



Prospective analysis of postoperative outcomes – immediate / delayed in patients undergoing Lichtenstein's open inguinal hernioplasty using Vypro® vs Prolene® mesh

Kaundinya Kiran Bharatam

General Surgery, Sri Ramachandra Medical College and Hospital, Chennai, India

Received for publication: September 15, 2015; Revised: September 22, 2015; Accepted: October 10, 2015

Abstract: As we advance towards improving inguinal hernia repair our goals remain to decrease the immediate post-operative complications like pain and seroma formation; and at the same time preventing long term complications like chronic groin pain and hernia recurrence. We present in our study comparison of outcomes in the immediate and late post-operative phase of 50 patients [25 - prolene® and 25 - vypro®] who underwent lichtenstein's inguinal hernia. Our results did encourage the lightweight mesh like vypro® in the immediate post-operative phase but did not give any major difference between the meshes in the long term complications or outcomes of hernia repair. Our observations were similar to other studies done comparing the various mesh used for hernia repair.

Key words: Vypro®; prolene®; inguinal hernia; open lichtenstein's repair; seroma; post-operative pain

INTRODUCTION

Inguinal hernias are one of the most commonly encountered general surgical problems. Their repairs have evolved from tension repairs to tension free repairs using appropriate mesh to reinforce the posterior wall of the inguinal canal. European hernia guidelines for open hernias emphasize grade a recommendation for synthetic non absorbable mesh or composite mesh with non-absorbable components. [1] Though most of the meshes used are optimal in the treatment of the hernias, the present trend is towards use of lighter mesh to decrease the rate of complications associated with the repair.

We present in the present article a prospective analysis of 50 cases in which 25 cases each underwent lichtenstein open inguinal hernioplasty using different meshes – prolene® and vypro®. We would like to highlight the efficacy of newer and lighter meshes like vypro in the open lichtenstein repair of inguinal hernias especially in the immediate postoperative period.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For the period of observation following patients were selected for hernioplasty:

- All patients having inguinal hernia – direct / indirect - unilateral / bilateral in all age groups
- Patients consenting for surgery – open lichtenstein hernioplasty

Following patients were not selected for the study:

- Complicated inguinal hernia
- Female inguinal hernia
- Patients who did not consent for open lichtenstein hernioplasty

The open inguinal hernioplasty included mesh repair using either of the two mesh:

1. Prolene® hernia mesh – ethicon® johnson and johnson division [purely polypropylene mesh]
2. Vypro® - ethicon® johnson and johnson division [mix of polygalactin and polypropylene mesh]

*Corresponding Author:

Dr. Kaundinya Kiran Bharatam,

Assistant Professor In General Surgery,
Sri Ramachandra Medical College And Hospital,
Chennai, India.

The selection of the patient and type of mesh to be used was in alternative fashion and random. There was no selection criterion for the type of mesh used and patients who requested for a particular type of mesh were excluded from the study to prevent bias.

RESULTS

Following were the observations seen in the patients groups:

- Total nos of cases – 50 [vypro® for 25 patients and prolene for 25 patients]
- Duration – 2012 to 2015
- Study – prospective analysis
- Center – single center and same team of surgeon, co-surgeon, and anesthetist
- Age of patients – all age groups
- Sex of patients – only males
- Period of follow-up – 1 year

The patients once diagnosed were asked to undergo anesthesia fitness evaluation prior to surgery. Once fit for surgery the procedure was performed under spinal anesthesia. The lichtenstein open inguinal hernioplasty was done in the routine fashion and strengthening of the posterior wall was fashioned using either vypro® or prolene® mesh and fixed using prolene 3-0 suture material.

The patients were given a prophylactic antibiotic preoperatively - ceftriaxone and postoperatively for 3 doses. They were advised to use appropriate undergarments allowing enough scrotal support and were ambulated as early as possible. Diet was initiated within 6 hours of surgery. The patients were discharged based on pain relief and after assessing for seroma formation, wound infection, and any other complications.

Following were the postoperative findings:

Complications	Vypro® mesh	Prolene® mesh
Postoperative pain score > 4	3	5
Seroma formation	0	3
Wound infection / gaping	0	0
Mesh rejection	0	0
Scrotal swelling / collection	0	1
Pain on discharge	0	0
Chronic groin pain	0	0
Foreign body sensation	0	0
Recurrence	0	0

Pain assessment was made postoperatively and during discharge using standard pain scale. Seroma formation, wound infection, mesh rejection, scrotal swelling, etc. were judged based on clinical examination of the surgical wound and operative site. Patient was asked to come for follow up after 7 days of discharge for suture removal and assessed for any local / scrotal swelling. He was assessed for chronic groin pain and any immediate recurrence of hernia during the 1 month, 6 month and 1 year follow up visit.

Our observations indicated that vypro® mesh had less immediate postoperative pain, seroma formation and foreign body sensation as compared to the prolene mesh used for the hernioplasty. We did not encounter any hernia recurrence or chronic groin pain in out patients.

Following parameters were performed of interest that compared the vypro® and prolene® mesh:

S.No.	Study	No. of Cases	Result
1	Goldenberg <i>a et al.</i> , / 2005	14 rabbits	Vypro had better fibrosis Both mesh had similar adhesions
2	Puccio <i>f et al.</i> , / 2005	45	Both mesh were similar for pain and discomfort
3	Bringman <i>s et al.</i> , / 2005	600	Results and complications seem to be similar
4	Gao <i>m et al.</i> , / 2010	2027	Results and complications seem to be similar
5	Peeters <i>e et al.</i> , / 2010	59	High incidence of poor sperm motility in prolene vs vypro
6	Hannu <i>paaajanen et al.</i> , / 2013	312	Results and complications seem to be similar

In our study, we sought to find a better mesh for the open inguinal hernioplasty and compared vypro® and prolene® in 25 cases each in a random fashion for approximate period of 3 years. Patients who received vypro® mesh had decreased tissue inflammation and reaction and thus decreased post-operative pain, seroma formation, etc. Patients who received prolene® had seroma formation in a few and more post-operative pain. Pain both immediate and delayed was mainly due to irritation of the inguinal nerves by sutures/mesh; inflammatory reactions against mesh or simply scar tissue. [15-19] The patients after 1 month, 6 months and 1 year had similar presentation with no complaints of chronic groin pain or recurrence of hernia.

We felt that lighter and mixed mesh material like the vypro® had better acceptance by the patient in the immediate post-operative phase of the surgery but mesh type and material did not affect the late post-operative period. Hernia recurrence and chronic groin pain was not seen in any mesh group. There was a definite liking towards

DISCUSSION

Vypro® consists of polypropylene and polyglactin multifilaments as contrast to prolene® which is polypropylene alone. The mesh mainly represent the lichtenstein open inguinal hernioplasty which is a tension free repair depending on the inflammatory foreign body reaction for the reinforcement of the posterior wall of inguinal canal. The inflammation leads to neovascularisation and connective / fat tissue ingrowth leading to fibrosis and entrapment of the surrounding structures along with marked dimunition of the abdominal wall movement. [2,7]

There lie a myriad of complications representing this response of the mesh like pain – immediate and chronic, nerve entrapment, vas entrapment, seroma formation, mesh rejection, wound infection, testicular atrophy along with hernia recurrence. [1,3,4,8-11]

Vypro, timesh, prolene, marlex, etc. are the various mesh types used for the surgery today. Though hernia recurrence and chronic groin pain rates equalled in most of the studies done to understand the efficacy of the meshes, immediate complications like seroma formation, improved abdominal movement, and decreased foreign body feeling, etc. were less in the lighter mesh like vypro® versus the standard prolene® mesh. [12-14].

the use of such lightweight / mixed mesh by the surgeon and patient as it made the surgery less painful and eventful than the prolene mesh. Ultimately a good mesh is one that has negligible foreign body reaction and no pathologic fibrosis. [20]

CONCLUSION

Vypro® mesh is better than prolene® mesh in the immediate post-operative complication rates in open inguinal hernioplasty. Long-term outcomes remain unaffected in our study. Long term and larger patient volume can be used to study the results of such mesh in prospective fashion and we encourage the same.

REFERENCES

1. Paaajanen H, Rönkä K, Laurema A. A single-surgeon randomized trial comparing three meshes in lichtenstein hernia repair: 2- and 5-year outcome of recurrences and chronic pain. *Int J Surg.* 2013; 11(1):81-4. doi: 10.1016/j.ijisu.2012.11.020.

2. Junge K1, Klinge U, Rosch R, Klosterhalfen B, Schumpelick V. Functional and morphologic properties of a modified mesh for inguinal hernia repair. *World J Surg.* 2002 Dec; 26(12):1472-80.
3. Peeters E1, Spiessens C, Oyen R, De Wever L, Vanderschueren D, Penninckx F, Miserez M. Laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair in men with lightweight meshes may significantly impair sperm motility: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Surg.* 2010 Aug;252(2):240-6.
4. Gao M1, Han J, Tian J, Yang K. Vypro II mesh for inguinal hernia repair: a meta analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Ann Surg.* 2010 May;251(5):838-42.
5. Bringman S1, Wollert S, Osterberg J, Smedberg S, Granlund H, Felländer G, Heikkinen T. One year results of a randomised controlled multi-centre study comparing Prolene and Vypro II-mesh in Lichtenstein hernioplasty. *Hernia.* 2005 Oct;9(3):223-7.
6. Puccio F1, Solazzo M, Marciano P. Comparison of three different mesh materials in tension-free inguinal hernia repair: prolene versus Vypro versus surgisis. *Int Surg.* 2005 Jul-Aug;90(3 Suppl):S21-3.
7. Goldenberg A1, Matone J, Marcondes W, Herbella FA, Farah JF. Comparative study of inflammatory response and adhesions formation after fixation of different meshes for inguinal hernia repair in rabbits. *Acta Cir Bras.* 2005 Sep-Oct;20(5):347-52.
8. Hakeem A, Shanmugam V. Inguinodynia following Lichtenstein tension-free hernia repair: a review. *World J Gastroenterol* 2011;14:1791e6.
9. Bay-Nielsen M, Perkins FM, Kehlet H. Pain and functional impairment 1 year after inguinal herniorrhaphy: a nationwide questionnaire study. *Ann Surg* 2001;233:1e7.
10. Poobalan AS, Bruce J, King PM. Chronic pain and quality of life following open inguinal hernia repair. *Br J Surg* 2001;88:1122e6.
11. Paajanen H, Scheinin T, Vironen J. Nationwide analysis of complications related to inguinal hernia surgery in Finland: a 5 year register study of 55,000 operations. *Am J Surg* 2010;199:746e51.
12. O'Dwyer PJ, Kingsnorth AN, Molloy RG, Small PK, Lammers B, Horeyseck G. Randomized clinical trial assessing impact of a lightweight or heavyweight mesh on chronic pain after inguinal hernia repair. *Br J Surg* 2005;92:166e70.
13. Nikkolo C, Lepner U, Murruste M, Vaasna T, Scepter H, Tikk T. Randomised clinical trial comparing lightweight mesh with heavyweight mesh for inguinal hernioplasty. *Hernia* 2010;14:253e8.
14. Post S, Weiss B, Willer M, Neufang T, Lorenz D. Randomized clinical trial of lightweight composite mesh for Lichtenstein inguinal hernia repair. *Br J Surg* 2004;91:44e8.
15. Heise CP, Starling JR. Mesh inguinodynia: a new clinical syndrome after inguinal herniorrhaphy? *J Am Coll Surg* 1998;187:514e8.
16. Di Vita G, Milano S, Frazzetta M. Tension-free hernia repair is associated with an increase in inflammatory response markers against the mesh. *Am J Surg* 2000;180:203e7.
17. Nahabedian MY, Dellon AL. Outcome of the operative management of nerve injuries in the ilioinguinal region. *J Am Coll Surg* 1997;184:265e8.
18. Morris-Stiff GJ, Hughes LE. The outcomes of nonabsorbable mesh placed within the abdominal cavity: literature review and clinical experience. *Am Coll Surg* 1998;186:352e67.
19. Grant A, EU Hernia Trialists Collaboration. Mesh compared with non-mesh methods of open groin hernia repair: systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Br J Surg* 2000;87:854e9.
20. Bringman S, Conze J, Cuccurullo D, et al. Hernia repair: the search for ideal meshes. *Hernia* 2010; 14:81e7.

CITE THIS ARTICLE AS:

Kaundinya Kiran Bharatam. Prospective analysis of postoperative outcomes – immediate / delayed in patients undergoing Lichtenstein's open inguinal hernioplasty using Vypro® vs Prolene® mesh. *International Journal of Bioassays* 4.11 (2015): 4451-4453.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None Declared