Evaluating Patient Restraints for Fall Prevention

Benefits, Risks & Setting-Specific Considerations

Clinical White Paper

Sponsored by Skil-Care

---

1. Introduction & Scope

Patient restraints—including bed rails, pelvic belts, and chair restraints—are used in hospitals, nursing homes, and home care to restrict patient movement with the goal of minimizing fall-related injuries. However, their efficacy is contested, and use often carries ethical, safety, and legal implications. This review examines clinical evidence, pros/cons, and recommendations for responsible use.

---

2. Clinical Evidence & Safety Concerns

2.1 Lack of Fall Reduction Benefits

- A 2012 systematic review covering hospital and nursing home settings concluded that physical restraints were *not effective* in reducing falls or fall-related injuries arXiv+10PSNet+10Texas Health and Human Services+10ResearchGate+1PMC+1.
- A U.S. study similarly found no substantial evidence that restraints prevent falls in acute care AGs Journals.

2.2 Increased Injury Risk

- Restraints have been linked to increased incidents of strangulation, pressure ulcers, delirium, and even death Healio Journals+3The Hospitalist+3Texas Health and Human Services+3.
- Institutional guidance warns that injuries sustained while restrained may be more severe .

2.3 Ethical, Regulatory & Quality Compliance

- CMS guidelines and long-term care regulations strongly discourage restraints for fall prevention, advocating for least-restrictive methods first The Hospitalist+15AHRQ+15PSNet+15.

- High restraint rates in nursing homes are often driven by mobility limitations and behavioral concernsResearchGate+5PMC+5ScienceDirect+5.

---

3. Pros & Cons by Care Setting

Setting	Pros	Cons
Hospitals	Perceived short-term fall risk reduction by staff	No proven fall prevention, increased harm, compliance risks
Nursing Homes	Control wandering in cognitively impaired residents	Skin issues, loss of autonomy, severe injuries, ethical concerns
Home Care	Temporary use in acute risk situations	Significant safety, ethical, and practicality risks; legal oversight lacks structure

---

4. Alternative Evidence-Based Strategies

- Multifactorial fall-prevention programs (e.g., mobility support, environment modifications, training) reduce falls by ~31–41% in institutional settings ResearchGate+15PMC+15Wikipedia+15.
- Bed alarms, patient education, physical rehab, and environmental strengthening provide safer and more effective fall prevention Wikipedia+2PMC+2The Hospitalist+2.

---

5. Guidelines & Ethical Considerations

- Restraints should be *last resort*, time-limited, and applied under order with regular re-evaluationWikipedia+2AHRQ+2Wikipedia+2.
- Use must include informed consent, comprehensive documentation, ongoing monitoring, and alternatives exhausted.
- Staff should be trained on ethical restraint practices and fall prevention alternatives.

---

6. Conclusions & Recommendations

- Current evidence does *not support* using restraints for preventing falls; their use can worsen patient safety outcomes.
- Restraints may be justified briefly when behavioral or clinical emergencies pose immediate risks—but only alongside validated fall-prevention measures.
- Organizations should adopt restraint-minimization policies, emphasizing comprehensive, patient-centered fall prevention strategies.

References

1. Physical restraints don’t reduce falls; may increase risk PSNet+3AHRQ+3AGs Journals+3Texas Health and Human Services+2The Hospitalist+2NursingHome411+2
2. No strong evidence for injury prevention via restraints
3. Continuous risk of severe harm from restraint use
4. Institutional recommendations favor alternatives over restraints
5. Restraints remain common in some nursing homes BioMed Central+15PMC+15LevelUpRN+15
6. Multifactorial interventions reduce falls ~31–41% ScienceDirect+15PMC+15Wikipedia+15
7. Bed alarms and education improve outcomes ScienceDirect+2The Hospitalist+2Wikipedia+2