

Evaluation of the Role of Autologous Fat Transfer in Reduction of Radiation Complications in Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction

Sherif Abdelmohsen Elmedany,¹ Iman Labib Salem,² Nasser Ahmed Ghozlan,² Eman Abd Elrahim El Bakoury³, Mahmoud Ahmed Alhussini,²

¹MBBCh, Master of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Alexandria, Egypt

²Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Alexandria, Egypt

³Department of Radiodiagnosis, Medical Research Institute, University of Alexandria, Egypt

Corresponding author: Sherif Abdelmohsen Elmedany

Address: Faculty of Medicine, Champollion Street, Almesallah, Sharq Al Attarin, Alexandria Governorate 5372066

E-mail: sherif.elmedany@alexmed.edu.eg

Mobile: 01221311373

Running Title: Lipofilling & reduction of radiation complications in implant breast reconstruction

ABSTRACT

Background: Implant-based breast reconstruction (IBBR) is the most common method of reconstruction after mastectomy. ⁽¹⁾ Postoperative radiotherapy is associated with a significant increase in complications. We report our experience with the use of autologous fat transfer (AFT) to reduce radiation complications in (IBBR) and assess survival of the transferred fat after breast radiation. **Patient and Methods:** This study was a prospective comparative study of 20 patients who were divided into two groups using the closed envelope technique: Group (A) consisted of 10 patients treated with (AFT) during the first phase of (IBBR), Group (B) consisted of 10 patients not treated with (AFT) during the first phase of (IBBR), both groups underwent postmastectomy radiotherapy (PMRT). A survey was done to analyze radiation complications and assessment of fat survival using CT. **Results:** Both groups (A) and (b) consist of 10 patients (9 unilateral and one bilateral) with 11 treated breasts in both groups Mean follow-up was 6 months. Complication rates in group (A) versus group (B) were as follows: surgical-site infection, 0 percent versus 9.1 percent; Superficial mastectomy flap necrosis, 9.1 percent versus

18.2 percent; wound dehiscence, 0 percent versus 9.1 percent; minor capsular contracture grade 1 2 , 36.4 percent versus 54.5 percent; major capsular contracture grade 3,4 0 percent versus 18.2 percent; Radiation dermatitis 9.1 percent versus 27.3 percent; no hematoma, Seroma, Full-thickness mastectomy flap necrosis nor extrusion in both groups. The average fat retention per cent after radiation was 74.82 ± 4.21 percent.

Conclusions: Early data on the use of AFT as a protective measure in pre-pectoral IBBR in Patients with postmastectomy radiation therapy show promising results.

Keywords: Lipofilling, Fat Transfer, Breast Reconstruction; Breast Cancer; Radiation, implant-based reconstruction

INTRODUCTION

The most popular kind of post-mastectomy reconstruction is implant-based breast reconstruction (IBBR), which has a low complication profile, quick recovery times, low cost, and attractive results.⁽¹⁾ In the United States, 107,238 individuals had post-mastectomy breast reconstruction in 2019, and 72,306 of them underwent 2-stage IBR.⁽¹⁾ and⁽²⁾ have demonstrated that immediate breast reconstruction can produce very patient-

satisfying cosmetic results without postponing adjuvant chemotherapy or radiation treatment (XRT) or raising the risk of cancer recurrence.⁽³⁻⁷⁾

Adjuvant breast XRT is performed in approximately 40% of patients requiring mastectomy and therefore has significant implications for post-mastectomy breast reconstruction.⁽⁷⁻¹⁰⁾ Implant-based breast reconstruction performed in the setting of postoperative XRT is associated with a significant increase in complications, including dehiscence, capsular contracture, infection, and even reconstruction failure, as well as the risk of unfavourable cosmesis.^(7, 11, 12) In the long term, greater resistance to expansion, pain, capsular contracture, thinning of the skin, and visibility of the prosthesis were observed.^(13, 14)

Postmastectomy XRT (PMRT) also results in an increased incidence of undesirable aesthetic and functional outcomes, including a tighter tissue envelope, higher position of the implant or expander on the chest wall, overlying skin lesions, poor skin flap quality, increased scarring, due to decreased quality and quantity of breast microvascular blood supply and skin flap fibrosis.^(9, 15, 16) These complications are inevitable, and the plastic surgeon does his best to prevent them during the first and second phases of reconstruction. The use of AFT has been used since 2002⁽¹⁷⁾ with a significant increase in the last 20 years.⁽¹⁸⁾ It is beneficial in patients undergoing (IBBR) with irradiated tissue,⁽¹⁹⁾ as it reduces the previously mentioned complications⁽²⁰⁾

AFT makes it possible to correct volume, contour defects, scars, and asymmetries after (IBBR) surgery for breast cancer, as well as to increase tissue thickness and enhance irradiated tissue to optimize the final result,⁽²⁰⁾ Over time, the technique has been perfected⁽²¹⁾ and numerous studies have been published demonstrating its safety⁽²²⁾

As a surgical technique, the procedure offers minimal donor site morbidity, ease of reproducibility, and long-term patient satisfaction of up to 80%.⁽²³⁾ Potential complications of the technique include: Fat necrosis, oil cyst formation, accumulation of liquefied necrotic fat, cellulitis, and abscess,

which are very rare at 8% to 12% in the literature.^(13, 24)

In 2007, Rigotti et al demonstrated significant improvement in skin and soft tissue healing after transplantation of liposuction fluid in reconstructions tissues with fibrosis due to irradiation. These investigators postulated that fat-derived cells have proangiogenic capabilities that promote tissue regeneration.⁽¹⁷⁾

PATIENT AND METHODS

This is a prospective comparative study. Twenty patients admitted to the surgical oncology and plastic and reconstructive surgery units between April 2021 and September 2022 were recruited for the study. These 20 patients were divided using the closed envelope technique into two groups. Group (A) consisted of 10 patients who underwent autologous fat transfer (AFT) during the first stage of implant-based breast reconstruction (IBBR) and then received postmastectomy radiation therapy (PMRT). Group (B) consisted of 10 patients who underwent the first phase of IBBR reconstruction without AFT and subsequently received PMRT.

Inclusion criteria:

1. Operable breast cancer eligible for mastectomy (skin-sparing, nipple-sparing, and skin-reducing mastectomy)
2. All patients who required postmastectomy radiation therapy (PMRT).

Exclusion criteria

1. Patients who didn't received postmastectomy radiation.

Patients were initially evaluated by a multidisciplinary team (breast surgeon, plastic surgeon, and medical oncologist), who confirmed the diagnosis of breast cancer and prescribed the treatment plan.

Procedure:

- Group (A)\ The mastectomy incision was marked on the skin using either skin-sparing, nipple-sparing, or skin-reducing techniques with or without a separate incision for axillary clearance. In addition, the donor area for the fat was marked and the mastectomy was performed. The donor area was infiltrated with tumescent solution (1 mg

epinephrine in 500 ml saline). An atraumatic 3 - 4 mm suction cannula was inserted through a 4-mm incision. With a 10-mL luer-lock syringe adapted to the cannula. The amount of fat aspirated was slightly greater than necessary to compensate for the loss during preparation.

Preparation of the fat

- The aspirated fat was processed in the syringes, washed, and placed in a rack for sedimentation. Sedimentation allows the formation of three layers in the syringe: oily upper layer, bloody lower layer with the infiltration solution. And a central layer containing purified fat. The central layer was transferred, and the others were discarded.

- Fat transfer was performed directly with a 1 - 3 mL syringe specially adapted to a 2 mm diameter cannula. Fat grafting was performed from a deep to a superficial level to realize a 3-dimensional pattern in the skin flap and increase its thickness. The amount of fat transplanted varied from patient to patient with a mean of 131.36 ± 11.85 ml of fat grafted per breast

- The tissue expander was inserted in the prepectoral plane and inflated with normal saline to achieve an acceptable size compared to the normal breast without stretching the suture line.

- Group (B): These patients underwent the same procedure as group (A) without (AFT)

-

- Patients in both groups received postoperative radiotherapy with a dose of 45-50 Gy in 15-25 fractions using 3 D conformal external beam radiotherapy.

- All patients were followed up at 15 days, 3 months, and 6 months. Photographs were taken at each consultation. Follow-up examinations were used to detect postoperative complications.

- Cosmetic outcome was evaluated by both independent reviewers and the patient herself using a 4-point Likert scale.

- Patients received (AFT) were subjected to two breast CT examinations to assess volume of fat, the baseline CT 1week after surgery and the second one after 3 months of surgery.

- CT examinations were performed with the Siemens Emotion 16 detector. The patients were lying in a prone position with the chin on the pillow and the abdomen on the lower leg pillow. This position allowed the breast to rest freely without wrinkling or compression. The following CT protocol constants were used as shown in **Table I**.

- After examination, all images were processed and reconstructed in multi-planner views. Volume calculations were performed using a freehand technique to estimate the volume of adipose tissue. Attenuation of mixed soft tissue was used (300 to -300).

- The percentage of fat retention is measured based on the calculation.

$$\frac{\text{Volume of breast on 2}^{\text{nd}} \text{ examination} - \text{volume of expander}}{\text{Volume of breast on 1}^{\text{st}} \text{ examination} - \text{volume of expander}} \times 100$$

Table I: Ct protocol

Slice thickness	1 mm
tube rotation	0.6
Collimation	0.6 mm
Pitch	1
Gap	no gap
Peak kilovoltage (PKV)	120
Milliampere (MA)	100-200
Scan field	Neck root-upper liver

Statistical analysis of the data:

Data were fed into the computer and analyzed using the software package IBM SPSS version 20.0 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp). Qualitative data were described with numbers and percentages. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to check the normality of the distribution. Quantitative data were described with mean \pm standard deviation. F-test (ANOVA) for normally distributed quantitative

variables. The significance of the obtained results was assessed at the 5% level.

Results

20 patients were divided into two groups. Group (A) consisted of 10 patients (one bilateral and 9 unilateral). Group (B) consisted of 10 patients (one bilateral and 9 unilateral), The average patient age in Group (A) was 39.40 ± 8.19 and in Group (B) 37.0 ± 5.16 . Patient characteristics and comorbidities are listed in **Table II**.

Table II: Demographics data

	Group A (n = 10)		Group B (n = 10)		p
	No.	%	No.	%	
Age (years)					
≤ 40	7	70.0	6	60.0	^{FE} p=1.000
> 40	3	30.0	4	40.0	
Min. – Max.	31.0 – 58.0		29.0 – 43.0		0.444
Mean \pm SD.	39.40 ± 8.19		37.0 ± 5.16		
BMI (kg/m ²)					
≤ 30	3	30.0	4	40.0	^{FE} p=1.000
> 30	7	70.0	6	60.0	
Min. – Max.	29.0 – 40.0		26.0 – 41.0		0.852
Mean \pm SD.	33.0 ± 2.98		32.70 ± 4.03		
Cup size					
C	8	80.0	7	70.0	^{MC} p=0.436
D	1	10.0	3	30.0	
D+	1	10.0	0	0.0	
DM	1	10.0	1	10.0	^{FE} p=1.000
Smoking	1	10.0	2	20.0	^{FE} p=1.000
Chemotherapy	9	90.0	8	80.0	^{FE} p=1.000

The types of oncologic resection are detailed in **Table III**. Average operative time in group (A) was 132.50 ± 17.68 min and in group (B) was 119.50 ± 8.32 .

Table III: Oncologic resection types

Type of mastectomy	Group A (n = 11)		Group B (n = 11)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Nipple sparing	0	0.0	3	27.3
Nipple sparing with skin reduction	5	45.5	0	0.0
Skin sparing	5	45.5	8	72.7
Skin sparing with skin reduction	1	9.1	0	0.0

Mean follow-up was 6 months (**Fig. 1**), Complication rates in group (A) versus group (B) were as follows: surgical-site infection, 0 percent versus 9.1 percent; Superficial mastectomy flap necrosis, 9.1 percent versus 18.2 percent; wound dehiscence, 0 percent versus 9.1 percent; minor capsular contracture

grade 1 2 , 36.4 percent versus 54.5 percent; major capsular contracture grade 3 4 0 percent versus 18.2 percent; Radiation dermatitis 9.1 percent versus 27.3 percent; no hematoma, Seroma, Full thickness mastectomy flap necrosis nor extrusion in both groups **Table IV.**



Fig 1: Skin sparing mastectomy on right side with injection of 150 ml of autologous fat and insertion of prepectoral 400 cc expander then PMRT & chemotherapy ((A)

Preoperative, (B) Early Post operative, (C) Immediate After radiotherapy, (D) 6 months after radiotherapy)

Table IV: Complication incidence

Complications	Group A (n = 11)		Group B (n = 11)		p
	No.	%	No.	%	
Hematoma	0	0.0	0	0.0	–
Seroma	0	0.0	0	0.0	–
Infection	0	0.0	1	9.1	
Wound dehiscence	0	0.0	1	9.1	
Skin-flap necrosis					
Superfascial flap necrosis	1	9.1	2	18.2	^{FE} p=1.000
Full thickness flap necrosis	0	0.0	0	0.0	–
Capsular contraction					
Minor grade 1 2	4	36.4	6	54.5	0.392
Major grade 3 4	0	0.0	2	18.2	^{FE} p=0.476
Expander removal	0	0.0	0	0.0	–
Radiation burn	3	27.3	4	36.4	^{FE} p=1.000
Radiation dermatitis	1	9.1	3	27.3	^{FE} p=0.586

In group (A) 9 (90%) patients were satisfied with breast shape (4 of them highly satisfied) while it was only 7 (70%) in group (B) (none of them highly satisfied) (Fig. 2). While

reviewers' opinion was good result about breast shape in 10 (100%) cases of group (A) (3 of them excellent result) while it was only 6 (60%) in group (B) (Fig. 3).




Fig 2: Comparison between the two studied groups according to patient satisfaction.






Fig 3: Comparison between the two studied groups according to reviewers’ opinion. The average amount of injected fat was 131.36 ± 11.85 ml ted per breast with average retention percent 74.82 ± 4.21 after 3 months from PMRT. (Fig. 4)



VOI	1
Volume [cm ³]	877.15
Height [cm]	16.55
Mean [HU]	-53.3
SD [HU]	93.9
L Threshold [HU]	---
U Threshold [HU]	---
L Eval Limit [HU]	-1000
U Eval Limit [HU]	1500



VOI	1
Volume [cm ³]	321.11
Height [cm]	9.35
Mean [HU]	1.8
SD [HU]	23.7
L Threshold [HU]	---
U Threshold [HU]	---
L Eval Limit [HU]	-1000
U Eval Limit [HU]	1500




Fig (4): A) Volume of the breast after 1 week from the operation before PXRT B) volume of the tissue expander C) Volume of the breast after 3months

Discussion

Treatment options for breast cancer continue to improve, and as such, there is growing emphasis on the quality of life of breast cancer survivors.⁽²⁵⁾ In the past decade, there has been a steady rise in the use of PMRT along with an increase in implant-based breast reconstruction.⁽²⁵⁾ Contrary to previous recommendations for delayed autologous reconstruction when radiotherapy is planned, advances in mastectomy, reconstruction, and radiation have led to an increasing number of patients opting for immediate implant-based reconstruction.⁽²⁶⁾

Postmastectomy radiation therapy (PMRT) has been shown to increase the risk of complications in prosthetic reconstruction and negatively impacts cosmetic outcomes, which is largely due to the microvascular damage and fibrosis of the breast soft-tissue envelope.^(10, 11)

This issue may have a number of partial remedies, according to reports. The main disadvantage of the Kronowitz and Robb⁽²⁷⁾ delayed-immediate breast Reconstruction is the use of autologous tissue (on a radiated area). By allowing PMRT on the permanent implant, the fast-track expander exchange approach put forward by Cordeiro et al.⁽¹⁴⁾ should reduce problems. However, there are still issues leading to extrusion, and time for expansion is frequently insufficient.

Some surgeons suggest RT first, then expander deflation and reinflation. Once more, research has shown that this is harmful to the cutaneous blood supply.⁽²⁸⁾ In the context of PMRT, the use of acellular dermal membranes has also been suggested as a way to lessen difficulties with prosthetic reconstructions⁽²⁹⁾. The main focus of the activity, however, is capsular contracture rather than tissue thinning and ulceration. Additionally, a number of studies show significant incidence of postoperative seromas, which eventually result in infection and higher expenditures.⁽³⁰⁾

Autologous fat transfer (AFT) offers a potential solution to prevent radiation complication. Far from inert, fat has regenerative potential, which is thought to be a function of its adipose stem cells.⁽³¹⁾ The AFT's regenerative potential has been found to promote angiogenesis and peripheral nerve regeneration and enhance dermal thickness and elasticity.⁽³¹⁾ Critically, fat grafting has also shown promise in reversing radiation-associated dermal fibrosis and improving pain and breast sensation when used to treat capsular contraction.⁽³²⁾

The findings of our investigation indicate clinical differences in the occurrence of complications in patients with IBBR receiving radiation whether or not AFT is used. The validity of these findings will need to be confirmed by other studies including larger number patients.

Abbreviations:

IBBR: Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction,
XRT: radiation therapy, PMRT:
Postmastectomy Radiotherapy, AFT:
Autologous Fat Transfer.

CONCLUSION

Radiation-induced tissue damage is a challenge for the reconstructive surgeon, especially in the setting of IBBR. There is increasing evidence that fat grafting has beneficial effects on radiated tissue.

Based on the available evidence, AFT is a powerful tool that offers a simple technique, with low donor site morbidity and very few complications.

Our study demonstrated encouraging results when AFT was used for reduction of radiation complication in IBBR, expanding the choices for IBBR to a lot of cases that need PMRT. Such approach is an accepted surgical approach from the oncologic and cosmetic aspects for women having immediate breast reconstruction.

Additional follow-up and a larger number of patients are required to assess the long-term benefits and complications.

Also, according to our study Fat survival after radiation did not differ from survival in non-radiated breast.

REFERENCES

1. **Saldanha IJ, Broyles JM, Adam GP, et al.** Implant-based Breast Reconstruction after Mastectomy for Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery Global open.* 2022;10(3):e4179.
2. **Thuman JM, Worbowtiz N, Jain A, et al.** Impact of Radiation on Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction in Prepectoral Versus Submuscular Planes. *Annals of plastic surgery.* 2021;86(6S Suppl 5):S560-S6.
3. **Pusic AL, Cordeiro PG.** Breast reconstruction with tissue expanders and implants: a practical guide to immediate and delayed reconstruction. *Seminars in plastic surgery.* 2004;18(2):71-7.
4. **Anker CJ, Hymas RV, Ahluwalia R, et al.** The Effect of Radiation on Complication Rates and Patient Satisfaction in Breast Reconstruction using Temporary Tissue

Expanders and Permanent Implants. *The breast journal.* 2015;21(3):233-40.

5. **Lam TC, Borotkanics R, Hsieh F, et al.** Immediate Two-Stage Prosthetic Breast Reconstruction Failure: Radiation Is Not the Only Culprit. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery.* 2018;141(6):1315-24.

6. **Gieni M, Avram R, Dickson L, et al.** Local breast cancer recurrence after mastectomy and immediate breast reconstruction for invasive cancer: a meta-analysis. *Breast.* 2012;21(3):230-6.

7. **Sbitany H, Gomez-Sanchez C, Piper M, Lentz R.** Prepectoral Breast Reconstruction in the Setting of Postmastectomy Radiation Therapy: An Assessment of Clinical Outcomes and Benefits. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery.* 2019;143(1):10-20.

8. **Newman MI, Hanabergh E, Samson MC.** AlloDerm performance in the setting of prosthetic breast surgery, infection, and irradiation. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery.* 2010;126(3):1120.

9. **Sbitany H, Serletti JM.** Acellular dermis-assisted prosthetic breast reconstruction: a systematic and critical review of efficacy and associated morbidity. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery.* 2011;128(6):1162-9.

10. **Nelson JA, Disa JJ.** Breast Reconstruction and Radiation Therapy: An Update. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery.* 2017;140(5S Advances in Breast Reconstruction):60S-8S.

11. **Momoh AO, Ahmed R, Kelley BP, et al.** A systematic review of complications of implant-based breast reconstruction with preconstruction and postreconstruction radiotherapy. *Annals of surgical oncology.* 2014;21(1):118-24.

12. **Graziano FD, Shay PL, Sanati-Mehrizy P, Sbitany H.** Prepectoral implant reconstruction in the setting of post-mastectomy radiation. *Gland surgery.* 2021;10(1):411-6.

13. **Turner A, Abu-Ghname A, Davis MJ, Winocour SJ, Hanson SE, Chu CK.** Fat Grafting in Breast Reconstruction. *Seminars in plastic surgery.* 2020;34(1):17-23.

14. **Cordeiro PG, Pusic AL, Disa JJ, et al.** Irradiation after immediate tissue expander/implant breast reconstruction: outcomes, complications, aesthetic results, and

satisfaction among 156 patients. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2004;113(3):877-81.

15. Carlson GW. Should we be doing implant-based breast reconstruction in the setting of radiotherapy? Annals of surgical oncology. 2014;21(7):2122-3.

16. Carlson GW. Discussion: postmastectomy radiation therapy after immediate two-stage tissue expander/implant breast reconstruction: a university of british columbia perspective. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2014;134(1):11e-2e.

17. Rigotti G, Marchi A, Galiè M, et al. Clinical treatment of radiotherapy tissue damage by lipoaspirate transplant: a healing process mediated by adipose-derived adult stem cells. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2007;119(5):1409-22.

18. Simonacci F, Bertozzi N, Grieco MP, et al. Autologous fat transplantation for breast reconstruction: A literature review. Annals of medicine and surgery (2012). 2016;12:94-100.

19. Salgarello M, Visconti G, Farallo E. Autologous fat graft in radiated tissue prior to alloplastic reconstruction of the breast: report of two cases. Aesthetic plastic surgery. 2010;34(1):5-10.

20. Shauly O, Gould DJ, Ghavami A. Fat Grafting: Basic Science, Techniques, and Patient Management. Plastic and reconstructive surgery Global open. 2022;10(3):e3987.

21. Gir P, Brown SA, Oni G, et al. Fat grafting: evidence-based review on autologous fat harvesting, processing, reinjection, and storage. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2012;130(1):249-58.

22. Fitoussi A, Razzouk K, Ahsan MD, et al. Autologous Fat Grafting as a Stand-alone Method for Immediate Breast Reconstruction After Radical Mastectomy in a Series of 15 Patients. Annals of plastic surgery. 2022;88(1):25-31.

23. Chan CW, McCulley SJ, Macmillan RD. Autologous fat transfer--a review of the literature with a focus on breast cancer surgery. Journal of plastic, reconstructive & aesthetic surgery : JPRAS. 2008;61(12):1438-48.

24. Komorowska-Timek E, Turfe Z, Davis AT. Outcomes of Prosthetic Reconstruction of Irradiated and Nonirradiated Breasts with Fat Grafting. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2017;139(1):1e-9e.

25. Martin S, Cai L, Beniwal A, et al. Autologous Fat Grafting and the Occurrence of Radiation-Induced Capsular Contracture. Annals of plastic surgery. 2021;86(5S Suppl 3):S414-s7.

26. Razdan SN, Cordeiro PG, Albornoz CR, et al. National Breast Reconstruction Utilization in the Setting of Postmastectomy Radiotherapy. Journal of reconstructive microsurgery. 2017;33(5):312-7.

27. Kronowitz SJ, Robb GL. Radiation therapy and breast reconstruction: a critical review of the literature. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2009;124(2):395-408.

28. Celet Ozden B, Guven E, Aslay I, et al. Does partial expander deflation exacerbate the adverse effects of radiotherapy in two-stage breast reconstruction? World journal of surgical oncology. 2012;10:44.

29. Basu CB, Jeffers L. The role of acellular dermal matrices in capsular contracture: a review of the evidence. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2012;130(5 Suppl 2):118s-24s.

30. Butterfield JL. 440 Consecutive immediate, implant-based, single-surgeon breast reconstructions in 281 patients: a comparison of early outcomes and costs between SurgiMend fetal bovine and AlloDerm human cadaveric acellular dermal matrices. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2013;131(5):940-51.

31. Khouri RK, Jr., Khouri RK. Current Clinical Applications of Fat Grafting. Plastic and reconstructive surgery. 2017;140(3):466e-86e.

32. Papadopoulos S, Vidovic G, Neid M, Abdallah A. Using Fat Grafting to Treat Breast Implant Capsular Contracture. Plastic and reconstructive surgery Global open. 2018;6(11):e1969.