

References

S-33

1. Zelen CM, Orgill DP, Serena T, et al. A prospective, randomized, controlled, multicenter clinical trial examining healing rates, safety and cost to closure of an acellular reticular allogenic human dermis versus standard of care in the treatment of chronic diabetic foot ulcers. *Int Wound J*. 2017;14:307-315.
2. Chang E, Liu J. Prospective unbiased experience with three acellular dermal matrices in breast reconstruction. *J Surg Oncol*. 2017;9999:1–6.
3. Brown-Etris M, Milne CT, Hodde JP. An extracellular matrix graft (Oasis wound matrix) for treating full-thickness pressure ulcers: A randomized clinical trial. *J Tissue Viability*. 2019;28:21-29.
4. Chang E, Liu J. Prospective unbiased experience with three acellular dermal matrices in breast reconstruction. *J Surg Oncol*. 2017;9999:1–6.
5. Yeh D, Nazarian R, Demetri L, et al. Histopathological assessment of OASIS Ultra on critical sized wound healing: A pilot study. *J Cutan Pathol*. 2017;44:523–529.
6. Hayes, Inc. Hayes Comparative Effectiveness Review. Cellular Skin Substitutes for Chronic Foot Ulcers in Adults with Diabetes Mellitus. Landsdale, Pa: Hayes, Inc. 03/26/2020.
7. Hayes, Inc. Hayes Comparative Effectiveness Review. Accellular Skin Substitutes for qrlwf Hayes, Inc. Hayes Evidence Analysis Research Brief. Puraply Antimicrobial (AM) Wound Matrix (Organogenesis Inc.) for the Treatment of Wounds. Landsdale, PA: Hayes, Inc. 05/27/2020.
8. Hayes, Inc. Hayes Comparative Effectiveness Review. Skin Substitutes for Venous Leg Ulcers in Adults. Landsdale, PA: Hayes Inc. 07/23/2020.
9. Holl J, Kowalewski C, Zimek Z, et al. Chronic diabetic wounds and their treatment with skin substitutes. *Cells*. 2021;10:655.
10. National Institute for Health Care Excellence (NICE). Diabetic Foot problems: Prevention and Management [NG19]. 2019; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng19/evidence>.
11. Mendenhall SD, Anderson LA, Ying J, et al. The BREASTrial Stage II: ADM breast reconstruction outcomes from definitive reconstruction to 3 months postoperative. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2017;5(1):e1209.
12. Snyder DL, Sullivan N, Margolis DJ, Schoelles K. Skin substitutes for treating chronic wounds. Technology Assessment Program Project. WNDT0818. (Prepared by the ECRI Institute-Penn Medicine Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. HHSA 290-2015-00005-I) Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. 2020.

13. Gurtner GC, Garcia AD, Bakewell K, et al. A retrospective matched-cohort study of 3994 lower extremity wounds of multiple etiologies across 644 institutions comparing a bioactive human skin allograft, TheraSkin, plus standard of care, to standard of care alone. *Int Wound J.* 2020;17(1):55-64.
14. Dikmans RE, Negenborn VL, Bouman MB, et al. Two-stage implant-based breast reconstruction compared with immediate one-stage implant-based breast reconstruction augmented with an acellular dermal matrix: An open-label, phase 4, multicentre, randomised, controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2017;18(2):251-258.
15. Dowsett C, Bain K, Hoffmann C, et al. The Wound Care Pathway: An evidence-based and step-by-step approach towards wound healing. *Wounds Int.* 2021;12(3):78-85.
16. Tavakili S, Klar A. Bioengineered skin substitutes: Advances and future trends. *Appl. Sci.* 2021;11:1493.
17. Chen T, Ayala-Haedo, Blessing N, et al. Bioengineered dermal substitutes for the management of traumatic periocular tissue loss. *Orbit.* 2018;37(2):115-120