

A Hospital Based Retrospective Assessment of the Mesh Related Infections

Roshani Prasad¹, Sumit Raj², Ashok Rai³

¹Senior Resident, Department of Surgery, JLN MCH, Bhagalpur, Bihar, India

²Senior Resident, Department of Surgery, JLN MCH, Bhagalpur, Bihar, India

³Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, JLN MCH, Bhagalpur, Bihar, India

Received: 25-11-2022 / Revised: 05-12-2022 / Accepted: 26-12-2022

Corresponding author: Dr. Sumit Raj

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract

Aim: The aim of this study was to analysis of mesh related infections in a tertiary care centre.

Methods: A retrospective descriptive study was conducted in the department of Surgery, JLN MCH, Bhagalpur, Bihar, India for one year and 50 patients were included in the study.

Results: Mesh infection was more common in males. Among 50 patients, 40 were males and 10 female patients. Majority of the patients were in the age group 40-50 (40%) followed by 50-60 age group 30%. 80% cases were repaired with open PP and rest of the patients was repaired with Lichtenstein repair. In our study, mesh infection was more common in obese patients with a mean BMI of 32.70+/-1.78kg/m². (Range 30.40-34.10). 40% patients had co-morbidities. The antibiotic protocol was followed in 48 cases out of 50. Antibiotic has used according to the protocol of our hospital; it was followed in 48 patients in the first surgery i.e., hernia repair surgery. Parenteral cephalosporin was used in 48 patients and amoxicillin-clavulanic acid in 2 patients. Antibiotic has repeated if the procedure was beyond 2 hours. After postoperative day 2, patients were switched over to oral antibiotics for three days. Likewise, during the second admission, i.e., when the patient was admitted with mesh infection, 48 patients were given cephalosporin, and 2 patients were given Piperacillin tazobactam.

Conclusion: In our study incidence was more common after open surgeries because there was a lapse in the sterilization process of the instruments, which was rectified with timely culture sensitivity tests and stringent sterilization process.

Keywords: Open Surgeries, Mesh, Infection

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

Introduction

Huge incisional ventral hernia is defined as hernia defect size ≥ 10 cm [1], and its surgical correction is considered technically challenging and with a high chance of recurrence. Although repair with prosthesis was proven to reduce hernia recurrences, it associates a series of mesh-related complications like seroma, mesh erosion with sinus formation, chronic pain and discomfort, etc. Even in expert

centers, postoperative wound related infective complications as high as 40–50%. [2-4] Seroma formation and mesh infection may also occur as long-term morbidities. [5] Nowadays, mesh removal is the preferred management strategy for mesh infection after incisional hernia repair [6-8], which inevitably causes secondary trauma to the abdominal wall tissue and increases the risk of recurrence

and other morbidities. Repair of re-recurrent hernia subsequent to mesh removal is even more technically demanding and which usually requires prolonged hospitalization and high medical expenses without promising results.

Hernioplasty is one of the most common surgeries performed by general surgeons. With the advent of synthetic mesh recurrence rates and the burden on healthcare have drastically reduced. [9] Incidence of mesh infection is 2% - 4% for open inguinal hernia repair, 6% -10% for open incisional hernia repair [10] and 3.6% for incisional hernia repair. [11] Mesh infection can lead to potential re surgeries and morbidity to the patient and thus should be prevented. Factors influencing mesh infection are patient factors like COPD, high BMI, consumption of tobacco, advanced age, ASA>3, comorbidities. [12]

In today's environment, biologic mesh is primarily used in patients with class 3 (contaminated) and class 4 (dirty) wounds. [13] Its use in class 1 (clean) and class 2 (clean- contaminated) wounds has not been well studied. Its efficacy has been debated in the recent medical literature with some studies finding that biologic mesh is associated with higher recurrence rates than synthetic mesh and others finding similar performance between the two techniques. [13,14]

A majority of ventral hernias are repaired using mesh, with synthetic mesh being the most common choice. [15] Synthetic mesh has been well demonstrated to significantly reduce the hernia recurrence rate in ventral hernia repairs. [16,17] However, synthetic mesh is susceptible to becoming infected in both clean and contaminated repairs, resulting in the need for additional procedures to remove the

infected mesh and repair a now larger hernia defect. [18,19] This adds additional costs due to extra procedures and a longer duration of stay in the hospital. The development and use of biologic mesh has been identified as an alternative to synthetic mesh for reducing infections. Biologic mesh has been used in contaminated cases to resist infection, thereby reducing the morbidity of postoperative wound infection and the need for additional procedures, which may justify the high cost of the mesh itself. [19]

The aim of this study was to analysis of mesh related infections in a tertiary care centre.

Materials and Methods

A retrospective descriptive study was conducted in the department of Surgery, JLNMC, Bhagalpur, Bihar, India for one year and 50 patients were included in the study.

Methodology

All cases that underwent ventral and groin hernia surgeries and reported with mesh infections in the Department of General Surgery were included in the study. Files with incomplete and inappropriate data needed for the study were excluded from the study.

All primary hernia repairs were done on an elective basis, and antibiotics are given as per the protocol of our hospital. All cases of mesh infection during the study period (n=50) were analyzed. Demographics like age, sex and factors associated with mesh infection like BMI, comorbidities, time of presentation, tobacco consumption, ASA grade, type of hernia, type of hernia repair done were taken from medical records of the patients and their association with mesh infections were analyzed.

Results

Table 1: Patient characteristics

Gender	N%
Male	40 (80)
Female	10 (20)
Age in years	
<40	10 (20)
40-50	20 (40)
50-60	15 (30)
>60	5 (10)
Type of repair	
Open Repair	
Open PP	40 (80)
Lichtenstein	10 (20)
BMI kg/m²	
<18.5	0
18.5-25	0
25-30	5 (10)
>30	45 (90)

Mesh infection was more common in males. Among 50 patients, 40 were males and 10 female patients. Majority of the patients were in the age group 40-50 (40%) followed by 50-60 age group 30%. 80% cases were repaired with open PP and rest of the patients was repaired with Lichtenstein repair. In our study, mesh infection was more common in obese patients with a mean BMI of 32.70 \pm 1.78kg/m². (Range 30.40-34.10).

Table 2: Time of presentation of mesh infection after primary repair, Co-morbidities in cases of mesh infection

Time in months	N%
1-5	34 (68)
6-10	16 (32)
Co-morbidities	
Present	34 (68)
Absent	16 (32)

The time of presentation after surgery was more after 5 months. The Mean \pm SD being 5.55 \pm 3.27 (Range being 1-10 months).

Table 3: Details of co morbidities, antibiotics used in cases of mesh infection and mesh used

Co-morbidities	N
COPD	5
COPD+Type 2 DM	5
Type 2 DM	3
COPD +HTN	2
Antibiotics	
1st admission	
Cephalosporin	48
Amoxicillin clavulanic acid	2
2nd admission	
Cephalosporin	48
Piperacillin tazobactam	2
Mesh used	
Polypropylene mesh	42
Composite mesh	8

40% patients had co-morbidities. The antibiotic protocol was followed in 48 cases out of 50. Antibiotic has used according to the protocol of our hospital; it was followed in 48 patients in the first surgery i.e., hernia repair surgery. Parenteral cephalosporin was used in 48 patients and amoxicillin-clavulanic acid in 2 patients. Antibiotic has repeated if the procedure was beyond 2 hours. After postoperative day 2, patients were switched over to oral antibiotics for three days. Likewise, during the second admission, i.e., when the patient was admitted with mesh infection, 48 patients were given cephalosporin, and 2 patients were given Piperacillin tazobactam. Polypropylene mesh was used in 42 patients, and the composite mesh was used in 8 patients who underwent IPOM. Polypropylene suture was used in all ten patients.

In our study, 44 patients underwent mesh explantation, i.e., complete removal of the mesh, the infected sinus, and the surrounding infected tissue, followed by proper drainage of the surgical site. 2 patients were managed conservatively with an antibiotic wash, and parenteral antibiotics and 4 patients were tried to manage conservatively but later underwent mesh explantation.

Discussion

Abdominal wall and inguinal hernia are common clinical scenarios in surgical practice. It is widely accepted that any sizable abdominal wall defect requires placement of mesh for reinforcement of repair and longer recurrence-free period. [20] SSI is defined as infections occurring within 30 days after surgery and affecting either the incision, organs, or body spaces at the site of the operation. [21]

Mesh infection is a type of surgical site infection (SSI). Patient factors known to increase the risk of SSI and mesh infection are morbid obesity, tobacco abuse, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD),

diabetes mellitus (DM), and immunosuppression. [22] The incidence of SSIs varies across surgical procedures, with a range of 0.1% to 50.4% reported in a systematic review by Korol et al. [23] Data showed that the inguinal hernia repair is associated with a lower incidence of mesh infection than an open procedure. [24] Nevertheless, thorough sterilization of instruments is more challenging, and the instruments are more prone to carry debris or organisms that can lead to infections. [25]

However, in our centre, according to the antibiotic protocol, the antibiotic dose was repeated if the procedure took more than 120 minutes. In line with the world literature even our study showed mesh infections in procedures' that took more than 100 minutes to complete. The time duration of open surgery was 94+/- 21.17mins and in patients who eventually had mesh infection were 118.0+/- 20 mins. Duration of surgery in patients who underwent open surgery was 111.50+/- 13mins, and in patients with mesh infection post, open repair was 133.45+/- 30mins. Time duration to complete open surgery procedure is more compared to open procedure. The cause of prolonged surgery could be that the procedure was performed by surgeons in the early phase of their learning curve. The risk for complications after hernia repair is increased among patients with comorbid conditions, such as obesity or diabetes. [26] Likewise, the body mass index of >30kg/m² was associated with mesh infection. Proper selection of the patient, ensuring good control of comorbid medical conditions will prevent mesh infections. [27] Patient age, ASA score, smoking and were found to be associated with the development of mesh infection.

Micro porous, multifilament mesh, and laminar mesh construction increase the surface area for bacterial adherence, impede leukocyte migration for bacterial clearance and leads to biofilm formation.

[28] Pretreatment of mesh with antimicrobial agents is not done in our setting. In our study, polypropylene mesh was used in 44 patients and composite mesh in 4 patients who underwent IPOM repair. Different guidelines exist to treat mesh infections but not very clear evidence in the literature to support a single optimal approach. While some studies prefer conservative management, some others prefer complete mesh removal. Large-pore monofilament mesh seems to be salvable in a majority of cases, particularly when placed in an extra peritoneal position, while micro porous, multifilament, and composite meshes typically require explantation. [29,30]

Conclusion

In our study incidence was more common after open surgeries because there was a lapse in the sterilization process of the instruments, which was rectified with timely culture sensitivity tests and stringent sterilization process. As ours is a teaching hospital, surgeries are performed by surgeons in the early phase of the learning curve, so it takes much longer to perform surgery than an experienced surgeon would take. Many parameters impact operating time, including pre-operative planning, surgeon experience, operating room staff experience, and access to equipment etc., which would lead prolonged exposure of the incision site to the environment and bacterial contamination.

References

- Muysoms FE, Miserez M, Berrevoet F, Campanelli G, Champault GG, Chelala E, Dietz UA, Eker HH, El Nakadi I, Hauters P, Hidalgo Pascual M. Classification of primary and incisional abdominal wall hernias. *Hernia*. 2009 Aug;13(4):407-14.
- Bikhchandani J, Fitzgibbons RJ. Repair of giant ventral hernias. *Advances in surgery*. 2013 Sep 1;47(1):1-27.
- Mathes T, Walgenbach M, Siegel R. Suture versus mesh repair in primary and incisional ventral hernias: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *World journal of surgery*. 2016 Apr;40(4):826-35.
- Helgstrand F, Rosenberg J, Kehlet H, Jorgensen LN, Bisgaard T. Nationwide prospective study of outcomes after elective incisional hernia repair. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2013 Feb 1;216(2):217-28.
- Kokotovic D, Bisgaard T, Helgstrand F. Long-term recurrence and complications associated with elective incisional hernia repair. *Jama*. 2016 Oct 18;316(15):1575-82.
- Bueno-Lledó J, Torregrosa-Gallud A, Carreño-Saénz O, García-Pastor P, Carbonell-Tatay F, Bonafé-Diana S, Iserte-Hernández J. Partial versus complete removal of the infected mesh after abdominal wall hernia repair. *The American Journal of Surgery*. 2017 Jul 1;214(1):47-52.
- Hanna M, Dissanaik S. Mesh ingrowth with concomitant bacterial infection resulting in inability to explant: a failure of mesh salvage. *Hernia*. 2015 Apr;19(2):339-44.
- Liu FD, Li JY, Yao S, Zhang Y. A retrospective analysis of surgical treatment of mesh infection after repair of ventral hernia or defect. *Genet Mol Res*. 2015 Nov 19;14(4):14387-95.
- Narkhede R, Shah NM, Dalal PR, Mangukia C, Dholaria S. Postoperative mesh infection—still a concern in laparoscopic era. *Indian journal of surgery*. 2015 Aug 1;77(4):322-6.
- Turner EJ, Owen ER, Reddy K. Necrotising fasciitis following inguinal hernia repair. *Case Reports*. 2009 Jan 1; 2009: bcr0120091535.
- Cevasco M, Itani KM. Ventral hernia repair with synthetic, composite, and biologic mesh: characteristics, indications, and infection profile. *Surgical infections*. 2012 Aug 1;13(4):209-15.

12. Yang L, Wang H, Liang X, Chen T, Chen W, Song Y, Wang J. Bacteria in hernia sac: an important risk factor for surgical site infection after incarcerated hernia repair. *Hernia*. 2015 Apr 1;19(2):279-83.
13. Rosen MJ, Krpata DM, Ermlich B, et al. A 5-year clinical experience with single staged repairs of infected and contaminated abdominal wall defects utilizing biologic mesh. *Ann Surg*. 2013;257(6):991-6.
14. Huntington CR, Cox TC, Blair LJ, Schell S, Randolph D, Prasad T, Lincourt A, Heniford BT, Augenstein VA. Biologic mesh in ventral hernia repair: outcomes, recurrence, and charge analysis. *Surgery*. 2016 Dec 1;160(6):1517-27.
15. Kokotovic D, Bisgaard T, Helgstrand F. Long-term recurrence and complications associated with elective incisional hernia repair. *JAMA*. 2016;316(15):1575-82.
16. Luijendijk RW, Hop WC, Van Den Tol MP, De Lange DC, Braaksma MM, IJzermans JN, Boelhouwer RU, de Vries BC, Salu MK, Wereldsma JC, Bruijninx CM. A comparison of suture repair with mesh repair for incisional hernia. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2000 Aug 10;343(6):392-8.
17. Nguyen MT, Berger RL, Hicks SC, Davila JA, Li LT, Kao LS, Liang MK. Comparison of outcomes of synthetic mesh vs suture repair of elective primary ventral herniorrhaphy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA surgery*. 2014 May 1;149(5):415-21.
18. Deerenberg EB, Mulder IM, Grotenhuis N, Ditzel M, Jeekel J, Lange JF. Experimental study on synthetic and biological mesh implantation in a contaminated environment. *Journal of British Surgery*. 2012 Dec;99(12):1734-41.
19. Kissane NA, Itani KM. A decade of ventral incisional hernia repairs with biologic acellular dermal matrix: what have we learned? *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2012;130(5 Suppl 2):194S-202S.
20. Pauli EM, Rosen MJ. Open ventral hernia repair with component separation. *Surgical Clinics*. 2013 Oct 1;93(5):1111-33.
21. Hagihara M, Suwa M, Muramatsu Y, Kato Y, Yamagishi Y, Mikamo H, Ito Y. Preventing surgical-site infections after colorectal surgery. *Journal of Infection and Chemotherapy*. 2012 Jan 1;18(1):83-9.
22. Breuing K, Butler CE, Ferzoco S, Franz m, Hultman CS, Kilbridge JF. Incisional ventral hernias: Review of the literature and recommendations regarding the grading and technique of repair, *J Surg*. 2010;148(3):544-58.
23. Korol E, Johnston K, Waser N, Sifakis F, Jafri HS, Lo M, Kyaw MH. A systematic review of risk factors associated with surgical site infections among surgical patients. *PloS one*. 2013 Dec 18;8(12):e83743.
24. McCormack K, Scott NW, Go PM, Ross S, Grant AM; EU Hernia Trialists Collaboration. Laparoscopic techniques versus open techniques for inguinal hernia repair. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2003;(1):CD001785.
25. Chowbey PK, Khullar R, Sharma A, Soni V, Bajjal M, Garg N, Najma K. Laparoscopic management of infected mesh after laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair. *Surgical Laparoscopy, Endoscopy & Percutaneous Techniques*. 2015 Apr 1;25(2):125-8.
26. Liang MK, Holihan JL, Itani K, Alawadi ZM, Gonzalez JR, Askenasy EP, Ballecer C, Chong HS, Goldblatt MI, Greenberg JA, Harvin JA. Ventral hernia management. *Annals of surgery*. 2017 Jan 1;265(1):80-9.
27. Vagholkar K, Budhkar A. Combined tissue and mesh repair for midline incisional hernia. (A study of 15 cases). *Journal of medical science and clinical research*. 2014;2(8):1890-900.

28. Perez-Koehler B, Bayon Y, Bellón JM. Mesh infection and hernia repair: a review. *Surgical Infections*. 2016 Apr 1;17(2):124-37.
29. Beffa LR, Warren JA. Management of mesh infection. In *Textbook of Hernia*. Springer, Cham 2017; 395-405.
30. Pertuz J. G. V. Impaction Due to Sharp-Shaped Trauma in the Thoracic Abdominal Region: A Case Report. *Journal of Medical Research and Health Sciences*. 2022; 5(4): 1941–1945.