A nomogram to predict failure rate in immediate implant-based breast

2 reconstruction

- 3 Meizhen Zhu¹, Fanrong Zhang¹, Jiefei Mao¹, Jun Fang², Daobao Chen^{1*}
- ⁴ ¹ Department of Breast Surgery, The Cancer Hospital of the University of
- 5 Chinese Academy of Sciences (Zhejiang Cancer Hospital), Institute of Basic
- 6 Medicine and Cancer (IBMC), Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hangzhou,
- 7 China
- ⁸ ² Department of Radiation Therapy, The Cancer Hospital of the University of
- 9 Chinese Academy of Sciences (Zhejiang Cancer Hospital), Institute of Basic
- 10 Medicine and Cancer (IBMC), Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hangzhou,
- 11 China
- 12 * Corresponding author
- 13 E-mail: <u>chendb@zjcc.org.cn</u> (DBC)
- 14 **A shortened title:** Breast Reconstruction Failure Rate
- 15
- 16

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

17 Abstract

18	Controversies on risk factors affecting immediate implant-based breast
19	reconstruction (IBBR) still exist. We aimed to evaluate risk factors of
20	reconstruction failure (RF) in immediate IBBR. We retrospectively reviewed
21	239 patients (241 breasts) who underwent immediate IBBR from 2011 to
22	2019. A nomogram was established to predict RF rate in stage I operation
23	and logistic regression model was created for stage II operation. 14 (5.81%)
24	and 7 (5.51%) reconstructive breasts experienced RF in stage I and II
25	operation, respectively. Body mass index (BMI) [odds ratio (OR)=1.569, 95%
26	confidence interval (CI): 1.087-2.263, <i>p</i> =0.016], implant/tissue expander (TE)
27	volume>86.30% (OR=5.711, 95% CI: 1.067-30.583, <i>p</i> =0.042), adjuvant
28	chemotherapy (ACT) (OR=30.094, 95% CI: 2.030-446.084, <i>p</i> =0.013) were
29	independent risk factors for RF in stage I operation. The nomogram to predict
30	RF rate in stage I operation revealed area under the curve (AUC) was 0.920
31	(95% CI: 0.844-0.995). Logistic regression demonstrated that mesh use was
32	the independent predictor of RF in stage II operation (OR=47.326, 95% CI:
33	3.11-720.081, <i>p</i> =0.005). The nomogram exhibited satisfied predictive ability.
34	Present findings enhanced our understanding of the risk factors contributing
35	to RF and might lead us clinical decision to improve the outcome of immediate
36	IBBR.

37 Introduction

38	Breast cancer is the most common carcinoma among female in China and
39	70% of patients are younger than 60 years old [1]. Along with significant
40	improvements in comprehensive treatment and multidisciplinary team
41	approach, the mortality rate of breast cancer is decreasing [2]. Moreover,
42	as the development of economy and the improvement of living conditions in
43	China, patients' demand for better body image and quality of life have also
44	been increasing, in especial of younger patients. Breast reconstruction
45	following mastectomy can help patients modify local deformity, improve
46	cosmetic outcome, and thus increase self-confidence and satisfaction in
47	social and psychological aspects [3].
48	Immediate breast reconstruction has been shown satisfactory aesthetic
49	results and overall psychological well-being compared with delayed breast
50	reconstruction [4]. Moreover, recent studies supported oncologic safety in
51	patients who received immediate breast reconstruction following total
52	mastectomy [5,6]. Similar with the United States, implant-based breast
53	reconstruction (IBBR) represents the most prevalent form of breast
54	reconstruction in China, partly due to low damage without donor site sacrifice
55	and thus postoperative recovery is fast, furthermore, the operation takes a

57	[7]. However, IBBR is often associated with higher incidence of complications,
58	including infection, implant exposure, capsular contracture, and malposition.
59	Adjuvant therapy, such as chemotherapy and post-mastectomy radiation
60	therapy (PMRT), at further increase the risk of complications [8].
61	Many tailored strategies, such as two-stage procedure, appropriate
62	incision design, coverage of prosthesis surface, and optimal time of adjuvant
63	therapy were explored for each individual patient to achieve a successful and
64	satisfied reconstruction. However, reconstruction failure (RF), defined as
65	tissue expander (TE) or implant removal due to complications, still has a high
66	rate of 17.6% [9]. Once RF occurs, it is not only a financial loss, but also a
67	frustrate both for surgeons and patients. Surgeons may experience a feeling
68	of guilty and their self-confidence may be undermined, while patients may
69	experience several physical and psychosocial impacts [10]. However, many
70	controversies still exist focusing on risk factors affecting reconstruction, such
71	as one- or two-stage prosthesis breast reconstruction, the impact of adjuvant
72	therapy on reconstructed breast [11]. Thus, the purpose of present study is to
73	evaluate risk factors of RF in immediate IBBR procedure from patient
74	characteristics, surgical techniques, and adjuvant therapies aspects, and
75	establish a nomogram model to predict individual RF risk for immediate IBBR
76	to lead clinical decision making.

77 Methods

78 Study design and patients enrollment

79	Breast cancer patients underwent breast reconstruction in our single center
80	from January 2011 to December 2019 were retrospectively reviewed following
81	the approval of Zhejiang Cancer Hospital Clinical Research Ethics Committee
82	(IRB-2020-327). Eligible criteria were as follows: (I) Female patients and
83	histologically confirmed with in situ or invasive breast cancer in primary or
84	post neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT); (II) Patients underwent immediate
85	IBBR including one- or two-stage procedure: inserting a permanent implant or
86	TE (classified as stage I operation), exchanging of TE for a permanent implant
87	or followed by flap reconstruction (classified as stage II operation). For data
88	analysis in stage I operation, patients were excluded with any of the following:
89	(I) Delayed breast reconstruction; (II) Immediate autologous breast
90	reconstruction (ABR); (III) Contralateral prophylactic mastectomy (CPM)
91	followed by reconstruction; (IV) Ipsilateral breast radiotherapy history; (V)
92	Patients progressed local recurrence or/and distant metastasis. For data
93	analysis in stage II operation, patient cohort was further excluded with any of
94	the following: (I) Exchange of TE for ABR; (II) TE with no subsequent
95	exchange; (III) TE removed with patients' requirements (Fig 1).

96 **Fig 1.** Flow chart for study design and patients enrollment. TE, tissue

- 97 expander; RF, reconstruction failure; ABR, autologous breast reconstruction;
- 98 CPM, contralateral prophylactic mastectomy.

99 Data collection

100 P	Patient charac	cteristics inclu	iding age,	body mass	index (BI	MI; calculated	as
-------	----------------	------------------	------------	-----------	-----------	----------------	----

- 101 weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared), smoking status,
- 102 comorbidities (diabetes, hypertension), pathological TNM stage according to
- 103 8th edition of the AJCC TNM staging system [12] were recorded. Surgical
- 104 techniques in stage I operation such as skin-sparing mastectomy (SSM) or
- 105 nipple-sparing mastectomy (NSM), incision types, sentinel lymph node biopsy
- 106 (SLNB) or axillary lymph node dissection (ALND), volume of implant or TE
- 107 inflation at surgery, mesh use, device coverage were collected. Adjuvant
- 108 therapies details such as NACT, adjuvant chemotherapy (ACT), PMRT,
- 109 perioperative antibiotics were recorded. Incisions for stage II operation were
- 110 recorded. The duration days from stage I operation to ACT or PMRT, and
- 111 months from PMRT to stage II operation were collected.

112 Surgical techniques

113 Patients following NACT were respected to receive surgery at least 2 weeks

114 from last chemotherapy. For patients clinically suspected or/and pathologically

115	confirmed of nipple involved, transverse ellipse incision to remove the nipple-
116	areola complex was chosen for performing SSM, while lateral transverse with
117	or without semicircle periareolar, or inframammary fold were common
118	incisions for NSM. In the subpectoral group, implant/TE would be inserted into
119	a pocket combined of pectoralis major and either a mesh or the serratus
120	anterior muscle, whereas in the prepectoral group, partial of latissimus dorsi
121	or skin envelop covered implant/TE. In immediate two-stage IBBR, TE was
122	filled with a variable volume of saline in stage I operation. Multidisciplinary
123	treatment was made for ACT or/and PMRT according to final pathology. For
124	immediate two-stage IBBR, TE was inflated by saline injection 4 weeks later
125	after stage I operation, usually 50-80ml every 2 weeks. TE was required fully
126	expansion, usually extra 20% volume lager than intended implant, before
127	PMRT. Stage II operation was performed at least 3 months from stage I
128	operation, and at least 6 months from radiotherapy. In stage II, some
129	surgeons explored another incision to lower the RF rate. Perioperative
130	antibiotic prophylaxis would be given for 48 hours in immediate IBBR while
131	second-generation cephalosporins were preferred and lincosamides may be
132	another choice for allergic patients.

133 Statistical analysis

134	For analyzing predictors of RF in stage I operation, the volume of implant/TE
135	which inserting to the prepared pocket was calculated as volume percentage
136	according to mastectomy specimen weight and then was divided into two
137	groups according to maximizing the Youden index by receiver operating
138	characteristic (ROC) curve analysis (13). Then enrolled patients were
139	randomly divided into training set and validation set (7:3) by using
140	createDataPartition function in caret package. Continuous variables were
141	analyzed using Student's t test or Mann-Whitney U test and were reported as
142	mean ± standard deviation (SD). Categorical variables were analyzed using
143	Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. Logistic regression analysis was
144	performed and potential prognostic factors (p <0.1) by univariate analysis
145	further entered multivariate analysis to identify independent predictors of RF.
146	Then a nomogram for predicting RF in stage I was established based on the
147	logistic model using rms package. The nomogram was quantified by
148	discrimination and calibration both in training set and validation set. For
149	analyzing predictors of RF in stage II operation, logistic regression
150	(Method=Enter) was used for multivariate analysis to identify independent
151	predictors. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software (version
152	25.0; IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA) and R software (version 4.0.3;
153	https://www.r-project.org/). All reported p values were two-sided, and p <0.05
154	was considered statistically significant.

155 **Results**

156	A total of 298 consecutive breast cancer patients (309 breasts) receiving
157	breast reconstruction surgery from January 2011 to December 2019 in our
158	single center were retrospectively reviewed and finally 239 patients (241
159	breasts) who met the inclusion criteria were enrolled for the study cohort. The
160	median follow-up time since breast reconstruction surgery was 48 months
161	(21-123) months. During nine years in our single center, both the use of two-
162	stage operation and NSM increased (Fig 2A-2B), and rates of RF per year
163	remain stable lower than 10% (Fig 2C). Overall, 14 (5.81%) and 7 (5.51%)
164	reconstructive breasts experienced failure in stage I and II operation,
165	respectively.
166	Fig 2. (A) Trends of one- or two-stage operation in immediate IBBR. (B)
167	Trends of SSM and NSM in immediate IBBR. (C) RF rate of immediate IBBR
168	per year in our single center. IBBR, implant-based breast reconstruction;
169	NSM, nipple-sparing mastectomy; SSM, skin-sparing mastectomy; RF,
170	reconstruction failure.

171 Characteristics of study cohort and treatment

172 To establish a nomogram for predicting RF, the study cohort was randomly

173 (7:3) divided into training cohort (169 breasts) and validation cohort (72

174 bre	easts). The	characteristics	of patients,	surgical	techniques,	and adjuvant
---------	-------------	-----------------	--------------	----------	-------------	--------------

- therapies of the training and validation cohorts were summarized in Table 1.
- 176 All patients had no history of smoking (present or former) and no patient had
- 177 comorbidity of diabetes or hypertension. The optimal cut-off value for
- implant/TE volume by ROC curve analysis was 86.30%. 34 (14.11%)
- 179 implant/TEs suffered immediate PMRT (all of them underwent surgery after
- 180 NACT and the time between surgery to PMRT ranged from 1-3 months) and
- 181 one implant lost. 33 implant/TEs experienced radiotherapy after ACT, usually
- 182 4-7 months later from surgery and no RF occurred.
- **Table 1.** Characteristics for the training and validation cohorts of 241 breasts

184	underwent stage I	operation of	<i>immediate</i>	implant-based	breast reco	onstruction
	5					

Characteristics	Overall cohort	Overall cohort Training cohort		n value
Characteristics	(n=241), n (%)	(n =169), n (%)	(n = 72), n (%)	p value
Age (mean ± SD), years	39.81 ± 7.77	39.30 ± 7.69	41.03 ± 7.86	0.932
BMI (mean ± SD), kg/m ²	21.99 ± 2.48	21.94 ± 2.35	22.11 ± 2.75	0.212
yp/pTNM stage				
0	30 (12.45)	22 (13.02)	8 (11.11)	0.967
I	102 (42.32)	72 (42.60)	30 (41.67)	
II	81 (33.61)	56 (33.14)	25 (34.72)	
III	28 (11.62)	19 (11.24)	9 (12.50)	
Mastectomy type				
SSM	147 (61.00)	102 (60.36)	45 (62.50)	0.775
NSM	94 (39.00)	67 (39.64)	27 (37.50)	
Incision				
Without periareolar	233 (96.68)	162 (69.53)	71 (30.47)	0.442
Periareolar	8 (3.32)	7 (87.50)	1 (12.50)	
Lymph node management				
SLNB	149 (61.83)	106 (71.14)	43 (28.86)	
ALND	92 (38.17)	63 (68.48)	29 (31.52)	0.667
Implant/TE volume				

≤86.30%	168 (69.71)	121 (71.60)	47 (65.28)	0.360
>86.30%	73 (30.29)	48 (28.40)	25 (34.72)	
Mesh use				
No	178 (73.86)	124 (73.37)	54 (75.00)	0.873
Yes	63 (26.14)	45 (26.63)	18 (25.00)	
Covering of pocket				
Latissimus dorsi	48 (19.92)	28 (16.57)	20 (27.78)	0.131
Pectoralis major muscle	182 (75.51)	133 (78.70)	49 (68.06)	
Skin	11 (4.57)	8 (4.73)	3 (4.17)	
NACT				
No	204 (84.65)	142 (84.02)	62 (86.11)	0.845
Yes	37 (15.35)	27 (15.98)	10 (13.89)	
ACT				
No	103 (42.74)	71 (42.01)	32 (44.44)	0.777
Yes	138 (57.26)	98 (57.99)	40 (55.56)	
Immediate PMRT				
No	207 (85.89)	143 (84.62)	64 (88.89)	0.426
Yes	34 (14.11)	26 (15.38)	8 (11.11)	
Perioperative antibiotics				
Lincosamides	26 (10.79)	17 (10.06)	9 (12.50)	0.651
Cephalosporins	215 (89.21)	152 (89.94)	63 (87.50)	
RF				
No	227 (94.19)	159 (94.08)	68 (94.44)	1.000
Yes	14 (5.81)	10 (5.92)	4 (5.56)	

185 SD, standard deviation; BMI, body mass index; SSM, skin-sparing mastectomy; NSM, nipple-sparing mastectomy; SLNB,

 $186 \qquad \text{sentinel lymph node biopsy; ALND, axillary lymph node dissection; TE, tissue expander; NACT, neoadjuvant chemotherapy;}$

187 ACT adjuvant chemotherapy; PMRT, post-mastectomy radiation therapy; RF, reconstruction failure.

188 **Predictors of reconstruction failure in stage I operation**

- 189 Analysis of 169 breasts in the training cohort revealed that 10 breasts
- 190 experienced RF, then characteristics between RF and no RF groups were
- 191 compared (Table 2). Logistic regression analysis was performed and
- 192 variables in case of zero count were excluded (variables of incision, skin
- 193 covering pocket and NACT) in the training cohort. Univariate analysis showed
- 194 that BMI, lymph node management, implant/TE volume, mesh use and ACT

- were possible factors associated with RF (p<0.1). Further multivariate
- analysis revealed that BMI [odds ratio (OR)=1.569, 95% confidence interval
- 197 (CI): 1.087-2.263, P=0.016], implant/TE volume>86.30% (OR=5.711, 95% CI:
- 198 1.067-30.583, P=0.042), ACT (OR=30.094, 95% CI: 2.030-446.084, P=0.013)
- 199 were independent risk factors for RF (Table 3).
- 200 **Table 2.** Comparisons of characteristics in RF and no RF groups of the
- training cohort in stage I operation

Variables	RF	no RF	<i>p</i> value	
	(n=10), n (%)	(n=159), n (%)	P	
Age (mean \pm SD), years	42.00 ± 7.41	39.13 ± 7.70	0.253	
BMI (mean \pm SD), kg/m ²	23.66 ± 2.84	21.83 ± 2.29	0.017*	
Mastectomy type				
SSM	4 (3.92)	98 (96.08)	0.197	
NSM	6 (8.96)	61 (91.04)		
Incision				
Without periareolar	0 (0.00)	7 (100.00)	1.000	
Periareolar	10 (6.17)	152 (93.83)		
Lymph node management				
SLNB	3 (2.78)	105 (97.22)	0.037*	
ALND	7 (11.48)	54 (88.52)		
Implant/TE volume				
≤86.30%	3 (2.48)	118 (97.52)	0.006**	
>86.30%	7 (14.58)	41 (85.42)		
Mesh use				
No	4 (3.23)	120 (96.77)	0.023*	
Yes	6 (13.33)	39 (86.67)		
Covering of pocket				
Latissimus dorsi	3 (10.71)	25 (89.29)	0.514	
Pectoralis major muscle	7 (5.26)	126 (94.74)		
Skin	0 (0.00)	8 (100.00)		
NACT				
No	10 (7.04)	132 (92.96)	0.367	
Yes	0 (0.00)	27 (100.00)		
ACT				
No	1 (1.41)	70 (98.59)	0.046*	
Yes	9 (9.18)	89 (90.82)		

00					standard deviation; BMI, body
05	Cephalosporins	8 (5.26)	144 (94.74)		 standard deviation: DML body.
04	Lincosamides	2 (11.76)	15 (88.24)	0.265	reconstruction failure: SD
03	Perioperative antibiotics				* <i>p</i> <0.05, ** <i>p</i> <0.01. RF,
	Yes	1 (3.85)	25 (96.15)		
02	No	9 (6.29)	134 (93.71)	1.000	
202	Immediate PMRT				

206 mass index; SSM, skin-sparing mastectomy; NSM, nipple-sparing mastectomy; SLNB, sentinel lymph node biopsy; ALND,

207 axillary lymph node dissection; TE, tissue expander; NACT, neoadjuvant chemotherapy; ACT, adjuvant chemotherapy;

208 PMRT, post-mastectomy radiation therapy.

209 **Table 3.** Logistic regression analysis of reconstruction failure in the training

cohort (169 breasts)

Variables	Univariate Analy	vsis	Multivariate Analys	Multivariate Analysis		
vanables	OR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> value	OR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> value		
Age, years	1.052 (0.964-1.149)	0.254				
BMI, kg/m2	1.388 (1.051-1.834)	0.021*	1.569 (1.087-2.263)	0.016*		
Mastectomy type						
SSM	1.000					
NSM	2.410 (0.654-8.886)	0.186				
Lymph node management						
SLNB	1.000					
ALND	4.537 (1.128-18.248)	0.033*	4.876 (0.966-24.617)	0.055		
Implant/TE volume						
≤86.30	1.000					
>86.30	6.715 (1.659-27.189)	0.008**	5.711 (1.067-30.583)	0.042*		
Mesh use						
No	1.000					
Yes	4.615 (1.238-17.204)	0.023*	3.510 (0.682-18.073)	0.133		
Position						
Latissimus dorsi	1.000					
Pectoralis major muscle	0.463 (0.112-1.913)	0.287				
ACT						
No	1.000					
Yes	7.079 (0.876-57.206)	0.066	30.094 (2.030-446.084)	0.013*		
Immediate PMRT						
No	1.000					
Yes	0.596 (0.072-4.911)	0.630				
Perioperative antibiotics						
Lincosamides	1.000					
Cephalosporins	0.417 (0.081-2.144)	0.295				

211	*p<0.05, **p<0.01. OR, odds ratio; Bl	MI, body mass index; S	SSM, skin-sparing mastectom	; NSM, nipple-sparing master	tomy:
211	*p<0.05, **p<0.01. OR, odds ratio; Bl	MI, body mass index; §	SSM, skin-sparing mastectomy	/; NSM, nipple-sparing mastec	

- 212 SLNB, sentinel lymph node biopsy; ALND, axillary lymph node dissection; TE, tissue expander; ACT, adjuvant
- 213 chemotherapy; PMRT, post-mastectomy radiation therapy.

214 Nomogram establishment and validation

215	A nomogram was established based on five variables, including BMI, lymph
216	node management, implant/TE volume, mesh use and ACT to predict the RF
217	rate in stage I operation. The points for the five factors were summed up to
218	calculate the probability of RF (Fig 3). ROC curves and calibration curves
219	were created based on the training and validation cohorts for internal and
220	external validation, respectively (Fig 4). The ROC curve of the nomogram
221	revealed area under the curve (AUC) was 0.920 (95% CI: 0.844-0.995) (Fig
222	4A) and external validation revealed AUC of 0.930 (Fig 4B), showing a
223	satisfactory discriminative ability of the nomogram. The calibration curve
224	based on training cohort with a bootstrap resampling frequency of 1000 and a
225	Hosmer-Lemeshow Chi square value of 8.946 (p=0.347), showed a goodness
226	of fit. Additionally, brier score was 0.040, showing a good calibration ability of
227	the nomogram. Calibration curves of training (Fig 4C) and validation (Fig 4D)
228	cohorts showed an acceptable consistency between the actual observation
229	and logistic model prediction.

Fig 3. A nomogram to predict the RF rate in stage I operation. BMI, body
 mass index; TE, tissue expander; SLNB, sentinel lymph node biopsy; ALND,

axillary lymph node dissection; ACT, adjuvant chemotherapy; RF,

reconstruction failure.

234	Fig 4. ROC curves	with an AUC of	0.920 derived	from the t	raining	cohort (A)
						0011011	

- and 0.930 derived from the validation cohort (B) demonstrated the
- discriminatory ability of the nomogram. The calibration curves for the
- nomogram as the internal validation group derived from the training cohort (C)
- and external calibration group derived from the validation cohort (D). AUC;
- area under the curves; ROC, receiver operating characteristic.

240 **Predictors of reconstruction failure in stage II operation**

- A total of 127 breasts met the inclusion criteria for analysis in stage II
- operation. There were 7 (5.51%) reconstructive breasts experienced failure in
- stage II operation. While comparing characteristics with and without RF, there
- was no significant difference in age, BMI, incision, pocket coverage,
- radiotherapy history or perioperative antibiotics. RF rate was significantly
- higher in the mesh use group (17.65% vs 1.07%; p=0.001). Multivariate
- analysis demonstrated that mesh use was the independent predictor of RF
- stage II operation (OR=47.326, 95% CI: 3.11-720.081, *p*=0.005) (Table 4).

249

250 **Table 4.** Comparison of variables between RF with no RF groups and

251 multivariate logistic regression model for predicting RF in stage II operation

Variables	RF	no RF	р	Multivariate Analysis	n value
	(n=7), n (%)	(n=120), n (%)	value	OR (95% CI)	
Age (mean ± SD), years	38.97 ± 7.39	38.00 ± 7.51	0.737	0.986 (0.863-1.125)	0.831
BMI (mean ± SD), kg/m ²	22.03 ± 2.39	21.53 ± 2.45	0.591	0.804 (0.527-1.227)	0.312
Mastectomy type					
SSM	4 (4.76)	80 (95.24)		1.000	
NSM	3 (6.98)	40 (93.02)	0.688	0.372 (0.021-6.527)	0.499
Incision for stage II operation					
Previous	6 (6.45)	87 (93.55)		1.000	
Another	1 (2.94)	33 (97.06)	0.674	0.241 (0.026-2.239)	0.211
Mesh use					
No	1 (1.07)	92 (98.92)		1.000	
Yes	6 (17.65)	28 (82.35)	0.001**	47.326 (3.11-720.081)	0.005**
Covering of pocket					
Latissimus dorsi	0 (0.00)	2 (100.00)			
Pectoralis major muscle	6 (5.00)	114 (95.00)		1.000	
Skin	1 (20.00)	4 (80.00)	0.334	3.105 (0.177-54.549)	0.439
Radiotherapy history					
No	3 (3.70)	78 (96.30)		1.000	
Yes	4 (8.70)	42 (91.30)	0.254	4.271 (0.519-35.172)	0.177
Perioperative antibiotics					
Lincosamides	1 (11.11)	8 (88.89)		1.000	
Cephalosporins	6 (5.08)	112 (94.92)	0.410	2.104 (0.072-61.082)	0.665

252 *p<0.05, *p<0.01. OR, odds ratio; BMI, body mass index; SSM, skin-sparing mastectomy; NSM, nipple-sparing mastectomy;

253 SLNB, sentinel lymph node biopsy; ALND, axillary lymph node dissection; TE, tissue expander; ACT, adjuvant

254 chemotherapy; PMRT, post-mastectomy radiation therapy.

255 **Discussion**

- 256 With the rising trend of immediate IBBR surgery over past nine years in our
- single center, the overall reconstruction failure rates were 5.81% and 5.51% in
- stage I and II operation, respectively, which were still acceptable and
- relatively lower compared with previous literatures (5.6%-22.9%) [14,15]. Each

260	stage of immediate IBBR was separated with its own risks, so risks of RF
261	were compared for each stage separately in present study. A nomogram was
262	established to predict RF rate in stage I operation and a logistic regression
263	model was established to predict RF rate in stage II operation, separately.
264	The nomogram was established based on five variables, including BMI, lymph
265	node management, implant/TE volume, mesh use and ACT. Among these
266	variables, higher BMI, implant/TE volume>86.30% and ACT were
267	independent risk factors for RF in stage I operation. During stage II operation,
268	a logistic regression model was established, and mesh use was demonstrated
269	as the independent predictor of RF. To our knowledge, this is the first clinical
270	study to use nomogram to develop a prediction model of RF rate for
271	immediate IBBR. Additionally, with an AUC of 0.920 (95% CI: 0.844-0.995)
272	and an AUC of 0.930 via external validation, the model exhibited satisfied
273	predict performance.
274	Old age and higher BMI were well-established risk factors for RF in

immediate IBBR from patient aspect [16]. Furthermore, many studies

indicated obesity was associated with RF in both implant-based and

autologous breast reconstruction [17,18]. The mean age and BMI in present

study were 39.81 years and 21.99 kg/m², respectively, indicating patients

279 underwent immediate IBBR in this study were mostly young and normal in

280	weight. Age was not a risk factor in our study both in stage I and II operations.
281	In contrast, higher BMI was be found significantly associated with RF in stage
282	I operation, with an OR of 1.569 compared with relative lower BMI individuals.
283	However, BMI was not a risk factor in stage II operation. Some studies have
284	proposed a theory to explain this result, because higher BMI women might
285	have larger breasts, which led to longer operative time, longer mastectomy
286	flaps and more ischemia flaps. While these high-risk patients might not
287	progress to stage II operation due to removal of TE in stage I operation [8,19].
288	Skin-sparing mastectomy was a widespread technique in breast
200	okin-spanng mastellomy was a widespread technique in breast
289	reconstruction surgery, which preserves native skin envelope and
290	inframammary fold [20]. By contrast, nipple-sparing mastectomy was an
291	improved satisfaction surgical technique with proven oncological safety in
292	appropriately selected patients [21,22]. However, different incision locations
293	for NSM procedure were associated with different rates of NAC necrosis.
294	Previous literatures demonstrated that periareolar incisions had a higher NAC
295	necrosis rate which might result in RF [23]. 39.00% of breasts in present study
296	retained NAC, and 8 [3.32%] breasts received periareolar incisions.
297	Nevertheless, mastectomy type and incision were not risk factors in our study
298	in stage I operation.

299	There were significant differences in axillary lymph node management
300	between RF and no RF groups during stage I operation. ALND was
301	associated with higher risk of RF in univariate analysis, however, it was not an
302	independent risk factor by multivariate analysis. Removal of axillary lymph
303	nodes affects lymph drainage and wound healing, which results in
304	postoperative complication such as flap lymphedema, wound infection, and
305	delayed healing [24]. Some studies demonstrated that seroma formation was
306	the most likely reason for wound infection after ALND and minimizing dead
307	space through fixation axillary flaps with underlying muscles can lower the
308	incidence of seroma [25,26]. We might try this method for improvement in
309	future surgery procedure.
310	Perfusion of the flap was closely associated with complication of delayed
311	wound healing in IBBR. Yang et al. quantified tension-perfusion relationship
312	and proved that the flap perfusion deteriorated as skin tension increased from
313	larger implant [27]. Permanent implant in one-stage breast reconstruction,

315 envelope. In case of SSM techniques, whose skin envelope was reduced due

whose volume cannot be manipulated, causes greater tension on the skin

314

to NAC dissection, will inherently create further stress to skin envelop [11]. On

- the contrary, the volume of TE can be manipulated by inflation or deflation.
- 318 Our study indicated that 86.30% of the mastectomy specimen weight was the

319	cutoff of implant/TE volume when inserting to prepared pocket in one-stage
320	immediate IBBR or in stage I operation of two-stage immediate IBBR.
321	Moreover, implant/TE volume>86.30% was independent risk factor for RF in
322	stage I operation. Recently, some studies recommended indocyanine green
323	fluorescence to assess the perfusion of flap during surgery, and volume of TE
324	can be modulated to ensure the skin perfusion and the skin with ischemic
325	condition can be removed to reduce complications [28]. We tried indocyanine
326	green fluorescence assessment in several cases and indeed found relatively
327	accurate evaluation of flap perfusion, but unfortunately, sample size was too
328	small for us to gather and analyze data.
329	The coverage of implant/TE would be skin, total muscular, or muscular
330	combined with a mesh in our study. The covering of pocket was not
0.01	

associated with RF rate both in stage I and II operation. Total muscular

332 coverage provides a protective pocket for implant/TE when flap necrosis or

wound disruption [29]. Mesh was generally placed and sutured with pectoralis

major muscle edges to support and cover prosthesis. The mesh has many

advantages such as reducing muscle sacrifice, reducing prosthesis migration,

improving better pole, and resulting in natural inframammary fold, specifically

in cases of larger size of breast or insufficient muscle coverage [11].

338 Nevertheless, mesh use significantly increased the risk of complications

339	compared with total muscular coverage in IBBR [30]. Titanium-coated
340	polypropylene mesh, which was approved for use in 2008 and the implant
341	loss rate were 8.7% in previous report [31], was popularly used in our center.
342	Our study showed mesh use was associated with higher risk of RF in
343	univariate analysis although it was not an independent risk factor by
344	multivariate analysis in stage I operation. Furthermore, mesh use was the
345	independent risk factor for RF in stage II operation.
346	Chemotherapeutic agents and irradiation have been proven to reduce
347	local recurrence and improve patient survival outcome in advanced breast
348	cancer [32]. However, many studies demonstrated that adjuvant
349	chemotherapy was associated with cytotoxicity effect and immunosuppression
350	which caused wound infection, delayed healing [33]. Similarly, PMRT on
351	prosthesis might increase complication and compromise aesthetic outcome
352	[34]. One systematic review showed that RF rate was significantly lower when
353	radiotherapy was given after stage II (5.6%, radiotherapy to implant)
354	compared to radiotherapy given after stage I (22.9%, radiotherapy to TE).
355	However, it was unclear how many implants were lost during chemotherapy
356	period of treatment following stage I without experiencing radiotherapy [14]. In
357	stage I operation of our study, RF rate was 0.97% (1/103), 8.70% (12/138),
358	2.94% (1/34) for reconstructive breasts with no ACT, with ACT, with

immediate PMRT, respectively. Meanwhile, radiotherapy history, which
contained immediate PMRT and radiotherapy after ACT, was not associated
with RF in stage II operation. Obviously, radiotherapy was not the only culprit
in IBBR. Nevertheless, ACT was considered as an independent risk factor for
RF in stage I operation.

364	Two-stage technique of breast reconstruction is the most commonly form
365	of immediate IBBR today [35]. Advocates for two-stage operation proposed
366	the ability of revision on radiation effect and symmetries in stage II operation
367	to obtain more satisfactory appearance, and because complications rate was
368	relatively lower when compared with single-stage reconstruction [11]. Some
369	surgeons in our center explored to choose another incision to lower RF rate in
370	stage II operation, especially for patients who had radiotherapy history, for the
371	theory that poor flap perfusion and delayed healing after radiotherapy.
372	However, the incision was not the predict factor of RF in stage II operation.
373	Many literatures demonstrated that 24 hours of antibiotic prophylaxis was
374	warranted [36] and infectious disease guidelines recommended
375	cephalosporins against Gram-positive organisms are appropriate for
376	nonallergic [37]. All patients in our study received antibiotic prophylaxis for 48
377	hours during the perioperative period, second-generation cephalosporins for

378 nonallergic patients and lincosamides for others. Moreover, the perioperative

antibiotic was not the predictor for RF.

380	Although the nomogram model created in our study demonstrated
381	satisfactory performance, we still acknowledged some limitations. Firstly, as
382	the data was retrospectively reviewed, some important details were
383	unavailable such as patients' satisfaction score of reconstructed breasts,
384	Baker grading following radiotherapy. Secondly, multiple breast and plastic
385	surgeons might have variative learning curve of reconstructive surgery
386	technique, which also affected the outcome and complication rate. Thirdly, the
387	number of patients is relatively smaller due to the low incidence rate of
388	events. Additionally, only logistic regression model is suitable due to the
389	limited sample and variables in analysis of stage II operation, which resulted
390	in insufficient data for validation. Therefore, a multicenter perspective study
391	with more data available is necessary to overcome these limitations.

392 CONCLUSION

393 This is the first application of nomogram to develop a prediction model of RF

³⁹⁴ rate for immediate IBBR, which demonstrated higher BMI, implant/TE

- 395 volume>86.30% and ACT were independent risk factors for RF in stage I
- 396 operation and the model exhibited satisfied predictive ability. Then a logistic

397	regression model was established, and mesh use was independent predictor							
398	of RF in stage II operation. The nomogram created in this study is an easy-to-							
399	use tool for clinicians to predict RF rate in immediate one-stage IBBR or stage							
400	I operation of immediate two-stage IBBR. Furthermore, these findings							
401	enhanced our understanding of the risk factors contributing to RF and might							
402	lead us clinical decision to improve the outcome of immediate IBBR.							
403	Acknowledgments							
404	This work is funded by grants from the Medical Health Science and							
405	Technology Project of Zhejiang Provincial Health Commission (2021RC045).							
406	References							
407	1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2020. CA Cancer J Clin.							
408	2020 Jan;70(1):7-30. doi: 10.3322/caac.21590. Epub 2020 Jan 8. PMID:							
409	31912902.							
410	2. Maajani K, Jalali A, Alipour S, Khodadost M, Tohidinik HR, Yazdani K.							
411	The Global and Regional Survival Rate of Women With Breast Cancer: A							
412	Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Clin Breast Cancer. 2019							
413	Jun;19(3):165-177. doi: 10.1016/j.clbc.2019.01.006. Epub 2019 Jan 29.							
414	PMID: 30952546.							
	24							

415	3.	Reefy S, Patani N, Anderson A, Burgoyne G, Osman H, Mokbel K.
416		Oncological outcome and patient satisfaction with skin-sparing
417		mastectomy and immediate breast reconstruction: a prospective
418		observational study. BMC Cancer. 2010 Apr 29;10:171. doi:
419		10.1186/1471-2407-10-171. PMID: 20429922.
420	4.	Fuertes V, Francés M, Casarrubios JM, Fernández-Palacios J, González
421		JM, Loro-Ferrer JF. Implant-based immediate breast reconstruction:
422		failure rate when radiating the tissue expander or the permanent implant-a
423		meta-analysis. Gland Surg. 2020 Apr;9(2):209-218. doi:
424		10.21037/gs.2020.01.20. PMID: 32420244.
425	5.	Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic
425 426	5.	Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic Outcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following Total
425 426 427	5.	Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic Outcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following Total Mastectomy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Matched Case-Control
425 426 427 428	5.	Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic Outcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following Total Mastectomy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Matched Case-Control Study. J Breast Cancer. 2017 Mar;20(1):74-81. doi:
425 426 427 428 429	5.	Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic Outcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following Total Mastectomy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Matched Case-Control Study. J Breast Cancer. 2017 Mar;20(1):74-81. doi: 10.4048/jbc.2017.20.1.74. Epub 2017 Mar 24. PMID: 28382097.
 425 426 427 428 429 430 	5.	 Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic Outcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following Total Mastectomy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Matched Case-Control Study. J Breast Cancer. 2017 Mar;20(1):74-81. doi: 10.4048/jbc.2017.20.1.74. Epub 2017 Mar 24. PMID: 28382097. Taqi K, Pao JS, Chen L, Ma C, Zhang M, McKevitt E, et al. Immediate
 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 	5.	 Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic Outcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following Total Mastectomy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Matched Case-Control Study. J Breast Cancer. 2017 Mar;20(1):74-81. doi: 10.4048/jbc.2017.20.1.74. Epub 2017 Mar 24. PMID: 28382097. Taqi K, Pao JS, Chen L, Ma C, Zhang M, McKevitt E, et al. Immediate breast reconstruction in locally advanced breast cancer: is it safe? Breast
 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 	5.	 Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. Oncologic Outcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following Total Mastectomy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Matched Case-Control Study. J Breast Cancer. 2017 Mar;20(1):74-81. doi: 10.4048/jbc.2017.20.1.74. Epub 2017 Mar 24. PMID: 28382097. Taqi K, Pao JS, Chen L, Ma C, Zhang M, McKevitt E, et al. Immediate breast reconstruction in locally advanced breast cancer: is it safe? Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2021 Nov;190(2):175-182. doi: 10.1007/s10549-021-
 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 	5.	Ryu JM, Paik HJ, Park S, Yi HW, Nam SJ, Kim SW, et al. OncologicOutcomes after Immediate Breast Reconstruction Following TotalMastectomy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Matched Case-ControlStudy. J Breast Cancer. 2017 Mar;20(1):74-81. doi:10.4048/jbc.2017.20.1.74. Epub 2017 Mar 24. PMID: 28382097.Taqi K, Pao JS, Chen L, Ma C, Zhang M, McKevitt E, et al. Immediatebreast reconstruction in locally advanced breast cancer: is it safe? BreastCancer Res Treat. 2021 Nov;190(2):175-182. doi: 10.1007/s10549-021-06366-6. Epub 2021 Aug 31. PMID: 34467443.

434	7.	Xu F, Lei C, Cao H, Liu J, Li J, Jiang H, Chinese Society Of Breast
435		Surgery. Multi-center investigation of breast reconstruction after
436		mastectomy from Chinese Society of Breast Surgery: A survey based on
437		31 tertiary hospitals (CSBrS-004). Chin J Cancer Res. 2021 Feb
438		28;33(1):33-41. doi: 10.21147/j.issn.1000-9604.2021.01.04. PMID:
439		33707926.
440	8.	Ozturk CN, Ozturk C, Soucise A, Platek M, Ahsan N, Lohman R, et al.
441		Expander/Implant Removal After Breast Reconstruction: Analysis of Risk
442		Factors and Timeline. Aesthetic Plast Surg. 2018 Feb;42(1):64-72. doi:
443		10.1007/s00266-017-1031-8. Epub 2017 Dec 21. PMID: 29270693.
444	9.	Ricci JA, Epstein S, Momoh AO, Lin SJ, Singhal D, Lee BT. A meta-
445		analysis of implant-based breast reconstruction and timing of adjuvant
446		radiation therapy. J Surg Res. 2017 Oct;218:108-116. doi:
447		10.1016/j.jss.2017.05.072. Epub 2017 Jun 15. PMID: 28985836.
448	10.	Kouwenberg CAE, van Hoogdalem LE, Mureau MAM, Ismail S, Gopie JP,
449		Tibben A, et al. Patients' and surgeons' experiences after failed breast
450		reconstruction: A qualitative study. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg. 2021
451		Jul;74(7):1480-1485. doi: 10.1016/j.bjps.2020.10.080. Epub 2020 Nov 8.
452		PMID: 33272843.

- 453 11. Frey JD, Salibian AA, Karp NS, Choi M. Implant-Based Breast
- 454 Reconstruction: Hot Topics, Controversies, and New Directions. Plast
- 455 **Reconstr Surg. 2019 Feb;143(2):404e-416e. doi:**
- 456 **10.1097/PRS.000000000005290. PMID: 30688910.**
- 457 12. Amin MB, Edge S, Greene F, Byrd DR, Brookland RK, Washington MK, et
- 458 al. AJCC Cancer Staging Manual. 8th Ed. New York: Springer; (2017).
- 459 13. YOUDEN WJ. Index for rating diagnostic tests. Cancer. 1950 Jan;3(1):32-
- 460 5. doi: 10.1002/1097-0142(1950)3:1<32::aid-cncr2820030106>3.0.co;2-3.
- 461 **PMID: 15405679**.
- 462 14. Lam TC, Hsieh F, Boyages J. The effects of postmastectomy adjuvant
- radiotherapy on immediate two-stage prosthetic breast reconstruction: a
- 464 systematic review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013 Sep;132(3):511-518. doi:
- 465 **10.1097/PRS.0b013e31829acc41**. **PMID**: **23676964**.
- 466 15. Lam TC, Borotkanics R, Hsieh F, Salinas J, Boyages J. Immediate Two-
- 467 Stage Prosthetic Breast Reconstruction Failure: Radiation Is Not the Only
- 468 Culprit. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2018 Jun;141(6):1315-1324. doi:
- 469 **10.1097/PRS.00000000004358. PMID: 29750759.**

470	16. Ilonzo N, Tsang A, Tsantes S, Estabrook A, Thu Ma AM. Breast
471	reconstruction after mastectomy: A ten-year analysis of trends and
472	immediate postoperative outcomes. Breast. 2017 Apr;32:7-12. doi:
473	10.1016/j.breast.2016.11.023. Epub 2016 Dec 16. PMID: 27988412.
474	17. Srinivasa DR, Clemens MW, Qi J, Hamill JB, Kim HM, Pusic AL, et al.
475	Obesity and Breast Reconstruction: Complications and Patient-Reported
476	Outcomes in a Multicenter, Prospective Study. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2020
477	Mar;145(3):481e-490e. doi: 10.1097/PRS.000000000006543. PMID:
478	32097295.
479	18. Banuelos J, Abu-Ghname A, Vyas K, Sharaf B, Nguyen MT, Harless C, et
480	al. Should Obesity Be Considered a Contraindication for Prepectoral
481	Breast Reconstruction? Plast Reconstr Surg. 2020 Mar;145(3):619-627.
482	doi: 10.1097/PRS.000000000006540. PMID: 32097293.
483	19. Hirsch EM, Seth AK, Kim JYS, Dumanian GA, Mustoe TA, Galiano RD, et
484	al. Analysis of risk factors for complications in expander/implant breast
485	reconstruction by stage of reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2014
486	Nov;134(5):692e-699e. doi: 10.1097/PRS.0000000000000607. PMID:
487	25347643.

	488	20. Ozturk CN	Ozturk C	. Soucise A.	Platek M.	Ahsan N	, Lohman R	, et al
--	-----	---------------	----------	--------------	-----------	---------	------------	---------

- 489 Expander/Implant Removal After Breast Reconstruction: Analysis of Risk
- 490 Factors and Timeline. Aesthetic Plast Surg. 2018 Feb;42(1):64-72. doi:
- 491 10.1007/s00266-017-1031-8. Epub 2017 Dec 21. PMID: 29270693.
- 492 21. Wu ZY, Kim HJ, Lee JW, Chung IY, Kim JS, Lee SB, et al. Breast Cancer
- 493 Recurrence in the Nipple-Areola Complex After Nipple-Sparing
- 494 Mastectomy With Immediate Breast Reconstruction for Invasive Breast
- 495 Cancer. JAMA Surg. 2019 Nov 1;154(11):1030-1037. doi:
- 496 **10.1001/jamasurg.2019.2959.** PMID: **31461141**.
- 497 22. De La Cruz L, Moody AM, Tappy EE, Blankenship SA, Hecht EM. Overall
- 498 Survival, Disease-Free Survival, Local Recurrence, and Nipple-Areolar
- 499 Recurrence in the Setting of Nipple-Sparing Mastectomy: A Meta-Analysis
- and Systematic Review. Ann Surg Oncol. 2015 Oct;22(10):3241-9. doi:
- 501 **10.1245/s10434-015-4739-1**. Epub 2015 Aug 5. PMID: 26242363.
- 502 23. Daar DA, Abdou SA, Rosario L, Rifkin WJ, Santos PJ, Wirth GA, et al. Is
- 503 There a Preferred Incision Location for Nipple-Sparing Mastectomy? A
- 504 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2019
- 505 May;143(5):906e-919e. doi: 10.1097/PRS.000000000005502. PMID:
- **30789474**.

507	24. Killelea BK, Long JB, Dang W, Mougalian SS, Evans SB, Gross CP, et al.
508	Associations Between Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy and Complications for
509	Patients with Ductal Carcinoma In Situ. Ann Surg Oncol. 2018
510	Jun;25(6):1521-1529. doi: 10.1245/s10434-018-6410-0. Epub 2018 Mar 7.
511	PMID: 29516364.
512 513 514 515 516 517	 25. ten Wolde B, van den Wildenberg FJ, Keemers-Gels ME, Polat F, Strobbe LJ. Quilting prevents seroma formation following breast cancer surgery: closing the dead space by quilting prevents seroma following axillary lymph node dissection and mastectomy. Ann Surg Oncol. 2014 Mar;21(3):802-7. doi: 10.1245/s10434-013-3359-x. Epub 2013 Nov 12. PMID: 24217790.
518 519 520 521 522	 26. Jung SM, Jeon BJ, Woo J, Ryu JM, Lee SK, Chae BJ, et al. Does chemotherapy or radiotherapy affect the postoperative complication in breast cancer patients who underwent immediate breast reconstruction with tissue expander? BMC Cancer. 2021 Jan 22;21(1):88. doi: 10.1186/s12885-020-07729-w. PMID: 33482758.

523

524

27. Yang CE, Chung SW, Lee DW, Lew DH, Song SY. Evaluation of the

525 Based Breast Reconstruction Using Laser-Assisted Indocyanine Green

Relationship Between Flap Tension and Tissue Perfusion in Implant-

526		Angiography. Ann Surg Oncol. 2018 Aug;25(8):2235-2240. doi:
527		10.1245/s10434-018-6527-1. Epub 2018 May 21. PMID: 29786124.
528	28.	Jones G, Yoo A, King V, Jao B, Wang H, Rammos C, et al. Prepectoral
529		Immediate Direct-to-Implant Breast Reconstruction with Anterior AlloDerm
530		Coverage. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2017 Dec;140(6S Prepectoral Breast
531		Reconstruction):31S-38S. doi: 10.1097/PRS.0000000000004048. PMID:
532		29166345.
533	29.	Cordeiro PG, Jazayeri L. Two-Stage Implant-Based Breast
534		Reconstruction: An Evolution of the Conceptual and Technical Approach
535		over a Two-Decade Period. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2016 Jul;138(1):1-11.
536		doi: 10.1097/PRS.000000000002243. PMID: 27348635.
537	30.	Kim JYS, Davila AA, Persing S, Connor CM, Jovanovic B, Khan SA, et al.
538		A meta-analysis of human acellular dermis and submuscular tissue
539		expander breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2012 Jan;129(1):28-
540		41. doi: 10.1097/PRS.0b013e3182361fd6. PMID: 22186498.
541	31.	Dieterich M, Paepke S, Zwiefel K, Dieterich H, Blohmer J, Faridi A, et al.
542		Implant-based breast reconstruction using a titanium-coated
543		polypropylene mesh (TiLOOP Bra): a multicenter study of 231 cases.

- 544 Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013 Jul;132(1):8e-19e. doi:
- 545 **10.1097/PRS.0b013e318290f8a0. PMID: 23806958**.
- 546 32. El-Sabawi B, Sosin M, Carey JN, Nahabedian MY, Patel KM. Breast
- reconstruction and adjuvant therapy: A systematic review of surgical
- 548 outcomes. J Surg Oncol. 2015 Oct;112(5):458-64. doi: 10.1002/jso.24028.
- 549 Epub 2015 Sep 8. PMID: 26345465.
- 33. Lee KT, Bae J, Jeon BJ, Pyon JK, Mun GH, Bang SI. Adjuvant
- 551 Chemotherapy in Two-Stage Tissue Expander/Implant Breast
- 552 Reconstruction: Does it Affect Final Outcomes? Ann Surg Oncol. 2021
- 553 Apr;28(4):2191-2198. doi: 10.1245/s10434-020-09177-z. Epub 2020 Sep
- 554 **24. PMID: 32974692.**
- 555 34. Yun JH, Diaz R, Orman AG. Breast Reconstruction and Radiation
- 556 Therapy. Cancer Control. 2018 Jan-Dec;25(1):1073274818795489. doi:
- 557 **10.1177/1073274818795489.** PMID: **30132338**.
- 35. Bellini E, Pesce M, Santi P, Raposio E. Two-Stage Tissue-Expander
- 559 Breast Reconstruction: A Focus on the Surgical Technique. Biomed Res
- 560 Int. 2017;2017:1791546. doi: 10.1155/2017/1791546. Epub 2017 Dec 10.
- 561 **PMID: 29376067**.

- 36. Phillips BT, Halvorson EG. Antibiotic Prophylaxis following Implant-Based
- 563 Breast Reconstruction: What Is the Evidence? Plast Reconstr Surg. 2016
- 564 Oct;138(4):751-757. doi: 10.1097/PRS.00000000002530. PMID:

27307337.

- 566 37. Cataife G, Weinberg DA, Wong HH, Kahn KL. The effect of Surgical Care
- 567 Improvement Project (SCIP) compliance on surgical site infections (SSI).
- 568 Med Care. 2014 Feb;52(2 Suppl 1):S66-73. doi:
- 569 **10.1097/MLR.00000000000028**. PMID: 24430269.



Fig 1





Points	0 10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
BMI	15 16	17 18	19 20	0 21	22 23	24	25 2	6 27	28	29
Lymph node	SLNB	A	LND							
Implant/TE volume	≤86.30%		> 86.30%							
Mesh use	No	Yes								
ACT	No				Yes					
Total Points	0 20	40	60 8	30 100	120	140	160	180	200	220
Probability of RF						0.1	0.3	0.5 0.7		

Fig 3







Predicted Probability

D



Fig 4