Implant-based breast reconstruction is responsible for more than 70% of the breast reconstructions performed in the United States [1], partially due to the fact that immediate breast reconstruction has recently become a customary procedure for both curative and prophylactic mastectomy whenever this is considered oncologically safe [2].

Implant-based breast reconstructions must include an adequate overlay over the breast implant, which is generally composed of the pectoralis major muscle in the superior and infero-medial quadrant. This commonly leads to an inadequate support of the implant and further complications [2]. In this respect, when the acellular dermal matrix (ADM) came into existence, it was seen as a good solution for dealing with this problem. ADM is an acellular, cryopreserved matrix, that lacks antigenic stimuli. Its use is intended to prevent extrusion and rupture of the implant while assuring its precise placement in the submuscular pocket of the newly reconstructed breast [3].

In spite of being such a widely used procedure, as local tissues are generally insufficient to cover a breast implant, implant-based breast reconstruction (IBBR) can present with issues like capsular contracture, implant rippling and bottoming out, as well as inadequate control of the implant's pocket and defective expansion of the lower pole [4]. ADM was the first tissue substitute used to complete the traditional subpectoral pocket and better define the inframammary fold while allowing better lower pole expansion and a more natural contour for the reconstructed breast [2]. ADM was considered an option not only for its biomechanical properties like elasticity and resistance [5], but also because it allows cellular ingrowth and revascularisation, resulting in a good integration within the implant's capsule and minimal inflammatory reaction [6]. Results obtained with ADM were favorable, but high costs and long-term complication like infection, seroma, flap necrosis and implant explantation reported by a number of studies urged us to search for better alternatives [7].

Synthetic meshes proved efficient in IBBR due to the good support and control they provide over the inferior and inferolateral poles of the implant, with good inflammatory and lateral fold delineation. Moreover, using a synthetic mesh to complete the subpectoral pocket allows for lower pole expansion and usage of an implant with increased volume, leading to a more natural contour and a better chance to attain symmetry [8]. Furthermore, the assistance of synthetic meshes in most surgical specialties makes these materials highly accessible at reasonable costs, with a well-studied low inflammatory reaction and absent biofilm formation [7]. On the European market, there are three types of synthetic meshes approved for breast reconstruction, each with different properties: Type A mesh - a partially absorbable one, Type B - an unabsorbable mesh and a rapidly absorbable one – Type C [2].

The Type A mesh, original from Germany is a partially absorbable mesh composed of an absorbable component (PGA caprolactone) which lasts for 90-120 days after surgery and a non-absorbable component (polypropylene) which remains in place for further support [9]. This mesh has a hydrophilic feature which makes its intraoperative manipulation easier if previously immersed in a saline solution. It has been observed that this mesh assimilates well in the implant's capsule, presents good cellular ingrowth and high biocompatibility, while offering irreplaceable support and coverage to the breast implant [10]. Its structural components offer a tensile strength of 70 N longitudinally and 40 N crosswise, at a low weight of 28g/m² once the absorption process is completed [2].
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The second – Type B mesh is a nonabsorbable mesh composed of polypropylene and coated with titanium, that has been approved for breast reconstructions in Europe since 2008 [11]. Similar to the first synthetic mesh used, it has a hydrophilic, lightweight structure, with competitive biocompatibility [12]. Unlike other synthetic meshes on the market, the titanium coating of these meshes reduces the inflammatory response and subsequent mesh contraction [12]. It can be found in 2 forms: as a light mesh with a tensile strength of 37 N/m² and as an extralight mesh with a tensile strength of 61 Newton at 35 g/m² and as an extralight mesh with a tensile strength of 37 N at 16 g/m² [2].

The third material – Type C is an absorbable synthetic mesh composed of fast degradable copolymer of lactide, glycolide and trimethylene carbonate which is degraded in the first 6 months after surgery, and a slow degradable copolymer of lactide and trimethylene carbonate which is kept in place for further support up to 3 years after implantation [2]. The absorption process of these meshes is possible due to the hydrolysis process that eventually eliminates the copolymers through normal metabolic pathways [13].

**Experimental part**

A prospective, nonrandomized study was performed evaluating 12 patients with immediate implant-based breast reconstruction with synthetic mesh support. The patients enrolled in the study between 2014 and 2017 underwent nipple-sparing or skin-sparing mastectomy followed by unilateral or bilateral breast reconstruction procedures. All patients that met these criteria were considered, including 2 patients with neoadjuvant chemotherapy completed before surgery, 1 patient with noninsulin dependent type II diabetes and 4 patients that were active smokers. Mutations of the BRCA1/BRCA2 gene were found in 2 patients. The only exclusion criteria involved patients who were considered for radiotherapy adjuvant treatment postoperatively. As radiotherapy is a compelling risk factor for immediate implant-based breast reconstruction with or without synthetic mesh support, patients expected to follow this treatment can benefit more from alternative reconstructive procedures and implant-based breast reconstruction is best to be avoided.

The volume of the breast implants used for reconstruction ranged from 320 cc to 550 cc and depended on intraoperative aspects and individual anatomy of each patient. All synthetic meshes used measured 10x15 cm. The age of the patients at the time of surgery ranged from 32 to 56 years, leading to an average age of 43 years. Follow-up period of patients ranged from 2 to 24 months and included all patients that participated in the study.

**Surgical technique**

In immediate implant-based breast reconstructions, the pectoral muscle has a very important role of coverage and support for the breast implant, which is usually placed in the rigorously dissected subpectoral pocket. The downfall of this procedure is that generally, the pectoral muscle can only cover the upper 2/3 and medial quadrant of the breast implant, overlocking the inferior and lateral parts. Traditionally, this downfall was solved by mobilizing the serratus anterior muscle and anterior fascia of the rectus muscle, which concluded to more trauma to the native tissue, poor delineation of the inframmary fold and an unnatural contour of the reconstructed breast mound with an ascended, dilatated upper pole. A better technique to fix the pectoral muscle to the inframmary fold could be achieved by supporting it with a synthetic mesh.

After completion of the nipple-sparing or skin-sparing mastectomy and creation of the subpectoral pocket, a synthetic mesh is fixed with sutures to the thoracic wall, 1.5 cm below the inframmary fold and laterally on the anterior axillary fold. After the implant is placed in the designed retropectoral pocket, the synthetic mesh is spread over the implant and sutured cranially to the inferolateral anterior margin of the serratus anterior muscle. The implant is thus accommodated in a fully closed pocket that assures its position, support and coverage while granting better aesthetic and contour to the reconstructed breast. Antibiotics are recommended for the perioperative period and usually continued as long as the drains are kept in place. This surgical technique is well tolerated by patients and by virtue of the pores present in the synthetic mesh the cells can grow within the pores and thus generate new tissue to cover the implant.

**Results and discussions**

Our study population included 12 patients with immediate breast reconstruction - 9 of the patients had bilateral breast reconstruction and the other 3 patients had unilateral breast reconstruction. Generally, the surgical interventions were performed following malignant conditions - 10 patients had unilateral breast cancer and 1 patient had bilateral breast cancer. As a prophylactic measure, 8 of the patients with unilateral breast cancer, from which 2 patients diagnosed with BRCA1/BRCA2 gene mutation, chose to also have simple mastectomy of the contralateral breast. Another patient with a history of unilateral breast carcinoma in situ opted for bilateral prophylactic mastectomy. All patients had nipple-sparing or skin-sparing mastectomy followed by immediate breast reconstruction with definitive breast implants and synthetic mesh. Moreover, for 3 patients who presented with large volume breasts and significant ptosis, a plus to the synthetic mesh support was the use of a dermal sling created from the de-epithelized inferior postmastectomy flap.

We experienced no intraoperative complications. In the postoperative period we were not faced with any reconstructive failure like infection, implant loss, rejection or need for surgical reintervention. Postoperative complications included two patients with seroma that required puncture for drainage, one mild wound dehiscence at a vegetative patient, one partial nipple necrosis in a
The aesthetic outcome of an immediate implant-based reconstruction with synthetic mesh support was demonstrated at the patient presented below (1 year follow-up). The 32 years old patient had a bilateral prophylactic mastectomy for in situ carcinoma of the right breast followed by bilateral breast reconstruction with cohesive gel implants (395 cc) and synthetic mesh support. As you can observe, beautiful shape and form was obtained for the reconstructed breast, with equally distributed volume bilaterally, nice contour from the upper chest wall to the peak of the nipple and areola and a well-centered nipple-arreolar complex at the maximum point of projection on the chest wall. The synthetic mesh support granted a natural contour and good delineation of the inframmary fold, supported the skin flaps and lower pole offering good stability and projection to the reconstructed breasts.

If we decide for a strictly submuscular pocket to accommodate the implant, we might be faced with the risk of a high-riding implant of restricted volume, unfavourable projection and shape of the breast mound, with unnatural ptosis and poor inframammary delineation. Advantages of using a synthetic mesh include the implant’s position and control, but also the possibility for increased volume of the implant, better defined inframammary and lateral folds, while the need for contralateral mastopexy decreases considerably. Results obtained so far, lead us to believe that synthetic meshes can offer better aesthetic outcomes for immediate breast reconstructions, at lower costs and with fewer complications [8]. Synthetic meshes are non-allergenic and easily accessible at relatively low costs. Moreover, due to their low inflammatory reaction and high-resistance to biofilm formation, it has been hypothesized that their use might decrease the incidence of inflammation, infection, seroma and capsular contracture in implant-based breast reconstructions [14].

Published data until date has not concluded to any noticeable differences between the long-term results of these synthetic meshes [15]. Moreover, complication rates for breast reconstructions with or without synthetic meshes are quite similar, ranging from 17.7-29% for breast reconstructions with synthetic meshes to 15% for breast reconstructions without synthetic meshes. Furthermore, publications comparing synthetic meshes to biological matrices noted that seroma rates of 1.8-4.8% in the context of synthetic meshes use are much lower than those found for biological matrices use (0-32%), probably due to the difference in surface that these two materials withstand [2, 15-20]. The smooth surface of biological matrices increases the risk of seroma between the matrix and the subcutaneous tissue overlaying it, while the rough surface of synthetic meshes interacts better with the subcutaneous tissue, thus reducing the risk of liquid formation and seroma [2].

Another important factor to consider when deciding upon biological matrices or synthetic meshes is the difference in thickness between these two materials. Based on this factor, synthetic meshes are predominantly used in immediate-breast reconstruction procedures where thick, well-vascularized mastectomy flaps permit it, and biological matrices are better used in delayed breast reconstruction procedures which require adequate soft-tissue substitute [2].

The aim of our analyze of synthetic meshes was to present additional solutions for IBBR surgery and to better understand the implications of synthetic meshes in the postoperative complications. Although these materials bring about significant value in the ever growing field of breast reconstruction surgery, with high patient satisfaction, good aesthetic results and low complication rates, it is necessary to further analyze the long-term results that these materials produce.

Conclusions

Synthetic meshes appear promising for breast reconstruction patients that require both a better stability of the implant and a better contour of the reconstructed breast. Results to date have been encouraging, with a low complication rate and excellent subjective patient satisfaction and aesthetic results. Continued follow-up is planned to evaluate long-term results.

Accordingly, we consider synthetic meshes a step further to the future of breast reconstruction and believe they will bring significant value in the course of treatment for patients undergoing implant-based breast reconstructive surgery.
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