Appendix 3B Characteristics of excluded studies

Abbruzzese 2009¹

Reason for exclusion
Both groups received debridement.

Abdelatif 2008²

Reason for exclusion
Nonrandomized study

Aceechurovai 2003³

Reason for exclusion
Nonrandomized study

Aftab 2010⁴

Reason for exclusion
Soft tissue laser intervention in this study was not used as a form of debridement.

Ahroni 1993⁵

Reason for exclusion
Surgical debridement was reported as being carried out routinely throughout study on both treatment arms.

Apelqvist 1994⁶

Reason for exclusion
Varidase is used as a debriding agent but no separate data were available for this group of patients. If such data had been available, the size of the study (n=17) is unlikely to be sufficiently powered.

Apelqvist 1996⁷

Reason for exclusion
Authors report that both treatment groups received surgical debridement performed during the course of the study indicating that debridement was not the primary focus of this study.
Armstrong 2000

Reason for exclusion
Although all wounds were debrided the primary intervention measured was a foot compression system, there was no comparison or conclusions drawn regarding the debridement methods used.

Ashry 1998

Reason for exclusion
Not an RCT on debridement but a cost related archival analysis on amputations among in diabetic minority groups.

Bahrami 2008

Reason for exclusion
Intervention was not a form of debridement but an oral herbal preparation.

Berry 1996

Reason for exclusion
Randomized study on the debridement of cavity wounds not diabetic foot ulcers.

Biliaieva 2009

Reason for exclusion
This was a non-randomized study investigating absorptive dressings.

Bowling 2007

Reason for exclusion
This was a non-randomized study - case series investigating larval therapy.

Brenes 2011

Reason for exclusion
This was a non-randomized study - case series on hyaluronate iodine.

Caputo 2008

Reason for exclusion
The study does not report outcomes separately for diabetic and other wound types.
Cardinal 2009\textsuperscript{16}

Reason for exclusion: Non-randomized retrospective study of healing rates as predictors of complete wound closure.

Chan 2007\textsuperscript{17}

Reason for exclusion: Systematic review of Maggot debridement therapy not RCT.

Chiglashvili 2004\textsuperscript{18}

Reason for exclusion: Non-randomized study - case series not on debridement but IV infusion of complex medical regimen.

Clavel 2008\textsuperscript{19}

Reason for exclusion: Narrative review article on preventing amputations in diabetics.

Davydov 2011\textsuperscript{20}

Reason for exclusion: Narrative review article on Larval therapy.

Dekhtiar 1995\textsuperscript{21}

Reason for exclusion: Non-randomized case series.

Dereure 2012\textsuperscript{22}

Reason for exclusion: RCT on Venous leg ulcers and Mixed etiology ulcers using Hyaluronic acid.

Ennis 2005\textsuperscript{23}

Reason for exclusion: Study utilized another form of debridement in both treatment arms.

Freeman 2010\textsuperscript{24}

Reason for exclusion: Non-randomized study of bee honey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gelunenko 2000™</td>
<td>The intervention under study is an oral immune modulating agent not a form of debridement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottrup 2001™</td>
<td>This is a cost evaluation paper. Not an RCT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough 1997™</td>
<td>RCT which compares granulocyte stimulating factor, with a placebo. There is no debriding agent included in the trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham 2014™</td>
<td>The study involved wounds of varying etiologies and was a non-randomized case series study on Oakin dressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson 1994™</td>
<td>RCT assessing the effectiveness of Imipenem / Cilastatin against ampicillin / Sulbactam in the treatment of pedal infections in diabetic. No debriding agent was considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holzer 1998™</td>
<td>This study was not an RCT but an archival data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2012™</td>
<td>This study was not an RCT but was reported as a quasi-experimental study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude 2007™</td>
<td>Standardized surgical debridement was used regularly in both treatment arms concurrently as part of standard care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude 2004™</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT of 120 people that compares silver based fiber dressing with an alginate, alternate form of debridement confounded both arms.</td>
<td>Kaviani 2011&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The laser therapy was not used here for debridement but to stimulate growth. Debridement was carried out separately.</td>
<td>Khramilin 2011&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative review article not an RCT.</td>
<td>Krupski 1991&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT which compared platelet derived wound healing with a placebo. Although all wounds were extensively debrided initially, there were no debriding agents included in the trial. The trial sample was 'mixed ulcers' - with leg ulcers mainly identified.</td>
<td>Krymets 2013&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-randomized study not an RCT.</td>
<td>Kuo 2012&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized study on the use of herbal botanical anti-inflammatory creams. These herbal botanicals were not used as a form of debridement.</td>
<td>Xi-qiang 2006&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth factors as focus of RCT. (Debridement to aid growth factor only).</td>
<td>Logachev 2001&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrandomized study - Case series.</td>
<td>Macleod 1991&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Martinez-de-Jesus 1997&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCT where all foot ulcers underwent surgical debridement and were then treated with either topical Ketanserin or normal saline (placebo). Excluded as the topical treatment, although gel based was compounded by the fact that it contained Ketanserin gel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Mehta 1999&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review article on cost using claims data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Mohajeri 2014&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Though topical Kiwifruit possesses debridement properties both treatment arms of the study were subjected regularly to surgical debridement concurrently throughout the study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Moore 2013&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic review on Silver dressings but in mixed etiology wounds, not restricted to diabetic foot ulcers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Moretti 2009&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study on shock wave therapy which was not used for debridement but for angiogenesis. Debridement was conducted similarly in both groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Motley 2014&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serial sharp debridement was carried out on both treatment arms with and without enzymatic debridement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reason for exclusion | Mulder 1994a<sup>48</sup> |
RCT comparing lamin gel with standard care and vehicle gel. The lamin gel contains a peptide copper complex, which has been shown to be a chemoattractant for capillary endothelial cells and stimulates angiogenesis. It is therefore not a debriding agent.

**Mulder 2005**

RCT comparing lamin gel with standard care and vehicle gel. The lamin gel contains a peptide copper complex, which has been shown to be a chemoattractant for capillary endothelial cells and stimulates angiogenesis. It is therefore not a debriding agent.

**Naidu 2005**

Study did not pertain to debridement but on off-loading of callus.

**Nielsen 2012**

Nonrandomized study on surgical wounds and not specific to diabetic patients.

**Oluwatosin 2000**

Intervention was not a comparison between forms of debridement but included a comparison Phenytin.

**Pettican 2012**

This study was not an RCT but a Non-randomized study on larval therapy, specifically a case series.

**Pollak 1997**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey 1999[^54]</td>
<td>RCT which assesses the effectiveness of human dermis replacement against conventional treatment. There is initially sharp debridement, but there is no debriding agent assessed in the trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricci 2010[^56]</td>
<td>RCT including 24 patients, dividing patients into treatment with either antibiotics or local insulin application. No debriding agent was assessed in this trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard 2012[^57]</td>
<td>Nonrandomized study on unspecified leg wounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saap 2002[^58]</td>
<td>Nonrandomized study on Immunomodulating NOSF dressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saied 2011[^59]</td>
<td>Fulfills the inclusion criteria for RCT and diabetic foot ulcers. The paper, however, is concerned with measuring the standard of debridement and the effectiveness of a debridement scale rather than the effectiveness of debridement as a treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez 2006[^60]</td>
<td>RCT of low intensity laser therapy as biostimulation not as a form of debridement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This was a retrospective non-randomized study on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparison in the study was not a form of debridement.

RCT of Low intensity laser therapy for use as biostimulation not a form of debridement.

An RCT of Low intensity laser therapy for use as biostimulation not a form of debridement.

This is a Non-randomized study - case series.

RCT which assess the use of short term retrograde transvenous leg perfusion. The trial is concerned with infection of foot ulcers; wound healing was not an outcome.

Though Royal Jelly could be considered a form of autolytic debridement both treatment arms received a regular form of debridement that was unspecified.

Systematic review on using hydrocolloids in chronic wounds not strictly diabetic foot ulcers.

Non-randomized study. Sharp debridement was done on
both groups.

Soos 2003<sup>69</sup>

**Reason for exclusion** Narrative review article on diabetic foot ulcer management.

Steed 1996<sup>70</sup>

**Reason for exclusion** RCT of 118 patients which compares treatment of human-derived growth factor against a placebo. The influence of debridement was evaluated by reviewing the records of the trial. This paper was used in the discussion section of this review.

Steenvoorde 2007<sup>71</sup>

**Reason for exclusion** Non-randomized study - prospective case series on larval therapy.

Tennvall 2000<sup>72</sup>

**Reason for exclusion** Non-randomized study on cost of care in diabetics with deep foot infections.

Van Acker 2000<sup>73</sup>

**Reason for exclusion** Costs for prevention and treatment of foot lesions in diabetics in Belgium not on debridement.

Van Houtum 1995<sup>74</sup>

**Reason for exclusion** The study investigates cost of amputations in the Netherlands not cost of debridement.

Varma 2006<sup>75</sup>

**Reason for exclusion** RCT undertaken on people whose wounds had already been debrided, and the effectiveness of the post debridement dressing was the focus of the trial.

Wieman 1998<sup>76</sup>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolff 2003⁷⁷</td>
<td>Nonrandomized study - case series of larval therapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zgonis 2014⁷⁸</td>
<td>Expert opinion narrative review not RCT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimny 2008⁷⁹</td>
<td>RCT of competing methods of off-loading including felted foam dressing versus pressure relief half-shoe. The debridement method was the same in both groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Characteristics of studies awaiting classification
Callaghan 1993


Dolynchuk 2001


Mulder 1994b


Characteristics of ongoing studies

Michailidis 2014

Michailidis L, Williams CM, Bergin SM, Haines TP. Comparison of healing rate in diabetes-related foot ulcers with low frequency ultrasonic debridement versus non-surgical sharps debridement: a randomized trial protocol. Journal of foot and


