Response to "Topical Phenytoin in Diabetic Foot Ulcers"

We read with interest the report by Muthukumarasamy et al. (1), in which the authors concluded that topical phenytoin may promote healing of diabetic foot ulcers. However, we are concerned that their conclusions do not seem to be justified on the basis of the data reported.

Because subjects with vascular disease were excluded, it would appear that this study is concerned mainly with the treatment of neuropathic foot ulceration. We are disappointed that the patients were not randomized to the treatment or control group, and the strength of this study is diminished further by the fact that it was not blinded. The problems associated with nonrandomized open trials in the assessment of new treatments is well recognized (2). Furthermore, Table 1 of the article shows the control subjects to have had larger ulcers to begin with. (Perhaps this is a typographical error?) A randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial is necessary to prove that topical phenytoin is indeed effective in healing neuropathic foot ulcers.

Finally, we cannot share the optimism expressed by the authors for the usefulness of topical phenytoin in rural areas where ready access to hospitals or clinics is not available. In their study, the subjects were treated in a hospital where bed rest is usually part of treatment in addition to daily dressings and prompt antibiotic therapy. It is not justified to extrapolate from the findings of this study to a rural setting where it is quite likely that patients with insensitive feet will walk on their ulcers and aggravate their problem; besides, they will not receive optimal foot care or antibiotic therapy. Thus, we fear that in such situations a diabetic patient with neuropathic ulceration is more likely to lose his limb, regardless of whether he receives topical phenytoin. We believe that in such a setting, amputations due to neuropathic ulcers may be reduced by identifying those at risk, teaching these individuals how to protect their feet, and by establishing a mechanism for early referral to a hospital or clinic (3).

SUDHESH KUMAR, MRCP
ANDREW J.M. BOULTON, MD

FROM THE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE, MANCHESTER ROYAL INFIRMARY, MANCHESTER, UNITED KINGDOM.

ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE AND REPRINT REQUESTS TO DR. SUDHESH KUMAR, UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE, MANCHESTER ROYAL INFIRMARY, OXFORD ROAD, MANCHESTER M13 9WL, UK.

References

1. Muthukumarasamy MG, Sivakumar G, Manokaran G: Topical phenytoin in diabetic foot ulcers *Diabetes Care* 14:909–11, 1991
2. Pocock SJ: *Clinical Trials*. Chichester, Wiley, 1983, p. 60–65, 90–99
3. Boulton AJM: The diabetic foot—of neuropathic aetiology? The RD Lawrence Lecture *Diabetic Med* 7:852–58, 1990

Reply

We appreciate the interest shown in our paper and the careful reading it has been given.

Drs. Kumar and Boulton are correct to point out that our study is concerned mainly with the treatment of neuropathic foot ulceration. This, of course, does not exclude some small vessel involvement by the diabetic process as both a contributor to the neuropathic process and to the failure of a skin ulceration to heal. The prominent neovascularization seen with phenytoin treatment on the light and electron microscopic examination of the biopsies of the patients' ulcers is of interest and encouraging in this respect.

The authors are also correct to point out that there is a typographical error in Table 1. For "Initial ulcer size (cm^2)" in the "Control" column, the number should be "10," and not "20." In fact, the two groups, as can be seen from the Table, were matched in all respects, making our study quite strong. Matching with respect to a variety of factors such as ulcer size, age, sex, metabolic and nutritional status and ulcer chronicity is critical to conducting an interpretable, reliable study of the healing of skin ulcers, especially in patients with less than optimal access to good therapeutic and preventive health care services.

We are well aware of the dangers of open trials in the assessment of new, and not-so-new, therapeutic modalities and with the advantages of randomization and blinding of both patient and observer. Careful matching of patients is a reasonable alternative in studies such as ours, where the sample size is relatively small. Uniform control of diabetic status and removal of variables related to infection also are crucial. Secondly, the planimetry was, in effect, blind. The clinical observations could not be blinded because it is very difficult to remove all traces of phenytoin powder prior to each observation and the wounds are so clearly different after three to four days that true blinding is impossible to achieve. Just to say a trial is "blind," when it really cannot be so, is misleading in itself. As a double-check on the validity of our conclusions in this trial, biopsies were submitted to a pathologist for blind evaluation. As the paper points out, his conclusions were supportive of both the evidence provided by the ulcer area measurements during treatment and the clinical impressions.

Placebo control in wound healing trials is problematic. We are not aware of