

Abdominal wound closure: current perspectives

Zachary F Williams
William W Hope

Department of Surgery, South East
Area Health Education Center, New
Hanover Regional Medical Center,
Wilmington, NC, USA

Abstract: This review examines both early and late wound complications following laparotomy closure, with particular emphasis on technical aspects that reduce hernia formation. Abdominal fascial closure is an area of considerable variation within the field of general surgery. The formation of hernias following abdominal wall incisions continues to be a challenging problem. Ventral hernia repairs are among the most common surgeries performed by general surgeons, and despite many technical advances in the field, incisional hernia rates remain high. Much attention and research has been directed to the surgical management of hernias. Less focus has been placed on prevention of hernia formation despite its obvious importance. This review examines the effects of factors such as the type of incision, suture type and size, closure method, patient risk factors, and the use of prophylactic mesh.

Keywords: incisional, abdominal, hernia, prevention, wound closure techniques

Introduction

Despite many advances in surgical techniques, equipment, and supplies, complications after abdominal wall closure remain a persistent problem. The ideal abdominal closure should be efficient, provide strength, and serve as a barrier to infection. It should have low rates of fascial dehiscence, infection, hernia formation, suture sinus formation, and incisional pain. There are many technical considerations and patient factors that may help prevent these complications. For this review, a MEDLINE search was performed. Articles related to abdominal fascial closure from 1952–2015 were used for this review.

Healing of abdominal incisions is similar to healing of other wounds. The inflammatory phase lasts approximately 4 days, followed by the proliferative phase for 3 weeks.^{1–4} The maturation phase continues for up to a year.^{1–4} By the end of the proliferative phase, the abdominal fascia has only 20% of its original strength.^{1–4} At 6 and 20 weeks postsurgery, the fascia has only 50% and 80% of its original strength, respectively. Postoperatively, abdominal fascia will never completely regain its original strength.^{1–4}

There is a large body of literature regarding the choice of incision and closure technique. Several patient risk factors are associated with increased dehiscence, wound complications, and hernia formation. Factors related to wound complications and incisional hernia formation and strategies to decrease their occurrence will be reviewed.

Type of incision

The type of operation and surgeon preference greatly influence the choice of abdominal incision. Vertical midline, lateral paramedian, and transverse incisions are the

Correspondence: William W Hope
Department of Surgery, New Hanover
Regional Medical Center, 2131 South
17th Street, PO Box 9025, Wilmington,
NC 28401, USA
Tel +1 910 343 2516 ext 233
Fax +1 910 763 4630
Email william.hope@seahec.net

most common types of abdominal incisions. Prospective trials have shown vertical midline incisions to have hernia rates of 5%–15%.^{5–7} Lateral paramedian incisions have been reported to have incisional hernia rates of less than 1%.⁸ Three separate randomized trials, which included a broad range of general surgical procedures, compared lateral paramedian and midline incisions. All three demonstrated the superiority of paramedian incisions with regard to hernia formation with equivalent rates of wound infection.^{9–11} Despite the apparent benefits of the paramedian incision, it has not gained widespread use. This is likely due to the challenge of ostomy creation, slower entrance and closure, and decreased exposure compared with a midline laparotomy.

Several randomized studies have compared midline incisions with transverse incisions. Greenall et al¹² randomized 579 patients to either the midline or transverse incision groups and reported no differences in postoperative hernias between the two groups. Seiler et al¹³ randomized 200 patients to midline or transverse incisions in major elective abdominal surgery and also reported no difference in mortality, pulmonary complications, length of hospital stay, and incisional hernia formation at 1 year. Conversely, Halm et al¹⁴ reported that midline incisions resulted in significantly more incisional hernias. A 2005 Cochrane review concluded that there was no difference in incisional hernia rates or other complications among patients undergoing midline compared with transverse incisions.¹⁵

Suture type and continuous versus interrupted abdominal wall closure

There has been much research and debate over the type of suture material that should be used in abdominal closures. Nonabsorbable, slowly absorbable, and rapidly absorbable sutures can be used for fascial closure. These sutures can be either monofilament or multifilament. Multifilament sutures have greater tensile strength for a given size;¹⁶ however, they cause greater tissue reactivity and are more prone to infection and sinus formation.¹⁶ It is thought that bacteria can be harbored within the filaments of a multifilament suture.¹⁷ Consequently, monofilament sutures are traditionally favored for abdominal closure.¹⁸ Ultimately, the choice of optimal sutures depends on the outcome that is being evaluated, with less hernia formation associated with permanent suture but increased infectious wound complications compared with the absorbable suture.

Several randomized trials and meta-analyses have examined continuous versus interrupted closures. Continuous closure is typically recommended over interrupted closure,

since it is faster and less costly. Dehiscence, wound complication rates, and incisional hernia rates are similar between interrupted and continuous closures. There is a theoretical benefit of even distribution of tension across the entire incision with continuous sutures.^{19,20} A potential disadvantage of a continuous closure is the risk that the entire suture line can be disrupted if a single knot or strand of suture breaks; however, this has proven to be an extremely rare cause of wound dehiscence.^{21,22} This potential disadvantage can be overcome if a self-locking knot is employed instead of a traditional knot. Self-locking knots are smaller and less likely to slip than conventional knots. Additionally, self-locking knots reduce the suture strength by only 5%–10%, compared with a 40% reduction caused by traditional knots.²³

In a meta-analysis by Hodgson et al,²⁴ continuous closure with nonabsorbable sutures resulted in the lowest rate of incisional hernia. The analysis also showed that polydioxanone (PDS), unlike other more rapidly absorbable sutures, did not significantly increase the risk of hernia. Meta-analyses by Diener et al²⁵ and Van't Riet et al²⁶ demonstrated no difference in incisional hernia incidence between slowly absorbable and nonabsorbable sutures; however, more wound pain and more suture sinuses occurred with the use of nonabsorbable sutures. Similar outcomes were observed with continuous and interrupted sutures, but continuous sutures took less time to insert. There is little literature regarding the optimal closure technique of emergent laparotomies with significant contamination. A randomized trial of patients undergoing laparotomy for peritonitis by Agrawal et al²⁷ showed no significant difference in incisional hernia formation between the absorbable and nonabsorbable suture. However, the study showed significantly more sinus formation with the use of nonabsorbable sutures.²⁷

Retention sutures have fallen out of favor and are rarely used in current general surgery practice. The presumed strength benefits of passing the suture through the skin and the entire abdominal wall have not borne out. They are associated with increased postoperative pain and do not decrease the incidence of fascial dehiscence.²⁸

Suture-to-wound-length ratio and suture size

The amount of suture used also appears to be important in reducing hernia formation.²⁹ A suture-to-wound-length ratio of at least 4:1 is thought to be the minimum amount of suture needed to provide a strong closure and reduce hernia formation.^{18,30} There are little randomized data to support this assertion; however, a threefold increased risk of herniation

has been reported when the ratio is less than 4:1.^{31,32} It is not clear with what frequency a 4:1 suture-to-wound-length ratio is obtained in clinical practice, since most surgeons do not routinely measure their exact suture usage.

One factor that affects the suture-to-wound-length ratio is the size and distance between the fascial bites. Some have questioned the traditional teaching that fascial bites should be 1 cm from the fascial edges and have 1 cm advances.³³ This is likely not the ideal closure method. Several studies from Israelsson et al have reported that a 4:1 ratio for suture-to-wound length and smaller fascial bites (<1 cm) result in less hernia formation.^{29,32,34–37} Larger bites contain and compress more soft tissue. Two recent randomized trials by Millbourn et al³⁶ and Deerenberg et al³⁸ comparing fascial closure using smaller bites (5–8 mm) to larger bites (10 mm) demonstrated decreased incisional hernias when smaller fascial bites were used.^{36,39,40} The use of smaller needles was found to encourage surgeons to take smaller bites as the smaller needles make taking larger bites more difficult.^{39,40} The use of smaller fascial bites to close prolonged each operation by an average of just 4 minutes; however, this was found to be cost-effective given the significant reduction in hernia formation.^{36,39,40} Cengiz et al³⁷ also demonstrated that a suture-to-wound-length ratio much greater than 4:1 did not increase wound complications.

Other closure techniques that affect the suture-to-wound ratio are mass closure versus closure of the aponeurosis only and the appropriate amount of tension to apply to the closing suture. A systematic review by Ceydeli et al concluded that mass closure should be used;⁴¹ however, an animal study in pigs showed more wound edge separation with mass closure compared with aponeurosis only.³⁵ The ideal amount of tension that should be placed on the closing suture remains unknown due to a lack of clinical research. One study by Mayer et al revealed that greater tension on the suture line increased the rate of wound infection compared with a lower suture line tension.⁴² It is thought that soft tissue caught in a tight stitch can become ischemic, increasing the risk of a wound infection and future hernia formation.⁴² There are reports of wounds closed with lower tension having an increased tensile strength compared with wounds closed with higher tension.^{4,43} Calculating and standardizing the amount of suture line tension remains a challenge clinically.²⁰ It is generally recommended that the tissue be reapproximated but not strangulated.²⁰ The tension of a midline closure is likely too high when the suture line is not visible due to being deeply embedded in the soft tissue.²⁰

The majority of surgeons and most studies use a number 1 or 0 sized suture for fascial closure. One study found no change in hernia formation when a 2-0 sized suture was used.⁴⁴ Millbourn et al³⁶ demonstrated a significantly lower rate of incisional hernia formation using 2-0 PDS taking small fascial bites.

There has been little research comparing fascial closure with double-loop suture compared with nonlooped suture. One study demonstrated an increased rate of pulmonary complications and death with double-loop suture.⁴⁵ This was possibly due to decreased abdominal wall compliance. Another prospective study found decreased rate of wound infection and dehiscence with the use of looped suture compared to nonlooped suture.⁴⁶ Given the conflicting results, further research is needed to draw any well-founded conclusions.

A single-layer mass closure technique includes all layers of the abdominal wall except the skin.⁴⁷ Experimental studies report a higher wound bursting strength and a lower rate of wound dehiscence when a mass closure is used compared with a layered closure.^{48–50} The inclusion of the peritoneum in the suture has no impact on wound strength, the rate of wound dehiscence, or incisional hernia; however, it may increase the formation of adhesions.^{51,52} A Cochrane review examining five trials comparing parietal peritoneal closure compared with no parietal peritoneal closure did not find any evidence for short- or long-term advantage in peritoneal closure.⁵³ Two meta-analyses favor the single-layer mass closure over layered closure.^{18,54} There is little data directly comparing the mass closure technique to the single-layer closure of the aponeurosis.⁴⁷ However, the recently published European Hernia Society guidelines on the closure of abdominal wall incisions under their weakest level of evidence recommended single layer closure of the aponeurosis.⁴⁷

Patient risk factors

Demographic risk factors for dehiscence and incisional hernia are similar. These risks include obesity, advanced age, male sex, smoking, diabetes mellitus, malnutrition, malignancy, and steroid use.^{48,55–63} These factors may contribute to delayed wound healing and decreased collagen synthesis.^{64–66} The effect of interventions focused on modifiable risk factors such as smoking and obesity remain a clinical challenge. Studies reporting the effect of weight loss and smoking cessation on the reduction of incisional hernia formation are lacking and likely reflect the difficulty of behavior modification.

Steroid or immunosuppressive therapy can have deleterious effects on wound healing, with patients undergoing liver transplantation reported to have incisional hernia rates of up to 23%.^{67,68} Another group at risk for incisional hernia are patients undergoing open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA). Compared with patients undergoing laparotomy for aortoiliac occlusive disease, patients undergoing AAA repair have more than a threefold increase in the rate of incisional hernia formation.^{69,70} Relaparotomy is another strong risk factor for postoperative incisional hernia formation.^{65,71} This may be due to resuturing of relatively nonvascular scar tissue leading to insufficient healing.⁷¹

Postoperative wound infections are one of the most well-documented risk factors for early dehiscence and subsequent hernia formation.^{48,55,56,62,72} The proliferation of bacteria leads to decreased collagen synthesis and weakening of the fascial closure.^{73–75} Postoperative abdominal distention and respiratory failure are also major risk factors for dehiscence and hernia formation. Distention increases tension along the suture line, causing higher risk of suture breaking, knot slipping, and suture cutting through the fascia and soft tissue. Loosening of the suture and separation of the fascial edges can lead to incisional hernia formation.^{31,35,71,72}

Prophylactic mesh

The success of mesh use in decreasing hernia recurrence rates in patients undergoing inguinal and ventral hernia repairs has led some to consider prophylactic mesh placement in the high risk patient population.⁴⁷ As in all prophylactic therapy, it is important to select patients in whom the therapy has a significantly lower complication rate than the expected rate without the intervention.

Several reports in animal models and high risk patient populations have supported the use of prophylactic mesh.^{76–80} The use of prophylactic mesh has been studied in patients undergoing open AAA repair with significantly lower rates of incisional hernia reported without more complications.^{81,82} However, other studies have demonstrated low rates on incisional hernia formation after open AAA repair using no mesh but with careful adherence to the previously discussed closure techniques.^{83,84} Another area of active research is the use of prophylactic mesh in ostomy creation due to the high rate of parastomal hernias. A significantly lower rate of parastomal hernias with no increase in complication rates was noted in two recent systematic reviews.^{85,86}

Evidence supporting the use of prophylactic mesh in high risk patient populations is building. However, further study with longer follow-up is needed. Questions regarding

the role of biologic mesh, placement techniques, and which populations would benefit the most remain unanswered and are areas of active research.

Conclusion

Decreasing local wound complications and incisional hernia formation after abdominal wound closure remains a persistent challenge. Yet there is a considerable amount of evidence regarding the optimal closure technique. While the type of incision seems to play a role in hernia formation, surgeons, who are typically focused on the operation at hand, are unlikely to change their practice.

To decrease local wound complications and hernia formation after laparotomy closure, fascial closure with a size 1 or 2 slowly absorbable monofilament suture should be used. It should be closed in one layer in a continuous manner with self-locking anchor knots. The suture length-to-wound-length ratio should be greater than 4:1. Closure should be accomplished with small fascial bites (5–8 mm). Excessive tension should be avoided. Obtaining the appropriate ratio and smaller fascial bites can more easily be done if a smaller suture and needle are used. The use of prophylactic mesh in certain high risk patient populations is a reasonable consideration.

The described optimal closure techniques are easy to follow and cost-effective. The current focus should be on obtaining widespread adoption to improve patient outcomes. A recent study evaluating surgery residents found that only 10% of residents knew the correct suture-to-wound-length ratio, and only 40% were familiar with literature on the proper technique of abdominal closure.⁸⁷ Thus, if incisional hernia rates are to be decreased, education regarding current best practices of abdominal closure needs to be addressed.

Disclosure

Neither author has financial or personal relationships that could inappropriately bias this work. The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

References

1. Rath AM, Chevrel JP. The healing of laparotomies: a review of the literature. Part 1. Physiologic and pathologic aspects. *Hernia*. 1998;2: 145–149.
2. Douglas DM. The healing of aponeurotic incisions. *Br J Surg*. 1952;40:79–84.
3. Peacock EE, van Winkle W. *Wound Repair*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia, PA: WB Saunders; 1984.
4. Hardy MA. The biology of scar formation. *Phys Ther*. 1989;69: 1014–1024.

5. Krukowski ZB, Cusick EL, Engeset J, Matheson JA. Polydioxanone or polypropylene for closure of midline abdominal incisions: a prospective comparative clinical trial. *Br J Surg*. 1987;74:828–830.
6. Wissing J, van Vroonhoven TJ, Schattenkerk ME, Veen HF, Ponsen RJ, Jeekel J. Fascia closure after midline laparotomy: results of a randomised trial. *Br J Surg*. 1987;74:738–741.
7. Israelsson LA, Jonsson T. Closure of midline laparotomy with polydioxanone and nylon: the importance of suture technique. *Br J Surg*. 1994;81: 1606–1608.
8. Donaldson DR, Hegarty JH, Brennan TG, Guillou PJ, Finan PJ, Hall TJ. The lateral paramedian incision – experience with 850 cases. *Br J Surg*. 1982;69:630–632.
9. Cox PJ, Ausobsky JR, Ellis H, Pollock AV. Towards no incisional hernias: lateral paramedian versus midline incisions. *J R Soc Med*. 1986;79:711–712.
10. Kendall SW, Brennan TG, Guillou PJ. Suture length to wound length ratio and the integrity of midline and lateral paramedian incisions. *Br J Surg*. 1991;78:705–707.
11. Guillou PJ, Hall TJ, Donaldson DR, Broughton AC, Brennan TG. Vertical abdominal incisions – a choice? *Br J Surg*. 1980;67:395–399.
12. Greenall MJ, Evans M, Pollock AV. Midline or transverse laparotomy? A random controlled clinical trial. Part 1: influence on healing. *Br J Surg*. 1980;67:188–190.
13. Seiler CM, Deckert A, Diener MK, et al. Midline versus transverse incision in major abdominal surgery: a randomized, double-blind equivalence trial (POVATI: ISRCTN60734227). *Ann Surg*. 2009;249:913–920.
14. Halm JA, Lip H, Schmitz PI, Jeekel J. Incisional hernia after upper abdominal surgery: a randomised controlled trial of midline versus transverse incision. *Hernia*. 2009;13:275–280.
15. Brown SR, Goodfellow PB. Transverse versus midline incisions for abdominal surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005;(4): CD005199.
16. Osther PJ, Gjode P, Mortensen BB, et al. Randomized comparison of polyglycolic acid and polyglyconate sutures for abdominal fascial closure after laparotomy in patients with suspected impaired wound healing. *Br J Surg*. 1995;82:1080–1082.
17. Osterberg B. Enclosure of bacteria within capillary multifilament sutures as protection against leukocytes. *Acta Chir Scand*. 1983; 149(7):663–668.
18. Ceydeli A, Rucinski J, Wise L. Finding the best abdominal closure: an evidence-based review of the literature. *Curr Surg*. 2005;62:220–225.
19. O'Dwyer PJ, Courtney CA. Factors involved in abdominal wall closure and subsequent incisional hernia. *Surgeon*. 2003;1:17–22.
20. Israelsson L, Millbourn D. Prevention of incisional hernias: how to close a midline incision. *Surg Clin North Am*. 2013;93:1027–1040.
21. Gislason H, Gronbech JE, Soreide O. Burst abdomen and incisional hernia after major gastrointestinal operations – comparison of three closure techniques. *Eur J Surg*. 1995;161:349–354.
22. Alexander HC, Prudden JF. The causes of abdominal wound disruption. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*. 1966;122:1223–1229.
23. Israelsson LA, Jonsson T. Physical properties of self locking and conventional surgical knots. *Eur J Surg*. 1994;160:323–327.
24. Hodgson NC, Malthaner RA, Ostbye T. The search for an ideal method of abdominal fascial closure: a meta-analysis. *Ann Surg*. 2000;231: 436–442.
25. Diener MK, Voss S, Jensen K, Buchler MW, Seiler CM. Elective midline laparotomy closure: the INLINE systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Surg*. 2010;251:843–856.
26. Van't Riet M, Steyerberg EW, Nellensteyn J, Bonjer HJ, Jeekel J. Meta-analysis of techniques for closure of midline abdominal incisions. *Br J Surg*. 2002;89:1350–1356.
27. Agrawal V, Sharma N, Joshi MK, Minocha VR. Role of suture material and technique of closure in wound outcome following laparotomy for peritonitis. *Trop Gastroenterol*. 2009;30:237–240.
28. Wasiljew BK, Winchester DP. Experience with continuous absorbable suture in the closure of abdominal incisions. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*. 1982;154:378–380.
29. Millbourn D, Israelsson LA. Wound complications and stitch length. *Hernia*. 2004;8:39–41.
30. Carlson MA. New developments in abdominal wall closure. *Chirurg*. 2000;71:743–753.
31. Jenkins TP. The burst abdominal wound: a mechanical approach. *Br J Surg*. 1976;63:873–876.
32. Israelsson LA, Jonsson T, Knutsson A. Suture technique and wound healing in midline laparotomy incisions. *Eur J Surg*. 1996;162: 605–609.
33. Israelsson, LA. Abdominal incision closure: small but important bites. *Lancet*. Epub 2015 Jul 15. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60687-0.
34. Israelsson LA, Jonsson T. Suture length to wound length ratio and healing of midline laparotomy incisions. *Br J Surg*. 1993;80:1284–1286.
35. Cengiz Y, Gislason H, Svanes K, Israelsson LA. Mass closure technique: an experimental study on separation of wound edge. *Eur J Surg*. 2001;167:60–63.
36. Millbourn D, Cengiz Y, Israelsson LA. Effect of stitch length on wound complications after closure of midline incisions: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Surg*. 2009;144:1056–1059.
37. Cengiz Y, Blomquist P, Israelsson LA. Small tissue bites and wound strength: an experimental study. *Arch Surg*. 2001;136:272–275.
38. Deerenberg EB, Harlaar JJ, Steyerberg EW, et al. Small bites versus large bites for closure of abdominal midline incisions (STITCH): a double-blind, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2015.
39. Millbourn D. *Closure of Midline Abdominal Incisions with Small Stitches. Studies on Wound Complications and Health Economy* [Doctoral thesis]. Umea, Sweden: Umea University; 2012.
40. Millbourn D, Cengiz Y, Israelsson LA. Risk factors for wound complications in midline abdominal incisions related to the size of stitches. *Hernia*. 2011;15:261–266.
41. Ceydeli A, Rucinski J, Wise L. Finding the best abdominal closure: an evidence-based review of the literature. *Curr Surg*. 2005;62: 220–225.
42. Mayer AD, Ausobsky JR, Evans M, et al. Compression suture of the abdominal wall: a controlled trial in 302 major laparotomies. *Br J Surg*. 1981;68:632–634.
43. Hoer J, Klinge U, Schachtrupp A, et al. Influence of suture technique on laparotomy wound healing: an experimental study in the rat. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. 2001;386:218–223.
44. Larsen PN, Nielsen K, Schultz A, Mejdahl S, Larsen T, Moesgaard F. Closure of the abdominal fascia after clean and clean-contaminated laparotomy. *Acta Chir Scand*. 1989;155:461–464.
45. Niggebrugge AH, Trimbos JB, Hermans J, Steup WH, Van de Velde CJ. Influence of abdominal wound closure technique on complications after surgery: a randomized study. *Lancet*. 1999;353:1563–1567.
46. Nasir GA, Baker KK. Continuous double loop closure for midline laparotomy wounds. *Saudi Med J*. 2001;22(4):351.
47. Muysoms FE, et al. European Hernia Society guidelines on the closure of abdominal wall incisions. *Hernia*. 2015;19(1):1–24.
48. Bucknall TE, Cox PJ, Ellis H. Burst abdomen and incisional hernia: a prospective study of 1129 major laparotomies. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)*. 1982;284:931–933.
49. Gallup DG, Nolan TE, Smith RP. Primary mass closure of midline incisions with a continuous polygluconat monofilament absorbable suture. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1990;76:872–875.
50. Nilsson T. Closure of the abdominal wound with single-layer and double-layer technique. Animal studies. *Acta Chir Scand*. 1981;147: 399–403.
51. Hugh TB, Nankivell C, Meagher AP, et al. Is closure of the peritoneal layer necessary in the repair of midline surgical abdominal wounds? *World J Surg*. 1990;14:231–233 (discussion: 233–234).
52. Pearl ML, Rayburn WF. Choosing abdominal incision and closure techniques: a review. *J Reprod Med*. 2004;49:662–670.
53. Gurusamy KS, Cassar DE, Davidson BR. Peritoneal closure versus no peritoneal closure for patients undergoing non-obstetric abdominal operations. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013;7:CD010424.

54. Rucinski J, Margolis M, Panagopoulos G, Wise L. Closure of the abdominal midline fascia: meta-analysis delineates the optimal technique. *Am Surg*. 2001;67:421–426.
55. Hoer J, Lawong G, Klinge U, Schumpelick V. Factors influencing the development of incisional hernia. A retrospective study of 2,983 laparotomy patients over a period of 10 years. *Chirurg*. 2002;73:474–480.
56. Sorensen LT, Hemmingsen UB, Kirkeby LT, Kallehave F, Jorgensen LN. Smoking is a risk factor for incisional hernia. *Arch Surg*. 2005;140:119–123.
57. Llaguna OH, Avgerinos DV, Lugo JZ, et al. Incidence and risk factors for the development of incisional hernia following elective laparoscopic versus open colon resections. *Am J Surg*. 2010;200:265–269.
58. Santora TA, Roslyn JJ. Incisional hernia. *Surg Clin North Am*. 1993;73:557–570.
59. Riou JP, Cohen JR, Johnson H Jr. Factors influencing wound dehiscence. *Am J Surg*. 1992;163:324–330.
60. Penninckx FM, Poelmans SV, Kerremans RP, Beckers JP. Abdominal wound dehiscence in gastroenterological surgery. *Ann Surg*. 1979;189:345–352.
61. Veljkovic R, Protic M, Gluhovic A, Potic Z, Milosevic Z, Stojadinovic A. Prospective clinical trial of factors predicting the early development of incisional hernia after midline laparotomy. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2010;210: 210–219.
62. Franchi M, Ghezzi F, Buttarelli M, Tateo S, Balestreri D, Bolis P. Incisional hernia in gynecologic oncology patients: a 10-year study. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2001;97:696–700.
63. Sugerma HJ, Kellum JM Jr, Reines HD, DeMaria EJ, Newsome HH, Lowry JW. Greater risk of incisional hernia with morbidly obese than steroid-dependent patients and low recurrence with prefascial polypropylene mesh. *Am J Surg*. 1996;171:80–84.
64. Jorgensen LN, Sorensen LT, Kallehave F, Vange J, Gottrup F. Premenopausal women deposit more collagen than men during healing of an experimental wound. *Surgery*. 2002;131:338–343.
65. Lenhardt R, Hopf HW, Marker E, et al. Perioperative collagen deposition in elderly and young men and women. *Arch Surg*. 2000;135:71–74.
66. Ashcroft GS, Horan MA, Ferguson MW. Aging is associated with reduced deposition of specific extracellular matrix components, an upregulation of angiogenesis, and an altered inflammatory response in a murine incisional wound healing model. *J Invest Dermatol*. 1997;108:430–437.
67. Kahn J, Muller H, Iberer F, et al. Incisional hernia following liver transplantation: incidence and predisposing factors. *Clin Transplant*. 2007;21:423–426.
68. Janssen H, Lange R, Erhard J, Malago M, Eigler FW, Broelsch CE. Causative factors, surgical treatment and outcome of incisional hernia after liver transplantation. *Br J Surg*. 2002;89:1049–1054.
69. Takagi H, Sugimoto M, Kato T, Matsuno Y, Umemoto T. Postoperative incision hernia in patients with abdominal aortic aneurysm and aortoiliac occlusive disease: a systematic review. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2007;33:177–181.
70. Liapis CD, Dimitroulis DA, Kakisis JD, et al. Incidence of incisional hernias in patients operated on for aneurysm or occlusive disease. *Am Surg*. 2004;70:550–552.
71. Lamont PM, Ellis H. Incisional hernia in re-opened abdominal incisions: an overlooked risk factor. *Br J Surg*. 1988;75:374–376.
72. Carlson MA, Ludwig KA, Condon RE. Ventral hernia and other complications of 1,000 midline incisions. *South Med J*. 1995;88:450–453.
73. Graham DJ, Stevenson JT, McHenry CR. The association of intra-abdominal infection and abdominal wound dehiscence. *Am Surg*. 1998;64:660–665.
74. Robson MC. Wound infection. A failure of wound healing caused by an imbalance of bacteria. *Surg Clin North Am*. 1997;77:637–650.
75. De Haan BB, Ellis H, Wilks M. The role of infection on wound healing. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*. 1974;138:693–700.
76. Bellon JM, Lopez-Hervas P, Rodriguez M, Garcia-Honduvilla N, Pascual G, Bujan J. Midline abdominal wall closure: a new prophylactic mesh concept. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2006;203:490–497.
77. Schug-Pass C, Lippert H, Kockerling F. Primary mesh augmentation with fibrin glue for abdominal wall closure – investigations on a biomechanical model. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. 2009;395:151–156.
78. El-Khadrawy OH, Moussa G, Mansour O, Hashish MS. Prophylactic prosthetic reinforcement of midline abdominal incisions in high-risk patients. *Hernia*. 2009;13:267–274.
79. Bevis PM, Windhaber RA, Lear PA, Poskitt KR, Earnshaw JJ, Mitchell DC. Randomized clinical trial of mesh versus sutured wound closure after open abdominal aortic aneurysm surgery. *Br J Surg*. 2010;97:1497–1502.
80. Caro-Tarrago A, Olona Casas C, Jimenez Salido A, et al. Prevention of incisional hernia in midline laparotomy with an onlay mesh: a randomized clinical trial. *World J Surg*. 2014;38(9):2223–2230.
81. Armañanzas L, Ruiz-Tovar J, Arroyo A, et al. Prophylactic mesh vs suture in the closure of the umbilical trocar site after laparoscopic cholecystectomy in high-risk patients for incisional hernia. A randomized clinical trial. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2014;218(5):960–968.
82. O'Hare JL, Ward J, Earnshaw JJ. Late results of mesh wound closure after elective open aortic aneurysm repair. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2007;33:412–413.
83. Gruppo M, Mazzalai F, Lorenzetti R, et al. Midline abdominal wall incisional hernia after aortic reconstructive surgery: a prospective study. *Surgery*. 2012;151(6):882–888.
84. Israelsson LA. Incisional hernias in patients with aortic aneurysmal disease: the importance of suture technique. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 1999;17(2):133–135.
85. Tam KW, Wei PL, Kuo LJ, Wu CH. Systematic review of the use of a mesh to prevent parastomal hernia. *World J Surg*. 2010;34:2723–2729.
86. Wijeyekoon SP, Gurusamy K, El-Gendy K, Chan CL. Prevention of parastomal herniation with biologic/composite prosthetic mesh: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2010;211:637–645.
87. Hope WW, Watson LI, Menon R, Kotwall CA, Clancy TV. Abdominal wall closure: resident education and human error. *Hernia*. 2010;14:463–466.

Open Access Surgery

Publish your work in this journal

Open Access Surgery is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal that focuses on all aspects of surgical procedures and interventions. Patient care around the peri-operative period and patient outcomes post surgery are key topics. All grades of surgery from minor cosmetic interventions to major surgical procedures are covered. Novel techniques

Submit your manuscript here: <http://www.dovepress.com/open-access-surgery-journal>

Dovepress

and the utilization of new instruments and materials, including implants and prostheses that optimize outcomes constitute major areas of interest. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.