

**Breast Reconstruction:
update searches and screening
for
Universitätsklinikum Schleswig-Holstein/Campus Kiel**



Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd

November 2021

Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd
Unit 6, Escrick Business Park
Riccall Road
Escrick
York
YO19 6FD
United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 (0)1904 727980
Fax: +44 (0)1904 720429
Email: robert@systematic-reviews.com
Website: www.systematic-reviews.com

Pawel Posadzki
Adrian Hernandez
Steven Duffy
Jos Kleijnen
Robert Wolff

1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

A key aim of the research project “Making SDM a reality” is to inform patients as part of shared decision making (SDM).

Kleijnen Systematic Reviews (KSR) Ltd has prepared an evidence report with a synthesis of the evidence of pre- vs. subpectoral breast reconstruction after mastectomy.

2. METHODS

LITERATURE SEARCHES

Literature searches were conducted to identify systematic reviews and evidence-based guidelines about breast reconstruction after mastectomy to update the 2019 evidence report.

The search strategies were developed specifically for each database and the keywords adapted according to the configuration of each database. Searches were limited by date range to update earlier searches: 2019-2021. Searches were not limited by language or publication status.

SEARCH SOURCES

Systematic reviews and guidelines

The following systematic review and health technology assessment specific databases were searched:

- Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) (Wiley): issue 9 of 12, September 2021
- KSR Evidence (Internet) (<https://ksrevidence.com/>): 2019-2021
- Epistemonikos (Internet) (<https://www.epistemonikos.org/>): 2019-2021
- International HTA Database (INAHTA) (<https://database.inahta.org/>): 2019-2021

The following guidelines resources were searched:

- Guidelines International Network (GIN) (Internet) (<https://www.g-i-n.net/home>): 2019-2021
- NICE Evidence (Internet) (www.evidence.nhs.uk/): 2019-2021
- NICE Guidance (Internet) (<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance>): 2019-2021
- ECRI Guidelines Trust (Internet) (<https://guidelines.ecri.org/>): 2019-2021
- Trip Database (<https://www.tripdatabase.com/>): 2019-2021
- Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) (www.cadth.ca): 2019-2021

Full details of all search strategies are presented in Appendix 1.

Handling of citations

References identified from the searches were downloaded into EndNote bibliographic management software for further assessment and handling.

Supplementary searches

The bibliographies of included studies and review articles were also checked for additional relevant articles.

Prioritisation

During formal screening of titles and abstracts, studies were subject to a prioritisation process whereby the recency e.g., to most up-to-date clinical practice guidelines (CPG), methodological quality e.g., Cochrane systematic review (CSR), quality of the analyses per outcome (e.g., ratio of RCTs to observational studies), the number of included RCTs, the breadth of the timepoints reported etc. were considered to further prioritise which studies would be used to inform analyses. Studies were categorised into the following three categories: '1' = German, American, European or similar CPG; '2' = CSR or similar quality SR; '3' = potentially lower/other quality SR.

3. RESULTS

The original EBSCO searches were conducted on September 16, 2019; and of the 20 references screened, 11 studies were deemed eligible. In the current update, a total of 560 records were retrieved from the electronic literature searches (see Appendix 1). After the removal of duplicate records 323 titles and abstracts were screened by two reviewers. Twelve records were found to be potentially eligible and were longlisted after a consensus. Of those, four were short-listed and included in the analyses (Table 1).¹⁻⁴ See also Table 2 for an overview of primary studies included in the identified SRs/CPGs.

UPDATE – Concluding Assessment by SHARE-TO-CARE Evidence Team (28/04/22)

On the basis of the update searches conducted by KSR Ltd in September 2021, we want to highlight the following aspects: While the majority of works corroborate the gist of the present decision aid (e.g., Li et al., 2020; Abbate et al., 2020; Vidya et al., 2019), uncertainty persists as to whether one of the two reconstruction approaches is associated with less pain after surgery (Saldanha et al., 2021; Li et al., 2020). Due to the inconsistent results, we will adjust the respective parts of the current version of the decision aid (suggesting favourable pain outcomes for the prepectoral reconstruction method) accordingly.

Conclusion regarding the evidence report: The former evidence report (September 12, 2019) remains valid but will be supplemented with this update report and its results regarding pain outcomes after surgery.

Table 1 Evidence sources

Study/year	Evidence type	Primary studies	Number of studies	Intervention(s)	Comparator(s)	Outcome(s)	Date searched	Conclusions
Saldanha 2021 ¹	SR	RCTs, non-RCT, OS	160	Implant-based reconstruction	Autologous reconstruction	Multiple	March 23, 2021	"Due to sparse evidence, the only conclusion that is feasible regarding any comparison of anatomic planes is that prepectoral and total submuscular placement of implants may be associated with comparable risks of infections that are not explicitly implant-related. No conclusions regarding clinical outcomes are feasible."
Li 2020 ²	SR	RCT, OS	15	Pre-pectoral Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction	Subpectoral Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction	Overall complication; capsular contracture; conversion; animation necrosis; visibility; implant loss; pain; quality of life	December 31, 2018	"The pre-pectoral implant-based breast reconstruction is a good alternative to subpectoral implant-based breast reconstruction for a certain group of patients, eliminating animation deformity without increasing complications."
Abbate 2020 ³	SR	RCT, OS	13	Pre-pectoral Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction	Subpectoral Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction	Complications; quality of life	January 2020	"This analysis demonstrated favourable risk profile in pre-pectoral reconstruction and comparable rates of complications among both pre-pectoral and subpectoral patients."
Vidya 2019 ⁴	CPG	N/M	23	Pre-pectoral	Subpectoral	Complications	N/M	"Prepectoral or muscle-sparing

Study/year	Evidence type	Primary studies	Number of studies	Intervention(s)	Comparator(s)	Outcome(s)	Date searched	Conclusions
				Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction	Implant-Based Breast Reconstruction			implant-based breast reconstruction provides a safe and effective alternative to traditional invasive methods of breast reconstruction. It is simple and it avoids problems related to animation and shoulder dysfunction while preserving natural anatomy. However, rippling is an adverse effect associated with this technique, and patients should be informed. The technique appears to add a new dimension to implant-based breast reconstruction"
CGP = clinical practice guideline; N/M = not mentioned; OS = observational study; RCT = randomised controlled trial; SR = systematic review.								

Table 2 Overview of primary studies included in the identified SRs/CPGs

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
Saldanha 2021 ^{1*}	RCTs, non-RCT, OS	1. BrandbergY, MalmM, BlomqvistL. A prospective and randomized study, "SVEA," comparing effects of three methods for delayed breast reconstruction on quality of life, patient-defined problem areas of life, and cosmetic result. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg.</i> 2000Jan;105(1):66–74 2. BrorsonF, ThorarinssonA, KölbyL, et al. Early complications in delayed breast reconstruction: A prospective, randomized study comparing different reconstructive methods in radiated and non-radiated patients. <i>Eur J Surg Oncol.</i> 2020Dec;46(12):2208–17 3. McCarthyCM, LeeCN, HalvorsonEG, et al. The use of acellular dermal matrices in two-stage expander/implant reconstruction: a multicenter, blinded, randomized controlled trial. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg.</i> 2012Nov;130(5 Suppl 2):57s–66s

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		4. RindomMB, GunnarssonGL, LautrupMD, et al. Shoulder-related donor site morbidity after delayed breast reconstruction with pedicled flaps from the back: An open label randomized controlled clinical trial. <i>J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.</i> 2019Dec;72(12):1942–9 5. TallrothL, VelanderP, KlassonS. A short-term comparison of expander prosthesis and DIEP flap in breast reconstructions: A prospective randomized study. <i>J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.</i> 2020Nov12 6. CohenWA, BallardTN, HamillJB, et al. Understanding and Optimizing the Patient Experience in Breast Reconstruction. <i>Ann Plast Surg.</i> 2016Aug;77(2):237–41. 7. CollierW, Scheefer Van BoerumM, KimJ, et al. Are 30-Day Outcomes Enough? Late Infectious Readmissions following Prosthetic-Based Breast Reconstruction. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg.</i> 2019Sep;144(3):360e–8e 8. LeeKT, BaeJ, JeonBJ, et al. Adjuvant Chemotherapy in Two-Stage Tissue Expander/Implant Breast Reconstruction: Does it Affect Final Outcomes? <i>Ann Surg Oncol.</i> 2021Apr;28(4):2191–8
Li 2020 ²	RCT, OS	1. Chandarana M, Jafferbhoy S, Marla S, et al. Acellular dermal matrix in implant-based immediate breast reconstructions: a comparison of prepectoral and subpectoral approach. <i>Gland Surg.</i> 2018;7:S64–S69. 2. Casella D, Bernini M, Bencini L, et al. TiLoop® Bra mesh used for immediate breast reconstruction: comparison of retropectoral and subcutaneous implant placement in a prospective single-institution series. <i>Eur J Plast Surg.</i> 2014;37: 599–604. 3. Sinnott CJ, Persing SM, Pronovost M, et al. Impact of postmastectomy radiation therapy in prepectoral versus subpectoral implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>Ann Surg Oncol.</i> 2018;25:2899–2908. 4. Walia GS, Aston J, Bello R, et al. Prepectoral versus subpectoral tissue expander placement: a clinical and quality of life outcomes study. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open.</i> 2018;6:e1731. 5. Baker BG, Irri R, MacCallum V, et al. A prospective comparison of short-term outcomes of subpectoral and prepectoral strattice-based immediate breast reconstruction. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg.</i> 2018;141:1077–1084. 6. Nahabedian MY, Cocilovo C. Two-stage prosthetic breast reconstruction: a comparison between prepectoral and partial subpectoral techniques. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg.</i> 2017;140:22S–30S. 7. Bernini M, Calabrese C, Cecconi L, et al. Subcutaneous direct-to-implant breast reconstruction: surgical, functional, and aesthetic results after long-term followup. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open.</i> 2016;3:e574. 8. Sbitany H, Piper M, Lentz R. Prepectoral breast reconstruction: a safe alternative to submuscular prosthetic reconstruction following nipple sparing mastectomy. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg.</i> 2017;140:432–443. 9. Fairchild B, Ellsworth W, Selber JC, et al. Safety and efficacy of smooth surface tissue expander breast reconstruction. <i>Aesthet Surg J.</i> 2018.

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		10. Cattelani L, Polotto S, Arcuri MF, et al. One-Step Prepectoral breast reconstruction with dermal matrix recovered implant compared to submuscular implantation: functional and cost evaluation. <i>Clin Breast Cancer</i>. 2018;18:e703–e711. 11. Schnarrs RH, Carman CM, Tobin C, et al. Complication rates with human acellular dermal matrices: retrospective review of 211 consecutive breast reconstructions. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i>. 2016;4:e118. 12. McCarthy CM, Lee CN, Halvorson EG, et al. The use of acellular dermal matrices in two-stage expander/implant reconstruction: a multicenter, blinded, randomized controlled trial. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i>. 2012;130:57S–66S. 13. Zhu L, Mohan AT, Abdelsattar JM, et al. Comparison of subcutaneous versus submuscular expander placement in the first stage of immediate breast reconstruction. <i>J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg</i>. 2016;69:e77–e86. 14. Maruccia M, Mazzocchi M, Dessy LA, et al. One-stage breast reconstruction techniques in elderly patients to preserve quality of life. <i>Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci</i>. 2016;20:5058–5066. 15. Bettinger LN, Waters LM, Reese SW, et al. Comparative study of prepectoral and subpectoral expander-based breast reconstruction and Clavien IIIb score outcomes. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i>. 2017;5:e1433.
Abbate 2020 ³	RCT, OS	1. Chandarana M, Jafferbhoy S, Marla S, et al. Acellular dermal matrix in implant-based immediate breast reconstructions: a comparison of prepectoral and subpectoral approach. <i>Gland Surg</i>. 2018;7:S64–S69. 2. Casella D, Bernini M, Bencini L, et al. TiLoop® Bra mesh used for immediate breast reconstruction: comparison of retropectoral and subcutaneous implant placement in a prospective single-institution series. <i>Eur J Plast Surg</i>. 2014;37: 599–604. 3. Sinnott CJ, Persing SM, Pronovost M, et al. Impact of postmastectomy radiation therapy in prepectoral versus subpectoral implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>Ann Surg Oncol</i>. 2018;25:2899–2908. 4. Nahabedian MY, Cocilovo C. Two-stage prosthetic breast reconstruction: a comparison between prepectoral and partial subpectoral techniques. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i>. 2017;140:22S–30S. 5. Sbitany H, Piper M, Lentz R. Prepectoral breast reconstruction: a safe alternative to submuscular prosthetic reconstruction following nipple sparing mastectomy. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i>. 2017;140:432–443. 6. Schnarrs RH, Carman CM, Tobin C, et al. Complication rates with human acellular dermal matrices: retrospective review of 211 consecutive breast reconstructions. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i>. 2016;4:e118. 7. Zhu L, Mohan AT, Abdelsattar JM, et al. Comparison of subcutaneous versus submuscular expander placement in the first stage of immediate breast reconstruction. <i>J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg</i>. 2016;69:e77–e86. 8. Bettinger LN, Waters LM, Reese SW, et al. Comparative study of prepectoral and subpectoral expander-based breast reconstruction and Clavien IIIb score outcomes. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i>. 2017;5:e1433.

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		9. Banuelos J, Abu-Ghname A, Vyas K, Sharaf B, Nguyen MT, Harless C, Manrique OJ, Martinez-Jorge J, Tran NV (2019) Should obesity be considered a contraindication for prepectoral breast reconstruction? <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 145:619–627 10. Copeland-Halperin LR, Yemc L, Emery E, Collins D, Liu C, Mesbahi AN, Venturi ML (2019) Evaluating postoperative narcotic use in prepectoral versus dual-plane breast reconstruction following mastectomy. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i> 7(2):e2082 11. Manrique OJ, Banuelos J, Abu-Ghname A, Nguyen MD, Tran NV, Martinez-Jorge J, Harless C, Sharaf B, Jakub JW, Degnim AC et al (2019) Surgical outcomes of prepectoral versus subpectoral ibbr in young women. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i> 7(3):e2119 12. Manrique OJ, Kapoor T, Banuelos J, Jacobson SR, Martinez-Jorge J, Nguyen MT, Tran NV, Harless CA, Degnim AC, Jakub JW (2019) Single-stage direct-to-implant breast reconstruction: a comparison between subpectoral versus prepectoral implant placement. <i>Ann Plast Surg</i>. 2019; 7: 4S: 56-57 13. Mirhaidari SJ, Azouz V, Wagner DS (2019) Prepectoral versus subpectoral direct to implant immediate breast reconstruction. <i>Ann Plast Surg</i> 84:263–270 14. Nealon KP, Weitzman RE, Sobti N, Jimenez RB, Ehrlichman R, Faulkner HR, Gadd M, Specht M, Austen WG, Liao EC (2020) Prepectoral direct-to-implant breast reconstruction: safety outcome endpoints and delineation of risk factors. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 145:898e–908e 15. Wormer BA, Valmadrid AC, Ganesh Kumar N, Al Kassis S, Rankin TM, Kaoutzanis C, Higdon KK (2019) Reducing expansion visits in immediate IBBR: a comparative study of prepectoral and subpectoral expander placement. <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 144(2):276–286
Vidya 2019 ⁴	N/M	1. Jeevan R, Cromwell D, and Browne J, et al (2009) The national mastectomy and breast reconstruction audit. A national audit of provision and outcomes of mastectomy and breast reconstruction surgery for women in England Second Annu Rep 2. American Society of Plastic Surgeons Plastic surgery statistics report 2015 [https://www.plasticsurgery.org/news/plastic-surgery-statistics] 3. Ho G, Nguyen TJ, and Shahabi A, et al (2012) A systematic review and meta-analysis of complications associated with acellular dermal matrix-assisted breast reconstruction <i>Ann Plast Surg</i> 68(4) 346–56 4. Vidya R and Iqbal FM (2017) Breast anatomy: time to classify the subpectoral and prepectoral spaces <i>Clin Anat</i> 30(4) 434–435 5. Becker H, Lind JG, and Elizabeth GHII (2015) Immediate implant-based prepectoral breast reconstruction using a vertical incision <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i>.

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		6. Rancati AO, Angrigiani CH, and Hammond DC, et al (2017) Direct to implant reconstruction in nipple sparing mastectomy: patient selection by preoperative digital mammogram <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i> 5(6) e1369 7. Frey JD, Salibian AA, and Choi M, et al (2017) Mastectomy flap thickness and complications in nipple-sparing mastectomy: objective evaluation using magnetic resonance imaging <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i> 5 e1439 8. Berna G, Cawthorn SJ, and Papaccio G, et al (2017) Evaluation of a novel breast reconstruction technique using the Braxon® acellular dermal matrix: a new muscle-sparing breast reconstruction <i>ANZ J Surg</i> 87(6) 493–498 9. Reitsamer R and Peintinger F (2015) Prepectoral implant placement and complete coverage with porcine acellular dermal matrix: a new technique for direct-to-implant breast reconstruction after nipple-sparing mastectomy <i>J Plast Reconstr Aesthetic Surg</i> 68(2) 162–167 10. Cheng A, Lakhiani C, and Saint-Cyr M (2013) Treatment of capsular contracture using complete implant coverage by acellular dermal matrix: a novel technique <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 132(3) 519–529 11. Schmitz M, Bertram M, and Kneser U, et al (2013) Experimental total wrapping of breast implants with acellular dermal matrix: a preventive tool against capsular contracture in breast surgery? <i>J Plast Reconstr Aesthetic Surg</i> 66(10) 1382–1389 12. Caputo GG, Marchetti A, and Dalla Pozza E, et al (2016) Skin-reduction breast reconstructions with prepectoral implant <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 137(6) 1702–1705 13. Thuman J, Freitas AM, and Schaeffer, C, et al (2019) Prepectoral wise-pattern staged implant-based breast reconstruction for obese or ptotic patients <i>Ann Plast Surg</i> (epub ahead of print) 14. Vidya R and Iqbal FM (2017) A guide to prepectoral breast reconstruction: a new dimension to implant-based breast reconstruction <i>Clin Breast Cancer</i> 17(4) 266–271 15. Casella D, Calabrese C, and Bianchi S, et al (2015) Subcutaneous tissue expander placement with synthetic titanium-coated mesh in breast reconstruction: long-term results <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i>. Wolters Kluwer Health 3(12) 16. Michelotti BF, Brooke S, and Mesa J, et al (2013) Analysis of clinically significant seroma formation in breast reconstruction using acellular dermal grafts <i>Ann Plast Surg</i> 71(3) 274–277 17. Vidya R (2017) Prepectoral breast reconstruction or muscle-sparing technique with the braxon porcine acellular dermal matrix <i>Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open</i> 5(6) e1364 18. Sbitany H, Piper M, and Lentz R (2017) Prepectoral breast reconstruction: a safe alternative to submuscular prosthetic reconstruction following nipple-sparing mastectomy <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 140(3) 432–443 19. Sbitany H and Serletti JM (2011) Acellular dermis–assisted prosthetic breast reconstruction: a systematic and critical review of efficacy and associated morbidity <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 128(6) 1162–1169

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		20. Sbitany H, Clara GS, and Piper M, et al (2019) Prepectoral breast reconstruction in the setting of postmastectomy radiation therapy an assessment of clinical outcomes and benefits <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 143(1) 10–20 21. Seth AK, Hirsch EM, and Fine NA, et al (2012) Utility of acellular dermis-assisted breast reconstruction in the setting of radiation: a comparative analysis <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 130 750–758 22. Cheng A, Lakhiani C, and Saint-Cyr M (2013) Treatment of capsular contracture using complete implant coverage by acellular dermal matrix: a novel technique <i>Plast Reconstr Surg</i> 132 519–529 23. Tasoulis M-K, Iqbal FM, and Cawthorn S, et al (2017) Subcutaneous implant breast reconstruction: Time to reconsider? <i>Eur J Surg Oncol</i> 43(9) 1646–1643
CGP = clinical practice guideline; N/M = not mentioned; OS = observational study; RCT = randomised controlled trial; SR = systematic review. * = only RCTs were extracted		

REFERENCES

- [1] Saldanha IJ, Cao W, Broyles JM, Adam GP, Bhuma MR, Mehta S, et al. Breast reconstruction after mastectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US), 2021 [accessed 20.9.21] Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK572812/>
- [2] Li Y, Xu G, Yu N, Huang J, Long X. Prepectoral versus subpectoral implant-based breast reconstruction: a meta-analysis. *Ann Plast Surg* 2020;85(4):437-47.
- [3] Abbate O, Rosado N, Sobti N, Vieira BL, Liao EC. Meta-analysis of prepectoral implant-based breast reconstruction: guide to patient selection and current outcomes. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2020;182(3):543-54.
- [4] Vidya R, Berna G, Sbitany H, Nahabedian M, Becker H, Reitsamer R, et al. Prepectoral implant-based breast reconstruction: a joint consensus guide from UK, European and USA breast and plastic reconstructive surgeons. *Ecancermedicalscience* 2019;13:927.

APPENDIX 1: SEARCH STRATEGIES

Shared Decision Making: Breast reconstruction update (EBSCO)

Systematic reviews and guidelines

Table 3. Systematic reviews and guideline search results

Database	Dates	Results
CDSR	2019 - Issue 9, September 2021	3
KSR Evidence	2019-2021	173
Epistemonikos	2019-2021	210
INAHTA	2019-2021	2
NICE Evidence	01/01/2019 - 20/09/2021	12
NICE Guidance	2019-2021	1
GIN	2019-2021	0
ECRI	2019-2021	5
Trip	2019-2021	154
CADTH	2019-2021	0
Total		560
Total after de-duplication		323

Search strategies

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) (Wiley): Issue 9 of 12, September 2021
Searched: 20.9.21

- #1 MeSH descriptor: [Mammaplasty] explode all trees 338
- #2 MeSH descriptor: [Tissue Expansion Devices] explode all trees 30
- #3 MeSH descriptor: [Prostheses and Implants] explode all trees 17936
- #4 MeSH descriptor: [Reconstructive Surgical Procedures] explode all trees 9051
- #5 MeSH descriptor: [Surgery, Plastic] explode all trees 120
- #6 #3 or #4 or #5 25383
- #7 MeSH descriptor: [Breast] explode all trees 790
- #8 #6 and #7 75
- #9 MeSH descriptor: [Breast Implants] explode all trees 66
- #10 MeSH descriptor: [Mastectomy] explode all trees 1676
- #11 #9 and #10 17
- #12 (breast* near/3 reconstruct*):ti,ab,kw 771
- #13 (mammaplast* or mammoplast* or mastoplast*):ti,ab,kw 442
- #14 (breast* near/3 (plastic* or cosmetic*) near/3 (surgery or surgical or surgeries or operat*)):ti,ab,kw 50
- #15 ((breast* near/3 (implant* or prosth* or expander*)) AND (mastectom* or postmastectom* or post-mastectom*)):ti,ab,kw 164
- #16 #1 or #2 or #8 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 with Cochrane Library publication date Between Jan 2019 and Jan 2021, in Cochrane Reviews, Cochrane Protocols 3**

KSR Evidence (Internet): Database last updated 20 September 2021

Searched: 20.9.21

1 breast* near/3 reconstruct* in All text 270 results
2 mammaplast* or mammoplast* or mastoplast* in All text 94 results
3 (breast* near/3 (plastic* or cosmetic*) near/3 (surgery or surgical or surgeries or
operat*)) in All text 12 results
4 ((breast* near/3 (implant* or prosth* or expander*)) and (mastectom* or
postmastectom* or post-mastectom*)) in All text 50 results
5 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 in All text Date published: 2019 - 2021 173 results
Search run Mon Sep 20 2021

Epistemonikos (Internet): up to 20 September 2021

<https://www.epistemonikos.org/en/>

Searched: 20.9.21

(title:("breast reconstruction" OR "breast reconstruct" OR "breast reconstructive" OR
"breast reconstructed" OR mammaplasty OR mammaplastys OR mammoplasty OR
mammaplostys OR mastoplasty OR mastoplastys) OR abstract:("breast reconstruction" OR
"breast reconstructive" OR "breast reconstructed" OR mammaplasty OR mammaplastys OR
mammoplasty OR mammaplostys OR mastoplasty OR mastoplastys))
Publication year: Custom year range: From 2019 To 2021; Publication Type: Systematic
Review

Records retrieved 173

(title:(breast* AND (plastic* OR cosmetic*) AND (surgery OR surgical OR surgeries OR
operat*)) OR abstract:(breast* AND (plastic* OR cosmetic*) AND (surgery OR surgical OR
surgeries OR operat*)))
Publication year: Custom year range: From 2019 To 2021; Publication Type: Systematic
Review

Records retrieved 65

(title:(breast* AND (implant* OR prosth* OR expander*) AND (mastectom* OR
postmastectom* OR post-mastectom*)) OR abstract:(breast* AND (implant* OR prosth*
OR expander*) AND (mastectom* OR postmastectom* OR post-mastectom*)))
Publication year: Custom year range: From 2019 To 2021; Publication Type: Systematic
Review

Records retrieved 33

Total retrieved 271

Total after removal of duplicates 210

International HTA Database (INAHTA): up to 20 September 2021

<https://database.inahta.org/>

Searched: 20.9.21

1 "Mammaplasty"[mh] 21

2 "breast reconstruction" OR mammaplasty* OR mammaplosty* OR mastoplasty* 21
 3 breast* AND (plastic* OR cosmetic*) AND (surgery OR surgical OR surgeries OR
 operat*) 21
 4 breast* AND (implant* OR prosthesis* OR expander*) AND (mastectomy* OR
 postmastectomy* OR post-mastectomy*) 13
 5 #1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 YEAR 2019 TO 2021 2

NICE Evidence Search (Internet): up to 20 September 2021

<https://www.evidence.nhs.uk/>

Searched: 20.9.21

Search terms	Results (Guidance): 01/01/2019-20/09/2021
"breast reconstruction"	10
mammaplasty	11
mammoplasty	11
mastoplasty	0
mastectomy	17
Total retrieved	49
Total (without duplicates)	20
Sifted for relevance	12

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE): Guidelines

<https://www.nice.org.uk/>

Searched: 20.9.21

NICE Guidance; Conditions and diseases; Cancer; Breast cancer 2019-2021

Guidance 0

Advice 0

Quality standards 0

Pathways 1

Total 1

Guidelines International Network (GIN). International Guidelines Library (Internet): up to 20 September 2021

<https://g-i-n.net/international-guidelines-library/>

Searched: 20.9.21

"breast reconstruction"

mammaplasty

mammoplasty

mastoplasty

mastectomy

2019-2021

0 records retrieved

ECRI Institute Guidelines Trust (Internet): up to 20 September 2021

<https://guidelines.ecri.org/>

Searched: 20.9.21

"breast reconstruction"

mammaplasty

mastoplasty

mastectomy

2019-2021

5 records retrieved

Trip Database: up to 20 September 2021

<https://www.tripdatabase.com/>

Searched: 20.9.21

"breast reconstruction" OR mammaplasty OR mammoplasty OR mastoplasty OR
mastectomy; in the Document; 2019, 2021

Guidelines: 61 records retrieved

"breast reconstruction" OR mammaplasty OR mammoplasty OR mastoplasty OR
mastectomy; in the Title; 2019, 2021

Systematic Reviews: 128 records retrieved

189 records retrieved

154 after removal of duplicates

Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH): up to 20 September 2021

<https://www.cadth.ca/>

Searched: 20.9.21

"breast reconstruction"

mammaplasty

mastoplasty

mastectomy

Advanced Search; Project Line; Health Technology Assessment; 2019-2021

0 records retrieved