

针灸推拿

针刺结合面部推拿治疗
孕期周围性面瘫的临床研究

陈国旗 朱海燕*

(安康市中心医院, 陕西 安康 725000)

摘要:目的 比较针刺结合面部推拿和单纯面部推拿治疗孕期周围性面瘫的临床疗效差异。方法 将门诊收入的 62 例孕期周围性面瘫患者随机分为治疗组($n=32$)和对照组($n=30$),治疗组采用针刺结合面部推拿的方法治疗,对照组则采用面部推拿的方法治疗,每日 1 次,10 次为 1 个疗程,观察 2 个疗程。应用 House-Brackmann 量表、FDI 面部残疾指数问卷、面神经炎的中医症状疗效标准对孕期周围性面瘫患者治疗前、后面神经功能和残疾指数等进行评价,并观察两组临床疗效差异。结果 与治疗前比较,两组患者在治疗后躯体功能评分、社会功能评分和中医症状、体征积分均有改善,差异有统计学意义($P<0.05$)。与治疗前相比,对照组总有效率为 71.43%,治疗组总有效率为 96.55%,治疗均有较好的临床疗效,且治疗组总有效率高高于对照组,差异有统计学意义($P<0.05$)。结论 针刺结合面部推拿对孕期周围性面瘫较单纯面部推拿治疗效果好,是临床治疗孕期周围性面瘫有效、安全的方法。

关键词:孕期;周围性面瘫;针刺;面部推拿

中图分类号:R254 文献标识码:A 文章编号:1672-0571(2019)02-0020-04

DOI:10.13424/j.cnki.mtcm.2019.02.006

Clinical Study on Acupuncture Combined with Facial Massage
for the Treatment of Peripheral Facial Paralysis During Pregnancy

Chen Guoqi Zhu Haiyan

(Central Hospital of Ankang, Ankang China, 725000)

Abstract Objective To compare the clinical efficacy of acupuncture combined with facial massage and facial massage alone in the treatment of peripheral facial paralysis during pregnancy. **Method** 62 cases of peripheral facial paralysis in pregnancy from the outpatient department were randomly divided into treatment group ($n=32$) and control group ($n=30$). The treatment group was treated by acupuncture combined with facial massage, while the control group was treated by facial massage, once a day, 10 times as a course of treatment. Two courses of treatment were observed. House-Brackmann Scale, FDI Facial Disability Index Questionnaire and TCM Symptom Therapeutic Criteria of Facial Neuritis were used to evaluate the nerve function and disability index of patients with peripheral facial paralysis before and after treatment, and the difference of clinical efficacy between the two groups were observed. **Result** Compared with before treatment, the scores of somatic function, social function, symptoms and signs of TCM in the two groups were improved after treatment, and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0.05$). Compared with before treatment, the total effective rate of the control group was 71.43%, and that of the treatment group was 96.55%. The treatment had good clinical efficacy, the total effective rate of the treatment group was higher than that of the control group, and the difference was

* 通讯作者:朱海燕,副主任医师。E-mail:2582977137@qq.com