KEY POINTS

- A RCT in neuropathic diabetic foot ulcers comparing PROMOGRAN® with standard of care (MWH) in 40 patients
- A significant difference in the number of wounds healed and time to complete healing was found when neuropathic diabetic foot ulcers were treated with PROMOGRAN® compared to control treatment (moist wound healing)
- PROMOGRAN® also resulted in a greater percentage reduction in wound size compared to control treatment. Wound size assessment included volume, area and ulcer depth

STUDY OBJECTIVE

To evaluate the efficacy of PROMOGRAN® in the treatment of neuropathic diabetic foot ulcers.

METHODS

Randomised, prospective, controlled, longitudinal, clinical trial in neuropathic diabetic foot ulcers

- 40 patients were enrolled, and followed for 6 weeks
- Patients were randomised into 2 groups; PROMOGRAN® (n=20) and control (n=20; standardized protocol for good wound care). The wounds in both groups were covered with TIELLE®, a moist wound healing dressing
- Wounds were evaluated using the Wagner and Texas classifications prior to the start of the study
- All wounds received decontamination therapy (ACTISORB®) prior to randomisation and wound dressings were changed every 48 hours
RESULTS
Complete healing was achieved in 12/19 (63%) patients receiving PROMOGRAN® treatment compared with 3/19 (15%) patients in the control group (p<0.03)

The mean time to achieve healing was 23.3 +/- 9.9 days in the PROMOGRAN® group compared with 40.06 +/- 1.15 days in the control group (p<0.01)

The percentage reduction in ulcer size was greater in the PROMOGRAN®-treated group as compared to control.
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CONCLUSIONS
In this study, the use of PROMOGRAN® in patients with neuropathic diabetic foot ulcers demonstrates a superior wound healing response, with an increased number of wounds healed and a shortened time to healing compared to control treatment (p<0.05).