

**ResultsTable (1):** characteristics of the studied population.

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Suction blister technique (n=10)</b>
<b>Age/year</b>	
<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>27.2±15.20</b>
<b>Median (range)</b>	<b>27 (16-60)</b>
<b>Gender</b>	
<b>Females</b>	<b>8 (80.00%)</b>
<b>Males</b>	<b>2 (20.00%)</b>
<b>Family history</b>	
<b>Negative</b>	<b>7 (70.0%)</b>
<b>Positive</b>	<b>3 (30.00%)</b>
<b>Duration of stability</b>	
<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>2.1±1.20</b>
<b>Median (range)</b>	<b>2.1 (1-5)</b>

**Table (2):**Repigmentation effect of suction blistering.

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Suction technique</b>
<b>Percent of repigmentation</b>	
<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>90±10.54</b>
<b>Median (range)</b>	<b>90 (70-100)</b>
<b>Repigmentationcategories</b>	
<b>Excellent</b>	<b>9 (90.0%)</b>
<b>Very good</b>	<b>1 (10.0%)</b>
<b>Good</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Poor</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table (3):**Complications of suction blistering.

<b>Complications at recipient site</b>		<b>Complicationsat donor site</b>	
<b>Hyperpigmentation</b>	<b>1 (10%)</b>	<b>Hyperpigmentation</b>	<b>2 (20%)</b>
<b>Cobblestoning</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Cobblestoning</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Rejection of graft</b>	<b>0</b>		

**Table (4):**Quality of life (QOL) score of suction blistering.

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Suction technique</b>
<b>QOL score before operation</b>	
<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>18.5±1.51</b>
<b>Median (range)</b>	<b>18.5 (16-21)</b>
<b>QOL score after operation</b>	
<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>1.6±2.07</b>
<b>Median (range)</b>	<b>1.6 (0-7)</b>
<b>P compared before and after</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>