

Modern Plastic Surgery

ISSN: 2164-5213



<https://www.scirp.org/journal/mps>



Journal Editorial Board

ISSN: 2164-5213 (Print) ISSN: 2164-5280 (Online)

<https://www.scirp.org/journal/mps>

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Randal Tanh Hoang Pham

Stanford University, USA

Editorial Board

Dr. Dror Aizenbud

Rambam Health Care Campus and Technion Rappaport Faculty
of Medicine, Israel

Prof. Eckhard U. Alt

Tulane University, USA

Prof. Bernardo Hontanilla Calatayud

University of Navarra, Spain

Prof. Salvatore Carlucci

Institute for Cancer Research and Treatment of Turin, Italy

Dr. Nitin Chauhan

University of Toronto, Canada

Prof. Abdou Mohammed Abd Allah Darwish

Minia University, Egypt

Dr. Christopher R. Davis

Royal Free Hospital, UK

Dr. Alexander Dionyssopoulos

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Dr. Marek Dobke

University of California, USA

Prof. Osama A. Farouk

Assiut University, Egypt

Prof. James D. Frame

Anglia Ruskin University, UK

Dr. Medhat Emil Habib

Zayed Military Hospital, Egypt

Dr. Fernando A. Herrera

Medical University of South Carolina, USA

Dr. Ali Izadpanah

McGill University Health Centre, Canada

Prof. Jih-Yang Ko

Chang Gung University, Chinese Taipei

Prof. David Daehwan Park

Daegu Catholic University Hospital, North Korea

Prof. Alberto Rancati

University of Buenos Aires, Argentina

Prof. David A. Sherris

University at Buffalo, State University of New York, USA

Prof. Zekeriya Tosun

Selcuk University, Turkey

Prof. Ronit Wollstein

University of Pittsburgh, USA

Table of Contents

Volume 9 Number 4

October 2019

**Safety of Single Vein Anastomosis versus Double Venous Anastomosis in ALT
Perforator Flap in Foot and Leg Reconstruction**

M. Abdelaal, A. Gaber.....65

**Comparison of Complications Following Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction Using
Triple Antibiotic Solution versus Low Concentration Chlorhexidine Gluconate Solution**

T. K. Merceron, U. Betarbet, A. Hart, N. Baker, G. Carlson, A. Losken.....74

Modern Plastic Surgery (MPS) Journal Information

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The *Modern Plastic Surgery* (Online at Scientific Research Publishing, <https://www.scirp.org/>) is published quarterly by Scientific Research Publishing, Inc., USA.

Subscription rates:

Print: \$79 per issue.

To subscribe, please contact Journals Subscriptions Department, E-mail: sub@scirp.org

SERVICES

Advertisements

Advertisement Sales Department, E-mail: service@scirp.org

Reprints (minimum quantity 100 copies)

Reprints Co-ordinator, Scientific Research Publishing, Inc., USA.

E-mail: sub@scirp.org

COPYRIGHT

Copyright and reuse rights for the front matter of the journal:

Copyright © 2019 by Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Copyright for individual papers of the journal:

Copyright © 2019 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

Reuse rights for individual papers:

Note: At SCIRP authors can choose between CC BY and CC BY-NC. Please consult each paper for its reuse rights.

Disclaimer of liability

Statements and opinions expressed in the articles and communications are those of the individual contributors and not the statements and opinion of Scientific Research Publishing, Inc. We assume no responsibility or liability for any damage or injury to persons or property arising out of the use of any materials, instructions, methods or ideas contained herein. We expressly disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. If expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought.

PRODUCTION INFORMATION

For manuscripts that have been accepted for publication, please contact:

E-mail: mps@scirp.org

Safety of Single Vein Anastomosis versus Double Venous Anastomosis in ALT Perforator Flap in Foot and Leg Reconstruction

Mohamed Abdelaal, Ahmed Gaber

Plastic Surgery Department, Sohag University Hospital, Sohag University, Sohag, Egypt
Email: gaberplastic@yahoo.com

How to cite this paper: Abdelaal, M. and Gaber, A. (2019) Safety of Single Vein Anastomosis versus Double Venous Anastomosis in ALT Perforator Flap in Foot and Leg Reconstruction. *Modern Plastic Surgery*, 9, 65-73.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/mps.2019.94009>

Received: August 27, 2019

Accepted: October 5, 2019

Published: October 8, 2019

Copyright © 2019 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

Introduction: Single or double venous anastomosis in free flap in general and ALT, in particular, is still a matter of debate between micro vascular surgeons. In this study, we will present our experience in single vein anastomosis versus double venous anastomosis in ALT perforator flap used in leg and foot reconstruction as regarding flap outcome, complications, operation time and the need for re-exploration. **Patient and Methods:** We retrospectively evaluate 60 patients with post traumatic foot and leg defects in the period between January 2014 and January 2018 where free ALT flap was done. The patients were divided into two groups, Group 1 where single vein anastomosis was done and Group 2 where double venous anastomosis was done; we utilize the deep venous system for the anastomosis in all cases. **Results:** Complete flap survival noticed in 56 cases (93.3%), defect size ranged from 70 to 200 cm (mean 126.35 ± 33.78). There was no difference between the 2 groups as regarding Flap survival, hospital stay, flap complications, donor site morbidity and vascular insufficiency. There is statistically significant difference between both groups as regarding Ischemia time, Operation time, and overall re-exploration rate. **Conclusions:** Our study suggests that the use of a single venous anastomosis in the venous drainage of anterolateral thigh free flaps is as safe and feasible as the two veins anastomoses.

Keywords

Single Vein, Perforator Flap, Foot Reconstruction

1. Introduction

As a result of the evolution of angiosomes, the era of perforator flaps began. Perforator flaps have become increasingly popular in reconstructive microsurgery.

gery [1]. The anterolateral thigh (ALT) flap was first reported by Song *et al.* [2] in 1984 and has become a popular option for soft-tissue reconstruction [3].

Initial experiences with free flap reconstruction carried a failure rate of 40% to 50%, which has since improved to success rates of 90% to 99% [4].

Single or double venous anastomosis in free flap in general and ALT, in particular, is still a matter of debate between micro vascular surgeons.

Many surgeons are doing double venous anastomosis routinely for many reasons especially venous insufficiency or thrombosis which is one of the main causes of flap failure [5].

On the other hand, surgeons doing single vein anastomosis are trying to reduce the operation time and cost which was added by the 2nd anastomosis [6].

In this study, we will present our experience in single vein anastomosis versus double venous anastomosis in ALT perforator flap used in leg and foot reconstruction as regarding flap outcome, complications, operation time and the need for re-exploration.

2. Patient and Methods

We retrospectively evaluate 60 patients with post traumatic foot and leg defects in the period between January 2014 and January 2018 where free ALT flap was done.

Preoperatively, full history and examination were taken as regarding age and sex of each patient, cause, size and site of the defect, time since injury to reconstruction, exposure of bone or tendons, and any co-morbid conditions.

The patients were divided into two groups, Group 1 where single vein anastomosis was done and Group 2 where double venous anastomosis was done; we utilize the deep venous system for the anastomosis in all cases.

Inclusion criteria

Patients with leg and foot defects, any age group, any defect size, exposed bone and tendons, fit for microsurgical operation.

Exclusion criteria

Un fit patients, superficial wounds, concomitant injuries.

The minimum follow up period was 6 months, and patients were examined for durability of coverage, flap success and the need for re-exploration.

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software program. Qualitative variables were recorded as frequencies and percentages. Quantitative variables were presented as means \pm standard deviation (SD) and compared by student t-test. P-value < 0.05 will be significant.

3. Results

Total number of cases was 60 patients, with post traumatic leg and foot defects. Complete flap survival noticed in 56 cases (93.3%). Age incidence was ranged

between 5 and 55 years (mean 23.63 ± 14.47), sex predilection was 45 males (75%), defect size ranged from 70 to 200 cm (mean 126.35 ± 33.78) and defect site was 19 (31.7%) in leg and 41 (69.3%) in foot.

The patients' demographic data are presented in **Table 1** including "number, age, sex, defect size and site, time before reconstruction and follow up time" for each group. We noticed that group 1 was 35 patients while group 2 was 25 patients, age incidence was younger in group 1 than group 2, males were more than females in both groups, defect size was smaller in group 1 than group 2 (p-value = 0.0039), defect site was more in foot than leg in both groups. Both groups were equal also in preoperative and follow up period.

Flap survival, ischemia time, operation time, hospital stay, flap complications and donor site morbidity also presented in **Table 2**. We notice a statistically significant difference between both groups as regarding operation and ischemia time (p-value = 0.0001) indicating that cases in group 1 need less operation time than group 2, also the ischemia time was less in group 1 due to the use of one vein in anastomosis. There were no differences between the two groups as regarding the total flap loss rate (p-value = 0.7268), or other flap complications "infection and partial dehiscence" (p-value = 0.9435) and donor site morbidity (p-value = 0.9345). Also, the hospital stay was nearly the same between both groups.

As regarding the arterial anastomoses (**Table 3**), in 77.1% of cases in group 1, we use posterior tibial artery, while in group 2 we use it with 80% of cases. In the remaining cases, we use the anterior tibial artery. Venous anastomoses were done with the deep venous system in both groups.

12 cases need re-exploration (20%) (**Table 4**), in group 1 there are 7 cases need re-exploration 2 of them were due to arterial spasm which was improved. The other 5 cases were affected by venous thrombosis were thrombectomy, wash with heparin and venous re-anastomosis was done but unfortunately, 2 of them were completely lost. In group 2, 5 cases need re-exploration 1 of them was due to arterial spasm which was improved. The other 4 cases were affected by venous thrombosis were thrombectomy, wash with heparin and venous re-anastomosis

Table 1. Patient demographic data.

	Group 1	Group 2	P-value
Patient number	35	25	
Age (years)	5 to 40 Mean 17.63 ± 10.7	8 to 55 Mean 32.04 ± 15.1	0.0001
Sex (percentage)	Male: 28 (80%) Female: 7 (20%)	Male: 17 (68%) Female: 8 (32%)	0.2940
Defect size (cm)	70 to 180 Mean 115.06 ± 28.7	90 to 200 Mean 139.04 ± 32.7	0.0039
Defect site	25 foot (71.4%) 10 leg (28.6%)	16 foot (64%) 9 leg (36%)	0.547
Time before reconstruction	3 days to 3 weeks	3 days to 3 weeks	
Follow up time	6 months to 1.5 years	6 months to 1.5 years	

Table 2. Comparing the outcomes for each group.

	Group 1	Group 2	P-value
Ischemia time (minutes)	30 to 50 Mean 40 ± 7.2	45 to 75 Mean 59.76 ± 9.02	0.0001
Operation time (minutes)	180 to 240 Mean 208.86 ± 18.9	220 to 300 Mean 259.96 ± 26.8	0.0001
Hospital stay (days)	7 to 14	7 to 13	
Total flap loss (percentage)	2 (5.7%)	2 (8%)	0.7268
Other flap complications infection, partial dehiscence and partial loss (percentage)	4 (11.4%)	3 (12%)	0.9435
Donner site closure	12 primary (34.3%) 23 with graft (65.7%)	10 primary (40%) 15 with graft (60%)	
Donner site morbidity (percentage)	3 (8.6%)	2 (8%)	0.9345

Table 3. Vascular Anastomosis.

	Group 1	Group 2	P-value
Arterial anastomosis	27 with posterior tibial a. (77.1%) 8 with anterior tibial (22.9%)	20 with posterior tibial a. (80%) 5 with anterior tibial (20%)	0.7899 0.7899
Venous anastomosis	single vein anastomosis with deep vein	double vein anastomosis with deep venous system	

Table 4. Re-explorations and survival rate.

	Group 1	Group 2	P-value
Overall re-exploration	7 cases (20%)	5 cases (20%)	0.0001
Arterial spasm cases	2 arterial spasm (5.7%): pass	1 arterial spasm (4%): pass	0.7675
Venous thrombosis cases	5 venous thrombosis (14.3%)	4 venous thrombosis (16%)	0.8570
Venous thrombosis outcome	3 pass (8.6%) 2 failed (5.7%)	2 pass (8%) 2 failed (8%)	0.9345 0.7268
Salvage success rate	71.4%	60%	0.3598
Timing of re-exploration	8 to 24 hours Mean 16.57 ± 6.08	8 to 36 hours Mean 23.2 ± 10.83	0.0037

was done but 2 of them also were completely lost. There was a statistically significant difference in the rate of re-exploration between the two groups (p-value = 0.0001), indicating that more cases need reoperation in group 1 than group 2. When analyzing the cause for re-exploration we found that arterial cause was 5.7% in group 1 and 4% in group 2 with no difference. The venous cause was 14.3% in group 1 and 16% in group 2 also with no statistically significant difference. As we say before, there were no differences between the two groups as regarding the total flap loss rate (p-value = 0.7268) which were due to venous thrombosis. There was a difference in the timing of the re-exploration between

the two groups (p-value = 0.0037) but not reaching the significance indicating that the reoperation was earlier in group 1 than group 2. Salvage success rate was higher in group 1 than group 2 71.4% and 60% respectively with significant difference.

Case Presentation:

Case (1):

Male patient, 14 years old, affected by motor car accident, have a raw area over the posteromedial aspect of the right foot over tendoachillis. Defect size was 10*9 cm. K wire fixation was done for fracture dislocation of the ankle joint and soft tissue debridement done also.

Free ALT flap was done. Anastomosis was done end to end with post tibial vessel. The donor site was closed with STG. Late post-operative results were satisfactory (**Figure 1** and **Figure 2**).

Case (2):

Male patient, 10 years old, affected by motor car accident, have a raw area over the dorsum of the right foot. Defect size was 5*9 cm. Soft tissue debridement is done also. Free ALT flap was done. Anastomosis was done end to end with post tibial vessel. The donor site was closed primary. Late post-operative results were satisfactory (**Figure 3** and **Figure 4**).

Case (3):

Male patient, 40 years old, affected by motor car accident, have a raw area over the sole of the right foot. Defect size was 7*11 cm. Soft tissue debridement is done also. Free ALT flap was done. Anastomosis was done end to end with post tibial vessel. The donor site was closed with STG. Late post-operative results were satisfactory (**Figure 5** and **Figure 6**).

4. Discussion

The choice of doing free flap reconstruction in lower limb should be done carefully, depending on multiple factors including age, size and site of the defect, presence or absence of exposed vital structures and patient general condition. Initial experiences with free flap reconstruction carried a failure rate of 40% to



Figure 1. Pre-operative picture of case 1.



Figure 2. Post-operative picture of case 1.



Figure 3. Pre-operative picture of case 2.



Figure 4. Post-operative picture of case 2.

50%, which has since improved to success rates of 90% to 99% [4]. In our study, we have success rate 93.3% which is comparable to the literature. Many technical controversies exist regarding the technical details of the microvascular anastomosis in order to prevent the occurrence of thrombosis and in order to optimize outcomes [7]. Anastomosis proximal to the site of injury should be preferred whenever practical [8].

Hanasono *et al.* in his study present 81 cases of single vein anastomosis and claiming that the blood velocity is high when comparing it with two venous



Figure 5. Pre-operative picture of case 3.



Figure 6. Post-operative picture of case 3.

anastomoses which will reduce the incidence of stasis and subsequently the thrombosis. On the other hand, to enhance venous drainage and especially to provide a rescue venous drainage if one of the venous anastomoses occludes, other authors postulate the use of two or more venous anastomoses [9] [10]. We chose the ALT flap in reconstruction of leg and foot defects for many reasons include donor harvesting with a two-team approach, long length and large caliber of the pedicle, volume variability, minimal donor site morbidity, and the ability to incorporate various tissue components, such as skin, subcutaneous fat, deep fascia, and muscle, in varying proportions as needed [11] [12].

The main complication in free flap surgery remains thrombosis of the vessels, usually venous thrombosis [13] [14]. Vascular complications leading to flap failure can include venous thrombosis, arterial thrombosis, or both. Reasons for flap failure can be divided into technical factors and patient factors. Technical factors, including flap design and surgeon error, are considered common causes of vessel thrombosis [15]. Patient factors, including the known (e.g., age, smoking, obesity, and radiation) and unknown (e.g., unknown coagulopathy and unknown medication effects), can also contribute to vascular compromise [16]. It is important to prevent venous thrombosis in order to achieve a better survival rate. We use the deep venous system for the vein anastomosis in all cases to create a homogenous atmosphere and facilitate the investigation which makes our data more reliable. When analyzing the difference between both groups as regarding venous complications, there was no difference (p-value = 0.8570) in

the overall thrombosis rate, salvage rate (p-value = 0.3598) and failure rate (p-value = 0.7268).

The initial 72 hours postoperative is the most critical for flap monitoring and stability [17]. In our work, the vascular insufficiency was noticed between 8 to 24 hours postoperatively in group 1 comparing to 8 to 36 hours postoperatively in group 2 with (p-value = 0.0037) although not reaching the significance but indicating that the vascular insufficiency was noticed earlier in group 1 than group 2.

The rate of re-exploration between the two groups (p-value = 0.0001) was statistically significant, indicating that more cases need reoperation in group 1 than group 2. When adding 2nd vein for anastomosis it will prolong the operation time that is used to prepare the vein and finish the anastomosis, so it is not surprising that when we analyze the ischemia time and total operation time there was a statistically significant difference between both groups (p-value = 0.0001) indicating that cases in group 1 need less operation time than group 2.

5. Conclusion

We assume that venous drainage through single vein anastomosis in the ALT free flap with deep venous system provides adequate safety for flap survival. In addition, the single venous anastomosis shortens operative time. Therefore, our study suggests that the use of a single venous anastomosis in the venous drainage of anterolateral thigh free flaps is as safe and feasible as the two veins anastomoses.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] Blondeel, P.N., Morris, S.F., Hallock, G.G. and Neligan, P.C. (2006) Perforator Flaps: Anatomy, Technique & Clinical Applications. Quality Medical Publishing, St. Louis, MO.
- [2] Song, Y.G., Chen, G.Z. and Song, Y.L. (1984) The Free Thigh Flap: A New Free Flap Concept Based on the Septocutaneous Artery. *Bricd Journal of Plastic Surgery*, **37**, 149-155. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-1226\(84\)90002-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-1226(84)90002-X)
- [3] Wei, F.C., Suominen, S., Cheng, M.H., Celik, N. and Lai, Y.L. (2002) Anterolateral Thigh Flap for Postmastectomy Breast Reconstruction. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **110**, 82-88. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006534-200207000-00015>
- [4] Pattani, K.M., Byrne, P., Boahene, K. and Richmon, J. (2010) What Makes a Good Flap Go Bad? A Critical Analysis of the Literature of Intraoperative Factors Related to Free Flap Failure. *The Laryngoscope*, **120**, 717-723. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.20825>
- [5] Coroneos, C.J., Heller, A.M., Voineskos, S.H. and Avram, R. (2015) SIEA versus DIEP Arterial Complications: A Cohort Study. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **135**, 802e-807e. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000001150>
- [6] Han, Z., Li, J., Li, H., Su, M. and Qin, L. (2013) Single versus Dual Venous Anasto-

- moses of the Free Fibula Osteocutaneous Flap in Mandibular Reconstruction: A Retrospective Study. *Microsurgery*, **33**, 652-655. <https://doi.org/10.1002/micr.22176>
- [7] Chen, W.F., Kung, Y.P., Kang, Y.C., Lawrence, W.T. and Tsao, C.K. (2014) An Old Controversy Revisited-One versus Two Venous Anastomoses in Microvascular Head and Neck Reconstruction Using Anterolateral Thigh Flap. *Microsurgery*, **34**, 377-383. <https://doi.org/10.1002/micr.22214>
- [8] Spector, J.A., Levine, S. and Levine, J.P. (2007) Free Tissue Transfer to the Lower Extremity Distal to the Zone of Injury: Indications and Outcomes over a 25-Year Experience. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **120**, 952-959. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000255175.92201.c7>
- [9] Ichinose, A., Terashi, H., Nakahara, M., Sugimoto, I., Hashikawa, K., Nomura, T., *et al.* (2004) Do Multiple Venous Anastomoses Reduce Risk of Thrombosis in Free-Flap Transfer? Efficacy of Dual Anastomoses of Separate Venous Systems. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, **52**, 61-63. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.sap.0000096425.18223.60>
- [10] Ross, G.L., Ang, E.S., Lannon, D., Addison, P., Golger, A., Novak, C.B., *et al.* (2008) Ten-Year Experience of Free Flaps in Head and Neck Surgery. How Necessary Is a Second Venous Anastomosis? *Head & Neck*, **30**, 1086-1089. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hed.20841>
- [11] Lutz, B.S. and Wei, F.C. (2005) Microsurgical Workhorse Flaps in Head and Neck Reconstruction. *Clinics in Plastic Surgery*, **32**, 421-430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cps.2005.02.006>
- [12] Lee, Y.C., Chiu, H.Y. and Shieh, S.J. (2011) The Clinical Application of Anterolateral Thigh Flap. *Plastic Surgery International*, **2011**, Article ID: 127353. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/127353>
- [13] Riot, S., Herlin, C., Mojallal, A., Garrido, I., Bertheuil, N., Filleron, T., *et al.* (2015) A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Double Venous Anastomosis in Free Flaps. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **136**, 1299-12311. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000001791>
- [14] Tran, N.V., Buchel, E.W. and Convery, P.A. (2007) Microvascular Complications of DIEP Flaps. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **119**, 1397-13405. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000256045.71765.96>
- [15] Nahabedian, M.Y., Momen, B. and Manson, P.N. (2004) Factors Associated with Anastomotic Failure after Microvascular Reconstruction of the Breast. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **114**, 74-82. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.PRS.0000127798.69644.65>
- [16] Mirzabeigi, M.N., Wang, T., Kovach, S.J., Taylor, J.A., Serletti, J.M. and Wu, L.C. (2012) Free Flap Take-Back Following Postoperative Microvascular Compromise: Predicting Salvage versus Failure. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **130**, 579-589. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e31825dbfb7>
- [17] Chen, K.T., Mardini, S., Chuang, D.C.C., Lin, C.H., Cheng, M.H., Lin, Y.T., Huang, W.C., Tsao, C.K. and Wei, F.C. (2007) Timing of Presentation of the First Signs of Vascular Compromise Dictates the Salvage Outcome of Free Flap Transfers. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **120**, 187-195. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000264077.07779.50>

Comparison of Complications Following Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction Using Triple Antibiotic Solution versus Low Concentration Chlorhexidine Gluconate Solution

Tyler K. Merceron¹, Udayan Betarbet², Alexandra Hart³, Nusaiba Baker², Grant Carlson³, Albert Losken³

¹Department of Surgery, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA

²School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

³Division of Plastic Surgery, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA
Email: alosken@emory.edu

How to cite this paper: Merceron, T.K., Betarbet, U., Hart, A., Baker, N., Carlson, G. and Losken, A. (2019) Comparison of Complications Following Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction Using Triple Antibiotic Solution versus Low Concentration Chlorhexidine Gluconate Solution. *Modern Plastic Surgery*, 9, 74-85.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/mps.2019.94010>

Received: September 3, 2019

Accepted: October 12, 2019

Published: October 15, 2019

Copyright © 2019 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

Background: Prevention of infection and capsular contracture remains a primary goal of implant-based breast reconstruction (IBBR). Previous studies have demonstrated improved outcomes with the use of triple-antibiotic solution (TAS) for breast pocket irrigation, but ready-to-use products have recently gained popularity. The purpose of this study is to compare outcomes following IBBR between TAS and low-concentration chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) solutions. **Methods:** This is a retrospective analysis of 690 consecutive patients undergoing IBBR from 2008-2017. The TAS (n = 346) irrigation solution was composed of 1 g cefazolin, 80 mg gentamicin and 50,000 U bacitracin diluted in 500 mL of normal saline; the CHG (n = 344) irrigation solution was the commercially-available product Irrisept® (0.05% chlorhexidine gluconate in sterile water, Irrimax Corporation, Lawrenceville, GA). Comparisons were made between demographic and clinical variables. Complications were recorded and statistical analysis, including multivariate regression analysis, was performed. **Results:** The TAS group underwent significantly more skin-sparing mastectomies, adjuvant chemotherapy/radiation and less direct-to-implant reconstruction than the CHG group. The CHG group experienced a significantly lower incidence of total complications (22.4% vs. 31.8%, p = 0.006), minor complications (8.7% vs. 16.5%, p = 0.003), infection (6.4% vs. 12.7%, p = 0.006) and seroma (2.6% vs. 6.9%, p = 0.011). There was a significantly increased rate of delayed wound healing in the CHG group.

Multivariate analysis showed that the use of CHG solution significantly decreased the odds of any complication by 1.6-fold (OR 0.637, 95% CI 0.414 - 0.977) and the odds of infection by 2.4-fold (OR 0.420, 95% CI 0.218 - 0.809). There were no statistically significant differences in rates of capsular contracture or other complications. **Conclusions:** The use of CHG as a pocket irrigant in post-mastectomy breast reconstruction is a reasonable alternative to other solutions, in efforts to minimize prosthetic based complications.

Keywords

Breast Reconstruction, Irrigation, Chlorohexidine

1. Introduction

Significant advances in breast cancer screening and management over the past thirty years have led to marked improvements in survivability after diagnosis and quality of life following oncologic treatment. According to the National Cancer Institute Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) database, 5-year overall survival for female patients with breast cancer from 2008-2014 was 89.7% [1]. Of the 62% of patients with localized disease and 31% of patients with regional disease, there was a 98.7% and 85.3% 5-year survival rate, respectively. These favorable statistics have paralleled global trends toward breast conserving therapy for patients with localized disease and contralateral mastectomy in patients requiring oncologic mastectomy in order to achieve an optimal reconstructive outcome. As a result, there has been a marked increase in the number of patients seeking breast reconstruction, demonstrated by a 62% increase in the rate of reconstructive procedures after mastectomy from 2009-2014 in one study [2].

The vast majority of breast reconstructive procedures following mastectomy are prosthetic-based. Of the 106,295 reconstructive breast procedures performed in the United States in 2017, 81.8% utilized tissue expanders (TE) or single-stage direct-to-implant (DTI) reconstruction [3]. According to a recent report of 67,450 patients undergoing mastectomy for breast cancer from 2005-2014, the percentage of patients undergoing reconstruction has increased from 26.94% in 2005 to 43.30% in 2014, with a significant increase in the use of TE-based implantation from 15.54% to 33.30% [4]. The use of prosthetic materials for breast reconstruction, however, presents the potential for complications associated with synthetic and foreign materials implanted *in vivo* [5]-[10]. One of the most important modifiable factors to decrease the rate of complications is a reduction of the bacterial load within the breast pocket prior to implant placement, which has prompted the development of various additions to standard antiseptic technique [5] [11]-[16]. One important technique reported in the literature is the use of surgical site irrigation within the breast pocket [14] [16] [17] [18]. While there are multiple previous reports demonstrating decreased complications when using

triple-antibiotic or povidone-iodine solutions, there has been a push for ready-to-use off-the-shelf products. The purpose of this study is to investigate the difference in outcomes following implant-based breast reconstruction (IBBR) using triple-antibiotic (TAS) versus low-concentration chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) solutions.

2. Methods

After obtaining Institutional Review Board approval, we performed an analysis of a prospectively maintained database of patients undergoing immediate implant-based breast reconstruction (IBBR) with either tissue-expanders or direct to implants between January 2008 and September 2017 at Emory University Hospital. All surgeries were performed by one of the two senior authors (GC and AL). Inclusion criteria included patients undergoing immediate implant-based reconstruction, no previous breast reconstruction or augmentation, use of either triple-antibiotic solution (50,000 IU bacitracin, 1 g cefazolin, 80 mg gentamicin in 500 mL of normal saline) or Irrisept® (0.05% chlorhexidine gluconate in sterile water, Irrimax Corp, Lawrenceville, GA, USA), and complete medical records. Patients undergoing autologous or delayed implant-based breast reconstruction, no record of implant pocket irrigation, follow-up less than 30 days, or incomplete medical records were excluded from analysis. Analysis was performed on a per-breast basis.

Demographic and clinical characteristics were recorded, including age, BMI, history of smoking, diabetes and hypertension. Surgical intervention, including mastectomy type (skin-sparing mastectomy, nipple-sparing mastectomy or modified radical mastectomy), laterality (unilateral vs. bilateral), management of the axillary lymph node basin (sentinel lymph node biopsy vs. axillary lymph node dissection), and breast reconstruction (tissue expander, latissimus myocutaneous flap + tissue expander, or direct implant) were recorded. The use of neoadjuvant and/or adjuvant chemotherapy and radiation was also analyzed.

The primary outcome of interest was the incidence of postoperative complications. Complications were further categorized as delayed wound healing (superficial incisional dehiscence requiring serial dressing changes, office debridement and/or operative revision), infection (requiring oral or intravenous antibiotics or return to the operating room for incision and drainage), mastectomy skin flap necrosis (requiring serial dressing changes and/or debridement), implant/expander exposure, implant/expander failure, capsular contracture (Baker Grade III or IV), hematoma (requiring drainage in the operating room), seroma (requiring clinic or operating room aspiration/drainage), and fat necrosis. Major complications were those requiring hospital re-admission or return to the operating room. All other complications were recorded as minor.

Comparisons were made between demographic and clinical variables. The Mann-Whitney U-Test, Pearson chi-square, Fisher's exact, student's t-test were used as appropriate to compare outcomes between breast irrigation solution

groups. Variables determined to be significantly different on univariate analysis that were included in the multivariate logistic regression model if >50 cases were present. All statistical analysis was conducted using the IBM® SPSS® Statistics 24.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y.). All statistical tests used a 0.05 alpha level.

3. Results

During the 10-year study period, 1900 women underwent breast reconstruction following mastectomy. Of these, 690 subjects had sufficient data to be included for analysis. Data were calculated for the entire study group (**Table 1**) and then compared between the triple antibiotic solution (TAS) cohort and low-concentration chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) cohort. The average follow up time was 854 days (range: 30 - 3550), with a mean of 36.1 months in the TAS group and mean of 18.8 months in the CHG group ($p < 0.0001$).

The average age of women undergoing breast reconstruction was 50.8 years (range: 26.9 - 82.1). The average BMI was 25.4 kg/m² (range: 14.0 - 44.7). Comorbidities included hypertension ($n = 193$, 27.8%), diabetes ($n = 44$, 6.3%), and smoking history ($n = 27$, 3.9%). The CHG group was older (52.1 years vs. 49.7 years, $p = 0.007$) and had a higher number of patients with hypertension ($n = 115$ (33.4%) vs. $n = 78$ (22.5%), $p = 0.002$) when compared to the TAS group.

For the entire patient population, skin-sparing mastectomy (SSM) was performed most often ($n = 482$, 70.1%), followed by nipple-sparing mastectomy (NSM) ($n = 199$, 28.9%) and modified radical mastectomy (MRM) ($n = 7$, 1.0%). However, SSM was more prevalent in the TAS group ($n = 288$ (83.7%) vs. $n = 194$ (56.4%)), and NSM and MRM were more prevalent in the CHG group ($n = 145$ (42.2%) vs. $n = 54$ (15.7%) and $n = 5$ (1.5%) vs. 2 (0.6%), respectively) ($p < 0.0001$). Bilateral mastectomy was performed in 74.1% of cases and axillary lymph node dissection occurred in 25.7%. There was no statistically significant difference in laterality or axillary lymph node management between the groups ($p = 0.258$ and $p = 0.067$, respectively).

281 subjects (40.5%) received chemotherapy and 168 (24.2%) underwent radiation therapy. 164 subjects (47.4%) in the TAS group underwent chemotherapy, while 115 patients (33.4%) in the CHG group did ($p < 0.0001$). Similarly, 99 subjects (28.6%) in the TAS group underwent radiation therapy, while 69 (20.1%) in the CHG group did ($p = 0.010$).

All subjects had a prosthetic-based reconstruction with either tissue expander (TE) or direct-to-implant (DTI). Overall, TEs were used in 537 cases (77.8%), DTI in 122 cases (17.7%) and latissimus flap + TE in 31 cases (4.5%). Patients in the TAS group had a higher percentage of women undergoing TE-based reconstruction compared to the CHG group ($n = 317$ (91.6%) vs. $n = 220$ (64.0%), $p < 0.0001$); while DTI-based reconstruction occurred at a higher rate in the CHG group ($n = 93$ (27.0%) vs. $n = 29$ (8.4%), $p < 0.0001$). All patients who underwent latissimus flap + TE were in the CHG group. Use of acellular dermal matrix was similar between both groups: 194 (56.6%) in the TAS group and 174 (50.6%) in the CHG group.

Table 1. Differences in clinical characteristics, oncologic treatment and complications in triple antibiotic vs. irrissept groups.

Clinical characteristic	Triple Antibiotic (n = 346)	Irrisept (n = 344)	p
Age, mean years	49.7	52.1	0.007
BMI, mean kg/m ²	25.3	25.6	0.402
Smoking history, n (%)	11 (3.2)	16 (4.7)	0.334
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	23 (6.6)	21 (6.1)	0.876
Hypertension, n (%)	78 (22.5)	115 (33.4)	0.002
Mastectomy type, n (%)			<0.0001
Modified radical	2 (0.6)	5 (1.5)	
Skin-sparing	288 (83.7)	194 (56.4)	
Nipple-sparing	54 (15.7)	145 (42.2)	
Laterality, n (%)			0.258
Unilateral	96 (27.9)	82 (23.8)	
Bilateral	248 (72.1)	262 (76.2)	
Lymph node dissection, n (%)			
Sentinel lymph node biopsy	269 (78.2)	269 (78.2)	1.000
Axillary lymph node dissection	100 (29.1)	78 (22.7)	0.067
Chemotherapy, n (%)			
Any	164 (47.4)	115 (33.4)	<0.0001
Neoadjuvant	82 (23.7)	79 (23.0)	0.857
Adjuvant	98 (28.3)	55 (16.0)	<0.0001
Radiotherapy, n (%)			
Any	99 (28.6)	69 (20.1)	0.010
Neoadjuvant	4 (1.2)	15 (4.4)	0.013
Adjuvant	98 (28.3)	56 (16.3)	<0.0001
Primary Reconstruction, n (%)			<0.0001
Tissue expander	317 (91.6)	220 (64.0)	
Direct-to-implant	29 (8.4)	93 (27.0)	
Latissimus flap/expander	0 (0.0)	31 (9.0)	
Use of acellular dermal matrix	194 (56.6)	174 (50.6)	1.000
Complications, n (%)			
Any complication	110 (31.8)	77 (22.4)	0.006
Ipsilateral (to cancer side)	81 (23.4)	59 (17.2)	0.047
Contralateral (to cancer side)	32 (9.2)	19 (5.5)	0.080
Major complication	69 (19.9)	55 (16.0)	0.198
Minor complication	57 (16.5)	30 (8.7)	0.003
Delayed wound healing	1 (0.3)	10 (2.9)	0.006

Continued

Infection	44 (12.7)	22 (6.4)	0.006
Mastectomy skin flap necrosis	14 (4.0)	13 (3.8)	1.000
Implant exposure	3 (0.9)	9 (2.6)	0.089
Implant failure	28 (8.1)	16 (4.7)	0.086
Capsular contracture	28 (8.1)	16 (4.7)	0.086
Hematoma	11 (3.2)	15 (4.4)	0.432
Seroma	24 (6.9)	9 (2.6)	0.011
Fat necrosis	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	0.499
Follow-up Time, months	36.1	18.8	<0.0001

There were a total of 188 complications, 124 of which were considered major. Patients in the TAS group were more likely to experience a complication than patients in the CHG group ($n = 110$ (31.8%) vs. $n = 77$ (22.4%), $p = 0.006$). Higher rates of complication following reconstruction were observed in the TAS group on the ipsilateral side to cancer resection ($n = 81$ (23.4%) vs. $n = 59$ (17.2%), $p = 0.047$) and in minor complications ($n = 57$ (16.5%) vs. 30 (8.7%), $p = 0.003$). Compared with the CHG group, the TAS group experienced a higher rate of infections ($n = 44$ (12.7%) vs. $n = 22$ (6.4%), $p = 0.006$) and seromas ($n = 24$ (6.9%) vs. $n = 9$ (2.6%), $p = 0.011$). Conversely, there was a higher rate of delayed wound healing in the CHG group ($n = 10$ (2.9%) vs. $n = 1$ (0.3%), $p = 0.003$). On multivariate analysis, the odds of having any complication were 1.6-fold lower in the CHG group (OR 0.637, 95% CI 0.414 - 0.977) and the odds of infection were 2.4-fold lower (OR 0.420, 95% CI 0.218 - 0.809). There were no statistically significant differences in major complications, complications on the contralateral reconstruction side, mastectomy skin flap necrosis, implant exposure, implant failure, capsular contracture, hematoma formation or fat necrosis.

4. Discussion

In 2017, more than 80,000 tissue expander or direct-to-implant reconstructive breast procedures were performed [3], representing the vast majority of breast reconstruction following mastectomy. Given the predominance of this technique and the use of synthetic materials, the prevention of complications has been a primary goal of surgeons performing prosthetic-based breast reconstruction. More specifically, reducing infection and capsular contracture has been of particular interest, as these pose the potential for devastating sequelae such as implant loss and the need for increasingly complex secondary reconstructions. While capsular contracture is a poorly understood phenomenon, there is a general consensus that subclinical infection and the development of peri-prosthetic biofilm contribute significantly [19] [20]. Thus, a significant body of literature has been produced in the pursuit of improved techniques that significantly diminish the potential for bacterial seeding of breast implants and tissue expanders

in order to decrease rates of major complications [13] [17] [21].

Efforts to reduce the potential for bacterial seeding of breast implants include skin antiseptic preparation, soaking of the implant in an antibacterial solution, irrigating the breast pocket with an antibacterial solution, using a “no-touch” technique to introduce the breast implant into the breast pocket, and utilizing perioperative antibiotics. One national survey by Gowda *et al.* demonstrated that a majority of surgeons were using chlorhexidine to prepare the skin, soaking the implant in triple antibiotic solution and irrigating the breast pocket with povidone-iodine solution prior to implantation, then using a no-touch technique for implantation, and subsequently using first-generation cephalosporins until drains were removed [16]. Of these measures, it appears that breast pocket management (*i.e.* decreasing the local microbiome) has more of a protective effect than systemic antimicrobial prophylaxis. There has been increasing evidence that oral and parenteral perioperative antibiotics beyond 24 hours have limited efficacy in preventing implant-associated infections [21] [22]. Furthermore, there is literature to support that the administration of prolonged antibiotics has the potential to give rise to drug-resistant organisms that are more difficult to eradicate if an attempt at implant salvage becomes necessary [23] [24]. Thus, the American Society of Plastic Surgery has clear guidelines stating that patients undergoing breast reconstruction with tissue expanders or implants should be administered a pre-operative antibiotic, but all antibiotics should be discontinued within 24 hours of the operation unless a surgical drain is present [12].

Local bacterial eradication and the creation of a microbe-free implant pocket are essential to preventing complications in prosthetic-based breast reconstruction. Breast pocket irrigation using antimicrobial solutions remains one of the important ways by which this can be achieved. The most common irrigation solutions include Adams’ triple antibiotic solution (TAS; 50,000 IU bacitracin, 1 g cefazolin, 80 mg gentamicin in 500 mL of normal saline) and povidone-iodine (P-I). While TAS has been widely used by plastic surgeons, there is little and conflicting evidence demonstrating its efficacy in preventing complications. For example, Adams and colleagues showed that TAS decreases bacterial populations responsible for peri-prosthetic infections and leads to reduced rates of capsular contracture for breast reconstruction [25] [26]; however, subsequent contrasting studies question the effect of TAS to reduce the rate of capsular contracture [27] [28]. In comparison to TAS, P-I reduces infection risk as an antiseptic solution. Review of current literature demonstrates the effectiveness of P-I to reduce subclinical infections and capsular contracture [29] [30] [31] [32]. Additional studies have advocated for the use of breast pocket irrigation containing both antibiotic solution and P-I [17].

In 2000, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued a ban on the use of Betadine for breast implants given a concern for delamination of shell integrity and the potential for implant rupture [33]. Although multiple studies have suggested this to be exceedingly unlikely [29] [30] [32] [34] [35], the proper use of Betadine to irrigate the breast pocket and resultant implant complications car-

ries the risk of legal implications [33]. For this reason, the immediate washout of Betadine irrigation with saline has been recommended, but this practice limits the antimicrobial effectiveness of Betadine [14] [33].

Another alternative to the above includes an antiseptic irrigation solution containing chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG), which has been shown to be an effective and relatively cheap antimicrobial that has both bacteriostatic and bactericidal effects against a wide range bacteria and fungi. CHG has been shown to be more effective in preventing surgical site infections than skin preparation with traditional povidone-iodine [36] [37] [38]. While there is no current clinical literature demonstrating the use of CHG as a breast pocket irrigation solution, there have been *in vitro* studies that establish superiority of CHG to P-I to eliminate the bacteria implicated in peri-prosthetic infection and the development of biofilms at shorter exposure times [18] [39]. This pre-clinical data thus supports CHG solution as a clinically viable option to decrease bacterial burden in the breast pocket without sacrificing operative time. Of note, there have been reports of rare allergic reactions to chlorhexidine-containing solutions which need to be taken into consideration [40], however, in lower concentrations (*i.e.* < 0.05%), this is less of an issue [41].

With this background, the purpose of our study was to compare the incidence of postoperative complications following implant-based breast reconstruction using either TAS or CHG for breast pocket irrigation. Our results reflect the pre-clinical studies in that patients undergoing breast pocket irrigation with CHG had significantly less risk of infection (6.4% vs. 12.7%, $p = 0.006$), seroma (2.6% vs. 6.9%, $p = 0.011$), minor complications (8.7% vs. 16.5%, $p = 0.003$) and total complications (22.4% vs. 31.8%, $p = 0.006$) when compared to patients with TAS breast pocket irrigation. Furthermore, implant failure (4.7% vs. 8.1%, $p = 0.086$) and capsular contracture (4.7% vs. 8.1%, $p = 0.086$) had trends towards significantly less incidence in the CHG group. We expect that with a larger sample size, the trends towards less implant failure and less capsular contracture would become statistically significant. These data suggest that CHG promotes sufficient breast pocket antisepsis and the potential for fewer complications when compared to TAS. Given the differences in patient follow-up and anecdotal improvements in mastectomy skin flap quality for our study population, these results should rather be regarded as CHG being a non-inferior alternative to TAS.

While our data are promising, it is important to note some potential complicating and limiting factors. First of all, this was a retrospective post-hoc analysis. Although variation in technique was significantly controlled by the fact that two surgeons performed all of the operations, there may have been small changes that led to improved outcomes in the CHG group that may not be attributed to the use of CHG alone. One noticeable change in technique was the increased use of direct-to-implant practice rather than staged tissue-expander reconstruction in the CHG group (27.0% vs. 8.4%). Clearly, single-staged reconstruction has less potential for bacterial seeding of the breast implant, which could potentially

muddle our results. Perhaps more importantly, however, is the fact that patients in the CHG group underwent chemotherapy and radiation at significantly decreased rates when compared to the TAS group (33.4% vs. 47.4%, $p < 0.0001$; and 20.1% vs. 28.6, $p = 0.010$, respectively). The increased rates of neoadjuvant and adjuvant therapy are important potential confounders as these are known to contribute to suboptimal healing; however, when controlling for these on multivariate analysis, our results remained valid with 2.4-fold decreased odds of infection, 2.8-fold decreased odds of minor complications and 1.6-fold decreased odds of any complication in the CHG group. Interestingly, the one complication that was increased in the CHG group was delayed wound healing (2.9% vs. 0.3%, $p = 0.006$). Finally, it is important to note that this was a relatively small single-center study with 690 subjects analyzed in a per-breast fashion. Thus, while our results do suggest improved outcomes with CHG compared to TAS, it is important to perform larger, multi-center studies with multiple surgeons utilizing different implants and techniques to obtain more generalizable data.

5. Conclusion

This was a retrospective review of a prospectively maintained database comparing triple antibiotic solution to low-concentration chlorhexidine gluconate for breast pocket irrigation in implant-based breast reconstruction. We found that the CHG group experienced significantly less overall and minor complications, had fewer infections and developed fewer seromas. There was no statistically significant difference in other complications analyzed; however, there was a trend toward decreased implant failure and capsular contracture in the CHG group as well. Future work with larger datasets is needed to confirm and expand these findings.

Financial Disclosures

None of the authors has a financial interest in any of the products, devices, or drugs mentioned in this manuscript.

Author Contribution

All of the aforementioned authors were involved in the acquisition, analysis and/or interpretation of data, drafting and/or revision of the manuscript, gave final approval for submission of the manuscript, and agree to be accountable for the data presented in the submitted manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] Cancer Stat Facts: Female Breast Cancer (2018) National Cancer Institute Surveil-

lance, Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) Program.

- [2] Miller, A.M., Steiner, C.A., Barrett, M.L., Fingar, K.R. and Elixhauser, A. (2006) Breast Reconstruction Surgery for Mastectomy in Hospital Inpatient and Ambulatory Settings, 2009-2014: Statistical Brief #228. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Statistical Briefs. Rockville.
- [3] American Society of Plastic Surgeons Plastic Surgery Statistics Report (2017) ASPS National Clearinghouse of Plastic Surgery Procedural Statistics, 2017.
- [4] Ilonzo, N., Tsang, A., Tsantes, S., Estabrook, A. and Thu Ma, A.M. (2017) Breast Reconstruction after Mastectomy: A Ten-Year Analysis of Trends and Immediate Postoperative Outcomes. *Breast*, **32**, 7-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2016.11.023>
- [5] Cohen, J.B., Carroll, C., Tenenbaum, M.M. and Myckatyn, T.M. (2015) Breast Implant-Associated Infections: The Role of the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program and the Local Microbiome. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **136**, 921-929. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000001682>
- [6] Forster, N.A., Kunzi, W. and Giovanoli, P. (2013) The Reoperation Cascade after Breast Augmentation with Implants: What the Patient Needs to Know. *Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery*, **66**, 313-322.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjps.2012.09.033>
- [7] Hidalgo, D.A. and Sinno, S. (2016) Current Trends and Controversies in Breast Augmentation. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **137**, 1142-1150.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000481110.31939.e4>
- [8] Ota, D., Fukuuchi, A., Iwahira, Y., *et al.* (2016) Identification of Complications in Mastectomy with Immediate Reconstruction Using Tissue Expanders and Permanent Implants for Breast Cancer Patients. *Breast Cancer*, **23**, 400-406.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12282-014-0577-4>
- [9] Ozturk, C.N., Ozturk, C., Soucise, A., *et al.* (2018) Expander/Implant Removal after Breast Reconstruction: Analysis of Risk Factors and Timeline. *Aesthetic Plastic Surgery*, **42**, 64-72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-017-1031-8>
- [10] Song, J.H., Kim, Y.S., Jung, B.K., *et al.* (2017) Salvage of Infected Breast Implants. *Archives of Plastic Surgery*, **44**, 516-522. <https://doi.org/10.5999/aps.2017.01025>
- [11] Adams, W.P., Rios, J.L. and Smith, S.J. (2006) Enhancing Patient Outcomes in Aesthetic and Reconstructive Breast Surgery Using Triple Antibiotic Breast Irrigation: Six-Year Prospective Clinical Study. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **117**, 30-36.
- [12] Alderman, A., Gutowski, K., Ahuja, A. and Gray, D. (2014) Postmastectomy Expander Implant Breast Reconstruction Guideline Work G. ASPS Clinical Practice Guideline Summary on Breast Reconstruction with Expanders and Implants. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **134**, 648e-655e.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000000541>
- [13] Araco, A., Gravante, G., Araco, F., Delogu, D., Cervelli, V. and Walgenbach, K. (2007) Infections of Breast Implants in Aesthetic Breast Augmentations: A Single-Center Review of 3,002 Patients. *Aesthetic Plastic Surgery*, **31**, 325-329.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-006-0156-y>
- [14] Craft, R.O., Damjanovic, B. and Colwell, A.S. (2012) Evidence-Based Protocol for Infection Control in Immediate Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, **69**, 446-450. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0b013e31824a215a>
- [15] Galdiero, M., Larocca, F., Iovene, M.R., *et al.* (2018) Microbial Evaluation in Capsular Contracture of Breast Implants. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **141**, 23-30. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.00000000000003915>

- [16] Gowda, A.U., Chopra, K., Brown, E.N., Slezak, S. and Rasko, Y. (2017) Preventing Breast Implant Contamination in Breast Reconstruction: A National Survey of Current Practice. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, **78**, 153-156. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0000000000000822>
- [17] Giordano, S., Peltoniemi, H., Lilius, P. and Salmi, A. (2013) Povidone-Iodine Combined with Antibiotic Topical Irrigation to Reduce Capsular Contracture in Cosmetic Breast Augmentation: A Comparative Study. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, **33**, 675-680. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090820X13491490>
- [18] Zhadan, O. and Becker, H. (2018) Surgical Site Irrigation in Plastic Surgery. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, **38**, 265-273. <https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjx171>
- [19] Rieger, U.M., Mesina, J., Kalbermatten, D.F., *et al.* (2013) Bacterial Biofilms and Capsular Contracture in Patients with Breast Implants. *British Journal of Surgery*, **100**, 768-774. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.9084>
- [20] Bartsich, S., Ascherman, J.A., Whittier, S., Yao, C.A. and Rohde, C. (2011) The Breast: A Clean-Contaminated Surgical Site. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, **31**, 802-806. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090820X11417428>
- [21] Viola, G.M., Raad, I.I. and Rolston, K.V. (2014) Breast Tissue Expander-Related Infections: Perioperative Antimicrobial Regimens. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, **35**, 75-81. <https://doi.org/10.1086/674390>
- [22] Phillips, B.T., Bishawi, M., Dagum, A.B., Khan, S.U. and Bui, D.T. (2013) A Systematic Review of Antibiotic Use and Infection in Breast Reconstruction: What Is the Evidence? *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **131**, 1-13.
- [23] Ranganathan, K., Sears, E.D., Zhong, L., *et al.* (2018) Antibiotic Prophylaxis after Immediate Breast Reconstruction: The Reality of Its Efficacy. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **141**, 865-877. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000004204>
- [24] McCullough, M.C., Chu, C.K., Duggal, C.S., Losken, A. and Carlson, G.W. (2016) Antibiotic Prophylaxis and Resistance in Surgical Site Infection after Immediate Tissue Expander Reconstruction of the Breast. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, **77**, 501-505. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0000000000000275>
- [25] Adams, W.P., Conner, W.C., Barton, F.E. and Rohrich, R.J. (2000) Optimizing Breast Pocket Irrigation: An *in Vitro* Study and Clinical Implications. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **105**, 9-43. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006534-200001000-00053>
- [26] Adams, W.P., Rios, J.L. and Smith, S.J. (2006) Enhancing Patient Outcomes in Aesthetic and Reconstructive Breast Surgery Using Triple Antibiotic Breast Irrigation: Six-Year Prospective Clinical Study. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **118**, 46S-52S. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000185671.51993.7e>
- [27] Drinane, J.J., Chowdhry, T., Pham, T.H. and Ritter, E. (2017) Examining the Role of Antimicrobial Irrigation and Capsular Contracture: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, **79**, 107-114. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0000000000001134>
- [28] Drinane, J.J., Kortess, M.J., Bergman, R.S. and Folkers, B.L. (2016) Evaluation of Antibiotic Irrigation versus Saline Irrigation in Reducing the Long-Term Incidence and Severity of Capsular Contraction after Primary Augmentation Mammoplasty. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, **77**, 32-36. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0000000000000302>
- [29] Burkhardt, B.R. and Demas, C.P. (1994) The Effect of Siltex Texturing and Povidone-Iodine Irrigation on Capsular Contracture around Saline Inflatable Breast Implants. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **93**, 123-128.

- <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006534-199401000-00018>
- [30] Burkhardt, B.R. and Eades, E. (1995) The Effect of Biocell Texturing and Povidone-Iodine Irrigation on Capsular Contracture around Saline-Inflatable Breast Implants. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **96**, 1317-1325. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006534-199511000-00013>
- [31] McGuire, P., Reisman, N.R. and Murphy, D.K. (2017) Risk Factor Analysis for Capsular Contracture, Malposition, and Late Seroma in Subjects Receiving Natrelle 410 Form-Stable Silicone Breast Implants. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **139**, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000002837>
- [32] Yalanis, G.C., Liu, E.W. and Cheng, H.T. (2015) Efficacy and Safety of Povidone-Iodine Irrigation in Reducing the Risk of Capsular Contracture in Aesthetic Breast Augmentation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **136**, 687-698. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000001576>
- [33] Wiener, T.C. (2013) Betadine and Breast Implants: An Update. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, **33**, 615-617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090820X13484036>
- [34] Wiener, T.C. (2007) The Role of Betadine Irrigation in Breast Augmentation. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **119**, 12-15. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000251088.51675.a8>
- [35] Zambacos, G.J., Nguyen, D. and Morris, R.J. (2004) Effect of Povidone Iodine on Silicone Gel Breast Implants *in Vitro*: Implications for Clinical Practice. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, **114**, 706-710. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.PRS.0000130972.59268.AA>
- [36] Darouiche, R.O., Wall, M.J., Itani, K.M., *et al.* (2010) Chlorhexidine-Alcohol versus Povidone-Iodine for Surgical-Site Antisepsis. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, **362**, 18-26. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa0810988>
- [37] Dumville, J.C., McFarlane, E., Edwards, P., Lipp, A., Holmes, A. and Liu, Z. (2015) Preoperative Skin Antiseptics for Preventing Surgical Wound Infections after Clean Surgery. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, No. 4, CD003949. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD003949.pub4>
- [38] Edmiston, C.E., Bruden, B., Rucinski, M.C., Henen, C., Graham, M.B. and Lewis, B.L. (2013) Reducing the Risk of Surgical Site Infections: Does Chlorhexidine Gluconate Provide a Risk Reduction Benefit? *American Journal of Infection Control*, **41**, S49-S55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2012.10.030>
- [39] Schmidt, K., Estes, C., McLaren, A. and Spangehl, M.J. (2018) Chlorhexidine Antiseptic Irrigation Eradicates *Staphylococcus epidermidis* from Biofilm: An *in Vitro* Study. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, **476**, 648-653. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999.0000000000000052>
- [40] FDA (2017) FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA Warns about Rare But Serious Allergic Reactions with the Skin Antiseptic Chlorhexidine Gluconate.
- [41] Rose, M.A., Garcez, T., Savic, S. and Garvey, L.H. (2019) Chlorhexidine Allergy in the Perioperative Setting: A Narrative Review. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, **123**, e95-e103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2019.01.033>



Call for Papers

Modern Plastic Surgery

ISSN: 2164-5213 (Print) ISSN: 2164-5280 (Online)
<https://www.scirp.org/journal/mps>

Modern Plastic Surgery is an international journal dedicated to the latest advancement of plastic surgery. The goal of this journal is to provide a platform for researchers and academics all over the world to promote, share, and discuss various new issues and developments in plastic surgery related problems. All manuscripts must be prepared in English, and are subject to a rigorous and fair peer-review process. Accepted papers will immediately appear online followed by printed hard copy.

Editorial Board

Dr. Dror Aizenbud

Prof. Eckhard U. Alt

Prof. Bernardo Hontanilla Calatayud

Prof. Salvatore Carlucci

Dr. Nitin Chauhan

Prof. Abdou Mohammed Abd Allah Darwish

Dr. Christopher R. Davis

Dr. Alexander Dionyssopoulos

Dr. Marek Dobke

Prof. Osama A. Farouk

Prof. James D. Frame

Dr. Medhat Emil Habib

Dr. Fernando A. Herrera

Dr. Ali Izadpanah

Prof. Jih-Yang Ko

Prof. David Daehwan Park

Prof. Alberto Rancati

Prof. David A. Sherris

Prof. Zekeriya Tosun

Prof. Ronit Wollstein

Subject Coverage

The journal publishes original papers including but not limited to the following fields:

- Burn Surgery
- Cosmetic Surgery
- Craniofacial Surgery
- Hand Surgery
- Microsurgery
- Pediatric Plastic Surgery
- Reconstructive Surgery

We are also interested in: 1) Short Reports—2-5 page papers where an author can either present an idea with theoretical background but has not yet completed the research needed for a complete paper or preliminary data; 2) Book Reviews—Comments and critiques.

Notes for Intending Authors

Submitted papers should not have been previously published nor be currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. Paper submission will be handled electronically through the website. All papers are refereed through a peer review process. For more details about the submissions, please access the website.

Website and E-Mail

<https://www.scirp.org/journal/mps>

E-mail: mps@scirp.org

What is SCIRP?

Scientific Research Publishing (SCIRP) is one of the largest Open Access journal publishers. It is currently publishing more than 200 open access, online, peer-reviewed journals covering a wide range of academic disciplines. SCIRP serves the worldwide academic communities and contributes to the progress and application of science with its publication.

What is Open Access?

All original research papers published by SCIRP are made freely and permanently accessible online immediately upon publication. To be able to provide open access journals, SCIRP defrays operation costs from authors and subscription charges only for its printed version. Open access publishing allows an immediate, worldwide, barrier-free, open access to the full text of research papers, which is in the best interests of the scientific community.

- High visibility for maximum global exposure with open access publishing model
- Rigorous peer review of research papers
- Prompt faster publication with less cost
- Guaranteed targeted, multidisciplinary audience



**Scientific
Research
Publishing**

Website: <https://www.scirp.org>

Subscription: sub@scirp.org

Advertisement: service@scirp.org