

**Evaluation of Topical Photo-Enhancer
Assisted Intense Pulsed Light versus
Methylene Blue Assisted Intense
Pulsed Light for Treatment of
Seborrheic Keratosis**

Thesis

Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree
in Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology

Presented By

Israa Mohammed Salahuddin

M.B. B.CH.

Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Under Supervision of

Dr. Ghada Fathy Muhammad

Professor of Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Khalid Mohammed Abd El Raouf Al Zawahry

Lecturer of Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Mona Mohamed Atef

Lecturer of Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

2019

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سببنا انك لا تعلم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدقة الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgments

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **Allah** the Most Beneficent and Merciful.*

*I wish to express my deepest thanks, gratitude and appreciation to **Dr. Ghada Fathy Mohammed**, Professor of Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her meticulous supervision, kind guidance, valuable instructions and generous help.*

*Special thanks are due to **Dr. Khalid Mohammed Abd El Raouf Al Zawahry**, Lecturer of Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his sincere efforts, fruitful encouragement.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Dr. Mona Mohamed Atef**, Lecturer of Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her great help, outstanding support, active participation and guidance.*

I would like to express my hearty thanks to all my family for their support till this work was completed.

Last but not least my sincere thanks and appreciation to all patients participated in this study.

Israa Mohammed Salahuddin

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	5
List of Figures	7
Introduction.....	- 1 -
Aim of the Work	4
Review of Literture	
▪ Seborrheic Keratosis.....	5
▪ Photodynamic Therapy and Intense Pulsed Light.....	23
Patients and Methods	46
Results	52
Discussion.....	89
Summary	95
Conclusion	99
Recommendations	100
References	101
Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Demographic data of the studied cases	52
Table (2):	Description of medical data among all patients (n=30).....	53
Table (3):	Grouping and method of treatment among the studied cases.....	54
Table (4):	Fitzpatrick's skin type classification of the studied cases.....	55
Table (5):	Comparison between the groups of patients regarding Fitzpatrick's skin type classification	56
Table (6):	Sun exposure among the studied cases	57
Table (7):	Comparison between the studied groups (I, II, III) regarding sun exposure	58
Table (8):	Site of lesions among the studied cases.....	59
Table (9):	Comparison between the studied groups (I, II, III) regarding site of lesions	60
Table (10):	Type of lesions among the studied cases	61
Table (11):	Comparison between the studied groups (I, II, III) regarding type of lesions.....	62
Table (12):	Response of the studied cases	63
Table (13):	Comparison between the studied groups regarding age and gender	64
Table (14):	Comparison of clinical response with age and gender	66
Table (15):	Comparison of clinical response with Fitzpatrick's skin type classification of the studied cases.....	68

List of Tables cont...

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (16):	Comparison between clinical responses with sun exposure among the studied cases	69
Table (17):	Comparison between clinical responses with site of lesions among the studied cases	70
Table (18):	Comparison of clinical reponse with type of lesions among the studied cases	71
Table (19):	Number of sessions in different groups	72
Table (20):	Comparion between types of lesions regarding number of sessions	73
Table (21):	Comparison between different groups (I,II,III) regarding number of sessions till complete clearance	74
Table (22):	Comparison between different types of treatment regarding clinical response of treatment	75
Table (23):	Comparison between according to cleared/cured number of lesions.....	76
Table (24):	Comparison between IPL with methylene blue and IPL with carbon gel according to the number of cured/cleared lesions.....	77

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Acanthotic type.....	12
Figure (2):	Hyperkeratotic type.....	12
Figure (3):	Colonal type	12
Figure (4):	Reticulated type.....	12
Figure (5):	Irritated Type	13
Figure (6):	Pigmented type.....	13
Figure (7):	Schematics of (a) dermoscopic and (b) histopatho- logical findings of seborrheic keratosi	16
Figure (8):	Dermoscopic image of seborrheic keratosis present- ing fissures and ridges (arrows) and comedo-like openings (ar- rowheads).....	16
Figure (9):	Dermoscopic image of early seborrheic keratosis lesion presenting “fat fingers” (circle).....	17
Figure (10):	Dermoscopic image of seborrheic keratosis present- ing hairpin vessels with white halo.....	17
Figure (11):	Histopathological image of seborrheic keratosis.....	18
Figure (12):	Dermoscopic image of seborrheic keratosis present- ing comedo-like openings (arrows) and milia-like cysts (arrow- heads).....	18
Figure (13):	Dermoscopic image of Unna nevus presenting comedo-like openings (black arrows) and milia-like cysts (arrow- heads)	19

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (14):	Dermoscopic image of basal cell carcinoma present- ing milia-like cysts (arrowheads)	19
Figure (15):	Photochemical reaction	25
Figure (16):	Structure of methylene blue.....	28
Figure (17):	Absorption in different wavelengths of chromophore and wavelengths used based on clinical indications	40
Figure (18):	A 47-year-old Japanese man	42
Figure (19):	A 54-year-old woman.....	44
Figure (20):	Gender distribution among the studied cases.	52
Figure (21):	Method of treatment among the studied cases.	54
Figure (22):	Skin types of the studied cases.	55
Figure (23):	Comparison between the group of patients regarding skin type of the studied cases.	56
Figure (24):	Sun exposure among the studied cases.	57
Figure (25):	Comparison between the studied groups (I, II, III) regarding sun exposure.....	58
Figure (26):	Site of lesions among the studied cases.....	59
Figure (27):	Comparison between the studied groups (I, II, III) regarding site of lesions.	60
Figure (28):	Type of lesions among the studied cases.	61
Figure (29):	Comparison between the studied groups (I, II, III) regarding type of lesions.....	62

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (30):	Clinical response of the all studied patients.	63
Figure (31):	Comparison between types of treatment regarding age of the studied cases.....	65
Figure (32):	Comparison between types of treatment regarding gender of the studied cases.	65
Figure (33):	Comparison between clinical response and age of the studied patients.	67
Figure (34):	Comparison between clinical responses with gender of the studied patients.	67
Figure (35):	Comparison between clinical response of the studied patients and their skin type	68
Figure (36):	Comparison between clinical responses with sun exposure among the studied cases.	69
Figure (37):	Comparison between clinical responses with site of lesions among the studied cases	70
Figure (38):	Comparison of clinical reponse with type of lesions among the studied cases.	71
Figure (39):	Comparion between types of lesions regarding number of sessions.	73
Figure (40):	Comparison between different groups (I,II,III) regarding number of sessions till complete clearance.....	74
Figure (41):	Comparison between types of treatment regarding clinical response of treatment.....	75

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (42):	Comparison between clinical cure according to cleared/cured number of lesions among all groups	76
Figure (43):	Comparison between IPL with methylene blue and IPL with carbon gel according to the number of cured/cleared lesions	77
Figure (44):	Seborrheic keratosis on the left side of face of a 50 year old female	79
Figure (45):	Seborrheic keratosis on the face of a 75 year old male	80
Figure (46):	7 Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the right side of the face of a 48-year-old male	81
Figure (47):	Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the right side of the face of 45-year-old male	82
Figure (48):	Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the face a 71-year-old male	83
Figure (49):	Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the face a 55-year-old male	84
Figure (50):	Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the face a 65-year-old male	85
Figure (51):	Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the face an 55-year-old female	86
Figure (52):	Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the back of a 65 year-old-male	87
Figure (53):	Seborrheic keratosis lesions on the face a 61-year-old male	88

INTRODUCTION

Seborrheic keratosis (SK) is one of the most common benign epidermal tumors that affects both sexes equally, and usually arises in individuals older than 50 years (*Lee et al., 1992; Kwon et al., 2003*).

It presents as sharply demarcated, slightly raised brownish patches or plaques, usually on sun-exposed surfaces of the skin (*Park et al., 2014; Elder et al., 2009*). The clinical presentation can be quite variable and includes clinical variants, such as stucco keratosis and dermatosis papulosa nigra (*Elder et al., 2009*).

Seborrheic keratosis may simulate other lesions, such as common warts, lentigines, melanocytic nevi, actinic keratosis, and Bowen disease, or occasionally more aggressive entities, such as basal cell and squamous cell carcinomas, or even cutaneous melanomas (*Kim et al., 2013*).

It can be divided into six major histopathological variants: acanthotic, hyperkeratotic, adenoid, irritated, clonal, and melanoacanthoma. Histopathologically, all of the subtypes have three features in common: hyperkeratosis, acanthosis, and papillomatosis. On low to moderate power magnification, the base of the lesion lies roughly on an imaginary axis drawn between two dermoepidermal junctions at both ends of the surrounding normal tissue (*Elder et al., 2009*).

Photodynamic therapy (PDT) is a technique that utilizes reactive oxygen species produced by a nontoxic dye or photosensitizer molecule in the presence of low intensity visible light to kill mammalian or microbial cells (*Macdonald et al., 2001*). The advantages of PDT are numerous; it is a safe, noninvasive technique which yields effective therapeutic results (*See et al., 2016*).

Intense Pulsed Light (IPL) is a broadband visible light emitted from a non-coherent, filtered flash lamp. IPL sources emit light in the 500-1200 nm range and allows treatment of melanocytic lesions (*Babilas et al., 2010*). Methylene blue (MB) is a widely known histological dye that has been in use to stain living organisms for many years. It belongs to the phenothiazinium class of compounds. It is well known to be photo dynamically active. The characteristic color of MB is caused by the strong absorption band in the 550–700 nm regions. Methylene blue has shown in vivo activity against several types of tumors when locally injected and illuminated with red laser light (*Moreira et al., 2012*).

Laser treatment has been reported for treatment of such lesions, but pain is often a problem, requiring some form of anesthesia. It is sometimes painful to obtain improvement of pigmented spots by laser treatment. Intense pulsed light (IPL) is less painful, and has become widely used for pigmented lesions with satisfactory results for patients with distinct, clearly demarcated pigmented lesions. However, when attempting to

treat less well demarcated lesions which are difficult to clearly identify even by inspection, IPL treatment can be less than satisfactory especially in patients with darker skin types. In addition, when IPL is used to treat thick melanogenic lesions such as seborrheic keratosis, high energy is required to remove such lesions successfully. Both indistinct, difficult to identify pigmented lesions and thick, well-pigmented lesions like seborrheic keratosis present a real challenge when IPL treatment is applied (*Sarkar et al., 2002*).

AIM OF THE WORK

To evaluate the efficacy and safety of topical carbon gel photo-enhancer assisted intense pulsed light versus methylene blue assisted intense pulsed light photodynamic therapy for treatment of Seborrheic Keratosis.

SEBORRHEIC KERATOSIS

I-Introduction:

Seborrheic keratosis represents one of the most common benign epidermal tumors that associate with increased age. The lesions manifest clinically as acquired, solitary or multiple, well demarcated brownish papules or plaques with a verrucous surface that predominantly localize at areas of the head, neck and trunk (*Toll et al., 2008; Hafner et al., 2008*).

II-Incidence of SK:

Seborrheic keratosis affects both sexes equally, and affects approximately 80-100% of people older than 50 years. It affects people all over the world but believed to be more common in Caucasians (*Kwon et al., 2003*).

III-Etiology:

The etiology is not well-known, although heredity, sunlight and human papilloma virus (HPV) have been suggested as risk factors. Genetic studies have suggested that somatic mutations in Fibroblast Growth Factor Receptor 3 (FGFR3) gene are important in the development of these lesions (*Neville et al., 2009*). FGFR3 belongs to a class of Trans membrane tyrosinase kinase receptors involved in signal transduction to regulate cell growth, differentiation, and migration, as well as wound healing. Mutation in FGFR3 have