

Abdominal Wall Reinforcement Using Acellular Tissue Matrix After Deep Inferior Epigastric Perforator Flap Harvest for Breast Reconstruction

Alec McCranie, BA, Caitlin Blades, MS, Steven Dawson, MD, Julian Winocour, MD, David Mathes MD, Christodoulos Kaoutzanis MD University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Center, Division of Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery, Aurora, Colorado

Patient Characteristics and Outcome Variables



Background

- Deep inferior epigastric perforator (DIEP) flap is a common method of
- autologous breast reconstruction.
- Abdominal complications following DIEP flaps include abdominal wall bulges and hernias.
- Synthetic meshes have been found to decrease bulges by up to 70%, > These meshes can lead to seromas, infections, and foreign body responses.
- Reinforced tissue matrix (RTM) mesh is another material that can be used for abdominal wall reinforcement.
 - > It can recruit fibroblasts and provide a scaffold for cell proliferation
- This study aimed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of its use in this setting.

Methods

- Retrospective review was performed on all patients undergoing unilateral or bilateral DIEP flap harvest for autologous breast reconstruction between 01/2020-12/2022.
- Patients with at least 6 months of follow up were included.
- RTM used in this study was Ovitex which is a fenestrated xenograft made of four layers of ovine (sheep) extracellular matrix
 - > Mesh was placed in the recto-rectus space.
- Patient, cancer, and reconstruction characteristics were collected and analyzed.

Disclosures and References

Chang El, Chang El, Soto-Miranda MA, Zhang H, Noss Surg. 2013 Dec;122(6):1383-91. Haddock NT, Culver AJ, Teotia SS. Abdominal weakness, bulge, or hernia after DIEP flaps: An algorithm of mana; Aasthat Sure, 2021 San-74/91-2104.001 astric perforator flap abdominal bulge: A 5-year single-surgeon series. J Plast Rec

Parameter (mean ± SD)	RTM (N = 45)	No Mesh (N = 104)	P-Value
Age	52.0 ± 10.6	50.5 ± 9.5	0.408
ВМІ	29.0 ± 5.0	30.2 ± 6.1	0.198
ссі	2.7 ± 2.2	2.5 ± 1.4	0.690
Follow up	391.3 ± 151.7	628.6 ± 219.7	<0.001



Complication rates in the RTM and no mesh cohorts Indicates Significance between BTM and no mesh cohorts, P<0.05 Results

> Total of 152 patients were included

Abdominal wall reinforcement was completed in 48 (31.58%) > 45 (93.75%) received RTM mesh

- > 3 (6.25%) received synthetic mesh
- > A bulge or hernia developed in 16 (10.53%) of the 152 patients
 - > 15 (14.42%) patients in the no mesh cohort developed a bulge or hernia
 - > None of the RTM mesh cohort developed a bulge or hernia (P<0.01)
 - > 1 (33.33%) of the synthetic mesh cohort developed a bulge or hernia

RTM mesh cohort developed less seromas/hematomas when compared to synthetic mesh (8.89% vs 100%, P<0.01)

RTM mesh cohort did not differ significantly in seroma/hematoma rates when compared to the no-mesh cohort (8.89% vs 5.61%, P=0.49)





Abdominal wall Defect



Figure 4 Closure over mesh

Conclusions

RTM mesh is safe and efficacious in reducing the rate of bulges and hernias following DIEP flap harvest.

> Future work is to increase sample size by an additional 6 months of patients