



DIABETIC ULCER FOOT: GENERAL SURGEONS PERSPECTIVE:

General Surgery

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Dr. Vipul Gurjar | Associate professor Department of General Surgery, Sumandeep Vidyapeeth, Pipariya, Vadodara |
| Dr Sudhir Singh | Resident Department of General Surgery, Sumandeep Vidyapeeth, Pipariya, Vadodara |
| Dr Ketul Shah* | Associate professor Department of General Surgery, Sumandeep Vidyapeeth, Pipariya, Vadodara *Corresponding Author |

ABSTRACT

Ulcers are the leading cause of hospitalization in patients with diabetes mellitus and precede approximately 70–80% of all diabetic-related amputations (1, 2). Timely healing and closure is critical to reducing the cost and morbidity associated with chronic diabetic lower extremity wounds (3–5). Split thickness skin grafts (STSG) are a well-known and widely accepted method for soft tissue coverage of open wounds (6). Historically, this technique has had a significant role in burn wounds and plastic surgery reconstruction, but has also been used successfully in the treatment of chronic diabetic foot ulcers (7–9). There are a vast number of wound care products and synthetic grafts available to the clinician today, but STSG remain the gold standard and may be considered a first-line treatment for lower extremity wounds associated with diabetes. Despite its common indications, there have been few large studies assessing the use of STSG as a modality for treatment of diabetic foot and leg wounds. Furthermore, few papers have examined the effect of individual patient risk factors on the healing time of STSG in the diabetic population. The aim of this retrospective review was to study the clinical use of STSG in a diabetic population and also identify any risk factors that may affect healing time or lead to complications.

KEYWORDS

MATERIALS AND METHOD:

Patients who presented with diabetic ulcer at our OPD were included in our study. Inclusion criteria included those patients who had a documented history of diabetes mellitus and an ulceration of the foot or leg distal to the tibial tuberosity. Patients were excluded from the study if they did not have a history of diabetes mellitus and/or less than 6 months follow up from the time of the application of the STSG. Patients with weight-bearing plantar ulcers were also excluded. 64 patients who met the inclusion criteria and were included in the study. Information regarding comorbidities and potential risk factors for healing was also collected from each patient's medical record including age, history of smoking, history of alcohol use, history of intravenous (IV) drug use, wound size, rheumatoid arthritis, end-stage renal disease, cardiac disease (coronary artery disease or congestive heart failure), peripheral vascular disease (PVD), history of fracture and history of Charcot neuroarthropathy. Prior to application of the STSG, all patients underwent conservative local wound care in form of daily dressing with saline/ EUSOL to promote a uniform granular wound bed with minimal wound exudates, fibrin, or slough.

STSG application was delayed if there were any local signs of infection, malodor, purulent drainage, or edema. No STSG were applied directly over exposed bone, joint capsule or tendon. Any patient with questionable peripheral vascular status was referred to vascular surgery for workup and cleared prior to surgery. All STSG were performed in an operating room setting under either general or local regional anesthesia. Surgical preparation of the wound was achieved by sharp or mechanical debridement of all non-viable tissue from the wound bed and wound edges in a sterile environment. The wound was measured and the dimensions documented. All donor sites for patients in this study were from the anterior aspect of the ipsilateral thigh. The donor STSG site was then harvested utilizing Humby's knife. The donor site was dressed with povidone-iodine soaked non-adherent gauze and sterile dry dressing. The STSG was then meshed in a 1:1.5 ratio and applied directly to the wound bed taking care to smooth any wrinkles and allow maximum apposition of the graft with the wound surface. The STSG was secured with staples around the edges under minimal tension and a non-adherent dressing was placed directly over the graft surface.

Gelvionate was applied soaked with Neosporin ointment and area was closed with gauze dressing. All patients were given splint. First dressing was done on 3rd or 4th day and alternate day dressing was done till 2 weeks with local application of soframycin ointment. The patients were followed clinically at two weeks post-operatively and then on a weekly basis for dressing changes and to assess healing progress. Once healed, patients were seen in the outpatient clinic every four weeks

until a minimum of 6 months follow up from the time of STSG application. The frequencies and mean time to healing were calculated for all variables of interest. Each variable was analyzed for healing time using a two-sample independent t-test. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were also used to compare healing times. P values of less than 0.05 were considered significant.

RESULTS:

A total of 64 diabetic patients met the inclusion criteria for this study ranging in age from 20 to 80 years. All 64 patients were available for follow up at 6 months.

DISCUSSION:

Despite success with STSG in surgery and wound care, there remain relatively few studies addressing its use in diabetic lower extremity wounds. In our study of diabetic patients, the mean time to complete wound healing was 14 weeks with a range 4-20 of weeks. This average is comparable to that of other studies of wound healing in diabetic populations. Recently, Ramanujam et al. retrospectively reviewed 83 diabetic patients treated with STSGs for diabetic foot and ankle wounds and reported a median time to healing of 6.9 weeks among those patients without complications (10).

Mahmoud et al. prospectively studied patients with STSG versus conservative wound care for diabetic foot wounds and found a statistically significant reduction in mean hospital stay and healing time for those patients treated with STSG (11). They noted that 62% of all STSG patients had healed by week eight. Puttiruvong et al. compared the healing rates of meshed vs non-meshed STSG in 42 patients and found no significant difference (12). The mean healing time for the meshed group was 19.84 and 20.36 days for the non-meshed group. Most STSG studies in non-diabetic studies report healing times between 2 and 4 weeks. Impaired healing in diabetic patients is well-studied and can be attributed to multiple factors including impaired macro and microcirculation, peripheral neuropathy, endothelial dysfunction, and poor glycemic control (14–16). One shortcoming of our study is that we did not quantitatively analyze preoperative glycemic control.

However, Ramanujam et al. did not find a statistically significant difference in preoperative hemoglobin A1C levels and healing time, despite high average preoperative hemoglobin A1C values in their patients (10). Conversely, a study by Marston found a direct correlation between hyperglycemia and wound healing. In this study, we found that the specific preoperative risk factors showed no effect on healing time (13). Likewise, age, wound size, and wound location did not seem to have a significant effect on healing time. Patients in our

study with complications took longer to heal by more than 7 weeks on average than those without complications. Of the 12 patients who had complications, two had healing times of 9 weeks and the other had a healing time of 17 weeks.

CONCLUSION:

We conclude that daily dressing ,good glycemic control, autologous STSG are a safe and reliable treatment of non-healing diabetic foot and leg wounds.

REFERENCES:

1. Frykberg RG, Zgonis T, Armstrong DG, Driver VR, Giurini JM, Kravitz SR, et al. Diabetic foot disorders. A clinical practice guideline (2006 revision) *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2006;45:S1–66.
2. Vuorisalo S, Venermo M, Lepántalo M. Treatment of diabetic foot ulcers. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)*2009;50:275–91.
3. Ramsey SD, Newton K, Blough D, McCulloch DK, Sandhu N, Reiber GE, et al. Incidence, outcomes, and cost of foot ulcers in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care.* 1999;22:382–7.
4. Reiber GE, Lipsky BA, Gibbons GW. The burden of diabetic foot ulcers. *Am J Surg.* 1998;176:S5–10.
5. Mayfield JA, Reiber GE, Sanders LJ, Janisse D, Pogach LM. Preventive foot care in people with diabetes. *Diabetes Care.* 2003;26:S78–9.
6. Chick LR. Brief history and biology of skin grafting. *Ann Plast Surg.* 1988;21:358–65.
7. Baumeister S, Dragu A, Jester A, Germann G, Menke H. The role of plastic and reconstructive surgery within an interdisciplinary treatment concept for diabetic ulcers of the foot [Article in German] *Dtsch Med Wochensh.* 2004;129:676–80.
8. Roukis TS, Zgonis T. Skin grafting techniques for soft-tissue coverage of diabetic foot and ankle wounds. *J Wound Care.* 2005;14:173–6.
9. Zgonis T, Stapleton JJ, Roukis TS. Advanced plastic surgery techniques for soft tissue coverage of the diabetic foot. *Clin Podiatr Med Surg.* 2007;24:547–68.
10. Ramanujam CL, Stapleton JJ, Kilpadi KL, Rodriguez RH, Jeffries LC, Zgonis T. Split-thickness skin grafts for closure of diabetic foot and ankle wounds: a retrospective review of 83 patients. *Foot Ankle Spec.* 2010;3:231–40.
11. Mahmoud SM, Mohamed AA, Mahdi SE, Ahmed ME. Split-skin graft in the management of diabetic foot ulcers. *J Wound Care.* 2008;17:303–6.
12. Puttirutvong P. Meshed skin graft versus split thickness skin graft in diabetic ulcer coverage. *J Med Assoc Thai.* 2004;87:66–72.
13. Marston WA. Risk factors associated with healing chronic diabetic foot ulcers: the importance of hyperglycemia. *Ostomy Wound Manage.* 2006;52:26–8.