



Editorial: risk factors for chest wall depression in breast reconstruction

Andres Rivera^{1,2^}, Gorka Ibarra^{3^}, Dafne Gascon^{2^}

¹Department of Plastic Surgery, University Hospital Infanta Elena, Valdemoro, Spain; ²Department of Surgery, University Complutense of Madrid, Madrid, Spain; ³Department of Plastic Surgery, University Hospital Gregorio Maranon, Madrid, Spain

Correspondence to: Andres Rivera. Department of Plastic Surgery, University Hospital Infanta Elena, Reyes Catolicos avenue, 21, 28342 Valdemoro, Madrid, Spain. Email: dr.riveramunoz@gmail.com.

Comment on: Kim JH, Lee S, Najmiddinov B, *et al.* Risk factors for chest wall depression after implant insertion for breast reconstruction: a retrospective quantitative study. *Gland Surg* 2022;11:1333-40.

Submitted Sep 09, 2022. Accepted for publication Sep 22, 2022.

doi: 10.21037/gS-22-525

View this article at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gS-22-525>

We read with great interest the manuscript of Kim *et al.* entitled “*Risk factors for chest wall depression after implant insertion for breast reconstruction: a retrospective quantitative study*” (1). This is a retrospective study aimed at measuring the chest wall deformity (CWD) after implant insertion and identifying associated risk factors. The authors’ results suggest that implant reconstruction causes CWD, which is associated with capsular contracture and patient age.

In 2015, Cherubino *et al.* reported that CWD were caused by the use of tissue expanders but found no specific risk factors to predict it (2). However, the study of Kim *et al.* did find the features mentioned that increase CWD.

Like any other solid, living tissues are subject to the fundamentals of the mechanics of materials. Vegas *et al.* shown how the long-term results in breast augmentation and augmentation-mastopexy could be explained by the resistance of the tissue material (3).

They focused on the resistance of each anatomical tissue, putting the most important point on the superficial fascia of the breast, which is the second strongest anatomical structure after the skin on breast surface (4,5). In this sense, these studies lay the groundwork for capsular contracture to cause CWD, as confirmed by Kim *et al.* (1).

This has taught us that the stiffness properties of the surrounding tissues are of utmost importance when planning our surgery and the final aesthetic and functional result (6). In this way Kuramoto *et al.* reported a case

of a large CWD after the insertion of an expander in a patient with the sole history of rib harvesting for microtia treatment (7). In this rare case, lack of mechanical support did cause the chest wall deformity and the deficiency in breast expansion.

CWD is an important clinical consequence of heterologous breast reconstruction which must be taken into account because it alters the preoperative reconstructive measures, modifying the cosmetic result. Autologous fat grafting is also an important tool to improve the tissue characteristics and implant coverage, but it is not a risk-free surgery (8,9). This also serves as a complementary procedure to improve capsular contracture and underexpansion expected on CWD.

Currently, there is no clinical evidence that this CWD has negative effects on respiratory physiology. Since the grade of deformity is minor (a difference of 1–2 cms maximum) and the total volume of depression should not exceed 100 cc, it seems reasonable that this deformity has no relevant consequences in dynamic mechanics. Increased chest wall stiffness and changes in vital capacity only occur when large defects take place in the thorax, such as sternal or multiple ribs resections (10,11). For this reason, it lead us to think that the CWD of breast reconstruction may not have a functional impairment.

We think that CWD implies a cosmetic relevant alteration that must be taken into account for future

[^] ORCID: Andres Rivera, 0000-0002-3223-8182; Gorka Ibarra, 0000-0003-0242-5152; Dafne Gascon, 0000-0002-9698-5849.

surgeries, thinking of oversizing the implants or changing the initial reconstructive plan. A proper evaluation of the learned risk factors, would help surgeons predict the final outcome.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned by the Editorial Office, *Gland Surgery*. The article did not undergo external peer review.

Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <https://gs.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/gS-22-525/coif>). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

References

1. Kim JH, Lee S, Najmiddinov B, et al. Risk factors for chest wall depression after implant insertion for breast reconstruction: a retrospective quantitative study. *Gland Surg* 2022;11:1333-40.
2. Cherubino M, Scamoni S, Maggiulli F, et al. Breast reconstruction by tissue expansion: What is the integrity of the chest wall? *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg* 2016;69:e48-54.
3. Vegas MR, Martin del Yerro JL. Stiffness, compliance, resilience, and creep deformation: understanding implant-soft tissue dynamics in the augmented breast: fundamentals based on materials science. *Aesthetic Plast Surg* 2013;37:922-30.
4. Gefen A, Dilmoney B. Mechanics of the normal woman's breast. *Technol Health Care* 2007;15:259-71.
5. Briot N, Chagnon G, Burlet L, et al. Experimental characterisation and modelling of breast Cooper's ligaments. *Biomech Model Mechanobiol* 2022;21:1157-68.
6. Rivera A, Gascon D. A Response and Discussion with Respect to Gulcelik's Study in Oncoplastic Level II Surgical Techniques for Breast Cancer Treatment. *Breast Care (Basel)* 2022;17:24-30.
7. Kuramoto Y, Yano T, Sawaizumi M, et al. A Rare Chest Wall Deformity after Usage of a Tissue Expander for Breast Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open* 2018;6:e1950.
8. Hamidian Jahromi A, Horen SR. Editorial: feasibility, complications, and cosmetic outcomes of immediate autologous fat grafting during breast-conserving surgery for early-stage breast cancer. *Gland Surg* 2021;10:2885-9.
9. Rivera A, González-Pozega C, Ibarra G, et al. Punctual Breast Implant Rupture following Lipofilling: Only a Myth? *Breast Care (Basel)* 2021;16:544-7.
10. Netscher DT, Izaddoost S, Sandvall B. Complications, pitfalls, and outcomes after chest wall reconstruction. *Semin Plast Surg* 2011;25:86-97.
11. Netscher DT, Baumholtz MA. Chest reconstruction: I. Anterior and anterolateral chest wall and wounds affecting respiratory function. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2009;124:240e-52e.

Cite this article as: Rivera A, Ibarra G, Gascon D. Editorial: risk factors for chest wall depression in breast reconstruction. *Gland Surg* 2022;11(10):1588-1589. doi: 10.21037/gS-22-525