A Systematic Review with Semi-Quantitative Synthesis and GRADE Qualification of the Effectiveness of a Keratin-Based Matrix in Treating Hard-to-Heal Wounds

William H Tettelbach,[1,2,3,4,5] Martha R Kelso,[6,7,8,9] Louis Cappa,[10,11] Mervin Low,[12]

BACKGROUND

Hard-to-heal wounds, including lower extremity diabetic ulcers (LEDUs), venous leg ulcers (VLUs), and epidermolysis bullosa (EB), represent a significant source of morbidity and cost, often refractory to standard of care (SOC) interventions. Keratin biomaterials derived from purified wool proteins have demonstrated regenerative properties that promote keratinocyte activation, upregulate keratin 6/16/17, and restore dermal–epidermal junction integrity. *Keramatrix* (BioWound Solutions, Las Vegas, NV, USA) is an FDA 510(k)-cleared keratin-based matrix (KBM) designed to accelerate dermal-epithelial repair in partial- and full-thickness wounds.

METHODS

Following *PRISMA 2020* methodology, a systematic review (2006–2025) identified clinical and translational studies evaluating Keramatrix and related keratin biomaterials. Data from one randomized controlled trial (RCT), comparative cohorts, and observational case series were extracted into a master evidence table and appraised across five *GRADE* domains (risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, publication bias). Because of study heterogeneity, findings were synthesized narratively and semi-quantitatively, summarizing directional effect sizes for ≥ 50 % wound-area reduction (WAR) and complete closure at 8–12 weeks. Full list of included studies and extracted data are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Author Affiliations

1. Chief Medical Officer, RestorixHealth, Metairie, LA, US. 2. President, American Professional Wound Care Association (APWCA), Milwaukee, WI, US. 3. President, Wound and Hyperbaric Association (WHA). 4. Adjunct Assistant Professor of Undersea & Hyperbaric Medicine, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, US. 5. Adjunct Professor of Podiatric Medicine & Surgery, Western University of Health Sciences, Pomona, CA, US. 6. Chief Executive Officer, Wound Care Plus, LLC, Kansas City, MO, US. 7. Board Member, American Professional Wound Care Association (APWCA). 8. Board Member, Post Acute Wound & Skin Integrity Council (PAWSIC). 9. Board Member, Wound and Hyperbaric Association (WHA). 10. Medical Director, Montefiore St. Lukes Cornwall Hospital Wound Care Center and Hyperbaric Center. 11. Chief of Podiatric surgery, Montefiore St. Lukes Cornwall Hospital. 12. Plastic Surgeon CEO, Newport Wound, Newport Beach, CA, US.

Corresponding author email: tarpon@xmission.com

Download Publication

RESULTS

Thirty-two studies (≈ 700 wounds) met inclusion criteria: one RCT, six comparative or cohort studies, fifteen case series, and ten case or preclinical reports, encompassing diabetic foot ulcers, venous leg ulcers, pressure injury ulcers, donor-site wounds, burns, and epidermolysis bullosa lesions. Across comparable chronic wound cohorts (≈ 400 wounds), keratin-based matrix (KBM) treated wounds achieved ≥ 50 % wound-area reduction (WAR) in 60–80 % of cases versus 25–45 % with SOC (approximate RR 1.9; 95 % CI 1.2–3.2). Complete epithelialization occurred in 45–70 % versus 25–40 % of controls. The Davidson 2013 RCT demonstrated a four-day acceleration in donor-site epithelialization compared with alginate dressing alone (High certainty). No device-related serious adverse events were reported. Overall certainty was High for acute donor-site healing and Moderate for chronic ulcers (LEDUs, VLUs, pressure injuries, and epidermolysis bullosa lesions), supported by consistent mechanistic plausibility and absence of any safety signal (See Table 1 for Summary-of-Findings).

DISCUSSION

Keratin-based matrices consistently improved epithelialization and closure across LEDUs, VLUs, pressure injury ulcers and EB lesions. Compared with other advanced biologics (e.g., Dermagraft), *Keramatrix* achieved equivalent or higher *GRADE* certainty, supported by robust mechanistic evidence and favorable safety.

CONCLUSION

Keramatrix provides a biologically active, clinically effective, and resource-efficient keratin platform for hard-to-heal wounds. With High certainty for acute donor-site healing and Moderate certainty for chronic ulcers (LEDUs, VLUs, pressure injuries, and EB lesions), it satisfies the evidentiary standards for recognition as an advanced therapy supported by high-quality clinical and mechanistic evidence, consistent with CMS coverage evaluation criteria for Cellular, Acellular, and Matrix-like Products (CAMPs) following ≥ 4 weeks of optimized standard care. Continued real-world data will further define its long-term clinical and economic impact across care settings.

Table 1. Summary-of-Findings (GRADE) for Keramatrix vs Standard of Care

Outcome	Keramatrix vs SOC	Relative Effect (95 % CI)	Absolute Difference	Certainty (GRADE)
≥ 50 % Wound-area reduction @ 8–12 wk	60–80 % vs 25–45 % (SOC)	RR 2.1 (1.1–3.3)	↑ Partial healing by 30–50 %	**Moderate**
Complete epithelialization ≤ 12 wk	45–70 % vs 25–40 % (SOC)	RR 1.6 (1.2–2.0)	↑ Closure by 20–40 %	**Moderate**
Pain reduction / comfort	Improved subjective scores in 5 studies (~120 wounds)	—	Moderate symptom improvement	**Low**
Infection / Adverse events	No increase vs SOC (> 15 studies)	—	No safety signal detected	**High**

SOC = standard of care; RR = relative risk. Certainty ratings per GRADE domains (risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, publication bias).

Poster development supported by **RestorixHealth**