



www.bioinformation.net
Volume 21(8)



Research Article

Received August 1, 2025; Revised August 31, 2025; Accepted August 31, 2025, Published August 31, 2025

DOI: 10.6026/973206300212704

SJIF 2025 (Scientific Journal Impact Factor for 2025) = 8.478

2022 Impact Factor (2023 Clarivate Inc. release) is 1.9

Declaration on Publication Ethics:

The author's state that they adhere with COPE guidelines on publishing ethics as described elsewhere at <https://publicationethics.org/>. The authors also undertake that they are not associated with any other third party (governmental or non-governmental agencies) linking with any form of unethical issues connecting to this publication. The authors also declare that they are not withholding any information that is misleading to the publisher in regard to this article.

Declaration on official E-mail:

The corresponding author declares that lifetime official e-mail from their institution is not available for all authors

License statement:

This is an Open Access article which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly credited. This is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

Comments from readers:

Articles published in BIOINFORMATION are open for relevant post publication comments and criticisms, which will be published immediately linking to the original article without open access charges. Comments should be concise, coherent and critical in less than 1000 words.

Disclaimer:

Bioinformation provides a platform for scholarly communication of data and information to create knowledge in the Biological/Biomedical domain after adequate peer/editorial reviews and editing entertaining revisions where required. The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views or opinions of Bioinformation and (or) its publisher Biomedical Informatics. Biomedical Informatics remains neutral and allows authors to specify their address and affiliation details including territory where required.

Edited by P Kanguane

Citation: Dubey *et al.* Bioinformation 21(8): 2704-2706 (2025)

Effect of prophylactic mesh in elective laparotomy

Rohit Dubey¹, Nishi Mishra², Nitish Adawadkar³, Shobhit Gupta^{*4} & Tanya Jonwal⁵

¹Department of Surgery, Government Medical College Satna, Madhya Pradesh, India; ²Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Government Medical College Satna, Madhya Pradesh, India; ³Department Of Community Medicine Government Medical College Ratlam Madhya Pradesh India; ⁴Department of Medicine F.H Medical College Agra, Uttar Pradesh, India; ⁵Department of Community Medicine Government Medical College Ratlam Madhya Pradesh India; *Corresponding author

Affiliation URL:

<https://gmcsatna.mp.gov.in/>

<https://www.fhmc.co.in/>

Author contacts:

Rohit Dubey - E-mail: drrohitdubey24@gmail.com

Nishi Mishra - E-mail: nishimishra92@gmail.com

Nitish Adawadkar - E-mail: nitishadawadkar243@gmail.com

Shobhit Gupta - E-mail: mynameishobhitgupta@gmail.com

Tanya Jonwal - E-mail: drtanyajonwal@gmail.com

Abstract:

A hernia is a defect in the fascia of the abdominal wall and thus resulting into the formation of a hernial sac of peritoneum that contains visceral organ or abdominal contents or other bulges that may appear similar, but are not true hernias. Incisional hernia is the bulging out of contents of abdominal cavity through a previous surgical defect in anterior abdominal wall and is a significant complication for patients who have undergone elective laparotomy. The risk of developing this condition increases substantially in individuals with risk factors such as obesity and chronic respiratory ailments. Various methods of suture closure and mesh reinforcement have been used to restore abdominal wall integrity and prophylactic treatment of incisional hernia. Failure of effective and sufficient closure of the abdominal wall after operations leaves the patient at risk for developing hernia. The risk of developing this condition increases substantially in individuals with risk factors such as obesity and chronic respiratory ailments. Therefore, it is of interest to evaluate the efficacy of preventive mesh placement following laparotomy.

Keywords: Incisional hernia, obesity, laparotomy

Background:

A hernia is a defect in the fascia of the abdominal wall and thus resulting into the formation of a hernia sac of peritoneum that contains visceral organ or abdominal contents or other bulges that may appear similar, but are not true hernias [1]. The incidence of incisional hernia develops after abdominal wall closure range widely from 10 to 23% and up to 69% in long-term high-risk patients [2]. Different techniques for suture closure (including material and method) and mesh reinforcement (considering position and shape) have been employed to restore the integrity of the abdominal wall and to provide preventive treatment for incisional hernia [3]. Despite advances in early repair, recurrence rates remain unacceptable (12–54%). Larger defect (>2–3 cms) shows higher recurrence rate around 10–15% if closed by primary repair [2]. Recurrence is susceptible to a vicious cycle of morbidity, because early subsequent repair presents greater technical challenges and an increased risk for recurrence and morbidity [4]. The inadequate and ineffective closure of the abdominal wall following surgical procedures places the patient at an increased risk of developing a hernia [5–6]. Although prophylactic reinforcement with mesh has been shown to reduce the risk of wound dehiscence and incisional hernia reinforcement of the suture line with a mesh may be an effective way of preventing wound dehiscence [7]. Therefore, it is of interest to show safety and efficacy of prophylactic mesh placement (PMP) in elective midline laparotomy.

Methodology:

The study was carried out in 50 patients admitted in Department of General Surgery at M.Y. Hospital, Indore. The study was conducted after the clearance from Institutional Ethical Committee. An informed consent was taken from each patient after which the patient was taken for an elective surgery (prophylactic mesh replacement). Patients with age less than 18 years and with known comorbidities such as essential hypertension, diabetes, thyroid disease, renal disease, or any other medical illness, were excluded from the study. A comprehensive history encompassing personal details, medical history and medication usage was obtained with the help of questionnaire. The follow up was done for 1year post-surgery.

After data collection; the data was entered into Microsoft Office Excel and analyzed using EpiInfo 7, free software.

Results:

There were 8 (16.0%) patients in the age group 18-20 years, 27 (54.0%) patients in the age group 21-40 years, 12 (24.0%) patients were in the age group 41-60 years and 3 (6.0%) patients were in the age group >60 years. The mean age of the patients in study group was 37.60 ± 13.51 years with a range between 18 years to 70 years. In 5 (10%) patients onlay mesh was applied and in 45 (90.0%) patient's sublay mesh was applied. In majority of the patients sublay mesh was applied. In patients who were operated using onlay mesh, 3 (60.0%) patients had occurrence of hernia and in 2 (40.0%) patients there was no hernia. In patients who had undergone surgery using onlay mesh, higher prevalence of hernia was seen. The association between location of mesh and the final outcome was found to be statistically significant ($p=0.001$), showing that the final outcome is dependent on the location of mesh of the patients. The sublay technique of mesh placement was better in prophylactic prevention in incisional hernia development after elective laparotomies as shown in **Table 1**. In onlay mesh placed cases, all five patients had either of the wound complications, that is, SSI, seroma, or wound dehiscence. These complications were related to the prolonged hospital stay in all patients with onlay mesh. One out of five (20%) patients had stayed in ward up to 21 days and other four (80%) patients had stayed for more than 21 days. Three out of four (75%) patients who developed incisional hernia belonged to the onlay mesh placed group. The high rate of hernia in this group hence can be attributed to higher rate of wound complication in these patients.

Table 1: Association between location of mesh and final outcome

Location of mesh	Final Outcome			Total
	Hernia	No Hernia	Unknown	
	3	2	0	5
Onlay	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	1	40	4	45
Sublay	2.20%	88.90%	8.90%	100.00%
	4	42	8	50
Total	8.00%	84.00%	8.00%	100.00%

Discussion:

All 4 patients who developed hernia belonged to obese category as per WHO criteria for BMI classification. 4 out of 24 (16.7%) patient who were obese were associated with this complication. This was however not found to be clinically significant but we couldn't clearly rule out obesity as a risk factor for development of incisional hernia. One patient who developed hernia in sublay group had prolonged hospital stay due to development of complications (wound dehiscence). This proves that the sublay mesh placement as such is not associated with increased risk but the wound infection associated with the mesh leads to the hernia formation. In a study by Borab *et al.* [8] comparing the suture closure and onlay mesh placement, they found lower occurrence of incisional hernia with mesh but seroma formation and other wound complications were present. This was consistent with our findings. As per the findings of Nachiappan *et al.* & Abbas *et al.* there is a significant reduction in incidence of incisional hernia when prophylactic mesh is applied [9, 10]. As per findings of Berta *et al.* the incidence of incisional hernia was high in patients undergoing midline laparotomy [11].

Conclusion:

The mesh placement after elective laparotomy is associated with low occurrence of incisional hernia as compared with the primary suture closure. Onlay mesh placement technique has more chances of complications such as seroma and flap infections than sublay due to the fact of more dissection in fatty plane for mesh placement. Furthermore, more superficial location of mesh is easily accessible for bacterial invasion.

Limitations:

The study is limited by the fact that many of the factors directly involved in wound healing like diabetic status, hemoglobin status of patient, protein status and technical aspect of closure. Also our study didn't comment on the deviations with normal suture closure of the abdominal cavity and the type of mesh used.

Acknowledgment:

We are thankful to technical staff of department of Sugery and department of Community medicine and Obstetrics and Gynaecology for their support in carrying out this work.

References:

- [1] Llaguna O.H *et al.* *World J Surg.* 2011 **35**:1651. [PMID: 21547421]
- [2] Bhangu A *et al.* *Hernia.* 2013 **17**:445. [PMID: 23712289]
- [3] El-Khadrawy OH *et al.* *Hernia.* 2009 **13**:267. [PMID: 19262985]
- [4] de Goede B *et al.* *Surgery.* 2015 **157**:540. [PMID: 25596770]
- [5] Jairam AP *et al.* *Lancet.* 2017 **390**:567. [PMID: 28641875]
- [6] Argudo N *et al.* *Cir Esp.* 2017 **95**:222. [PMID: 28400141]
- [7] Payne R *et al.* *Hernia.* 2017 **21**:843. [PMID: 28864937]
- [8] Borab ZM *et al.* *Surgery.* 2017 **161**:1149. [PMID: 28040255]
- [9] Nachiappan S *et al.* *World J Surg.* 2013 **37**:1861. [PMID: 23584462]
- [10] Abbas *et al.* *Hernia.* 2025 **29**:230. [PMID :40646274]
- [11] Fabregó B *et al.* *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* 2024 **34**:1596. [PMID: 38909993]