based on Clinical Evaluation Report V12

issued: 2025.02.28

SUMMARY OF SAFETY AND CLINICAL PERFORMANCE (SSCP)

Part I: for healthcare professionals

(Part II: for patients or lay persons – located below)

This Summary of Safety and Clinical Performance (SSCP) is intended to provide public access to an updated summary of the main aspects of the safety and clinical performance of the medical device Suprathel®.

The SSCP is not intended to replace the Instructions For Use as the main document to ensure the safe use of the device, nor is it intended to provide diagnostic or therapeutic suggestions to intended users or patients.

The following information is intended for healthcare professionals.

1. Device Identification and general information

1.1	Device trade names	**Suprathel®, Suprathel® 250**
1.2	Manufacturer's name and address	PolyMedics Innovations GmbH (PMI) Am Hegelesberg 1 73230 Kirchheim unter Teck, Germany
1.3	Manufacturer's single Registration number (SRN)	DE-MF-000006353
1.4	Basic UDI	426018402AAA0000001PQ
1.5	Medical device nomenclature description/text	GMDN 64853: Synthetic wound matrix dressing
1.6	Class of device	III *(according to Medical Device Regulation (MDR) (EU) 2017/745 Annex VIII, rule 8)*
1.7	Year when the first certificate (CE) was issued covering the device	2004
1.8	Authorised representative if applicable	n/a
1.9	NB's name and NB's single identification number	DEKRA, 0124
1.10	SSCP Identifier	SSCP-Suprathel

SUPRATHEL® variant 1

Basic UDI-DI: 426018402AAA0000001PQ

				UDI –DI (Device Identifier)		UDI –PI (Product Identifier)			
Product name	**Size (cm)**	**Sales Unit**	**Packaging Level**	**GS1**	**GTIN**	**AI Shelf Life**	**Shelf Life**	**AI LOT**	**LOT**
SUPRATHEL®	5 x 5	1	Inner	**(01)**	04260184020003	(17)	YYMMDD	(10)	P-YYYY-NN-ZZ K-YYYY-NNN-ZZ
			outer		04260184020010				
		5	Inner		04260184020003				
			outer		04260184020027				
	9 x 10	1	inner		04260184020034				
			outer		04260184020041				
		5	inner		04260184020034				
			outer		04260184020058				
	18 x 10	1	inner		04260184020065				
			outer		04260184020072				
		5	inner		04260184020065				
			outer		04260184020089				
	18 x 23	1	inner		04260184020096				
			outer		04260184020102				
		5	inner		04260184020096				
			outer		04260184020119				
	hand shape	2	inner		04260184020126				
			outer		04260184020133				
	face mask	1	inner		04260184020140				
			outer		04260184020157				

based on Clinical Evaluation Report V12

issued: 2025.02.28

SUPRATHEL® variant 2

Basic UDI-DI: 426018402AAA0000001PQ				UDI –DI (Device Identifier)		UDI –PI (Product Identifier)			
Product name	**Size (cm)**	**Sales Unit**	**Packaging Level**	**GS1**	**GTIN**	**AI Shelf Life**	**Shelf Life**	**AI LOT**	**LOT**
SUPRATHEL® 250	5 x 5	1	inner	**(01)**	04260184020164	(17)	YYMMDD	(10)	P-250-YYYY-NN-ZZ K-250-YYYY-NNN-ZZ
			outer		04260184020171				
		5	inner		04260184020164				
			outer		04260184020188				
	9 x 10	1	inner		04260184020195				
			outer		04260184020201				
		5	inner		04260184020195				
			outer		04260184020218				
	18 x 10	1	Inner		04260184020225				
			outer		04260184020232				
		5	inner		04260184020225				
			outer		04260184020249				
	18 x 23	1	inner		04260184020256				
			outer		04260184020263				
		5	inner		04260184020256				
			outer		04260184020270				

2. Intended use of the device

2.1. Intended purpose

- Suprathel® is an absorbable, microporous membrane and an alloplastic skin substitute for the treatment of epidermal and dermal wounds.

2.2. Indications and target population(s)

- Suprathel® is indicated for patients with epidermal and dermal wounds, including abrasions, split skin graft donor sites, 2nd degree burns as well as 2nd degree burns mixed with 3rd degree burned areas.
- Suprathel® is used for patients with chronic wounds, such as venous and arterial ulcers, as well as diabetic wounds.

2.3. Contraindications and/or limitations

- Suprathel® should not be used on infected wound sites or on severely bleeding wounds without additional hemostatic treatment.
- Suprathel® should not be applied on chronic dry wounds.

3. Device Description

3.1. Description of the device

Suprathel® characteristics:

- single use, one-time application skin substitute
- highly permeable to oxygen and water vapour
- composed of three synthetic and bioresorbable components: lactide, trimethylene carbonate and caprolactone
- no medicinal substances, tissue or blood derivates incorporated
- wound application possible with both sides of the device
- enables visual assessment of the healing process due to its transparency after contact to the wound

Suprathel® sizes and shape:

- Available in two variants with different thicknesses: 50 - 150 µm and 180 - 320 µm
- solid, rectangular sheets in sizes: 5 x 5 cm, 9 x 10 cm, 18 x 10 cm up to 18 x 23 cm, hand shape and face mask
- Suprathel may be manually trimmed by the user to other shapes and sizes as needed for optimal coverage of the affected areas.

3.2. A reference to previous generation(s) or variants if such exist, and a description of the difference

Not applicable

3.3. Description of any accessories which are intended to be used in combination with the device

Not applicable

3.4. Description of any other devices and products which are intended to be used in combination with the device

Suprathel® can be used either alone or in combination with various conventional gauze dressings with and without fatty additives. Combination with such dressings may serve to further secure the membrane and prevent dislocation.

4. Risks and warnings

4.1. Residual risks and undesirable effects

All performed risk analyses conclude with an acceptable overall benefit/risk ratio.

The three risks in the „non-acceptable" field were analyzed and accepted since the benefits far outweigh the risks. All three of them are linked to potentially serious infections as indicated in this SSCP at section contraindications and warnings and precautions. However, the probability of occurrence is linked either to sterility issues which by definition can occur with a certain probability, or to a hazardous situation that has never occurred in the entire product history of more than 20 years.

Acceptable residual risks are provided to the users within the Instructions for Use. Corresponding warnings and precautions resulting from the accepted residual risks are listed below.

4.2. Warnings and precautions

- Do not apply a product, where the sterility may not be ensured as this may lead to severe infections.
- The content is sterile unless sterile packaging is damaged
- In case of packaging damages, the sterility of the product is not ensured. The unused contents of opened or damaged sterile packages are to be discarded
- Do not reuse and do not resterilise. If the product is nevertheless reused, this may lead to impairment of product performance characteristics (reduced permeability, elasticity, adherence capability as well as sterility). Such changes of material properties may in turn lead to treatment impairments, such as inadequate wound healing as well as infections
- In the case of known allergies against components of Suprathel®, the membrane should not be applied. Suprathel® should be removed immediately if there are any signs of allergic reactions to the material.
- Suprathel® should be removed immediately if there are any signs of allergic reactions to the material. Suprathel® should be removed in cases of severe pain or accumulations of wound secretions
- Coverage of intact skin may lead to skin macerations and should be avoided

4.3. Other relevant aspects of safety, including a summary of any field safety corrective action (FSCA including FSN) if applicable

Not applicable

5. Summary of clinical evaluation and post-market clinical follow-up (PMCF)

5.1. Summary of clinical data related to equivalent device

Not applicable

5.2. Summary of clinical data from conducted investigations of the device before the CE-marking,

Acc. to MDCG 2019-9	2nd degree burns & split skin donor sites (SSDS)	Chronic wounds
Identity of the investigation/study: If performed under the Medical Device Directives or the MDR, then give the **CIV ID** or **single identification number**. Add reference details if the clinical investigation report is available in Eudamed.	DE/CA37/1540/KP-1 Not available in EUDAMED	DE/CA37/PolyMedics/KP-1 Not available in EUDAMED
Identity of the device including any model number/version	Suprathel®	Suprathel®
Intended use of the device in the investigation	Treatment of split skin grafts and second-degree burns	Local Treatment of Ulcus Cruris
Objectives of the study	The aim of the study was to examine whether Suprathel® is superior to the established procedures for split skin donor sites and burns in terms of pain behavior.	Target of the study was the measurement of the influence of Suprathel® on the wound area (main target), the wound pain, the inflammatory activity of the skin, the wound surface and the wound secretion
Study design: randomised controlled trial, other pivotal trial, short-term feasibility study, other; and the duration of the follow-up	prospective, randomized, two center clinical study Marienhospital (Stuttgart) and the Surgical Hospital Berlin with Prof. K.-K. Dittel as the Principal Investigator	prospective, multicenter study Six hospital departments from four hospitals enrolled 22 patients duration of the treatment was limited to 24 weeks
Primary and secondary endpoint(s)	study endpoints: 1. Pain, 2. Healing time, frequency of local events, quality of scarring	study endpoints: 1. Wound area 2. Pain, inflammatory activity (skin, wound surface), wound secretion, detect side effects
Inclusion/exclusion criteria for subject selection	Inclusion criteria: - Patients 18 years of age or older who are capable of giving consent and for whom - one split thickness skin removal or multiple split thickness skin removals for the purpose of a Skin grafting is necessary. The minimum size of the entire split skin removal site must not be less than 8 x 10 cm. - at least one contiguous area or two corresponding areas a 2nd degree burn over a total of at least 1.5 % of the body surface area show. Exclusion criteria: General exclusion criteria - Pregnancy. - Age under 18 years and over 80 years.	Inclusion criteria: - Written documentation of consent - Location of the wound distal to the knee joint - Age of the wound at least 3 months - Area of the wound maximum 25cm^2 - (Presumed) availability during the six-month period of the Study participation Exclusion criteria: - Younger than 18 years - Pregnancy and non-exclusion of pregnancy - Risk of pregnancy occurring during study integration - Study integration (for women, failure to meet at least one of the following criteria: Onset of menopause more than 2 years ago, - postmenopausal sterilization, surgical sterilization, commitment to contraception during the

	- Burns that are so severe that artificial respiration must be performed and thus consent to the study is not possible. - Burns with an ABSI greater than 10, because in these patients the vital threat is so high that the conduct of a study does not seem justifiable. Medical history exclusion criteria - Dialysis requirement. - Heart failure NYHA 3 or greater. - Ongoing chemotherapy. - Blood coagulation disorders (Quick value permanently below 50). Local exclusion criteria Burns in the regions will not be included in the study: - Face, - Neck, - Palm of the hand, - Genitals, - Buttocks, and - Soles of the feet. Secondary exclusion criteria - acute danger to life occurring during treatment, - severe general infections, - drug problem not primarily recognized (delirious state).	- Contraception during study integration with hormones, IUD or - Diaphragm/condom + spermicide. - Breastfeeding period - Incapacity or inability to consent (e.g. dementia) - Custody (by court or official order) or (already effected or initiated) - appointment of a guardian (which has already taken place or has been initiated) - Severe general illness requiring intensive care - Complete immobility - Malignancy in need of treatment or not treated curatively - Current immunosuppressive or chemotherapeutic treatment - Heart failure NYHA 3 or higher and cardiac-related leg edema - Severe liver disease with effects on the organism - derail diabetes mellitus (HbA1c >10%) - Apoplexy within the last 6 months - Dependency disease affecting internal organs (exception: - Nicotine abuse) - Presence of at least 1 ulcer larger than 25cm^2. - Venous or arterial vascular status in need of surgery (3 months after - inclusion in the study possible) - Concomitant deep infection, especially with bone involvement - (phlegmon, lymphangiitis, osteomyelitis) - Circular ulcers (so-called gaiter ulcers) - Systemic antibiotic therapy started or started in the last 4 weeks with a probable - antibiotic therapy with a presumed duration of >7 days. - Contraindication for Suprathel® (especially infected or heavily bleeding wounds). - wound) - Expected non-compliance (incl. known drug use) - Simultaneous participation in another clinical trial with existing insurance coverage.
Number of enrolled subjects, including if applicable in different treatment arms	two groups. 22 patients were enrolled in Group A (Skin covering at burns S1: Split skin grafts) and 24 patients were enrolled in Group B (Skin covering at burns S2: Covering of second degree burns).	22 patients in cohort design with absence of a control group
Study population: main baseline characteristics of each study group, including **gender** and **age** of enrolled subjects	Group A: 22 patients [18 males, 4 females; mean age 39.6 years (range 18-64 years)] Group B: 24 patients [20 male, 4 females; mean age 40.5 years, (range 19-64 years)]	The patients were 73 (±10) years old, 73% female and all suffered from ulcus cruris, which persisted at enrollment for 12 (±6) months in average
Summary of **study methods**	Wound pain: Visual Analog Scale (VAS) Healing time: Timing of complete epithelialization. Infections: Swabs (three-day intervals)	Survey of the wound area: Area calculation (length times width in cm^2) Definition of healing: complete epithelialization Wound pain: Visual Analog Scale (VAS):
Summary of results: any **clinical benefits**; any **undesirable side-effects** or **adverse events**, and their frequency in relation to time; any results on **long-term benefits or risks**, for example implant survival rates at 5 or 10	With reference to the primary target criterion, statistically significant evidence was accumulated that, in the case of split-skin graft donor sites [Group A; Suprathel® –group: mean 10-day pain score was 0.92; (median: 1.0; range 0.2-1.8); Jelonet®-group: mean 10-day pain score was 2.1 (median 2.8; range 0.4-3.0; p=0.0002], Suprathel® reduces pain	At the end of the study, max. after 24 weeks, in 73% of the cases the ulcus was completely healed, in all cases who remained in the protocol the wound size was smaller. The average wound size shrunk from 7.5 cm2 (±7.3 median 4.0) to 1.0 cm2 (±2.2 median 0.0) (p<0.001) in the per protocol analysis. The wound pain measured by using a visual analog scale (VAS) improved from 2.5 (±2.4, max. 8) to 0.1

years and/or cumulative experience in patient-years. A **statement of percentage completeness of follow-up** should be provided. Add a note if the **study is still ongoing for long-term follow up**.	compared to use of paraffin gauze, and also that in the case of 2nd degree burns [Group B; Suprathel®-group: mean 10-day pain score was 1.0 (median:0.9, range:0.2-1.8); Omiderm®-group: mean 10-day pain score was 1.59 (median 1.0, range 0.6-2.5); p=0.0072], there is a reduction of pain compared to use of Omiderm®. No statistically significant improvement with respect to healing time was documented [p= 0.5 (A+B); Group A: complete re-epithelization after a mean 10.5-day period (median: 10.5, range: 6-14) in the Suprathel®-group and after a 10.85-day period (median: 11, range 6-14); Group B: complete re-epithelization after a mean 10.2-day period (median:10.0, range 10-16) in the Suprathel®-group and after 10.3-day period (median:10.0, range 6-16) in the Omiderm®-group].	(±0.3, max. 1) (p=0.002) with Suprathel®. Any inflammatory activity was observed in 66.7% of wounds at the start of the trial, only 6.7% remained at the endpoint (p=0.004). In 100% of cases the observer judged the wound surface satisfactory after 66.7% at the start of the trial (p=0.1). No secretion was found in 73.3% of cases in comparison to 20.0% in the beginning (p=0.02).
Any **limitations of the study**, such as high loss to follow-up, or potential confounding factors that may question the results.	Not reported	Not reported
Any **device deficiency** and any **device replacements** related to safety and/or performance during the study.	Not reported	Not reported

Indication: small 3rd degree areas

The Approval was based on a collection of six case studies from the Marienhospital (Stuttgart) carried out by Dr. Uhlig. The report attests a positive risk/benefit balance for patients, since: Spontaneous healing is possible without transplantation. Also, re-transplantations can be carried out in a targeted fashion using less split skin. And better cosmetic results are obvious because “overgrafting” can be avoided.

5.3. Summary of clinical data from other sources (published Literature)

The most important findings identified as clinical benefits are:

- easy use
- significant pain relief
- less pain medication
- less cost and effort for dressing changes
- reduced length of hospital stay
- fast(er) healing process
- improved epithelization (histological research)
- good scar assessment (VSS/POSAS results)
- less oxidative stress
- reduced pro-inflammatory cytokines
- increased telomerase expression
- lower long-term reintervention rates, such as scar contracture releases

5.4. Overall summary of the clinical performance and safety

Clinical performance

The main clinical benefits of applying the Suprathel® medical device based on the current scientific knowledge are summarized in the following table:

Product claims made by PMI	Study Findings* related to device performance
Easy one-time application and assessment	Easy application of device
Significant Pain Relief	Significant Pain Relief Less pain medication required
Lower treatment costs	Less cost and effort for dressing changes Less costs due to less pain medication required Reduced length of patient hospital stays
Quick healing process	Fast(er) healing process Improved epithelization
Excellent cosmetic results	Improved epithelization Good scar assessment
Reduced inflammatory reaction	Less oxidative stress Reduced pro-inflammatory cytokines Increased telomerase expression
Reduced transplantation rate	Reduced need for grafting
Reduced need for reconstructive surgeries	Lower long-term reintervention rates, such as scar contracture releases Less reconstructive procedures
Reduced Length of stay in Hospital	Reduced Length of stay in Hospital

* *literature/references are listed at the end of the SSCP*

Clinical safety

With respect to device safety, none of the published studies reported any additional risks, for example due to increased infection rates or allergic reactions.

No adverse events or undesirable effects have ever been reported. Additionally, there have never been any customer complaints regarding the clinical safety of patients or where the product's defined specifications and quality were impacted.

5.5. Ongoing or planned post-market clinical follow-up

To continuously monitor the product's safety and performance, the Clinical Evaluation of the Suprathel® medical device is regularly updated with newly acquired clinical data throughout the device's life cycle. Due to its long-term product experience, PMCF studies are not required to establish further safety and performance evidence.

6. Possible diagnostic or therapeutic alternatives

Possible alternative treatment options for the above-mentioned indications:

- silver sulfadiazines creams
- traditional wound dressings (such as gauze dressings)
- hydrocolloid-, alginate-, hydrogel- polyurethane film and foam dressings,
- silicon-coated nylon dressings,
- wound dressings with antimicrobial properties

7. Suggested profile and training for users

The use of the medical device is restricted to healthcare professionals only. The application and aftercare procedures are described in the Instructions for Use accompanying the medical device and no additional user trainings are required in order to be able to apply Suprathel® correctly.

The suggested patient profile comprises patients within the above-mentioned indications. Apart from patients showing symptoms listed in the contraindications or known allergies against device components, there are no restrictions on the use of Suprathel® or any other patient selection criteria.

8. Reference to any (harmonized) standards and CS applied

Harmonised Standards	Brief Description
DIN EN ISO 13485:2021	Medical devices – Quality management systems – Requirements for regulatory purposes
DIN EN ISO 11737-1:2021	Sterilization of medical devices – Requirements for the estimation of population of microorganisms on a product
DIN EN ISO 11737-2:2020	Sterilization of medical devices – Microbiological methods – Part 2: Tests of sterility performed in the definition, validation and maintenance of a sterilization process
DIN EN ISO 11137-1:2020	Sterilization of health care products – Radiation – Part 1: Requirements for development, validation and routine control of a sterilization process for medical devices
EN ISO 15223-1:2021	Medical Devices - Symbols To Be Used With Medical Device Labels, Labelling And Information To Be Supplied - Part 1: General Requirements
Common specifications	Non available for the product
DIN EN ISO 13485	Medical devices - Quality management systems - Requirements for regulatory purposes
DIN EN 62366-1	Medical devices - Part 1: Application of usability engineering to medical devices
DIN EN ISO 14971	Medical devices – Application of risk management to medical devices
DIN EN ISO 14155	Clinical Investigation of Medical Devices for Human Subjects - Good Clinical Practice
DIN EN ISO 10993-1	Biological evaluation of medical devices - Part 1: Evaluation and testing within a risk management system
DIN EN ISO 10993-3	Biological evaluation of medical devices - Part 3: Tests for genotoxicity, carcinogenicity and reproductive toxicity
DIN EN ISO 10993-5	Biological evaluation of medical devices - Part 5: Tests for in vitro cytotoxicity

DIN EN ISO 10993-6	Biological evaluation of medical devices – Part 6: Tests for local effects after implantation
DIN EN ISO 10993-10	Biological evaluation of medical devices - Part 10: Tests for irritation and skin sensitization
DIN EN ISO 10993-11	Biological evaluation of medical devices - Part 11: Tests for systemic toxicity
DIN EN ISO 10993-12	Biological evaluation of medical devices - Part 12: Sample preparation and reference materials
DIN EN ISO 11737-1	Sterilization of medical devices - Requirements for the estimation of population of microorganisms on a product
DIN EN ISO 11737-2	Sterilization of medical devices - Microbiological methods - Part 2: Tests of sterility performed in the definition, validation and maintenance of a sterilization process
DIN EN ISO 11137-1	Sterilization of health care products - Radiation - Part 1: Requirements for development, validation and routine control of a sterilization process for medical devices
DIN EN ISO 11137-2	Sterilization of Health Care Products - Radiation - Part 2: Establishing The Sterilization Dose
DIN EN 556-1	Sterilization of medical devices - Requirements for medical devices to be designated "STERILE" - Part 1: Requirements for terminally sterilized medical devices
DIN EN IS0 11607-1	Packaging for terminally sterilized medical devices - Part 1: Requirements for materials, sterile barrier systems and packaging systems
DIN EN IS0 11607-2	Packaging for terminally sterilized medical devices - Part 2: Validation requirements for forming, sealing and assembly processes
DIN EN ISO 20417	Medical devices – Information to be supplied by the manufacturer
DIN EN ISO 15223-1	Medical Devices - Symbols To Be Used With Medical Device Labels, Labelling And Information To Be Supplied - Part 1: General Requirements
DIN EN 868-2	Packaging for terminally sterilized medical devices - Part 2: Sterilization wrap - Requirements and test methods
DIN EN 868-5	Packaging for terminally sterilized medical devices - Part 5: Sealable pouches and reels of porous materials and plastic film construction - Requirements and test methods
DIN EN IS0 14698-1	Cleanrooms and associated controlled environments -- Biocontamination control - Part 1: General principles and methods
DIN EN IS0 14698-2	Cleanrooms and associated controlled environments -- Biocontamination control - Part 2: Evaluation and interpretation of biocontamination data
ISTA 2a	Partial Simulation Performance Tests - Packaged Products 150 lb (68 kg) or Less
USP <151>	Pyrogen Study
ASTM F1886/F1886M	Standard Test Method for Determining Integrity of Seals for Flexible Packaging by Visual Inspection
ASTM F88/F88M	Standard Test Method for Seal Strength of Flexible Barrier Materials
ASTM F3039	Standard Test Method for Detecting Leaks in Nonporous Packaging or Flexible Barrier Materials by Dye Penetration

9. Literature references

Abbott, C. A., Carrington, A. L., Ashe, H., Bath, S., Every, L. C., Griffiths, J., Hann, A. W., Hussein, A., Jackson, N., Johnson, K. E., Ryder, C. H., Torkington, R., Van Ross, E. R., Whalley, A. M., Widdows, P., Williamson, S., Boulton, A. J. & North-West Diabetes Foot Care, S. (2002). The North-West Diabetes Foot Care Study: incidence of, and risk factors for, new diabetic foot ulceration in a community-based patient cohort. Diabet Med, 19, 377-84.

Albertsson, A., Eklund, M. (1995). Influence of Molecular Structure on the degradation mechanism of Degradable Polymers: In Vitro Degradation of Poly(Trimethylene Carbonate, Poly(Trimethylene Carbonat-co-Caprolactone), and Poly(Adipic Anhydride). J Applied Polymer Sci 57, 87-103.

Ali, S. A., Zhong, S. P., Doherty, P. J. & Williams, D. F. (1993). Mechanisms of polymer degradation in implantable devices. I. Poly(caprolactone). Biomaterials, 14, 648-56.

Apelqvist, J., Bakker, K., Van Houtum, W. H., Nabuurs-Franssen, M. H. & Schaper, N. C. (2000). International consensus and practical guidelines on the management and the prevention of the diabetic foot. International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot. Diabetes Metab Res Rev, 16 Suppl 1, S84-92.

Baartmans, M. G., Dokter, J., Den Hollander, J. C., Kroon, A. A. & Oranje, A. P. (2011). Use of skin substitute dressings in the treatment of staphylococcal scalded skin syndrome in neonates and young infants. Neonatology, 100, 9-13.

Barbachowska A, Korzeniowski T, Surowiecka A, Tomaka P, Bugaj-Tobiasz M, Łączyk M, Górecka Z, Chrapusta A, Strużyna J. The Effectiveness of an Alloplastic Epidermal Substitute in the Treatment of Burn Wounds in Children: A Comparative Clinical Study of Skin Substitutes and Silver and Paraffin Gauze Dressings.J Clin Med. 2024 Nov 28;13(23):7238.

Blome-Eberwein, S.A., Amani, H., Lozano, D.D., Gogal, C., Boorse, D., Pagella, P. Burns. A bio-degradable synthetic membrane to treat superficial and deep second degree burn wounds in adults and children – 4 year experience. 2020 Aug 29;S0305-4179(20)30507-6

Bostman, O. M. (1991). Absorbable implants for the fixation of fractures. J Bone Joint Surg Am, 73, 148-53.

Brady, J. M., Cutright, D. E., Miller, R. A. & Barristone, G. C. (1973). Resorption rate, route, route of elimination, and ultrastructure of the implant site of polylactic acid in the abdominal wall of the rat. J Biomed Mater Res, 7, 155-66.

Burd, A. & Yuen, C. (2005). A global study of hospitalized paediatric burn patients. Burns, 31, 432-8.

Bryant, R., Nix, D. (2006). Acute and Chronic Wounds 3rd Edition.

Cha, Y. & Pitt, C. G. (1990). The biodegradability of polyester blends. Biomaterials, 11, 108-12.

Cheema L, Manzoor S, Khalid U, Shamim R, Hashaam, Tayyab Z, Bashir M. Suprathel Dressing at Split Thickness Skin Graft Donor Site for Pain Control and Wound Healing. Pakistan journal of medical and health sciences, 2022, 16(10), 116-118

Dastagir N, Kijas D, Obed D, Tamulevicius M, Vogt PM, Dastagir K. Suprathel® and water-filtered infrared-A radiation (wIRA) as a new treatment strategy for toxic epidermal necrolysis (TEN): A prospective study. Burns. 2024 Dec;50(9):107283

Delgado-Miguel C, García Morán A, Fuentes Gómez L, Díaz M, Miguel-Ferrero M, López-Gutiérrez JC. Comparison of the effectiveness of three different skin substitutes for the treatment of pediatric burns. Eur J Pediatr. 2024 Dec 13;184(1):80.

Demircan, M., Gürünlüoglu, K., Gözükara, Bag, H.G., Koçbıyık, A., Gül, M., Üremiş, N., Gül, S., Gürünlüoğlu, S., Türköz, Y., Taşçı, A. Impaction of the polylactic membrane or hydrofiber with silver dressings on the interleukin-6, tumor necrosis factor-α, transforming growth factor-b3 levels in the blood and tissues of pediatric patients with burns. Ulus Travma Acil Cerrahi Derg. 2021 Jan;27(1):122-131

Dhivya, S., Padma, V. V. & Santhini, E. (2015). Wound dressings - a review. Biomedicine (Taipei), 5, 22.

Everett, M., Massand, S., Davis, W., Burkey, B. & Glat, P. M. (2015). Use of a copolymer dressing on superficial and partial-thickness burns in a paediatric population. J Wound Care, 24, S4-8.

Fernandes S, Teixeira I, Carmo L, Campos M, Garcia M. The Use of a Polylactic Membrane in Pediatric Burns Proves to be Successful Even After Late Application. J Burn Care Res. . 2023 Sep 7;44(5):1176-1181

Fischer, S., Kremer, T., Horter, J., Schaefer, A., Ziegler, B., Kneser, U., Hirche, C. Suprathel(®) for severe burns in the elderly: Case report and review of the literature. Burns. 2016 Aug;42(5):e86-92

Galati V, Vonthein R, Stang F, Mailaender P, Kisch T. Split thickness skin graft versus application of the temporary skin substitute suprathel in the treatment of deep dermal hand burns: a retrospective cohort study of scar elasticity and perfusion. Int J Burns Trauma. 2021 Aug 15;11(4):312-320

Gürünlüoglu, K., Demircan, M., Tasci, A., Uremis, M. M., Turkoz, Y., Bag, H. G., Akinci, A. & Bayrakci, E. (2019). The Effects of Two Different Burn Dressings on Serum Oxidative Stress Indicators in Children with Partial Burn. J Burn Care Res, 40, 444-450.

Gürünlüoglu, K., Demircan, M., Koç, A., Koçbıyık, A., Taşçı, A., Durmuş, K., Gürünlüoğlu, S., Gözükara Bağ, H. The Effects of Different Burn Dressings on Length of Telomere and Expression of Telomerase in Children With Thermal Burns. J Burn Care Res. 2019 Apr 26;40(3):302-311.

Hakkarainen, T., Koivuniemi, R., Kosonen, M., Escobedo-Lucea, C., Sanz-Garcia, A., Vuola, J., Valtonen, J., Tammela, P., Mäkitie, A., Luukko, K., Yliperttula, M., Kavola, H. J Control Release. Nanofibrillar cellulose wound dressing in skin graft donor site treatment. 2016 Dec 28;244(Pt B):292-301.

Harenberg, P. S., Hrabowski, M., Ryssel, H., Gazyakan, E., Germann, G., Engel, H. & Reichenberger, M. A. (2010). CASE REPORT Febrile Ulceronecrotic Mucha-Habermann Disease. Eplasty, 10.

Heitzmann W, Mossing M, Fuchs PC, Akkan J, Seyhan H, Grieb G, Opländer C, Schiefer JL. Comparative Clinical Study of Suprathel® and Jelonet® Wound Dressings in Burn Wound Healing after Enzymatic Debridement.

Hettiaratchy, S. & Papini, R. (2004). Initial management of a major burn: II--assessment and resuscitation. BMJ, 329, 101-3.

Highton, L., Wallace, C., Shah, M. Use of Suprathel® for partial thickness burns in children. Burns. 2013 Feb;39(1):136-41

Hollinger, J. O. & Battistone, G. C. (1986). Biodegradable bone repair materials. Synthetic polymers and ceramics. Clin Orthop Relat Res, 290-305.

Hundeshagen, G., Collins, V. N., Wurzer, P., Sherman, W., Voigt, C. D., Cambiaso-Daniel, J., Nunez Lopez, O., Sheaffer, J., Herndon, D. N., Finnerty, C. C. & Branski, L. K. (2018). A Prospective, Randomized, Controlled Trial Comparing the Outpatient Treatment of Pediatric and Adult Partial-Thickness Burns with Suprathel or Mepilex Ag. J Burn Care Res, 39, 261-267.

Hunt, T., Aslam, R., Beckert, S., Wagner, S., Ghani, R., Hussain, M., Roy, S., And Sen, C. (2007). Aerobically Derived Lactate Stimulates Revascularization And Tissue Repair Via Redox Mechanisms. Antioxidants & Redox Signaling Volume 9, Number 8.

Kaartinen, I. S. & Kuokkanen, H. O. (2011). Suprathel((R)) causes less bleeding and scarring than Mepilex((R)) Transfer in the treatment of donor sites of split-thickness skin grafts. J Plast Surg Hand Surg, 45, 200-3.

Karlsson M, Steinvall I, Elmasry M. Suprathel® or Mepilex® Ag for treatment of partial thickness burns in children: A case control study. Burns. 2023 Mar 11;S0305-4179(23)00043-8.

Kamolz, L.-P., Herndon, D. N., Jeschke, M. G. (2009). Verbrennungen – Diagnose, Therapie und Rehabilitation des thermischen Traumas. Wien Springer-Verlage.

Kamolz, L., Lumenta, D., Kitzinger, H., Frey, M. (2008). Tissue engineering for cutaneous wounds: an overview of current standards and possibilities. Eur Surg 40, 19-26.

Katz, A. R., Mukherjee, D. P., Kaganov, A. L. & Gordon, S. (1985). A new synthetic monofilament absorbable suture made from polytrimethylene carbonate. Surg Gynecol Obstet, 161, 213-22.

Keck, M., Selig, H. F., Lumenta, D. B., Kamolz, L. P., Mittlbock, M. & Frey, M. (2012). The use of Suprathel((R)) in deep dermal burns: first results of a prospective study. Burns, 38, 388-95.

Kumar, S., Ashe, H. A., Parnell, L. N., Fernando, D. J., Tsigos, C., Young, R. J., Ward, J. D. & Boulton, A. J. (1994). The prevalence of foot ulceration and its correlates in type 2 diabetic patients: a population-based study. Diabet Med, 11, 480-4.

Larson, M.L., Elkady, D., Sharma, S., Beaucock, B., Lou, R.B., Khandelwal, A. (2024). Burns. 2024 Sep;50(7):1832-1839

Lindford, A. J., Kaartinen, I. S., Virolainen, S. & Vuola, J. (2011). Comparison of Suprathel(R) and allograft skin in the treatment of a severe case of toxic epidermal necrolysis. Burns, 37, e67-72.

Liodaki, E,, Schopp, B.E., Lindert, J., Krämer, R., Kisch, T., Mailänder, P., Stang, F. Kombination von universellem Antidot und temporärem Hautersatz bei Verätzungen [Combination of a universal

antidote and temporary skin substitute for chemical burns: Extended case report]. Unfallchirurg. 2015 Sep;118(9):804-7.

Madry, R., Struzyna, J., Stachura-Kulach, A., Drozdz, L. & Bugaj, M. (2011). Effectiveness of Suprathel(R) application in partial thickness burns, frostbites and Lyell syndrome treatment. Pol Przegl Chir, 83, 541-8.

Margolis, D. J., Allen-Taylor, L., Hoffstad, O. & Berlin, J. A. (2004). The accuracy of venous leg ulcer prognostic models in a wound care system. Wound Repair Regen, 12, 163-8.

Margolis, D. J., Allen-Taylor, L., Hoffstad, O. & Berlin, J. A. (2004). The accuracy of venous leg ulcer prognostic models in a wound care system. Wound Repair Regen, 12, 163-8.

Margolis, D. J., Malay, D. S., Hoffstad, O. J., Leonard, C. E., Macurdy, T., Lopez De Nava, K., Tan, Y., Molina, T. & Siegel, K. L. 2011. Prevalence of diabetes, diabetic foot ulcer, and lower extremity amputation among Medicare beneficiaries, 2006 to 2008: Data Points #1. Data Points Publication Series. Rockville (MD).

Markl, P., Prantl, L., Schreml, S., Babilas, P., Landthaler, M. & Schwarze, H. (2010). Management of split-thickness donor sites with synthetic wound dressings: results of a comparative clinical study. Ann Plast Surg, 65, 490-6.

März V, Vogt M. Skin Healing of Deep Second Degree Burn Injuries in Four Individuals Sustained in a Boat Explosion Results after Different Approaches. Eur. Burn J. 2020, 1, 191–195

Merz, K. M., Sievers, R., Reichert, B. (2011). Suprathel® for coverage of superficial dermal burns of the face. GMS Verbrennungsmedizin, 4.

Miguel-Ferrero M, Delgado-Miguel C, Díaz M, Carlos López-Gutiérrez J. Toxic epidermal necrolysis management with suprathel™Tratamiento de la necrólisis epidérmica tóxica con suprathel®. An Pediatr (Engl Ed). 2023 Aug 17:S2341-2879(23)00185-0

Moellhoff N, Lettner M, Frank K, Giunta RE, Ehrl D. Polylactic Acid Membrane Improves Outcome of Split-Thickness Skin Graft Donor Sites: A Prospective, Comparative, Randomized Study. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2022 Nov 1;150(5):1104-1113

Moffatt, C. J. & Dorman, M. C. (1995). Recurrence of leg ulcers within a community ulcer service. J Wound Care, 4, 57-61.

Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med. 2009;6:e1000097. DOI:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

Mueller, E., Haim, M., Petnehazy, T., Acham-Roschitz, B. & Trop, M. (2010). An innovative local treatment for staphylococcal scalded skin syndrome. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis, 29, 893-7.

Nischwitz SP, Popp D, Shubitidze D, Luze H, Zrim R, Klemm K, Rapp M, Haller HL, Feisst M, Kamolz LP. The successful use of polylactide wound dressings for chronic lower leg wounds: A retrospective analysis. Int Wound J. 2021 Nov 8.

O'meara, S. & Martyn-St James, M. (2013). Foam dressings for venous leg ulcers. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, CD009907

Pego, A. P., Van Luyn, M. J., Brouwer, L. A., Van Wachem, P. B., Poot, A. A., Grijpma, D. W. & Feijen, J. (2003). In vivo behavior of poly(1,3-trimethylene carbonate) and copolymers of 1,3-trimethylene carbonate with D,L-lactide or epsilon-caprolactone: Degradation and tissue response. J Biomed Mater Res A, 67, 1044-54.

Pfurtscheller, K. & Trop, M. (2014). Phototoxic plant burns: report of a case and review of topical wound treatment in children. Pediatr Dermatol, 31, e156-9.

Pfurtscheller, K., Zobel, G., Roedl, S. & Trop, M. (2008). Use of Suprathel dressing in a young infant with TEN. Pediatr Dermatol, 25, 541-3.

Pitt, C. G., Gratzl, M. M., Kimmel, G. L., Surles, J. & Schindler, A. (1981). Aliphatic polyesters II. The degradation of poly (DL-lactide), poly (epsilon-caprolactone), and their copolymers in vivo. Biomaterials, 2, 215-20.

Quinn, K. J., Courtney, J. M., Evans, J. H., Gaylor, J. D. & Reid, W. H. (1985). Principles of burn dressings. Biomaterials, 6, 369-77.

Rahmanian-Schwarz, A., Beiderwieden, A., Willkomm, L.M., Amr, A., Schaller, H.E., Lotter, O. A clinical evaluation of Biobrane(®) and Suprathel(®) in acute burns and reconstructive surgery. Burns. 2011 Dec;37(8):1343-8

Rajendran, S., Anand, S.C. (2011). Hi-tech textiles for interactive wound therapies: Handbook of Medical Textiles.

Rashaan, Z. M., Krijnen, P., Allema, J. H., Vloemans, A. F., Schipper, I. B. & Breederveld, R. S. (2017). Usability and effectiveness of Suprathel((R)) in partial thickness burns in children. Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg, 43, 549-556.

Robson, M. C., Steed, D. L. & Franz, M. G. (2001). Wound healing: biologic features and approaches to maximize healing trajectories. Curr Probl Surg, 38, 72-140.

Rothenberger, J., Constantinescu, M. A., Held, M., Aebersold, D. M., Stolz, A., Tschumi, C. & Olariu, R. (2016). Use of a Polylactide-based Copolymer as a Temporary Skin Substitute for a Patient With Moist Desquamation Due to Radiation. Wounds, 28, E26-30.

Ruckley, C. V. (1998). Caring for patients with chronic leg ulcer. BMJ, 316, 407-8.

Sari, E., Eryilmaz, T., Tetik, G., Ozakpinar, H. R. & Eker, E. (2014). Suprathel((R)) -assisted surgical treatment of the hand in a dystrophic epidermolysis bullosa patient. Int Wound J, 11, 472-5.

Schiefer, J.L., Rahmanian-Schwarz, A., Schaller, H.E., Manoli, T. A Novel Hand-shaped Suprathel simplifies the Treatment of Partial-Thickness Burns. Adv Skin Wound Care. 2014 Nov;27(11):513-6

Schiefer JL, Andreae J, Bagheri M, Fuchs PC, Lefering R, Heitzmann W, Schulz A. A clinical comparison of pure knitted silk and a complex synthetic skin substitute for the treatment of partial thickness burns. Int Wound J. 2022 Jan;19(1):178-187.

Schiefer JL, Aretz GF, Fuchs PC , Bagheri M, Funk M, Schulz A, Daniels M. Comparison of wound healing and patient comfort in partial-thickness burn wounds treated with SUPRATHEL and epicte hydro wound dressings. Int Wound J. 2022 May;19(4):782-790. (a)

Schiefer JL, Aretz FG, Fuchs PC, Lefering R, Yary P, Opländer C, Schulz A, Daniels M. Comparison of Long-Term Skin Quality and Scar Formation in Partial-Thickness Burn Wounds Treated with Suprathel® and epicitehydro® Wound Dressings. Medicina (Kaunas). 2022 Oct 28;58(11):1550. (b)

Schiefer JL, Andreae J, Fuchs PC, Lefering R, Heidekrueger PI, Schulz A, Bagheri M. Evaluation of Scar Quality after Treatment of Superficial Burns with Dressilk® and Suprathel®-In an Intraindividual Clinical Setting. J Clin Med. 2022 May 18;11(10):2857 (c)

Schreml, S., Szeimies, R. M., Prantl, L., Karrer, S., Landthaler, M. & Babilas, P. (2010). Oxygen in acute and chronic wound healing. Br J Dermatol, 163, 257-68.

Schriek K, Ott H, Sinnig M. Paradigm Shift in Treatment Strategies for Second-Degree. Eur. Burn J. 2022, 3, 1–9

Schwarze, H., Kuntscher, M., Uhlig, C., Hierlemann, H., Prantl, L., Noack, N. & Hartmann, B. (2007). Suprathel, a new skin substitute, in the management of donor sites of split-thickness skin grafts: results of a clinical study. Burns, 33, 850-4.

Schwarze, H., Kuntscher, M., Uhlig, C., Hierlemann, H., Prantl, L., Ottomann, C. & Hartmann, B. (2008). Suprathel, a new skin substitute, in the management of partial-thickness burn wounds: results of a clinical study. Ann Plast Surg, 60, 181-5.

Selig, H. F., Keck, M., Lumenta, D. B., Mittlbock, M. & Kamolz, L. P. (2013). The use of a polylactide-based copolymer as a temporary skin substitute in deep dermal burns: 1-year follow-up results of a prospective clinical noninferiority trial. Wound Repair Regen, 21, 402-9.

Sun, H., Mei, L., Song, C., Cui, X. & Wang, P. (2006). The in vivo degradation, absorption and excretion of PCL-based implant. Biomaterials, 27, 1735-40.

Szycher, M. & Lee, S. J. (1992). Modern wound dressings: a systematic approach to wound healing. J Biomater Appl, 7, 142-213.

Tams, J., Joziasse, C. A., Bos, R. R., Rozema, F. R., Grijpma, D. W. & Pennings, A. J. (1995). High-impact poly(L/D-lactide) for fracture fixation: in vitro degradation and animal pilot study. Biomaterials, 16, 1409-15.

Thomas, S. S., Lawrence, J. C. & Thomas, A. (1995). Evaluation of hydrocolloids and topical Medication In Minor Burns. J Wound Care, 4, 218-20.

Trabold, O., Wagner, S., Wicke, C., Scheuenstuhl, H., Hussain, Z., Rosen, N., Seremetiev, A., Becker, H., Hunt, T (2003). Lactate and oxygen constitute a fundamental regulatory mechanism in wound healing. Wound Rep Reg 11:504–509.

Uhlig, C., Hierlemann, H., Dittel, K.-K. (2007). Actual Strategies in the Treatment of Severe Burns - Considering Modern Skin Substitutes. Osteo trauma care 15, 2-7.

Uhlig, C., Rapp, M. & Dittel, K. K. (2007a). [New strategies for the treatment of thermally injured hands with regard to the epithelial substitute Suprathel]. Handchir Mikrochir Plast Chir, 39, 314-9.

Uhlig, C., Rapp, M., Hartmann, B., Hierlemann, H., Planck, H. & Dittel, K. K. (2007b). Suprathel-an innovative, resorbable skin substitute for the treatment of burn victims. Burns, 33, 221-9.

Vasel-Biergans, A., Probst, W. (2010). Wundauflagen. Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft Stuttgart.

Vowden, K. R. & Vowden, P. (2009). The prevalence, management, equipment provision and outcome for patients with pressure ulceration identified in a wound care survey within one English health care district. J Tissue Viability, 18, 20-6.

Wasiak, J., Cleland, H., Campbell, F. & Spinks, A. (2013). Dressings for superficial and partial thickness burns. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, CD002106.

Wasiak, J., Cleland, H. (2005). Minor thermal burns. Clinical Evidence, 2754-2763.

Wild, S., Roglic, G., Green, A., Sicree, R. & King, H. (2004). Global prevalence of diabetes: estimates for the year 2000 and projections for 2030. Diabetes Care, 27, 1047-53.

Woodward, S. C., Brewer, P. S., Moatamed, F., Schindler, A. & Pitt, C. G. (1985). The intracellular degradation of poly(epsilon-caprolactone). J Biomed Mater Res, 19, 437-44.

Wu, L., Norman, G., Dumville, J. C., O'meara, S. & Bell-Syer, S. E. (2015). Dressings for treating foot ulcers in people with diabetes: an overview of systematic reviews. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, CD010471.

10.Revision history

SSCP version no.	Date issued	Change description	Revision validated by the Notified Body
01	2021.05.26	The SSCP document was firstly initiated and written based on the new requirement of the MDR (EU) 2017/745.	☐ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
02	2022.03.17	The SSCP was updated with the indication of chronic wounds.	☐ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
03	2022.05.30	The SSCP so far was lacking a full list of harmonized standards. This list was now amended (acc. to MDD as no MDR certification was obtained yet)	☐ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
04	2022.06.30	Correction of formatting errors in chapter 1 – the lines of the table have shifted (points 1.1 – 1.9 on page 1) and therefore didn't match the content in the neighboring column.	☐ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
05	2022.11.28	The newly updated CER reference was added to the report's header.	☐ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
06	2023.02.14	**Only editorial change**: Due to the extremely high translation costs into the 24 EU national languages, the SCCP was formulated more concisely. For example, extensive text passages were converted into bullet points, etc.	☒ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
07	2024.04.01	**Substantive change:** Due to the official change of the manufacturer's address (relocation of the company headquarters to Kirchheim unter Teck), the manufacturer's address was also updated in the SSCP.	☒ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
08	2024.07.22	**Substantive change:** As part of the annual updates to the PMCF report and the CER, the SCCP was also updated accordingly. The CER reference in the header was updated and part II for patients or lay persons was added.	☒ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No
09	2025.02.28	**Substantive change:** Update after annual PMCF activities: Additional product claims ("Reduced need for reconstructive surgeries" and "Reduced length of patient hospital stays")	☒ Yes Validation language: EN ☐ No

based on Clinical Evaluation Report V12

issued: 2025.02.28

SUMMARY OF SAFETY AND CLINICAL PERFORMANCE (SSCP)

Part II: for patients or lay persons

This Summary of Safety and Clinical Performance (SSCP) is intended to provide public access to an updated summary of the main aspects of the safety and clinical performance of the medical device Suprathel®. The information presented below is intended for patients or lay persons.

The SSCP is not intended to give general advice on the treatment of a medical condition. Please contact your healthcare professional in case you have questions about your medical condition or about the use of the device in your situation. This SSCP is not intended to replace an Implant card or the Instructions For Use to provide information on the safe use of the device

1. Device Identification and general information

1.1	Device trade names	**Suprathel®, Suprathel® 250**
1.2	Manufacturer's name and address	PolyMedics Innovations GmbH (PMI) Am Hegelesberg 1 73230 Kirchheim unter Teck, Germany
1.3	Basic UDI	426018402AAA0000001PQ
1.4	Year when the first certificate (CE) was issued covering the device	2004

2. Intended use of the device

2.1. Intended purpose

- Suprathel® is an absorbable, microporous membrane and an alloplastic skin substitute for the treatment of epidermal and dermal wounds.

2.2. Indications and intended patient groups

- Suprathel® is indicated for patients with epidermal and dermal wounds, including abrasions, split skin graft donor sites, 2nd degree burns as well as 2nd degree burns mixed with 3rd degree burned areas.
- Suprathel® is used for patients with chronic wounds, such as venous and arterial ulcers, as well as diabetic wounds.
- Apart from patients with allergies against device components, there are no patient selection criteria, such as age or gender.

2.3. Contraindications

- Suprathel® should not be used on infected wound sites or on severely bleeding wounds without additional hemostatic treatment.
- Suprathel® should not be applied on chronic dry wounds.

3. Device Description

3.1. Description of the device

Suprathel® characteristics:

- single use, one-time application skin substitute
- highly permeable to oxygen and water vapour
- composed of three synthetic and bioresorbable components: lactide, trimethylene carbonate and caprolactone
- no medicinal substances, tissue or blood derivates incorporated
- wound application possible with both sides of the device
- enables visual assessment of the healing process due to its transparency after contact to the wound

Suprathel® sizes and shape:

- Available in two variants with different thicknesses: 50 - 150 µm and 180 - 320 µm
- solid, rectangular sheets in sizes: 5 x 5 cm, 9 x 10 cm, 18 x 10 cm up to 18 x 23 cm, hand shape and face mask
- Suprathel may be manually trimmed by the user to other shapes and sizes as needed for optimal coverage of the affected areas.

3.2. Description of how the device is achieving its intended mode of action

Suprathel® is a synthetic skin coverage designed to mimic human skin. It is flexible, allows water vapor to pass through, but blocks bacteria. Since it's fully synthetic, it avoids risks associated with products from human or animal sources. The degradation products of Suprathel® may facilitate the healing process by supporting the angiogenesis and the re-building of the dermis. Suprathel® forms a thin, elastic layer that sticks to the wound on its own, usually without needing stitches. For traumatic wounds, it's applied once

and stays until healing is complete. For chronic wounds, it may need to be changed periodically. The membrane becomes transparent, allowing the wound to be monitored. When the skin heals, Suprathel® is easily removed without causing pain.

3.3. Description of any accessories which are intended to be used in combination with the device

Not applicable

4. Risks and warnings

Contact your healthcare professional if you believe that you are experiencing side effects related to the device or its use or if you are concerned about risks. This document is not intended to replace a consultation with your healthcare professional if needed.

4.1. How potential risks have been managed

All known risks were evaluated and mitigated as part of risk analyses. All performed risk analyses conclude with an acceptable overall benefit/risk ratio.

4.2. Remaining risks and undesirable effects

The three risks in the „non-acceptable" field were analyzed and accepted since the benefits far outweigh the risks. All three of them are linked to potentially serious infections as indicated in this SSCP at section contraindications and warnings and precautions. However, the probability of occurrence is linked either to sterility issues which by definition can occur with a certain probability, or to a hazardous situation that has never occurred in the entire product history of more than 20 years.

Acceptable residual risks are provided to the users within the Instructions for Use. Corresponding warnings and precautions resulting from the accepted residual risks are listed below.

4.3. Warnings and precautions

- Do not apply a product, where the sterility may not be ensured as this may lead to severe infections.
- The content is sterile unless sterile packaging is damaged
- In case of packaging damages, the sterility of the product is not ensured. The unused contents of opened or damaged sterile packages are to be discarded
- Do not reuse and do not resterilise. If the product is nevertheless reused, this may lead to impairment of product performance characteristics (reduced permeability, elasticity, adherence capability as well as sterility). Such changes of material properties may in turn lead to treatment impairments, such as inadequate wound healing as well as infections
- In the case of known allergies against components of Suprathel®, the membrane should not be applied. Suprathel® should be removed immediately if there are any signs of allergic reactions to the material.
- Suprathel® should be removed immediately if there are any signs of allergic reactions to the material. Suprathel® should be removed in cases of severe pain or accumulations of wound secretions
- Coverage of intact skin may lead to skin macerations and should be avoided

4.4. Other relevant aspects of safety, including a summary of any field safety corrective action (FSCA including FSN) if applicable

Not applicable

5. Summary of clinical evaluation and post-market clinical follow-up (PMCF)

5.1. Clinical background of the device

Suprathel® was designed to mimic natural skin, providing a protective barrier and creating an optimal environment for healing. It should help reduce pain and the risk of infection.

The effectiveness of Suprathel® has been demonstrated in various studies. An approval study for burns and donor sites showed that the device creates an optimal healing environment, and significantly reduce pain. Two further studies expanded the indications to include chronic wounds and small third-degree areas, confirming their benefits in these conditions. Since approval, 48 additional studies have been published, highlighting the following advantages: easy one-time application and assessment, significant pain relief, lower treatment costs, quick healing process, excellent cosmetic results, reduced inflammatory reaction, reduced transplantation rate, reduced need for reconstructive surgeries and reduced length of hospital stay.

5.2. Summary of clinical data from conducted investigations of the device before the CE-marking,

Burns and donor sites: Approval Study Summary

The approval study for Suprathel involved 46 patients with second-degree burns and split skin donor sites at two hospitals in Germany. The study aimed to compare pain levels between Suprathel and traditional dressings. Results showed that Suprathel significantly reduced pain compared to paraffin gauze and Omiderm. The study also monitored wound healing time and the occurrence of local complications like infections and allergies, with no significant differences observed. Additionally, the study highlighted the easy handling of Suprathel, making it a convenient option for both patients and healthcare providers.

Chronic Wounds

Earliest Case Studies:
In 2008, Dr. Uhlig treated eight patients with chronic ulcers using Suprathel. The patients, averaging 76 years old, had ulcers for about 14 months. Treatment lasted around 222 days, with all ulcers healing completely. Immediate pain reduction was noted.

Clinical Trial:
In 2010, a clinical trial was conducted across six departments in four hospitals, involving 22 patients with leg ulcers. The study aimed to measure Suprathel's impact on wound size, pain, inflammation, and secretion over 24 weeks. Patients, mostly women with an average age of 73, had ulcers for about 12 months. By the end of the study, 73% of ulcers healed completely, wound size significantly reduced, pain decreased, and inflammation was minimized. The trial demonstrated Suprathel's effectiveness in promoting healing and reducing discomfort in chronic wound patients.

Small 3rd degree areas

The approval was based on six case studies from Marienhospital Stuttgart by Dr. Uhlig. It highlights that spontaneous healing is possible without the need for transplantation. Additionally, if re-transplantations are needed, they can be done more precisely using less skin. This approach also leads to better cosmetic results because excessive grafting can be avoided.

5.3. Clinical safety

Regarding the safety of the device, no studies have reported any additional risks, such as increased infections or allergic reactions. There have been no adverse events or unwanted effects. Furthermore, there have never been any customer complaints about the safety of patients or the quality of the product.

6. Possible diagnostic or therapeutic alternatives

When considering alternative treatments, it is recommended to contact your healthcare professional who can take into account your individual situation.

Possible alternative treatment options for the above-mentioned indications:

- silver sulfadiazines creams
- traditional wound dressings (such as gauze dressings)
- hydrocolloid-, alginate-, hydrogel- polyurethane film and foam dressings,
- silicon-coated nylon dressings,
- wound dressings with antimicrobial properties

7. Suggested training for users

The use of the medical device is restricted to healthcare professionals only. The application and aftercare procedures are described in the Instructions for Use accompanying the medical device and no additional user trainings are required in order to be able to apply Suprathel® correctly.

The suggested patient profile comprises patients within the above-mentioned indications. Apart from patients showing symptoms listed in the contraindications or known allergies against device components, there are no restrictions on the use of Suprathel® or any other patient selection criteria.