Conservative Augmentation with Periareolar Mastopexy Reduces Complications and Treats a Variety of Breast Types
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Abstract: Augmentation with mastopexy remains a challenge because reported complication and revision rates remain high. Previous publications are difficult to interpret because of inclusion of a broad array of mastopexy techniques and different implant styles and placements. This is a review of 100 consecutive augmentation/mastopexy patients performed by a single surgeon using a single procedure, implant style, and placement.

Between January 2003 and December 2008, 100 female patients underwent primary augmentation mammoplasty with periareolar mastopexy. All patients had either grade II or grade III ptosis, or tubular deformity. All implants were Allergan style 168 (270–390 mL saline prosthesis).

All patients (N = 100) were available for follow-up, an average 8.3 months postoperatively (1.5–21 months). Overall complication rate was 11%. Nonimplant-related complication rate was 6%—2 deflations, 3 hypertrophic scars, and 1 partial nipple necrosis. Implant-related complication rate was 5%—2 deflations, 1 capsular contracture, 1 implant shifting, and 1 infection.

Augmentation mammoplasty with periareolar mastopexy treats a wide variety of breast types including tubular deformity and grade II and III ptosis. Planned nipple-areolar elevation should be 4 cm or less. Vertical and horizontal skin envelope redraping is required for each case.
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Augmentation with mastopexy continues to be the most frequently litigated operation in plastic surgery, reflecting the high complication rates and poor outcomes associated with these combined procedures. However, breast ptosis and tubular deformity are common findings among patients seeking breast enlargement. In these cases, optimal esthetic results require proper implant selection and placement, which can be further enhanced by mastopexy.

The sentinel publication by Spear in 2003 highlighted the common and possibly severe complications that can occur when augmentation and mastopexy are performed simultaneously. Since that report, several recent articles have reviewed the safety and efficacy of combining these procedures. Although these studies have been useful, the cited complication and revision rates remain substantial. In addition, these publications have been difficult to interpret because they include a variety of mastopexy techniques, different implant styles, and different implant placements. This single-surgeon retrospective review quantifies surgical outcomes of a single mastopexy procedure, using the same style saline-filled mammary prostheses in a retropectoral position.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Between January 2003 and February 2008, 100 women underwent augmentation mammoplasty with periareolar mastopexy under general anesthesia in an accredited ambulatory surgery center by the senior author. Appropriate medical workup and clearance were obtained when indicated. Follow-up photographs were obtained at 2 and 10 months postoperatively.

Surgical Technique

The vertical breast meridian is marked by draping a flexible measuring tape around the posterior neck, over the midportion of the clavicles bilaterally, and intersecting the nipples. The inframammary fold is projected onto this line by pinching the breast tissue. This point represents the desired location of the superior aspect of the areola (Fig. 1). Superior crescents are combined with inferior periareolar markings to give an eccentric elliptical configuration. The width and height of the ellipse vary with the breast dimensions and the planned vertical and/or horizontal reduction of the skin envelope. The saline prostheses are placed in a submuscular position through

FIGURE 1. The inframammary fold projects the desired location of the superior aspect of the areola.
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the inferior periareolar incisions (Fig. 2). Final positioning of the implants is done intraoperatively with the patient in a sitting position. Final nipple-areolar placement and planned skin envelope reductions are also confirmed at this time. Adjustments are routinely required to account for multiple variables including skin elasticity, parenchymal distribution, and implant size and fill volume.

The superior crescent of breast skin is deepithelialized (Fig. 3). Parenchyma is undermined medially and laterally to the minimal amount required to facilitate a near tensionless translational movement of the nipple-areolar complex based on a superior dermal/parenchymal pedicle. For tubular deformities, parenchymal scoring and release are performed at this time to facilitate a more uniform glandular redraping over the prosthesis. Closure is completed with buried, interrupted, deep dermal 3-0 Vicryl, and subcuticular purse string with 4-0 Vicryl (Ethicon, a Johnson & Johnson company, Somerville, NJ) (Fig. 4).

RESULTS

All 100 patients were available for follow-up ranging from 1.5 to 21 months (average 8.3 months) postoperatively. Seventy-six patients had grade 2 breast ptosis, 16 patients had grade 3 breast ptosis, and 8 patients had tubular breast deformity. All implants were Allegan style 168 round, textured (average 330 mL, range 270–390 mL).
The overall complication rate in this series was 11%. The nonimplant-related complication rate was 6%. There were 2 (2%) patients who underwent revision under local anesthesia related to areolar stretching and scar widening (Fig. 5). Both of these patients had 330 mL saline implants, and planned nipple-areolar elevation was less than 4 cm. There were 3 cases (3%) of moderate hypertrophic scarring that responded to a single office injection of Kenalog. There were 6 (6%) cases of mild hypertrophic scarring, not considered complications (Fig. 6), that responded to topical Cordran (DPT Laboratories, Ltd., San Antonio, TX) tape. Of the 9 patients experiencing some degree of hypertrophic scarring, 5 had planned nipple elevation of 5 cm or more and 2 had 390 mL implants.

There was 1 (1%) case of partial nipple necrosis that healed secondarily in a patient with grade 3 breast ptosis (Fig. 7). In this patient, the planned nipple-areolar elevation was 7 cm, and the implant size was 390 mL. A summary of nonimplant-related complications is given in Table 1.

The implant-related complication rate was 5%. One (1%) patient presented with infection requiring implant removal and subsequent staged replacement. Two patients (2%) experienced implant deflation requiring replacement. One patient developed a unilateral mild (Baker grade II) capsular contracture not requiring treatment. One patient experienced mild implant shifting not requiring revision. A summary of implant-related complications is given in Table 2.

When compared with preoperatively, average sternal notch to nipple distance decreased 2.2 cm (0–3.2 cm). Average bust measurement increased to 2.3 inches (0.9–3.4 inches). Representative photographs for patients with grade II ptosis, grade III ptosis, and tubular deformity are shown (Figs. 8–10). There was no observed instance of the “tomato effect” in this series. Pleating in the circum-areolar areas subsided by 6 months postoperatively.

**DISCUSSION**

We report a low (6%) nonimplant-related complication rate in this series of 100 patients undergoing augmentation with periareolar mastopexy. The complications that did occur were of low severity and correctable except for the 1 patient who experienced partial nipple necrosis. This compares favorably with other series and also allows meaningful analysis of a uniformly applied surgical procedure for a variety of breast types. Although statistical signifi-
FIGURE 6. Preoperative and postoperative views of hypertrophic scarring.

FIGURE 7. Preoperative and postoperative views of partial nipple necrosis in a patient with grade III ptosis.

### TABLE 1. Nonimplant-Related Complications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>Areolar stretching/scar widening</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Office revision with local anesthesia. Problems resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>Hypertrophic scarring</td>
<td>Intrallesional injection with Kenalog</td>
<td>No further treatments required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>Partial nipple necrosis</td>
<td>Conservative wound care, secondary healing</td>
<td>Permanent depigmentation of the inferior areolar skin and loss of nipple projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2. Implant-Related Complications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>Unilateral infection</td>
<td>Explantation</td>
<td>Successful reimplantation after 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>Mild implant shifting</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No revision requested or recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>Unilateral Baker II capsular contraction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No revision requested or recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>Implant deflation</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Cosmetic outcome not affected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 8. Preoperative and postoperative views of grade II ptosis after augmentation and periareolar mastopexy.

FIGURE 9. Preoperative and postoperative views of grade III ptosis after augmentation and periareolar mastopexy.

FIGURE 10. Preoperative and postoperative views of tubular breast deformity after augmentation and periareolar mastopexy.
TABLE 3. Favorable Factors for Augmentation With Periareolar Mastopexy

1. Flaccid, empty breasts
2. Small to moderate implant size (360 mL or less)
3. Planned nipple-areolar elevation 4 cm or less
4. Lighter skin tones
5. Absence of deep stretch marks

In this small series, conservative augmentation with periareolar mastopexy reduces complications and increases predictability. Factors that mitigate for a favorable result are summarized in Table 3 and have been cited previously.13-15

Major differences between this and previous publications lies in the preoperative planning. Most mastopexy and reduction procedures rely on the anterior projection of the inframammary fold onto the breast meridian to define desired nipple position.14,16 With the combined augmentation/periareolar mastopexy, this landmark represents the desired location of the superior aspect of the areola. However, this recommendation is an approximation, and the final position is determined intraoperatively with the patient in the sitting position as has been noted by previous authorities.17-19

Periareolar mastopexy with augmentation has now superseded all other types of mastopexy with augmentation in the senior author’s practice. Good results with both vertical and inverted-T mastopexy configurations are routinely reported.20,21 However, we have had experience similar to others who note a substantially increased complication rate when the more extensive mastopexy procedures are used. In a recent review by Spear et al.22 of 34 patients undergoing revision augmentation/mastopexy, 20 (59%) had previous inverted-T type mastopexies. High rates of widen or unacceptable scars, implant asymmetry, nipple necrosis, soft tissue necrosis, and revisional surgery has resulted in our recommendations for a more narrow patient, procedure, and implant selection.

For patients requiring nipple-areolar elevation greater than 4 cm or for patients requiring breast mound repositioning (including pseudoptosis), the senior author favors a staged approach. Mastopexy, either vertical or inverted-T, is performed first followed by staged augmentation 6 months later.

Although we report our success combining these procedures, we note that these are short-term results needing long-term observation. Implant-related complications such as deflation, contracture, displacement, and wrinkling will steadily increase with time. However, we believe the follow-up provided in this study does allow for assessment of ptosis correction, symmetry, scar quality, and patient satisfaction.
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