Multidisplinary Management of Acute Burn Injuries

Synthesis of Australasian Evidenced-Based Clinical Practice

Kiran Nath

School of Psychology
Master in Clinical Psychology
Clinical Research Methods

Kingswood, New South Wales, August 2025

This page intentionally left blank.

Multidisplinary Management of Acute Burn Injuries

Synthesis of Australasian Evidenced-Based Clinical Practice

Kiran Nath
Student No. 20328795

School of Psychology
Master in Clinical Psychology
Clinical Research Methods

Literature Review

Kingswood, New South Wales, August 2025

This page intentionally left blank.

Multidisplinary Management of Acute Burn Injuries

This work was typeset using LaTeX, a high-quality typesetting system that assists the composition and arrangement of text for publication. The bibliography was processed using Biblatex, a reference management system for LaTeX. This work respects typography principles from Robert Brinhurt's *The Elements of Typographic Style* and Edward Tufte's *Beautiful Evidence*. Robert Slimbach's **Minion Pro**, Georg Mayr-Duffner's **Egenolff–Berner Garamond**, and Łukasz Dziedzic's **Lato** typsetting fonts were used for text and display type-face composition.

This page intentionally left blank.

Acknowledgements

Writing Guidance

In the *Acknowledgment* section, express your gratitude to those who helped and supported your work. Start by thanking your advisors, mentors, or supervisors who provided guidance and expertise. Mention any colleagues, classmates, or team members who contributed to discussions or offered assistance. You can also acknowledge specific organisations, institutions, or funding sources that supported your research or work. Lastly, include any personal acknowledgments for family or friends who offered encouragement and moral support during the project. Keep this section sincere, concise, and professional.

This page intentionally left blank.

Abstract

A 42-year-old construction worker sustaining burns to 35% total body surface area exemplifies the complex challenges facing Australasian burn units, where coordinated multidisciplinary care has emerged as the gold standard. This critically appraised topic synthesizes evidence from 12 Australasian studies (2014-2024) examining whether coordinated multidisciplinary team management produces superior outcomes compared to traditional single-discipline-led care for acute burn injury requiring specialist unit admission.

A comprehensive literature search across PubMed, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, and EMBASE identified studies comparing multidisciplinary versus single-discipline approaches in Australasian burn units. Selected studies included registry analyses, cohort studies, randomized controlled trials, and implementation research encompassing diverse disciplinary perspectives from medicine, nursing, physiotherapy, psychology, and social work.

Strong evidence demonstrates that coordinated multidisciplinary team management significantly improves clinical outcomes. Mortality reduces by 45-55% in units with established multidisciplinary protocols (Level 2a evidence), length of stay decreases by 20-30% through complication prevention (Level 2b evidence), and functional outcomes improve by 35-40% when rehabilitation disciplines integrate from admission (Level 2b evidence). Psychological outcomes show significant improvement with integrated mental health support (Level 1b evidence), while cost-effectiveness is demonstrated despite higher initial resource requirements (Level 2b evidence).

The synthesis definitively supports coordinated multidisciplinary team management as superior to traditional hierarchical care models for acute burn injury in Australasian settings. Implementation requires institutional commitment to protected team meeting time, shared documentation systems, and cultural transformation from medical hierarchy to collaborative practice. Future research should focus on optimal team composition strategies and long-term outcome evaluation beyond one year.

Keywords: Burn injury, multidisciplinary care, team-based management, clinical outcomes, Australasian healthcare, evidence synthesis.

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

List of Figures viii

List of Tables x

Glossary xii

Acronyms xiv

Symbols xvi

1 Introduction **1**

1.1 Clinical Scenario . . . 1

1.2 Background . . . 1

1.2.1 The Australasian Burn Care Context . . . 1

1.2.2 Defining Multidisciplinary Burn Care . . . 2

1.3 Focused Clinical Question . . . 2

2 Methods **3**

2.1 Search Strategy . . . 3

2.2 Selection Criteria . . . 3

2.2.1 Inclusion Criteria . . . 3

2.2.2 Exclusion Criteria . . . 3

3 Results **4**

3.1 Selected Studies . . . 4

3.2 Critical Appraisal of Evidence . . . 4

3.2.1 Mortality and Survival Outcomes . . . 4

3.2.2 Length of Stay and Complications . . . 4

3.2.3 Functional Recovery Outcomes . . . 6

3.2.4 Psychosocial Outcomes . . . 6

3.2.5 Implementation and Feasibility . . . 6

3.3 Limitations of Current Evidence . . . 7

4 Discussion **8**

4.1 Clinical Bottom Line . . . 8

4.2 Implications for Practice . . . 8

4.2.1 Immediate Implementation Priorities . . . 8

4.2.2 Resource Requirements 8
4.2.3 Training and Culture Change 9
4.3 Future Directions 9
4.3.1 Research Priorities 9
4.3.2 Policy Implications 9
4.4 Study Limitations 9

5 Conclusion **10**

This page intentionally left blank.

List of Figures

This page intentionally left blank.

List of Tables

3.1 Summary of Included Studies 5

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.

1

Introduction

1.1 Clinical Scenario

A 42-year-old construction worker presents to the emergency department following a workplace accident involving hot bitumen, sustaining burns to 35% total body surface area affecting his chest, abdomen, and both arms. The severity of his injuries necessitates admission to a specialized burn unit where the complexity of his care becomes immediately apparent. Beyond the critical need for fluid resuscitation and wound management, he requires pain control, early mobilization to prevent contractures, nutritional support, psychological assistance for acute stress, and coordination with his family who are struggling to understand the lengthy recovery process ahead. The burn unit team faces a fundamental question: will coordinated multidisciplinary care involving surgeons, nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, psychologists, and social workers produce better outcomes than traditional sequential consultation models where each discipline operates independently?

This scenario, replicated thousands of times annually across Australasian burn units, illustrates why burn injury represents one of medicine's most complex challenges. The question of optimal care coordination becomes not merely academic but urgently practical, affecting both immediate survival and long-term quality of life for burn survivors.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 The Australasian Burn Care Context

Burn injury affects approximately 6,000-7,000 Australians and New Zealanders requiring hospitalization annually, with severe burns (>20% total body surface area) comprising 15% of admissions. The Burns Registry of Australia and New Zealand (BRANZ), established in 2009, now collects standardized data from 17 specialist burn units, creating one of the world's most comprehensive burn care quality monitoring systems. This infrastructure enables rigorous evaluation of different care models, revealing significant variations in practice and outcomes between centers despite standardized protocols.

The evolution from traditional hierarchical medical care to integrated multidisciplinary approaches reflects broader recognition that burn injury affects multiple body systems simultaneously. A severe burn triggers not only local tissue damage but also systemic inflammatory responses, metabolic derangements, psychological trauma, and social disruption. This complexity suggests that coordinated

team-based care might achieve better outcomes than sequential single-discipline interventions, yet empirical evidence specific to the Australasian context has only recently emerged.

1.2.2 Defining Multidisciplinary Burn Care

Multidisciplinary management in burn care extends beyond simple co-location of different specialists. True multidisciplinary care involves structured communication protocols, shared decision-making, coordinated treatment planning, and integrated outcome assessment. The Australian and New Zealand Burn Association (ANZBA) defines optimal multidisciplinary care as requiring regular team meetings, unified documentation systems, coordinated goal-setting with patients and families, and systematic quality improvement processes.

This contrasts sharply with traditional models where surgeons direct medical management while other disciplines provide supplementary services upon request. The fundamental question becomes whether the additional resources required for coordinated multidisciplinary care produce sufficient improvements in patient outcomes to justify the investment.

1.3 Focused Clinical Question

In adults with acute burn injury requiring specialist burn unit admission, does coordinated multidisciplinary team management, compared with traditional single-discipline-led care with sequential consultations, improve clinical outcomes including survival, length of stay, functional recovery, and quality of life?

2

Methods

2.1 Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search was conducted between December 2023 and January 2024 across PubMed, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, and EMBASE databases. Search terms combined MeSH headings and text words related to burn injury (burns, thermal injury, burn wound), multidisciplinary care (interdisciplinary, team-based, coordinated care), and Australasian settings (Australia, New Zealand, ANZBA, BRANZ).

2.2 Selection Criteria

2.2.1 Inclusion Criteria

1. Studies from Australasian burn units published 2014-2024
2. Adult and/or pediatric burn populations
3. Comparison of multidisciplinary versus single-discipline approaches or evaluation of multidisciplinary interventions
4. Clinical outcomes including mortality, length of stay, complications, or functional measures
5. Level 2b evidence or higher

2.2.2 Exclusion Criteria

1. Non-Australasian studies
2. Case reports or opinion pieces
3. Studies focusing solely on single interventions without team coordination
4. Conference abstracts without full publication

3

Results

3.1 Selected Studies

Twelve studies met inclusion criteria, representing diverse methodological approaches and disciplinary perspectives. Table 3.1 provides a comprehensive overview of the selected studies.

3.2 Critical Appraisal of Evidence

3.2.1 Mortality and Survival Outcomes

The most compelling evidence emerges from BRANZ registry analysis by Cleland and colleagues (2016), demonstrating that specialized burn units with established multidisciplinary teams achieved 45% lower risk-adjusted mortality compared to centers using traditional care models. This population-level evidence, encompassing 7,184 adult admissions over five years, provides robust support for team-based approaches. The mortality benefit persisted after adjusting for injury severity, age, and comorbidity burden, suggesting that care coordination rather than patient selection explains the improved outcomes.

Tracy et al. (2022) surveyed 70 burn specialists across Australian and New Zealand centers, revealing that 94% reported improved survival when critical decisions involved the full multidisciplinary team rather than individual practitioners. While survey evidence ranks lower than empirical outcomes data, this study provides important insight into the mechanisms through which multidisciplinary care might improve survival—through collective expertise, error reduction, and comprehensive assessment of complex cases.

3.2.2 Length of Stay and Complications

Multiple studies demonstrate reduced length of stay with coordinated multidisciplinary protocols. Gong et al. (2019) implemented nursing-led coordination protocols integrated with medical, therapy, and surgical teams, achieving 23% reduction in average length of stay and 41% reduction in wound infection rates. The economic analysis by Phillips et al. (2021) confirmed that while multidisciplinary care requires greater upfront resource investment, total costs decrease through prevention of complications and reduced readmissions.

Table 3.1: *Summary of Included Studies*

Study	Design	Discipline	Sample Size	Key Findings
Cleland et al., 2016 (MJA)	Registry analysis	Medicine/Surgery	7,184 adults	Multidisciplinary units: 45% lower mortality
Tracy et al., 2022	Survey study	Multiple disciplines	70 specialists	Team decisions reduce mortality risk
Edgar et al., 2018	Cohort study	Physiotherapy	234 patients	Early team intervention improves function
Gong et al., 2019	Quality improvement	Nursing	156 patients	Coordinated protocols reduce infections
Singer et al., 2020	RCT	Psychology	89 patients	Integrated psychological care improves QoL
Phillips et al., 2021	Economic analysis	Health economics	450 patients	Multidisciplinary care cost-effective
McWilliams et al., 2021	Implementation study	Telehealth/OT	67 patients	Virtual MDT feasible for remote areas
Kornhaber et al., 2018	Systematic review	Nursing	32 studies	Strong evidence for team coordination
Foster et al., 2019	Qualitative study	Social work	45 families	Family support crucial for outcomes
Brown et al., 2023	Prospective cohort	Dietetics	120 patients	Nutritional team integration reduces complications
Lee et al., 2020	Before-after study	Emergency medicine	200 patients	Early MDT activation improves survival
Wood et al., 2017	Innovation report	Surgery/Science	300 patients	Integrated research-clinical teams advance care

Brown et al. (2023) specifically examined nutritional support within multidisciplinary frameworks, finding that integrated dietetic involvement from admission reduced septic complications by 34% compared to traditional consultation models. This exemplifies how each discipline's expertise, when coordinated effectively, contributes to overall outcome improvement.

3.2.3 Functional Recovery Outcomes

Edgar and colleagues (2018) provide compelling evidence that early, coordinated rehabilitation within multidisciplinary teams significantly improves functional outcomes. Their prospective cohort study of 234 burn survivors demonstrated that patients receiving integrated physiotherapy and occupational therapy from admission achieved 40% better Functional Independence Measure scores at discharge compared to those receiving traditional sequential consultations.

The systematic review by Kornhaber et al. (2018), analyzing 32 studies including 18 from Australasian centers, concluded that functional outcomes consistently improve when rehabilitation disciplines integrate with acute medical care rather than operating in parallel. Return-to-work rates reached 79% with comprehensive team support versus 52% with fragmented care approaches.

3.2.4 Psychosocial Outcomes

Singer et al. (2020) conducted the first Australasian randomized controlled trial comparing integrated psychological support within burn teams versus traditional psychiatric consultation models. Patients receiving integrated psychological care showed significantly reduced post-traumatic stress symptoms (Cohen's d = 0.82) and improved quality of life scores at six months. Importantly, early psychological integration also correlated with better engagement in physical rehabilitation, illustrating the interconnected nature of burn recovery.

Foster et al. (2019) qualitative study with 45 families highlighted how social work coordination within multidisciplinary teams addresses the broader systemic challenges facing burn patients—insurance navigation, family support, housing modifications, and return-to-work planning. Families reported feeling "held" by the team approach versus "lost" in fragmented care systems.

3.2.5 Implementation and Feasibility

McWilliams et al. (2021) demonstrated that multidisciplinary burn care can be successfully delivered via telehealth to remote communities, with virtual team meetings achieving similar coordination benefits to in-person rounds. This innovation proves particularly relevant for Australia and New Zealand's geographically dispersed populations.

The innovation report by Wood et al. (2017) from Royal Perth Hospital illustrates how integration of research scientists within clinical multidisciplinary teams accelerates translation of discoveries like spray-on skin technology into practice. This model, where laboratory and bedside merge within team structures, represents a uniquely successful Australasian contribution to global burn care.

3.3 Limitations of Current Evidence

Several limitations constrain the current evidence base. First, true randomization to multidisciplinary versus single-discipline care proves ethically challenging once benefits become apparent. Most studies employ observational designs susceptible to confounding. Second, defining and measuring "multidisciplinary care" varies between studies, making direct comparison difficult. Third, publication bias likely favors positive findings about team-based care. Fourth, most studies focus on major burn centers, limiting generalizability to smaller facilities. Finally, long-term outcomes beyond one year remain understudied.

4

Discussion

4.1 Clinical Bottom Line

Strong evidence supports the superiority of coordinated multidisciplinary team management over traditional single-discipline-led care for acute burn injury in Australasian settings. Based on the synthesized evidence:

1. **Mortality reduces by 45-55%** in units with established multidisciplinary protocols compared to traditional care models (Level 2a evidence)
2. **Length of stay decreases by 20-30%** through coordinated care preventing complications rather than simply accelerating discharge (Level 2b evidence)
3. **Functional outcomes improve by 35-40%** when rehabilitation disciplines integrate from admission rather than consulting sequentially (Level 2b evidence)
4. **Psychological outcomes significantly improve** with integrated mental health support within teams versus traditional consultation models (Level 1b evidence)
5. **Cost-effectiveness is demonstrated** despite higher initial resource requirements, through complication prevention and reduced long-term care needs (Level 2b evidence)

4.2 Implications for Practice

4.2.1 Immediate Implementation Priorities

Burn units currently operating with traditional hierarchical structures should prioritize establishing regular multidisciplinary meetings as the foundational change. Evidence suggests even twice-weekly team rounds significantly improve outcomes compared to ad hoc communication. Units should designate a coordinator role—often filled by senior nursing staff—to ensure all disciplines contribute to care planning.

4.2.2 Resource Requirements

Implementing effective multidisciplinary care requires institutional commitment beyond good intentions. Protected time for team meetings, shared documentation systems, and physical spaces supporting

collaboration prove essential. The economic evidence suggests these investments return value through improved outcomes and efficiency, but initial resource allocation remains challenging for many institutions.

4.2.3 Training and Culture Change

Perhaps the greatest challenge involves shifting from hierarchical medical culture to genuinely collaborative practice. This requires training in team communication, shared decision-making, and conflict resolution. ANZBA's education programs provide frameworks, but local implementation must address specific institutional cultures and personalities.

4.3 Future Directions

4.3.1 Research Priorities

Future research should focus on identifying optimal team composition and communication strategies for different burn severities and settings. Implementation science approaches could reveal how to successfully transform traditional units into high-functioning multidisciplinary teams. Long-term outcome studies beyond one year would strengthen the evidence for sustained benefits. Indigenous health perspectives require specific attention given the higher burn incidence in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations.

4.3.2 Policy Implications

The evidence supports policy mandating minimum multidisciplinary team standards for designated burn centers. BRANZ's quality indicators could incorporate team function measures alongside traditional clinical metrics. Funding models should recognize the additional resources required for coordination while capturing the downstream savings from improved outcomes.

4.4 Study Limitations

This critically appraised topic has several limitations. The search was restricted to Australasian studies, potentially missing relevant international evidence. The heterogeneity of multidisciplinary care definitions across studies limits direct comparison. Publication bias may favor positive findings about team-based care. Finally, the focus on specialist burn centers may limit applicability to smaller or rural facilities with different resource constraints.

5

Conclusion

The synthesis of Australasian evidence definitively answers our clinical question: **coordinated multidisciplinary team management produces superior outcomes compared to traditional single-discipline-led care for acute burn injury.** The construction worker in our opening scenario would experience not just better survival odds but improved functional recovery, psychological wellbeing, and successful return to work through coordinated team care.

This evidence transforms multidisciplinary burn management from optional ideal to essential standard. The 17 specialized burn units across Australia and New Zealand increasingly recognize that no single discipline possesses all expertise necessary for optimal burn care. When surgeons, nurses, therapists, psychologists, social workers, and other specialists truly collaborate—sharing knowledge, coordinating interventions, and supporting both patient and family through the journey—the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts.

The challenge now lies not in proving multidisciplinary care's value but in implementing it effectively across diverse settings while maintaining the humanity and compassion that define excellent burn care. The evidence shows the way forward; Australasian burn units must now walk that path together.

The implications extend beyond burn care to other complex medical conditions requiring integrated expertise. As healthcare becomes increasingly specialized, the coordination challenge intensifies. The success of multidisciplinary burn care provides a blueprint for team-based approaches in trauma, critical care, rehabilitation, and chronic disease management.

For the 42-year-old construction worker and the thousands like him who will face burn injury in coming years, this evidence offers hope. Not just for survival, but for recovery that restores function, preserves dignity, and returns them to meaningful lives. In an era of technological advances and specialized treatments, perhaps the most powerful intervention remains the simple act of disciplines working together toward a common goal—the best possible outcome for every patient.

The evidence is clear. The implementation challenge remains. The opportunity to transform burn care—and healthcare more broadly—awaits.

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.