbidities
10 and heterogenous medications. Almost half of the patients used analgesics (44.7% NSAIDs or
11 paracetamol and 15.2% opioids), whereas different psychopharmaceuticals were used by 11.7%–
12 17.8% of the patients.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 4. Description of the sample (n = 197) in individuals; medication.

Medication	Female (n)	%	Male (n)	%	Total (n)	%	chi-square
Cardiac and vessel medicine							
Anticoagulant	41	20.8	26	13.2	67	34.0	p = 0.164
Antithrombotic	29	14.7	28	14.2	57	28.9	
b-blocker	57	28.9	41	20.8	98	49.7	p = 0.018
Diuretic	45	22.8	32	16.2	77	39.1	
Ca-blocker	27	13.7	31	15.7	58	29.4	
ACE-blocker	38	19.3	47	23.9	85	43.1	
Statin	40	20.3	35	17.8	75	38.1	
Diabetes medicine							
Oral diabetes medicine	16	8.1	21	10.7	37	18.8	p = 0.134
Insulin	12	6.1	30	15.2	42	21.3	p < 0.001
Psychopharmaceuticals							
Dementia medicine	16	8.1	6	3.0	22	11.2	p = 0.066
Antidepressant	14	7.1	11	5.6	25	12.7	
Benzodiazepine	13	6.6	10	5.1	23	11.7	p = 0.135
Sleeping pills	23	11.7	12	6.1	35	17.8	
Analgesia(mild)	57	28.9	31	15.7	88	44.7	p = 0.008
Opiates	18	9.1	12	6.1	30	15.2	
Immune system medicine							
Cancer medicine	2	1.0	3	1.5	5	2.5	p = 0.124
Immunosuppressive	11	5.6	4	2.0	15	7.6	
Cortisone per oral	12	6.1	4	2.0	16	8.1	p = 0.083
Cortisone cream	4	2.0	0	0.0	4	2.0	p = 0.064
Supplements							
Thyroxin	16	8.1	3	1.5	19	9.6	p = 0.006
Ca-supplement	46	23.4	16	8.1	62	31.5	
Folic acid	7	3.6	3	1.5	10	5.1	p = 0.013
B12-supplement	11	5.6	12	6.1	23	11.7	
Vitamin D suppl.	44	22.3	22	11.2	66	33.5	
Nutrition suppl.	6	3.0	2	1.0	8	4.1	
Mg suppl.	7	3.6	4	2.0	11	5.6	
K suppl.	11	5.6	9	4.6	20	10.2	
Other							
Inhaler/nebulizer	26	13.2	16	8.1	42	21.3	p = 0.030
Proton pump inhibitor	39	19.8	20	10.2	59	29.9	
Urine medicine	8	4.1	12	6.1	20	10.2	p = 0.190
Skin cream	19	9.6	10	5.1	20	10.2	

Diagnostics

Forty-two (21.3%) patients were not seen by a primary care physician before they visited the wound care team, meaning that the diagnostic process was not even started before this visit. Of the 155 patients who had been seen by a physician prior to the wound care team, 129 (83.2%) had a recorded diagnosis code (ICD-10), while 26 (16.8%) patients remained undiagnosed. Thus, 34.5% of the patients (n = 68) received their first diagnosis by the wound care team.

Out of the patients who were seen by a primary care physician, 85 (58.8%) had no delay (median 0 days), meaning that the patients visited an emergency room and were seen by a physician immediately. The diagnoses for these patients mainly comprised infectious wounds (n = 30, 35.3%) and wounds with no specific cause (n = 21, 24.7%), while a diagnostic code was not recorded for 10.6% (n = 9). Hence, 15 patients had traumatic wounds and saw the physician at an acute appointment.

Of those patients who saw a primary care physician (n = 155), 36.2% (n = 56) had clinical signs of infection according to the patient records. However, as many as 94 (60.6%) patients were treated with antibiotics, and 82 (52.9%) had a bacterial swab taken.

Of the 129 patients who had a diagnosis before the first appointment with the wound care team, the same diagnosis was made by the team and the primary care physician in 59 (45.7%) of the cases. The concordant diagnoses most often entailed pressure ulcers, infectious ulcers, as well as venous and post-traumatic ulcers. Specialist care was received by 111 patients. The same diagnosis (ICD-10) was made by all three points in the clinical pathway in only 24 (12.2%) cases, and the majority of these comprised infectious ulcers, followed by a venous aetiology and wounds without a specific diagnosis. (Table 5)

Table 5. Differentiation of the diagnoses when they remained unchanged or were revised over the clinical pathway.

Categorised diagnostic groups	Diagnoses that remained unchanged			Diagnoses that were revised	
	within primary care	throughout the entire clinical pathway	by wound care team and specialist care	Primary care physician's diagnosis	Wound care team physician's diagnosis
Arterial wound	0	0	16	4	7
Venous or oedematous ulcer	13	5	17	2	24
Diabetic foot ulcer	2	1	13	2	11
Pressure ulcer	11	3	9	1	8
Post-traumatic wound	15	3	3	0	2
Atypical wound	0	0	7	0	4
Mixed-aetiology wound	0	0	2	0	3
Infectious wound	10	8	9	32	1
Foot malformation or pressure ulcer	0	0	1	0	5
Wound of unspecified aetiology	8	4	6	27	3

1
2
3
4
5 Of the patients who visited a specialist, the same diagnosis was made by the wound care team
6 physician and the specialist in 75.5% of the cases (Table 5 and 6). The concordant diagnoses most
7 often comprised diabetic foot ulcers (20.5%), arterial ulcers (19.3%) and venous or oedematous
8 ulcers (15.7%). In the remaining 24.6% (n = 27) of the patients, the diagnosis made by the wound
9 care team was revised in specialist care, mostly comprising arterial ulcers (40.7%) that were
10 usually referred for further investigations with a suspicion of an arterial wound. The ulcers that
11 turned out to be arterial wounds were diagnosed by the wound care team as diabetic foot ulcers
12 (14.8%), wounds of mixed aetiology (18.5%), foot malformations (14.8%) and oedematous ulcers
13 (37.0%).
14
15
16

17 Post-traumatic wounds were categorised into one category. In the primary care setting, there
18 were 16 post-traumatic ulcers, 15 of which were assessed in the emergency room (ER).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 6. Diagnostic differentiation through the treatment pathway.

	The same diagnosis~ throughout entire treatment pathway	The same diagnosis within primary care~~	The same diagnosis by wound care team and specialist
1 = the same	24	60	83
0 = different	47	67	27
total	71	127 [#]	110
% of diagnosed*^ patients	21,8	47,2	75,5
% of 197 (whole sample)	12,2	30,5	42,1

~ treatment pathway: primary care physician, wound care team (physician) and specialist care.

~~primary care physician and wound care team (physician)

*155 patients visited a doctor in primary care before the appointment with the wound care team, but only 129 patients were diagnosed.

^110 patients were diagnosed in specialist care.

2 patients were undiagnosed in the wound care team. They were of those of the 129 diagnosed in the primary care

Delays

The median time from wound appearance to the first health care contact was 2 days (IQR 0–14 days, range 0–351 days) and from wound appearance to the first evaluation by a physician 8 days (IQR 1–32 days, range 0–314 days). The majority of the patients had their first health care contact at the emergency department where a physician also examined the patient, or at the district nurse's office at a health centre with the possibility of an immediate physician's consultation. The median time from the onset of the wound to the first wound care team appointment was 57 days (IQR 33–100 days, range 2–358 days). The median time between the first health care contact and the wound care team appointment was 41 days (IQR 22–80 days; range 1–484 days). Only one in three patients (n = 61) had an organisational delay of less than 4 weeks between the first contact with health services and the appointment with the wound care team.

Half of the patients (n = 113, 57.4%) were referred to a secondary health care unit to be seen by a specialist, most often by a vascular surgeon (n = 67), followed by a plastic surgeon (n = 43) and a dermatologist (n = 13). Twenty-one (18.6%) patients were referred to two or more specialists. The median delay from the first appointment with the wound care team to the appointment with the secondary health care specialist was 21 days (IQR 8–55, min–max -58–235; range 293 days).

The median time from the appearance of the wound to the final diagnosis was 57 days (IQR 33–101; min–max 2–358; range 356 days).

The delays in different the subgroups are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Delays in different subgroups. Figures are presented as medians (IQR; Min–Max; Range)

Delays are calculated and analysed with the inclusion criterion 'wound appearance within 365 days prior to wound care team appointment'.

	n	Wound appearance - first contact to health care	Wound appearance to first physician evaluation	Wound appearance to wound care team	Delay from first contact to wound care team (organizational delay within primary care)	Delay Wound care team to specialist care	Mann-Whitney-U
All patients	182	2 (0–14;0–351;351)	8(1–32;0–314;314)	57(33–101;2–358;356)	42(22–80;1–484;483)	21(7–52;-58–252;414)	
Male	81	3 (0–24;0–351;351)	9(1–37;0–314;314)	69(37–111;2–358;356)*	44(23–85;2–484;482)	23(3–48;-58–235;293)	*p = 0.058
Female	101	1 (0–8;0–295;295)	8(1–24;0–295;295)	54(30–96;2–306;304)*	41(22–76;1–264;263)	20(8–58;0–176;176)	
Age under 65 y (1)	46	6 (1–27;0–298;298)*	9(3–30;0–142;142)	62(36–100;11–320;309)	37(22–76;6–382;376)	28(14–48;1–182;181)	*1 vs 2; p = 0.005
Age 65–80 y (2)	62	0 (0–14;0–258;258)*	10(0–38;0–314;314)	61(41–106;10–337;327)	49(25–88;4–264;260)	16(2–50;0–235;235)	*1 vs 3; p = 0.003
Age over 80 y (3)	74	1 (0–8;0–351;351)*	7(1–32;0–295;295)	53,5(30–98;2–358;356)	40(22–78;1–484;483)	16(6–56;-58–167;225)	
DM+	72	1 (0–15;0–142;142)	10(1–37;0–142;142)	59(36–102;2–324;322)	45(26–75;2–245;243)	14(3–48;0–235;235)	no statistical difference
DM-	110	2 (0–13;0–351;351)	7(1–32;0–314;314)	56(31–101;4–358;354)	40(22–84;1–482;483)	26(8–56;-58–167;225)	
Living at home	160	2 (0–15;0–351;351)	9(1–33;0–314;314)	57(33–102;2–358;356)	42(22–83;1–382;381)	20(5–48;0–235;235)*	*p = 0.010
Living in institution	22	1 (0–8;0–295;295)	3(0–14;0–295;295)	55(34–86;7–306;299)	43(24–72;7–484;477)	56(16–143;-58–176;234)*	
Walking; outdoors	134	3 (0–15;0–351;351)*	8(1–27;0–246;246)	56(33–97;4–358;354)	40(22–76;1–382;381)	22(6–56;-58–235;293)	*p = 0.047
Not-walking; staying indoors	48	0 (0–5;0–298;298)	9(1–55;0–314;314)	71(33–108;2–337;335)	54(24–94;2–484;482)	16(7–46;0–182;182)	
Delay before wound care team under 28 days	61	6 (0–20;0–351;351)*	7(3–24;0–295;295)	26(19–41;2–358;356)*	18(12–22;1–28;27)	22(4–42;0–167;167)	*p < 0.001
Delay before wound care team over 28 days	121	0 (0–8;0–258;258)	9(0–34;0–314;314)	73(51–112;29–337;308)	70(42–101;29–484;455)	20(7–55;-58–235;293)	
Unchanged diagnosis (PC-WT-spec.)	20	3 (2–12;0–246;246)	7(3–19;0–246;246)	51(32–80;5–267;262)	35(20–74;2–186;184)	23(8–45;0–89;89)	
Different diagnosis	43	1 (0–17;0–258;258)	8(0–42;0–314;314)	71(37–111;4–337;333)	57(30–89;1–245;244)	18(7–98;0–235;235)	
The same DG within primary care	55	2 (0–7;0–246;246)	3(1–18;0–246;246)	52(31–78;5–267;262)*	40(20–71;2–186;184)	33(9–56;0–176;176)	*p=0.042
Different DG	61	1 (0–24;0–258;258)	17(1–56;0–314;314)	73(37–126;4–337;333)	53(31–98;1–245;244)	15(7–64;0–235;235)	

Discussion

1
2
3 It is well-known that an early diagnosis of the underlying cause of a chronic wound is essential for
4 wound healing and for avoiding amputations (8, 16, 17). However, there are only a few studies
5 describing the importance of wound diagnosis and the deleterious effects of diagnostic delays (18-
6 20). In the current study, we investigated the diagnostic processes and delays in wound care in the
7 Helsinki area. The patients' first contact with health care services after wound appearance was
8 prompt, the median delay being only 2 days. In stark contrast, it took 57 days from the appearance
9 of the wound before the patient was seen by the wound care team for the first time. In our
10 material, only 31.0% of the patients visited the wound care team within 4 weeks of the first health
11 care appointment. This caused a significant delay in reaching the correct diagnosis of the wound.
12 We also discovered that only 65.5% of all patients had a recorded wound diagnosis before the first
13 wound care team appointment and that this diagnosis matched the final diagnosis in
14 approximately 50% of the cases. Accordingly, in European countries, the delay in diagnosing
15 diabetic foot ulcers (DFU) was over 3 weeks in 21%–34% of the patients. The shortest average
16 time from event to diagnosis was 10 days in the UK, 14 days in Spain and France, and 20 days in
17 Germany. (12)

23 In Finland, wound patients are evaluated and treated mainly during primary care appointments,
24 including home care and nursing homes (21). In the mentioned European countries, the health
25 care professionals who participate in the diagnostic process vary considerably. In the UK, only 6%
26 of GPs completely agreed that the care and management of DFUs is the GP's responsibility, and
27 22% did not diagnose DFUs. Instead, in 27% of the cases, district nurses made the diagnosis. In the
28 UK, the approach seems more often to be multidisciplinary, as 49% of the GPs referred patients to
29 a podiatrist if needed. In all four countries, GPs were able to refer DFU patients to specialised
30 multidisciplinary clinics. (22)

34 In the UK, DFUs were diagnosed by a GP in only 45% of the cases, and most of the wounds were
35 diagnosed by a district nurse or practice nurse (12).

38 The optimal treatment pathways for wound patients include patient surveillance and an early
39 detection of wound healing problems. Errors in the pathway may lead to delays and,
40 consequently, even fatal errors, such as amputations, in some patients. (17)

42 We took a closer look at the ICD-10 codes assessed by the primary care physicians, wound care
43 team physician and specialists and found that they differed from each other significantly. This
44 highlights the complexity of wound diagnostics. Surprisingly, only 12.2% of the patients had the
45 same diagnosis throughout the whole pathway of care, and these mostly comprised infectious
46 wounds. Based on our data, we assume that there was a significant overdiagnosis of infections in
47 primary care, since an infectious wound was diagnosed in 32.6% of the cases and antibiotics were
48 prescribed for 63.2% of the patients in the primary care setting. Similar results have been obtained
49 in Sweden, where the use of a national wound register diminished the use of antibiotics (23).
50 Evidence of difficulties in the diagnostics of wound infections is also found in a study of GPs
51 recognising and treating wound infections – according to the results, GPs mostly desired further
52 knowledge about when to start or stop treatment (81%–82%), about topical antimicrobials (80%–
53 68%) and about when to prescribe antibiotics (82%–95%) (24).

1
2
3 Another diagnostic challenge was the diagnosis of an ischaemic wound and diabetic foot ulcer in
4 primary care. Only four diabetic and arterial ulcers were diagnosed in primary care. In contrast,
5 the wound care team diagnosed a DFU in 54 patients, and 26 patients were referred to a specialist
6 when an ischaemic wound was suspected. This problem is also detected in a multi-centre study
7 performed in four European countries. The researchers found that, even though GPs described
8 neuropathy and peripheral arterial disease as cofactors in the DFU development, they investigated
9 DFUs with additional tests in only half of the cases; this entailed monofilament tests in 21%–43%
10 and, more often, pulse palpation or the measurement of the ankle brachial index in 78%–90% of
11 the cases, but diabetic foot infection (DFI) was tested in only 7%–20% of the investigated cases.
12
13
14
15 (11)

16
17 Our main finding was that there was an organisational delay in reaching a timely diagnosis. The
18 time between wound appearance and the first contact with a physician was adequate, the median
19 being 8 days, and two-thirds (58.8%, n = 85) of the patients had their first evaluation at the first
20 contact with health services. This means that a physician's examination was mostly available at the
21 emergency room or as a rapid consultation during a nurse's appointment at the health centre.
22 However, our study shows that, among these patients, the initial physician's evaluation very
23 seldom leads to a correct diagnosis and treatment.
24
25

26
27 Regarding wound patients, emergency room assessment should include the three most important
28 and acute aetiologies, such as infection, ischaemia and diabetes (25), but otherwise the
29 emergency room might not be the optimal setting for diagnosing wounds.
30

31
32 Post-traumatic ulcers could be a subgroup of oedematous leg ulcers due to the same management
33 approach, namely compression therapy, which should be assessed immediately after
34 vascular/arterial causes have been ruled out. Hence, according to the present data, oedematous
35 and post-traumatic ulcers accounted for 40.6% of all the ulcers and were treated with
36 compression.
37

38
39 We found that the wound diagnostic process was good enough in the wound care team, as the
40 diagnosis did not change for 75.5% of the patients who were referred by the team to specialist
41 care. In the remaining 24.5%, in whom the diagnosis made by a specialist differed from the
42 diagnosis made by the wound care team, the final diagnosis was confirmed using diagnostic tools
43 that were not available in the health centre. In these cases, however, the wound care team often
44 had a default diagnosis to base the referral on, and specialist care then responded to this idea,
45 most often leading to the correct treatment. Indeed, the referral was very useful for these
46 patients.
47
48

49
50 On the other hand, there were ordinary delays in receiving a specialist evaluation, as the median
51 delay was 21 days, where the largest differences were between the subgroups of patients living in
52 institutions and those living at home. This might be explained by the advance care planning among
53 nursing home residents. However, previous studies propose delays of less than two weeks in
54 diagnosing arterial ulcers and DFUs to avoid leg losses (17). As a response to the challenge of
55 timely referral to correct department for treatment there are globally several multidisciplinary
56 wound clinics to have only one place to send a patient for a consultation (26,27,28).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Previous studies suggest that diagnostic errors are often preceded by common symptoms,
4 followed by common diagnoses (29, 30). Studies have shown that the most frequent error is
5 “premature closure”, meaning ‘the tendency to stop considering other possibilities after reaching
6 a diagnosis’ (31, 32). In the UK, diagnosis- and assessment-related incidents were the highest
7 causes of patient harm (29). As a conclusion, the ability to utilise differential diagnostic methods is
8 key when diagnosing wound aetiologies. There is always a danger of diagnosing a wound
9 incorrectly, if possibilities to perform differential diagnostics are lacking (19, 30).
11

12
13 As a solution, a broader range of differential diagnostic possibilities as regards the origin of the
14 wound would probably help in the first evaluation and in avoiding diagnostic error and delay in the
15 treatment (33-34). Our study shows that the problem for wound management lies in the primary
16 care; i.e. wounds that should be referred to multidisciplinary care are not recognized. The solution
17 is continuous education of primary care physicians and nurses focusing on basic differential
18 diagnostics of chronic wounds instead of wound management *per se*. Education is needed also to
19 bring up the awareness of the triage –remembering that also an acute wound may turn into a
20 chronic wound which needs quick response and treatment. One practical tool to tackle these
21 diagnostic challenges could be the use of checklists (35-37) and digitalized wound diagnostic tools
22 (38, submitted for publication). It has been determined in other contexts that there are tools for
23 avoiding fatal errors in differential diagnostics, such as existing guidelines and, to be regarded with
24 a grain of salt, electronic aids in decision making (39-41).
28

29 **Limitations**

30
31 The limitations of this study are related to the variety of aetiologies behind chronic wounds. There
32 are no generally agreed-upon diagnostic codes to be used for chronic wounds, and the
33 differentiation potential is enormous. Most often wounds are coded as merely a wound of
34 unspecified aetiology (L97, L98), or they are S-coded, which refers to a traumatic wound.
35 Therefore, it is difficult to define when a diagnosis is correct or not.
37

38
39 Outliers also constituted a limitation of the study, as we could not include them in the data
40 analysis. Some patients in the material had suffered from a wound for several years. Despite this,
41 they were referred to the wound care team when it was established in 2013. In our delay analyses,
42 we tried to avoid this bias by selecting patients whose wounds had appeared less than one year
43 prior to the appointment with the wound care team.
44

45 **Conclusion**

46
47 It seems that the diagnostic delay of wound patients occurs within primary care. It is an
48 organisational delay and causes patient harm, as the patients are not receiving a timely and
49 correct diagnosis and treatment. Infectious wounds seem to be easy to detect, but there is a risk
50 of overdiagnosis, leading to an overuse of antibiotics. However, primary care physicians seem to
51 pay little attention to distinguishing arterial insufficiency or diabetic foot ulcers (DFU).
52

53
54 The delay before seeing a primary care physician was not substantial, but the physicians’
55 differential diagnostic approaches did not cover peripheral arterial disease or diabetic foot ulcers.
56 Consequently, the delay before being seen by the wound care team was over one month, which is
57 a long time when treating diabetic foot ulcers, especially those of vascular origin.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Based on our results, we propose that it is possible to arrange an optimal treatment pathway
4 within a primary care setting, where a holistic wound care process is initiated, provided that there
5 is organisational support, knowledge, skills and a multidisciplinary team available. It has been
6 demonstrated that such an approach does not even require any additional resources, but rather a
7 rearrangement of the patient care (16, 42). We also suggest that the specialist care clinics could
8 play a supportive role in the treatment of complex wounds, while the primary care system could
9 take responsibility for the holistic wound care.
10
11
12

13 **Ethics:** Not applicable/No human participants included. This is a retrospective registry-based
14 study. Data were anonymised before the authors assessed them for the purpose of the study. Due
15 to the nature of the study ethical approval was not required for the study. Study was approved in
16 the IRB of Abdominal center, Helsinki University Hospital and in the IRB of City of Helsinki.
17
18

19 **Contributorship statement:**

20
21 Kirsti Ahmajärvi is the responsible guarantor of content and has contributed to the designing the
22 study, conducting, collecting and analyzing the data, and reporting of the work described in the
23 article.
24

25
26 Kirsi Isoherranen has contributed to the following parts of the study: design of the study, reporting
27 and review and editing of the final manuscript.
28

29
30 Maarit Venermo has contributed to the following parts in this study: Design of the study, data
31 analysis and interpretation, revisions to scientific content of the manuscript, review and editing of
32 the final manuscript.
33

34
35 The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no
36 others meeting the criteria have been omitted.
37

38 **Competing interest:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form
39 at Helsinki and declare: Kirsi Isoherranen and Maarit Venermo have no support from any
40 organisation for the submitted work, Kirsti Ahmajärvi has received a working grant from the
41 University of Helsinki, The Finnish Wound Association and The Finnish Association for General
42 Practice. ; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the
43 submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear
44 to have influenced the submitted work.
45
46
47

48 **Funding:** Kirsti Ahmajärvi has received a personal working grant from the University of Helsinki,
49 The Finnish Wound Association and The Finnish Association for General Practice. This research
50 received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit
51 sectors.
52
53

54 **Data sharing statement:** Data is not available in any system for data sharing.
55
56
57
58
59
60

References:


1. Lindholm C, Searle R. Wound management for the 21st century: combining effectiveness and efficiency. *Int Wound J*. 2016;13:5-15.
2. Phillips CJ, Humphreys I, Fletcher J et al. Estimating the costs associated with the management of patients with chronic wounds using linked routine data. *Int Wound J*. 2016;13(6):1193-7.
3. Guest JF, Ayoub N, McIlwraith T et al. Health economic burden that different wound types impose on the UK's National Health Service. *Int Wound J*. 2017;14(2):322-30.
4. Guest JF, Fuller GW, Vowden P. Cohort study evaluating the burden of wounds to the UK's National Health Service in 2017/2018: update from 2012/2013. *BMJ open*. 2020;10(12):e045253-e.
5. Sen CK. Human Wound and Its Burden: Updated 2020 Compendium of Estimates. *Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle)*. 2021;10(5):281-92.
6. Herber OR, Schnepf W, Rieger MA. A systematic review on the impact of leg ulceration on patients' quality of life. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2007;5:44.
7. Green J, Jester R, McKinley R et al. The impact of chronic venous leg ulcers: a systematic review. *J Wound Care*. 2014;23(12):601-12.
8. Mooij MC, Huisman LC. Chronic leg ulcer: does a patient always get a correct diagnosis and adequate treatment? *Phlebology*. 2016;31(1 Suppl):68-73.
9. Dean S. Leg ulcers - causes and management. *Aust Fam Physician*. 2006;35(7):480-4.
10. Atkin L, Bučko Z, Conde Montero E et al. Implementing TIMERS: the race against hard-to-heal wounds. *J Wound Care*. 2019;23(Sup3a):S1-s50.
11. Garcia-Klepzig JL, Sánchez-Ríos JP, Manu C et al. Perception of diabetic foot ulcers among general practitioners in four European countries: knowledge, skills and urgency. *J Wound Care*. 2018;27(5):310-9.
12. Sánchez-Ríos JP, García-Klepzig JL, Manu C et al. Referral of patients with diabetic foot ulcers in four European countries: patient follow-up after first GP visit. *J Wound Care*. 2019;28(Sup8):S4-s14.
13. Sheikh A, Donaldson L, Dhingra-Kumar N et al. Diagnostic Errors: *Technical Series on Safer Primary Care*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO2016.
14. Kostopoulou O, Delaney BC, Munro CW. Diagnostic difficulty and error in primary care--a systematic review. *Fam Pract*. 2008;25(6):400-13.
15. Irving G, Neves AL, Dambha-Miller H et al. International variations in primary care physician consultation time: a systematic review of 67 countries. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(10):e017902.
16. Laakso M, Honkasalo M, Kiiski J et al. Re-organizing inpatient care saves legs in patients with diabetic foot infections. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*. 2017;125:39-46.
17. Noronen K, Saarinen E, Albäck A et al. Analysis of the Elective Treatment Process for Critical Limb Ischaemia with Tissue Loss: Diabetic Patients Require Rapid Revascularisation. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2017;53(2):206-13.
18. Walker CM, Bunch FT, Cavros NG et al. Multidisciplinary approach to the diagnosis and management of patients with peripheral arterial disease. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2015;10:1147-53.
19. Eliassen A, Vandy F, McHugh J et al. Marjolin's ulcer in a patient with chronic venous stasis. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2013;27(8):1182.e5-8.

- 1
- 2
- 3 20. Janowska A, Oranges T, Chiricozzi A et al. Synergism of Therapies After Postoperative
- 4 Autograft Failure in a Patient With Melanoma of the Foot Misdiagnosed as a Pressure Ulcer.
- 5 *Wounds*. 2018;30(4):E41-e3.
- 6
- 7 21. Ahmajärvi KM, Isoherranen KM, Mäkelä A et al. A change in the prevalence and the
- 8 etiological factors of chronic wounds in Helsinki metropolitan area during 2008-2016. *Int Wound J*.
- 9 2019;16(2):522-6.
- 10
- 11 22. Manu C, Lacopi E, Bouillet B et al. Delayed referral of patients with diabetic foot ulcers
- 12 across Europe: patterns between primary care and specialised units. *J Wound Care*.
- 13 2018;27(3):186-92.
- 14
- 15 23. Oien RF, Forssell HW. Ulcer healing time and antibiotic treatment before and after the
- 16 introduction of the Registry of Ulcer Treatment: an improvement project in a national quality
- 17 registry in Sweden. *BMJ open*. 2013;3(8):e003091-e.
- 18
- 19 24. Woo KY. Physicians' knowledge and attitudes in the management of wound infection. *Int*
- 20 *Wound J*. 2016;13(5):600-4.
- 21
- 22 25. Salava A, Isoherranen K. Rule of three I's: a mnemonic aid in undergraduate teaching of
- 23 lower limb wounds. *J Wound Care*. 2021;30(12):1030.
- 24
- 25 26. Gottrup F. A specialized wound-healing center concept: importance of a multidisciplinary
- 26 department structure and surgical treatment facilities in the treatment of chronic wounds. *Am J*
- 27 *surg*. 2004;187(5A):38S-43S.
- 28
- 29 27. Leon J, Bohn GA, DiDomenico L et al. Wound Care Centers: Critical Thinking and Treatment
- 30 Strategies for Wounds. *Wounds*. 2016;28(10):S1-S23.
- 31
- 32 28. Kim PJ, Attinger CE, Steinberg JS et al. Building a Multidisciplinary Hospital-Based Wound
- 33 Care Center: Nuts and Bolts. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2016;138(3):241S-247S.
- 34
- 35 29. Carson-Stevens A, Hibbert P, Williams H, Evans HP, Cooper A, Rees P, et al. Health Services
- 36 and Delivery Research. Characterising the nature of primary care patient safety incident reports in
- 37 the England and Wales National Reporting and Learning System: a mixed-methods agenda-setting
- 38 study for general practice. Southampton (UK): *NIHR Journals Library*.2016.
- 39
- 40 30. Ely JW, Kaldjian LC, D'Alessandro DM. Diagnostic errors in primary care: lessons learned. *J*
- 41 *Am Board Fam Med*. 2012;25(1):87-97.
- 42
- 43 31. Norman GR, Eva KW. Diagnostic error and clinical reasoning. *Med Educ*. 2010;44(1):94-100.
- 44
- 45 32. Graber ML, Franklin N, Gordon R. Diagnostic error in internal medicine. *Arch Intern Med*.
- 46 2005;165(13):1493-9.
- 47
- 48 33. Schiff GD, Hasan O, Kim S et al. Diagnostic error in medicine: analysis of 583 physician-
- 49 reported errors. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169(20):1881-7.
- 50
- 51 34. Maude J. Differential diagnosis: the key to reducing diagnosis error, measuring diagnosis
- 52 and a mechanism to reduce healthcare costs. *Diagnosis (Berl)*. 2014;1(1):107-9.
- 53
- 54 35. Snyder RJ, Jensen J, Applewhite AJ et al. A Standardized Approach to Evaluating Lower
- 55 Extremity Chronic Wounds Using a Checklist. *Wounds*. 2019;31(5 Suppl):S29-s44.
- 56
- 57 36. Kapp S, Santamaria N. The "self-treatment of wounds for venous leg ulcers checklist"
- 58 (STOW-V Checklist V1.0): Part 1-Development, pilot and refinement of the checklist. *Int Wound J*.
- 59 2022;19(3):705-713.
- 60

- 1
2
3 37. Wiseman JT, Fernandes-Taylor S, Gunter R et al. Inter-rater agreement and checklist
4 validation for postoperative wound assessment using smartphone images in vascular surgery. *J*
5 *Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2016;4(3):320-8.e2.
6
7 38. Kaari S, Vähätalo M, Ahmajärvi K et al. A Digital Wound Management Checklist to support
8 clinical decision-making: a qualitative validation study. Submitted for publication.
9
10 39. Bond WF, Schwartz LM, Weaver KR et al. Differential diagnosis generators: an evaluation of
11 currently available computer programs. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2012;27(2):213-9.
12
13 40. Riches N, Panagioti M, Alam R et al. The Effectiveness of Electronic Differential Diagnoses
14 (DDX) Generators: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(3):e0148991.
15
16 41. El-Kareh R, Hasan O, Schiff GD. Use of health information technology to reduce diagnostic
17 errors. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2013;22 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):ii40-ii51.
18
19 42. Sanders AP, Stoeldraaijers LG, Pero MW et al. Patient and professional delay in the referral
20 trajectory of patients with diabetic foot ulcers. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2013;102(2):105-11.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Figure 1

Diagnoses by the primary care physician



N = 155 patients visited primary care physician

Diagnoses by the wound care team physician



N = 197 patients visited the wound care team physician

Supplementary Table 1. Diagnostic codes included in the 10 chosen diagnostic categories.

Category	no.	ICD-10 codes
Arterial wound	1	I70.2, L97, E10.4, E11, E11.7, E11.5, E11.4, M10, R60, S91.1, S81.8
Venous or oedematous ulcer	2	S81.8, S81.2, R60, R60.9, L97, I83, I83.0, I83.2, I87.2, I89.0, I88.0, R66+R60+L97
Diabetic ulcer	3	E11 + L97, E11.7+L97, E11.5, M20.2, M20.4, S92.5, E11.4+L97, E11.8+L97+I70.2, E11.7+S91.3, E11.5+L97, E11+G30.1, E10.7+L97, E10.6+M14.2+L97, N08.39*E11.2+L97, E10+L97, E10.6+R02+L07, E11.2+L97, E10.4+L97
Pressure ulcer	4	L89, G58.7 + L97, I69.3+L89+L97
Post-traumatic wound	5	S80, T22, S81, S81.1, T24.4, T24.0, S81.8, S81.0, S81.8, T93.0, S91.0, S51.9, S01.1
Atypical wound	6	C44.75, C44.72, S01.3, D23.2, L90.5, T95.2, L88, K42.9, S31.3, T09.1
Mixed aetiology	7	I70.2+L97+I83, I70.2+R60+L97, T33.5+M86, T33.4+M86, I87.2+I70.2+E11.7+L97
Infectious wound	8	L02.4, L02, L02.3, L02.9, L03, L05.0, A46, L08.8, L08, L08.9, L05, L05.0, L05.9, L00, T79.3, A49.9, M86.6+L89, L30, L72, L72.0, L72.1, K61.0, K60.3, K60
Foot malformation/pressure	9	L97, L89, I70.2 +L97, L97+M10, M05.9+L89
Wound of unspecified aetiology	10	S71.0, S82.3, S91.3, S91.0, S91, S81.3, S81, S81.9, L97, S86.0, M71.1, S41.1, T13.1, L98.4, T93.0, T81.4, T81.3

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No.	Recommendation	Page No.	Relevant text from manuscript
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	5	A cohort study
Introduction				
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5	Chronic wounds pose a significant burden to health care, both to the patients and to the system. Diagnostic process begins from primary care, and there should be timely diagnostic processes for patients suffering from a wound
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5	We analysed delay in the treatment of patients with chronic wounds and analyzed also the diagnostic process among wound patients. Furthermore, we evaluated the impact of a special wound care team within primary care on this process
Methods				
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6	A cohort was collected
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6	A cohort was collected in April-September 2016, in Helsinki health care centre at first visit to a wound care team and included

1				
2				197 consecutive patients. The
3				patient records were analysed
4				both backwards and onwards for
5				data collection. Data collection
6				included onset of the wound
7				until endpoint which was
8				healing. Diagnostic delays were
9				recorded by collecting the dates
10				of first visit in the health
11				services, wound care team and
12				specialist care and by collecting
13				the diagnosis found from the
14				patient record.
15				
16				
17				
18	Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	6
19			<i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case	
20			ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls	
21			<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of	
22			participants	
23				Criteria: Patients suffering for a
24				chronic wound and sent to a
25				wound care team consultation
26				within primary care at their first
27				visit there. Follow-up from
28				patient records as well as
29				gathering the data backwards
30				from the patient records until
31				the onset of the wound.
32				Additionally, demographic data,
33				the number of visits to health
34				care and earlier examinations
35				were collected. The diagnoses
36				set at the first visit, at the wound
37				care team and at the specialist
38				care visit were compared.
39			(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and	
40			unexposed	
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

For peer review only

<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case				
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6	For delay article we examined the dates and diagnostic codes of each visit for a physician in the health care system throughout the clinical treatment path. We examined how the ICD-codes differentiated between physicians' and which diagnostic procedures and tests or treatment was used to determine the correct diagnosis.
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6	Data collected from the patient records.
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8	Potential bias is the variation of the diagnostic codes, ICD-10, as the diagnostic procedures varied remarkably. We have explained in the article how we decided the date of the correct diagnosis. Also outliers constitute a possible bias. Some had been suffering from a wound for years and/or the wound never healed.
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6	We collected 197 patients: No power estimates have been done.

Continued on next page

1					
2	Quantitative	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which	6	We removed patients who had
3	variables		groupings were chosen and why		wounds over 365 days prior the
4					wound care team visit from the
5					delay analyses, but included them
6					in the descriptive analyses for basic
7					demography.
8					
9					
10	Statistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	11,19	We were using SPSS for statistical
11	methods				analysis. Descriptives and
12					Frequencies, Explore, Means were
13					used. Two-Independent Samples
14					Test were used.
15					
16			(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	11,19	Two-Independent Samples Test
17					were used, (Mann-Whitney-U test)
18					when comparing the subgroups and
19					differences in delays between them
20					and Pearsons chii-square and
21					ANOVA-tests when comparing
22					subgroups of male and female in
23					background descriptives
24					
25					
26			(c) Explain how missing data were addressed		Not much missing data. We
27					analysed the groups and removed
28					the outliers from delay analyses.
29					
30			(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed		No loss to follow-up
31			<i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed		
32			<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling		
33			strategy		
34					
35			(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses		
36					
37	Results				
38	Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined	8	197 patients included in the study
39			for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed		182 patients in the delay analyses
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					

		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6	Excluded from the delay analyses patients which had onset of the wound over 365 days prior the wound care team visit.
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram		
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-11,13	Characteristic are found in the table 1–3
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	11	Missing data: fP-Gluk n=4, HbA1c n=44, LDL n=28, BMI n=19, ABI primary care n=179, ABI wound care team n=86
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)		Follow-up from the first visit in the wound care team for until wound healing or 365days.
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	18,19	Delays are presented in Median days (IQR;Min-Max;Range) Patient-related delay 2(0-14;0-351;351), From onset of the wound to first physician evaluation 8(1-32;0-314;314), From onset of the wound to wound care team(diagnostic delay) 57(33-101;2-358;356), From the first contact to wound care team(organizational delay) 42(22-80;1-484;483) wound care team to specialist 21(7-52;-58-252;414)
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure		
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures		

1				
2	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision	18,19
3			(eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were	
4			included	
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
12			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time	
13			period	
14				
15	Continued on next page			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				

Continued on next page

1					
2	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	14	21.3% out of 197 were not seen by
3					primary care physician. Of those
4					who met the physician, the
5					diagnosis was recorded in 129
6					cases. The diagnosis was consistent
7					with the diagnosis of the wound
8					care team was in 59 cases.
9					
10					
11	Discussion				
12	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	21	Key results are: the delay for
13					correct diagnosis is median 57 days
14					from the onset of the wound,
15					whereas optimate wound diagnosis
16					should occur in 14 days.
17					The delay is organizational (and
18					diagnostical) since the first
19					physician contact is median 8 days
20					from the onset of the wound and
21					there was a minimum patient-
22					related delay.
23					
24					
25					
26	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	23	The same as in Bias- section.
27					Also one limitation might be
28					selection bias, when all patients are
29					sent to a consultation. Additionally,
30					there was not a comparison group
31					(patients with chronic wounds and
32					not possibilities for a wound care
33					team consultation/before the
34					establishment of the team).
35					
36					
37	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	23	This study describes the diagnostic
38					processes and delays of patients
39					with wounds in Helsinki
40					
41					
42					

1				
2				metropolitan area. Our conclusion
3				and suggestion is, that it is
4				beneficial to organize wound care
5				teams in the firstline in the primary
6				care to detect as soon as possible
7				the wounds and to start optimal care
8				for these patients. Avoiding delays
9				and erroneous diagnosis is essential
10				in avoiding patient harm and costs.
11				
12				
13	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	23
14				This study provides a model for the
15				primary care; how to make wound
16				care safer for the patients with a
17				little effort, team education, re-
18				organization and support from the
19				specialist care. Similar teams could
20				be arranged anywhere in primary
21				care.
22				
23				
24	Other information			
25	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	24
26				Funding is for Kirsti Ahmajärvi ,
27				responsible author, from the
28				University of Helsinki to work
29				some months as PhD Student(“out-
30				of office”-vacations for studies)
31				Also Grants for a couple of months
32				from non-profital organizations to
33				support the PhD work (“out-of-
34				office”-vacations supports)
35				The Finnish Wound Association
36				and The Finnish Association for
37				General Practice
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

For peer review only