



OPEN ACCESS

Key Words

Staph aureus, diabetes, split skin grafting

Corresponding Author

S.R. Eashwar Maniyen,
Department of General Surgery,
Sree Mookambika Institute of
Medical Sciences College
Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu, India

Author Designation

¹Professor

²Junior Resident

Received: 20th March 2025

Accepted: 15th April 2025

Published: 27th May 2025

Citation: Vinu Gopinath and S.R. Eashwar Maniyen, 2025 Assessment of Surgical Complications and Management of Diabetic Foot. Res. J. Med. Sci., 19: 42-44, doi: 10.36478/makrjms.2025.4.42.44

Copy Right: © 2025. Vinu Gopinath and S.R. Eashwar Maniyen. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Assessment of Surgical Complications and Management of Diabetic Foot

¹Vinu Gopinath and ²S.R. Eashwar Maniyen

¹Department of General Surgery, Sree Mookambika Institute of Medical Sciences Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu, India

²Department of General Surgery Sree Mookambika Institute of Medical Sciences College Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

Diabetes is a chronic disease that occurs when the pancreas don't produce enough insulin or when body cannot effectively use the insulin when it produces. The present study was conducted to assess surgical complications and management of diabetic foot. 90 diabetes patients of both genders were included. Patients with diabetic ulcer foot were treated with conservative treatment, split skin grafting and amputation. Out of 90 patients, males were 50 and females were 40. Ulcer was seen in 45, gangrene in 30 and cellulitis in 15 patients. Bacteria isolated was staph aureus in 42, anaerobic cocci in 30, streptococci in 5, Proteus in 12, gram negative organisms in 6 and Klebsiella in 5 cases. Bacteria isolated was staph aureus, anaerobic cocci, streptococci, Proteus, gram negative organisms and Klebsiella. Management done was debridement, split skin grafting, amputation of toes and transmetatarsal amputation.

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes mellitus is a group of physiological dysfunctions characterized by hyperglycemia resulting directly from insulin resistance, inadequate insulin secretion, or excessive glucagon secretion^[1]. Type 1 diabetes (T1D) is an autoimmune disorder leading to the destruction of pancreatic beta-cells^[2]. Type 2 diabetes (T2D), which is much more common, is primarily a problem of progressively impaired glucose regulation due to a combination of dysfunctional pancreatic beta cells and insulin resistance^[3]. According to WHO, diabetes is a chronic disease that occurs when the pancreas don't produce enough insulin or when body cannot effectively use the insulin when it produces^[4]. Diabetic foot ulcers are a growing problem in the diabetic community^[5]. Globally, diabetes mellitus has grown to pandemic proportions, affecting 194 million people worldwide and is expected to increase in prevalence to 344 million by the year 2030. Of these patients, between 2 and 6% will develop a diabetic foot ulcer (DFU) yearly^[6]. The onset of a DFU often precipitates a complex chain of events that may lead to limb loss. The long- term outcome for a diabetic patient after a major limb amputation is grave, with 50% of these patients deceased at 5 years.⁷The present study was conducted to assess surgical complications and management of diabetic foot.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study comprised of 90 patients of diabeticfoot infection of both genders. All gave their written consent for the participation in the study. Data such as name, age, gender etc. was recorded. General physical and systemic examination was carried out. Routine investigations such as complete blood counts, fasting and post prandial blood sugar levels, ESR, ECG, complete urine examination was done. Patients with diabetic ulcer foot were treated with conservative treatment, split skin grafting and amputation. Data thus obtained were subjected to statistical analysis. P value <0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1: Distribution of Patients


Total- 90		
Gender	Males	Females
Number	50	40

(Table 1) shows that out of 90 patients, males were 50 and females were 40.

Table 2: Assessment of Clinical Presentation

Clinical presentation	Number	P value
Ulcer	45	0.05
Gangrene	30	
Cellulitis	15	

(Table 2), graph I shows that ulcer was seen in 45, gangrene in 30 and cellulitis in 15 patients. The difference was significant (P<0.05).



Graph I: Assessment of Clinical Presentation

Table 3: Assessment of Bacteria Isolated

Bacteria isolated	Number	P value
staph aureus	42	0.01
anaerobic cocci	30	
streptococci	5	
Proteus	6	
Gram negative organisms	4	
Klebsiella	3	

(Table 3) shows that bacteria isolated was staph aureus in 42, anaerobic cocci in 30, streptococci in 5, Proteus in 6, gram negative organisms in 4 and Klebsiella in 3 cases. The difference was significant (P<0.05).

Table 4: Management of Cases

Management	Number	P value
Debridement	24	0.05
split skin grafting	38	
amputation of toes	18	
Transmetatarsal amputation	10	

Management done was debridement in 24, split skin grafting in 38, amputation of toes in 18 and transmetatarsal amputation in 10 cases. The difference was significant (P<0.05). Foot infections can be classified in several ways: by the depth of the infection and its severity, by the anatomic site affected, by the tissues involved, and by the causative factors, including any arterial insufficiency^[8,9]. To ensure an optimal outcome, the surgeon must also possess an understanding of the microbiology and pathophysiological behavior of infection, wound management principles and foot biomechanics^[10]. The present study was conducted to assess surgical complications and management of diabetic foot. We found that out of 90 patients, males were 50 and females were 40. Ravitheja^[11] found that commonest presenting lesion was ulcers (64%), followed by cellulitis (20%) and gangrene (16%). Trauma is the initiating factor in most of the cases. Out of which 82% of patients had infection. Most common microorganism grown from wound discharge culture was staphylococcus aureus (56%), 86% of patients were treated with wound debridement, 14% of patients underwent amputation. Prognosis was good in all patients. We found that ulcer was seen in 45, gangrene in 30 and cellulitis in 15 patients. Madan^[12] study was carried out on 100 patients with diabetes mellitus with associated surgical complications. The

average age of the patients was 65 years. It is implied that the most common age group is 61-70 years and the least common is older than 70 years. Sex Incidence In the present series of 100 cases, 70 were males and 30 were females. About 60% of the patients belonged to either the middle or the upper class and about 40% belonged to the low-income group. In this area, most of the people are agriculturists and are ignorant of the sequel of diabetes mellitus. We found that bacteria isolated was staph aureus in 42, anaerobic cocci in 30, streptococci in 5, Proteus in 12, gram negative organisms in 6 and Klebsiella in 5 cases. Armstrong^[13] compared the efficacy of a TCC and removable cast walker and half-shoe in patients with diabetic foot ulcers. It was found that TCC to be the most effective modality. Hyperbaric Oxygen (HBO) has been found to be a useful adjunctive therapy for DFUs and is associated with decrease in amputation rates. Surgical debridement must be considered a minor surgical procedure, with all of its possible complications. During any surgical procedure, the patient must be protected from feeling any pain. Apart from the discomfort to the patient, pain causes inadvertent motion, with consequent unintended damage. Unless the patient has severe sensory neuropathy, local anesthesia must be used. The surgeon must take into consideration the anatomic boundaries., unnecessary damage to healthy neighboring structures may lead to the loss of the limb. On the other hand, removal of all dead tissue is mandatory^[14]. Eneroth^[15] demonstrated that deep foot infections in diabetic patients are a heterogeneous entity and the type of infection is related to the outcome. Amputation was required more often for patients with deep soft-tissue infection, either alone or in combination with osteomyelitis, than for those with osteomyelitis alone. The limitation the study is small sample size.

CONCLUSION

Authors found that bacteria isolated was staph aureus, anaerobic cocci, streptococci, Proteus, gram negative organisms and Klebsiella. Management done was debridement, split skin grafting, amputation of toes and transmetatarsal amputation.

REFERENCES

1. Lipsky B.A., 1999. A current approach to diabetic foot infections. *Curr. Infect. Dis. Rep.*, Vol. 1: 10.1007/s11908-999-0027-1.
2. 1999. Consensus Development Conference on Diabetic Foot Wound Care: 7–8 April 1999, Boston, Massachusetts. American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care.*, 22: 1-10.0.
3. Lipsky B.A. and A.R. Berendt., 2000. Principles and practice of antibiotic therapy of diabetic foot infections. *Diabetes/Metab. Res. Rev.*, Vol. 16: 10.1002/1520-7560(200009/10)16:1+<::aid-dmrr109>3.0.co;2-b.
4. Lipsky B.A., 2004. A report from the international consensus on diagnosing and treating the infected diabetic foot. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev.*, Vol. 20: 10.1002/dmrr.453.
5. Larsson J., C.D. Agardh, J. Apelqvist and A. Stenstrom., 1994. Local signs and symptoms in relation to final amputation level in diabetic patients: A prospective study of 187 patients with foot ulcers. *Acta Orthop.a*, Vol. 65: 10.3109/17453679408995476.
6. Gibbons G.W., 1987. The diabetic foot: Amputations and drainage of infection. *J. Vasc. Surg.*, Vol. 5: 10.1067/mva.1987.avs0050791.
7. Stadelmann W.K., A.G. Digenis and G.R. Tobin., 1998. Impediments to wound healing. *The Am. J. Surg.*, Vol. 176: 10.1016/s0002-9610(98)00184-6.
8. Tannenbaum G.A., F.B.Pomposelli and E.J. Marcaccio, *et al.*, 1992. Safety of vein bypass grafting to the dorsalis pedis artery in diabetic patients with foot infection. *J VascSurg.*, 15: 982-988.
9. Lower R.F. and J.E. Kenzora., 1994. The diabetic neuropathic foot: a triple crush syndrome-measurement of compartmental pressures of normal and diabetic feet. *Orthopedics*, Vol. 17: 10.3928/0147-7447-19940301-05.
10. Rauwerda J.A., 2000. Foot debridement: Anatomic knowledge is mandatory. *Diabetes/Metab. Res. Rev.*, Vol. 16: 10.1002/1520-7560(200009/10)16:1+<::aid-dmrr106>3.0.co;2-k.
11. Ravitheja K. P. Jyothirmayee, R. Chiranjeevi and M. Dushyanth., 2017. A clinical study of surgical complications and management of diabetic foot. *International Journal of Contemporary Medical Research.*, 4: 65-67.
12. Madan M., T.K. Naveen and M. Balachandra., 2012. A Study of Surgical Management of Diabetic Limb Complications Among Rural Population. *Indian J. Surg.*, Vol. 74: 10.1007/s12262-011-0341-3.
13. Armstrong D.G., H.C. Nguyen, L.A. Lavery, C.H.M. van Schie, A.J.M. Boulton and L.B. Harkless., 2001. Off-Loading the Diabetic Foot Wound: a randomized clinical trial. *Diabetes Care*, Vol. 24: 10.2337/diacare.24.6.1019.
14. Jeffcoate W.J., P. Price and K.G. Harding., 2004. Wound healing and treatments for people with diabetic foot ulcers. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev.*, Vol. 20: 10.1002/dmrr.476.
15. Eneroth M., J. Apelqvist and A. Stenström., 1997. Clinical Characteristics and Outcome in 223 Diabetic Patients with Deep Foot Infections. *Foot and Ankle Int.*, Vol. 18: 10.1177/107110079701801107.