

EFFECT OF INFRA RED LASER THERAPY VERSUS HONEY THERAPY ON POST-OPERATIVE WOUND HEALING IN PATIENTS WITH ANAL FISTULA

Musab Wahed Soliman Elassaad

Supervised by:

Title

Prof. Dr. Adel Abd El-Hamid Nossier

Professor of Physical Therapy for Surgery Faulty of Physical Therapy

Prof. Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Ezzeldeen. Professor of Gen.Surgery. Faulty of Medicine

ACKNOLEDGEMEN

FIRST AND FOREMOST, I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE ALL THANKS TO ALLAH FOR GUIDANCE, SUPPORT AND RECONCILE THROUGHOUT MY LIFE.

ALSO, I WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS MY DEEPEST GRATITUDE TO MY PRINCIPLE SUPERVISOR **DR. ADEL ABD EL-HAMID NOSSIER** PROFESSOR OF PHYSICAL THERAPY FOR SURGERY, FACULTY OF PHYSICAL THERAPY, CAIRO UNIVERSITY FOR HIS CONTINUOUS SUPERVISION, SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGEMENT THROUGH OUT THE WORK.

ACKNOLEDGEMEN

MY APPRECIATION TO SUPERVISOR **Dr. ASHRAF HASSAN M. SOLIMAN**

ASS. PROFESSOR OF PHYSICAL THERAPY FOR SURGERY,

FACULTY OF PHYSICAL THERAPY, CAIRO UNIVERSITY FOR HIS

GUIDANCE AND SCIENTIFIC ADVICES.

A SPECIAL THANKS TO

DR. MAHMOUD MOHAMED EZZ ELDEEN

PROFESSOR OF GEN. SURGERY, FOR HIS SUPPORT, USEFUL

ADVICES AND ESSENTIAL HELP IN THIS STUDY.

ALSO, MY APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE TO ALL PATIENTS FOR

THEIR CO-OPERATION AND COMMITMENT.

ACKNOLEDGEMEN

DEEPEST THANKS TO

PROF. DR. MAGID MOHAMED MOHAMED ISMAEL

PROFESSOR OF GEN. SURGERY, EL AZHAR UNIVERSITY

PRO. DR. MOHAMED ABDEL KHALIK KHALLAF PROFESSOR OF PHYSICAL THERAPY FOR SURGERY, FACULTY OF PHYSICAL THERAPY, CAIRO UNIVERSITY FOR ACCEPTANCE TO DISCUSSING MY STUDY

Introduction

 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I

is opening in the skin near the anus that leads into a blind pouch or may connect through a tunnel with the rectal canal.

Introduction Honey therapy It evacuates fluid from the wound, accelerates wound closure, Increase tensile strength of wound, removal of offensive swell, It facilitates tissue regeneration and has a chemical debridement effect of wound.

Introduction ſ Low level laser therapy Increase collagen organization, Improve local blood supply, stimulates biological reaction of wound, It reduces pain sensation and muscle spasm

Statement of the problem

- Does honey therapy have a positive effect on wound healing of post-operative anal fistula?
- Does laser therapy have a positive effect on wound healing of post-operative anal fistula?
- Which one of them was the best?

The Purposes of this study

- To determine the therapeutic efficacy of honey therapy on wound healing after anal fistula surgery
- To determine the therapeutic efficacy of laser therapy on wound healing after anal fistula surgery
- To compare between the effect of honey therapy and Laser therapy on wound healing after anal fistula surgery

IIIIIIIIIIIIIIII Subjects:

Thirty patients who had anal fistula surgery participated in this study .Their ages ranged from 30-50 years. The patients selected from Department of Surgery, Cairo University Hospitals. The patients were classified into two equal groups in numbers. The study was carried out from Jan 2015 to May 2015

Group A (honey therapy) Patient in This group 15 patients (7 male and 8 female) received honey therapy . Treatment conducted for 8 weeks, 3Times per week, day after day

Group B (LLLT group) In this group, 15 patients (8 male and 7 female) received low level laser therapy with frequency 904 nm and intensity 25 Mille Watts . Treatment conducted for 8 week, 3 times per week day after day

Equipment used

Measurement equipment

Ulcer surface area



Equipment used

Measurement equipment

• Ulcer volume measurements



Equipment used

Therapeutic equipment

Honey therapy



Equipment used

Therapeutic equipment

Phyaction 740 Laser Therapy Device











| RESULTS | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| lll | | | | | | |
| Ulcer Surfa | Ulcer Surface Area values before treatment in group A | | | | | |
| | and group I | B | | | | |
| | Ulcer Surface Area (pre- treatment) | | | | | |
| item | Honey Therapy Group | B- Ga-As Laser Group | | | | |
| | (Group A) | (Group B) | | | | |
| Mean | 14.78 15.3 | | | | | |
| \pm SD | $\pm 3.26 \qquad \pm 1.86$ | | | | | |
| MD | 0.52 | | | | | |
| T-value | 0.53 | | | | | |
| P-value | 0.599 | | | | | |
| Level of | NC | | | | | |
| significance | NS | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |





RESULTS

I

| items | Pre- treatment | Post(1) | Post(2) | Post(3) | Post(4) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|
| Mean | 14.78 | 7.4 | 1.68 | 0.23 | 0 |
| SD ± | 3.26± | $1.99 \pm$ | $1.05 \pm$ | 0.2 ± | 0 ± |
| Max. value | 18 | | | | |
| Range | 18 | | | | |
| Min. value | | | 0 | | |
| F-value | 191.1 | | | | |
| P-value | | | 0.000 | | |
| Level of significance | | | S↓ | | |



| RES | JLTS | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| I 1 | 111 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 1 1 |
| | | Ulcer su | urface area | | |
| | val | lues after tre | atment in gro | oup B | |
| | Ulcer Surface Area (cm ²) | | | | |
| items | pre treatment | Post(1) | Post(2) | Post(3) | Post(4) |
| Mean | 15.3 | 11.13 | 8.2 | 1.07 | 0.03 |
| $SD \pm$ | 1.86± | $1.88 \pm$ | 1.34 ± | $0.64 \pm$ | 0.09 ± |
| Max. value | 18 | | | | |
| Range | 18 | | | | |
| Min. value | 0 | | | | |
| F-value | 348.53 | | | | |
| P-value | 0.000 | | | | |
| Level of significance | S↓ | | | | |





| | Ulcer Volume Measurement (post-4 treatment) | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| item | Honey Therapy Group (Group A) | B- Ga-As Laser Group (Group B) | |
| Mean | 0 | 0.08 | |
| \pm SD | ± 0 | ± 0.3 | |
| MD | 0.08 | | |
| T-value | 0.23 | | |
| P-value | 0.039 | | |
| Level of significance | S | | |





the Ulcer Surface Area (cm2) post (4) treatment between both groups of the study (A and B groups)

| | Ulcer Surface Area (post-4 treatment) | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| item | Honey Therapy Group (Group A) | | B- Ga-As Laser Group (Group B) | | |
| Mean | 0 | | 0.03 | | |
| \pm SD | ± 0 | | ± 0.2 | | |
| MD | 0.03 | | | | |
| T-value | 0.19 | | | | |
| P-value | 0.045 | | | | |
| Level of significance | S | | | | |



Conclusion • Honey therapy and Laser therapy have a significant improvement on anal wall healing for post anal fistula patients as evidence by decrease ulcer surface area and volume. The percentage of improvement in both modalities (honey and laser therapy) was significant.

Recommendation It is recommended to add both honey therapy and infrared laser therapy with different approaches and protocols to standard lines of physical therapy of post anal fistula cases.

Similar study should be conducted on anal wall healing with other types of surgical anal cases.

Recommendation

 A similar study should be conducted with other physical therapy modalities.

 More extensive studies assigning the efficacy of honey therapy and the laser in wound healing are needed

Recommendation

• Further studies should be undertaken to a large number of patients providing better statistical analysis of data.

- Further researches should be extended for a longer period than 8 weeks.
- Further researches could include a comparison
 between another physiotherapeutic modalities and

protocols.

