Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences
www.pjlss.edu.pk

https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.005

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Assessing the Efficacy of Two Advanced Laser Therapies in Dermatology: A Comparative Study

Yasser Khaled Abdel Karim Masa'deh*

O.O. Bogomolets National Medical University, Kyiv

ARTICLE INFO

Received: May 11, 2024

Accepted: Aug 28, 2024

Keywords

Efficacy

Advanced Laser Therapie

Dermatology

Nonablative fractional laser

Ablative partial laser

***Corresponding Author:**

mamran@unikl.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Scars (Acne, Burn, and Surgical) originate in the site of tissue injury may cause distress to patients. To decide the viability of nonablative fragmentary laser (NAFL) and ablative partial laser (AFL) to creating appearance of scars.A Eighty-three patients had a scar due to acne, a trauma or surgery. Every portion of the scar at 4-week is treated by AFL or NAFL then, at that point, utilizing the size of Patient and Onlooker Scar and a fulfillment score by understanding and utilizing the size of Manchester Scar and visual simple by dermatologists. Scar appearance reported by dermatologists had no statistically significant difference. But, it had an improvement of scar appearance detailed by patients ($p < .0001$). In any case, two laser treatments revealed by patients and dermatologists had no genuinely critical proof ($p = .3173$ and $p = .2513$, separately). High tolerant fulfillment for Scar treatment with AFL or NAFL. Yet, dermatologists didn't decide improvement in scar appearance

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the field of dermatology has focused on laser therapies, there various types of laser designed to treat specific skin defects. For example, ablative fractional laser (AFL), neodymium: (Nd: YAG) laser, Erbium: glass fractional laser, fractional CO_2 laser, erbium fractional laser, picosecond alexandrite laser, beat color laser (PDL), nonablative partial laser (NAFL). These kinds of laser are endorsed by the Food and Medication Organization (FDA) for the treatment. photothermy is the principle of laser treatment. Some studies have reported that NAFL and AFL have different effect on different forms of scars.[1]

Tissue injury can cause tissue scar 100 million patients each year in the world.[2] scarring can cause some symptoms such as pain, itching, sleep and mood disturbance.[3] also, Acne vulgaris can cause scars as complications.[4] Also, cause defects in facial appearance.[5] Scars can be treated by different therapies such as surgical release, platelet-rich-plasma (PRP), and laser therapy.[6] Recently, the most common therapy to treat scars is laser treatment. That started in the 1980s.[7] Moreover, few studies reported about laser therapies to detect efficacy to normal scar maturation. Some studies have reported about NAFL treatment and AFL treatment for acne scars, surgical scars, and traumatic scars.[8-10]

This study reported two types of advanced laser therapy, one of these types the 1,550-nm NAFL and another one is 10,600-nm AFL. The aim of this study was to detect which one the NAFL and AFL were efficacious in improving scars.

METHODS

Subject selection

.A sum of 83 patients were accounted for from the emergency clinic of Jordan. Patients matured more established than 18 years had Fitzpa-stunt skin Type I to IV that optional to medical procedure or injury that had 4 cm long. We avoided scar under about a month and a half old, or keloid scarring, utilization of any photosensitizing drug, and pregnancy. Concentrate on endorsement was gotten from the College.Written informed consent was taken from a sample for the treatment and clinical photography.

Study Design

This was a randomised, prospective, blinded, comparative split-scar trial. That aim was to compare the efficacy of the NAFL versus AFL and was reported from December 2021 to December 2022. Following time was 9 months for all patients and achieved 6 clinical visits: initial consult, 3 laser treatments, what's more, a scar assessment at 90 days and a half year. At the principal treatment, every portion of the scar was randomized to get treatment with either NAFL or AFL. Before every treatment, the midpoint of the scar was estimated and checked. All subjects were dazed to the sort of laser treatment, educated to wear defensive eyewear, and kept their eyes shut during their last treatment (Figure 1).Treatment selected randomised either NAFL or AFL and subjects were blinded. Digital photographs were taken to detect improvement during the follow up visit.

Assessment of Efficacy

Subjective and objective scale to evaluate improvement.

Objective Assessment

Three blinded dermatologists using the previously MSS and VAS to detect the changes in photographs at first visit and 6 months without knowing which photograph before or after treatment. Those dazed dermatologists contrasted from getting dermatologists that due treating dermatologists were not dazed to treatment methodology.

Subjective Assessment

POSAS and a fulfillment score (exceptionally fulfilled, fulfilled, somewhat fulfilled, and unsatisfied) using by patients to evaluate scars at follow up visits.

Statistical Analysis

At first, we check observers differences by using scoring distributions and detect paired +-tests for each observer. Detected paired + test and McNemar test for each PSAS and observer photograph scores in order to detect efficacy of the AFL and NAFL. All paired t-tests threshold is $p < .05$ for significance.

RESULTS

Objective Assessment

Free Dermatologists recognize no factual contrast at first visit and at the half year follow up visit (Figure 1).But, paired +-tests detect differences in observer scores for AFL and NAFL after the 6-months that detect scores were larger for the NAF that mean more improvement (Figure 3).

Subjective Assessment

PSAS by patients detect improvement in symptoms and appearance between first visit and 6 months follow up visit (Figure 2).

Results for the Ablative Fractional Laser:

Subjective Assessment

POSAS detect significant improvement between first visit to 6 months (Figure 3):

- Colour of scar (p = .0005)
- Stiffness of scar (p = .0013)
- Thickness of scar ($ < .0001)
- Irregular scar (p < .0001)
- Opinion (p < .0001)

Results for the Nonablative Fractional Laser:

Subjective Assessment

POSAS detect significant improvement between first visit to 6 months (Figure 4):

- Pain of scar (p = .0258)
- Itching of scar (p = .0073)
- Colour of scar (p < .0001)
- Stiffness of scar (p = .0014)
- Thickness of scar ($ < .0001)
- Irregular scar (p < .0001)
- Opinion (p < .0001)

Subjective Assessment between two types of laser

The typical change showed no genuinely tremendous distinction among AFL and NAFL (Figure 5) for torment (p = .369), tingling (p = .117), variety (p = .272), solidness (p = .567), thickness (p = .269), anomaly (p = .532), and assessment of scar (p = .281).

DISCUSSION

There are several treatment options for scars. A non-invasive treatment such as laser treatment became the most common one. Therefore, we directed a forthcoming, randomized, split-scar study to distinguish viability of the AFL and NAFL. There are several studies reported about these two type of laser, but this study is large and split scar study to compare between two types of laser AFL and NAFL.

Fragmentary reemerging (ablative and non-ablative) is a promising development that produces pixelated light onto the skin to make a columnar framework called microthermal zones (M'TZ), which Segment lattices are dependent upon warm harm from light. Each MTZ is encircled by typical, unexposed tissue, which speeds up epithelialization, bringing about quicker mending times and less secondary effects than conventional ablative lasers. [11-13]

Some studies reported about these two types of laser and concluded these types can improve scar appearance without specific the cause of age of scar. [14,15]

One study reported to compare between fractional CO2 laser and no treatment, and another study reported to compare between ablative CO2 laser and nonablative fractional Er: glass laser. These examinations finished up were like the out concentrate on in that the objective evaluation announced no genuinely massive change. [14,16]

Ibrahim and partners led a review that treated horrible and careful scars first utilizing exact focusing on strategies with a standard ablative CO2 laser, trailed by 3 to 5 medicines with a nonablative partial 1,540 nm emergency room: Glass laser. They treat scars three to multiple times, three weeks separated. Results were surveyed utilizing the Vancouver Scar Scale and quartile scale. Both goal and abstract measures were genuinely huge. Nonetheless, it is critical to take note of that spectators were not oblivious in regards to the course of events of clinical photographs (for example which photographs were benchmark and which photographs were post-treatment), which might present inclination. Both of the above examinations showed huge changes in persistent fulfillment with scar inclination after treatment, as displayed in the creators' review.[14]

Patients in our review detailed enhancements in all boundaries estimated on the scar side treated with NAFL contrasted and just 5 of 7 boundaries (no scar torment or tingling) on the scar side treated with AFL. Because of the restricted ablative nature of AFL, pain and itching may not improve or even worsen. At a half year, the distinction in tolerant evaluations of scar variety between the two lasers moved toward measurable importance (P = 0.0686), showing a pattern toward progress in NAFL tone. We accept this might be because of the bigger region or inclusion given by the NAFL. Because of the size of the NAFL tip, both the scar and the encompassing sound skin are dealt with. This is as opposed to AFL, which leaves an example on the skin and is less inclined to treat encompassing skin or cross-over with scarring. All patients in our review were happy with the aftereffects of the two sides of their scars. Yet, the dermatologist announced that there was no advantage to treatment. This end is entirely expected in the writing. [17, 18.] This distinction could be made sense of by a self-influenced consequence. Also, the impact of interest attributes can't be precluded in emotional assessment, that is to say, H. Patients may unwittingly answer surveys in manners that they trust make them "great" members. Be that as it may, patient fulfillment can't be disregarded; rather, it ought to be viewed as the highest quality level for stylish assessment. Scars are known to make pressure patients and can prompt a reduction in personal satisfaction. 19,20 Albeit most genuine estimations are not measurably huge, this doesn't imply that they are not clinically critical. Constraints of our review remember inconstancy for scar age, anatomic area, and its etiology. Moreover, in light of the expanded gamble of hyperpigmentation with laser treatment for skin types V and VI, the concentrate just included skin types I to IV; subsequently, the outcomes don't make a difference to all skin types. A month and a half was decided to permit the underlying irritation to quiet down after a medical procedure and the rebuilding system to start. Future examinations could take a gander at contrasting laser medicines directed intraoperatively or promptly postoperatively. One more limit of the creators' review is the somewhat low energy setting utilized for NAFL scarring. Scarring may create more sure outcomes while beginning from energy levels of 40 to 50 m, which might be a potential improvement point for future investigations.

CONCLUSION

Taking everything into account, two medicines either AFL or NAFL cause worked on persistent fulfillment of their scar appearance.

Extra examination is important to recognize the presence of a critical differentiation between scars treated with AFI or NAFL contrasted with those left untreated

REFERENCES

1. Lin L, Liao G, Chen J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis on the effects of the ultra-pulse CO2 fractional laser in the treatment of depressed acne scars. Ann Palliat Med 2022;11:743-55.
2. Walmsley G, Maan Z, Wong V, Duscher D, et al. Scarless wound healing: chasing the holy grail. Plast Reconstr Surg 2021;135:907-17.

3. Taub AF. The Treatment of Acne Scars, a 30-Year Journey. Am J Clin Dermatol 2019; 20:683-90?
4. Samuels DV, Rosenthal R, Lin R, et al. Acne vulgaris and risk of depression and anxiety: A meta-analytic review. J Am Acad Dermatol 2020;83:532-41.
5. Mahamoud WA, El Barbary RA, Ibrahim NF, et al. Fractional carbon dioxide laser combined with intradermal injection of autologous platelet-rich plasma versus noncross-linked hyaluronic acid in the treatment of atrophic postacne scars: A split face study. J Cosmet Dermatol 2020;19:1341-52.
6. Shi Y, Jiang W, Li W, et al. Comparison of fractionated frequency-doubled 1,064/532 nm picosecond Nd:YAG lasers and non-ablative fractional 1,540 nm Er: glass in the treatment of facial atrophic scars: a randomized, split-face, double-blind trial. Ann Transl Med 2021;9:862.
7. Sabry HH, Hegazy MS, Ahmed E, et al. Q-Switched 1064-nm Nd: YAG laser versus fractional carbon dioxide laser for post acne scarring: A split-face comparative study. Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed 2022;38:465-70.
8. Emam AAM, Nada HA, Atwa MA, et al. Split-face comparative study of fractional Er: YAG laser versus microneedling radiofrequency in treatment of atrophic acne scars, using optical coherence tomography for assessment. J Cosmet Dermatol 2022;21:227-36.
9. Sirithanabadeekul P, Tantrapornpong P, Rattakul B, et al. Comparison of Fractional Picosecond 1064-nm Laser and Fractional Carbon Dioxide Laser for Treating Atrophic Acne Scars: A Randomized Split-Face Trial. Dermatol Surg 2021;47:e58-65.
10. Pratiwi I, Widayati RI. Muslimin. Effectiveness of the long-pulsed ND:YAG 1064 nm laser with 15% vitamin C (L-acid ascorbate) solution combination therapy in the treatment of patients with atrophic acne scars. Iran J Dermatol 2021;24:262-6.
11. Husein-ElAhmed H, Steinhoff M. Comparative appraisal with meta-analysis of erbium vs. CO (2) lasers for atrophic acne scars. J Dtsch Dermatol Ges 2021;19:1559-68.
12. Chang HC, Sung CW, Lin MH. Efficacy of Autologous Platelet-Rich Plasma Combined With Ablative Fractional Carbon Dioxide Laser for Acne Scars: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Aesthet Surg J 2019;39:NP279-87.
13. Saluja SS, Walker ML, Summers EM, et al. Safety of non-ablative fractional laser for acne scars within 1 month after treatment with oral isotretinoin: A randomized split-face controlled trial. Lasers Surg Med 2017; 49:886-90.
14. Ibrahim SM, Elsaie ML, Kamel MI, Mohammed EE. Successful treatment of traumatic scars with combined nonablative fractional laser and pinpoint technique of standard CO2 laser. Dermatol Ther 2016; 9:52-7.
15. Arsiwala NZ, Inamadar AC, Adya KA. A Comparative Study to Assess the Efficacy of Fractional Carbon Dioxide Laser and Combination of Fractional Carbon Dioxide Laser with Topical Autologous Platelet-rich Plasma in Post-acne Atrophic Scars. J Cutan Aesthet Surg 2020; 13:11-7.
16. Buelens S, Van Hove A, Ongenae K, Lapeere H, et al. Fractional carbon dioxide laser of recent surgical scars in the head and neck region: a split-scar, evaluator-blinded study. Dermatol Surg 2017;43:575-84.
17. Sobanko JF, Vachiramon V, Rattanaumpawan P, Miller CJ. Early postoperative single treatment ablative fractional lasing of Mos micrographic surgery facial scars: a split-scar, evaluator-blinded study Lasers Surg Med 2018;47:1-5.
18. Pham A, Green R, Woolery-Lloyd H, Kaufman J, et al. 1550-nm nonablative laser resurfacing for facial surgical scars. Arch Facial Plast Surg 2017;13:203-10.
19. Brown BC, McKenna SP, Siddhi K, McGrouther DA, et al. The hidden cost of skin scars: quality of life after skin scar ring. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 2018;61:1049-58.
20. Young VL, Hutchison J. Insights into patient and clinician concerns about scar appearance: semiquantitative structured surveys. Plast Reconstr Surg 2017;124:256-65.