International Journal of Medical Science and Clinical Research Studies

ISSN(print): 2767-8326, ISSN(online): 2767-8342

Volume 05 Issue 02 February 2025

Page No: 289-295

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmscrs/v5-i02-17, Impact Factor: 8.188

The Role of Free Perforator Flaps in Complex Post-Oncological Reconstruction: Insights into DIEP, ALT, and SCIP Flap Techniques

Abigail Berenice Gómez Valenzuela[1], Angélica Estefanía Carpinteiro Valero[2], Joab Ulises Calderón Barrientos[1]

[1]Hospital Regional Instituto de Seguridad y Servicios Sociales de los Trabajadores del Estado. Irapuato, Guanajuato, México.

[2]Hospital General con Especialidades Juan María de Salvatierra. La Paz, Baja California, México.

ABSTRACT

Background: Complex post-oncological reconstruction remains a cornerstone in restoring form and function following extensive oncological resections. Among the reconstructive options, free perforator flaps, including the deep inferior epigastric perforator (DIEP), anterolateral thigh (ALT), and superficial circumflex iliac perforator (SCIP) flaps, have emerged as versatile tools offering superior outcomes.

Objective: This article evaluates the indications, surgical techniques, and outcomes associated with the use of DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps in managing complex defects in oncological reconstruction.

Methods: A comprehensive review of the literature was conducted, focusing on patient selection, anatomical considerations, operative nuances, and postoperative results for each flap type.

Results: DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps provide significant benefits, including reduced donor-site morbidity, reliable vascularity, and aesthetic outcomes. Each flap exhibits unique advantages depending on the reconstructive needs and patient characteristics, with tailored approaches enhancing both functional and cosmetic results.

Conclusion: Free perforator flaps represent the gold standard for addressing complex reconstructive challenges in post-oncological surgery. An individualized, multidisciplinary approach is critical to optimize outcomes and patient satisfaction.

KEYWORDS: free perforator flaps, post-oncological reconstruction, DIEP flap, ALT flap, SCIP flap, microsurgery, reconstructive surgery

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
14 February 2025

Available on:
https://ijmscr.org/

INTRODUCTION

Advances in oncological treatments have dramatically improved survival rates, but they often necessitate extensive surgical resections that leave patients with challenging defects requiring reconstruction. The restoration of both form and function in these patients is a complex endeavor, particularly when addressing defects involving multiple tissue layers, including skin, soft tissue, and sometimes bone. Microsurgical techniques, particularly free perforator flaps, have revolutionized the field by offering robust and adaptable solutions tailored to the unique demands of post-oncological reconstruction.1,2

Among the myriad of available reconstructive techniques, the deep inferior epigastric perforator (DIEP), anterolateral thigh (ALT), and superficial circumflex iliac perforator (SCIP) flaps have gained prominence. These flaps are renowned for their reliability, versatility, and ability to minimize donor-site morbidity while providing optimal functional and aesthetic results.

The DIEP flap, sourced from abdominal tissue, is often preferred for breast reconstruction due to its superior contour and minimal impact on abdominal musculature. The ALT flap, derived from the lateral thigh, offers a robust volume of soft tissue, making it suitable for reconstructing larger defects. In contrast, the SCIP flap, harvested from the groin region, provides a thinner tissue profile ideal for resurfacing smaller or delicate areas.2

This article explores the principles underpinning the use of free perforator flaps in post-oncological reconstruction, delving into the anatomical considerations, patient selection

criteria, surgical techniques, and postoperative outcomes associated with DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps. By integrating clinical evidence and expert perspectives, this review aims to underscore the transformative role of these techniques in modern reconstructive surgery.3

Medical Indications for the Use of Free Perforator Flaps in Complex Post-Oncological Reconstruction

The utilization of free perforator flaps, including the deep inferior epigastric perforator (DIEP), anterolateral thigh (ALT), and superficial circumflex iliac perforator (SCIP) flaps, has become a pivotal aspect of reconstructive surgery in the management of complex defects following oncological resections. These flaps offer a range of benefits, including high vascular reliability, versatility in tissue composition, and reduced donor-site morbidity. The medical indications for their use encompass a wide array of clinical scenarios where form, function, and aesthetics must be restored simultaneously.3

1. Breast Reconstruction Post-Mastectomy

The DIEP flap is the gold standard for breast reconstruction following mastectomy due to its ability to provide sufficient autologous tissue for contour restoration. It is indicated in patients who:4

- Require unilateral or bilateral breast reconstruction.
- Desire natural results with reduced reliance on prosthetics.
- Have adequate abdominal adipose tissue for flap harvesting.
- Are suitable candidates for microsurgical procedures based on vascular health and overall fitness.

The ALT flap may also be considered for breast reconstruction when abdominal tissue is unavailable or inadequate, offering an alternative source of robust soft tissue.4

2. Head and Neck Reconstruction

Patients undergoing extensive resections for head and neck cancers, such as squamous cell carcinoma or salivary gland tumors, often experience significant deficits in soft tissue, skin, and mucosa. Free perforator flaps are indicated in scenarios where:4

- There is a need to reconstruct composite defects involving both external and intraoral components.
- Vascularized tissue is required to prevent fistula formation or ensure adequate wound healing post-radiotherapy.
- Restoration of facial symmetry and contour is critical for functional and aesthetic rehabilitation.

The ALT flap is particularly well-suited for large-volume soft tissue reconstruction in this region, while the SCIP flap is advantageous for smaller, delicate areas requiring thin and pliable coverage.5

3. Reconstruction of Trunk and Extremities

Free perforator flaps are instrumental in the management of extensive soft tissue defects of the trunk and extremities, commonly resulting from sarcoma resections or post-radiotherapy necrosis. Indications include:5

- Closure of defects with exposed critical structures, such as bones, tendons, or vascular grafts.
- Restoration of limb contour and function in cases of significant soft tissue loss.
- Management of chronic wounds with poor vascularity requiring well-perfused tissue for coverage.

The ALT flap is ideal for large defects due to its robust vascularity and adaptability, while the SCIP flap can be employed for smaller, less demanding reconstructions.

4. Perineal and Pelvic Reconstruction

Patients who undergo abdominoperineal resection or extensive pelvic surgeries for oncological conditions such as rectal or gynecological cancers may require free perforator flaps for perineal reconstruction. Indications include:5

- Reconstruction of defects with high risk of infection or delayed healing.
- Coverage of exposed pelvic organs or prosthetic materials.
- Restoration of perineal contour and support for adjacent structures.

The SCIP flap's thin profile and ease of dissection make it a suitable option for these cases, whereas the DIEP or ALT flaps may be employed for more extensive defects.5

5. Complex Wound Closure in Oncological Patients

Free perforator flaps are indicated for complex wound closure in patients with non-healing wounds secondary to prior oncological treatment, such as:5

- Radiation-induced soft tissue necrosis.
- Chronic wounds with recurrent infection despite conservative management.
- Post-resection defects with compromised local blood supply.

6. Pediatric Oncology Patients

Although less common, pediatric oncological patients with significant defects from tumor excision can benefit from free perforator flaps. Indications include:5

- Reconstruction of defects requiring minimal donor-site morbidity to preserve growth potential.
- Aesthetic and functional restoration in growing children.
- Coverage of defects following resection of rare pediatric cancers or syndromic conditions requiring oncological intervention.

7. Salvage Procedures in Reconstructive Failure

Free perforator flaps may be indicated as secondary or salvage options in cases where:

- Previous reconstructive attempts, such as pedicled flaps or skin grafts, have failed.

- Complex revision surgeries are required to address complications such as infection, flap necrosis, or poor aesthetic outcomes.

In summary, the indications for DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps in complex post-oncological reconstruction are diverse and tailored to the specific needs of the patient and defect. The choice of flap depends on defect size, location, patient anatomy, and overall health, underscoring the importance of a multidisciplinary approach in planning and execution.5

Medical Contraindications for the Use of Free Perforator Flaps in Complex Post-Oncological Reconstruction

While free perforator flaps such as the deep inferior epigastric perforator (DIEP), anterolateral thigh (ALT), and superficial circumflex iliac perforator (SCIP) flaps represent gold-standard options for complex post-oncological reconstruction, their use is not universally applicable. Contraindications, both relative and absolute, must be carefully evaluated to optimize patient outcomes and prevent perioperative complications. These contraindications can be broadly categorized into systemic, local, and procedural considerations.6

1. Systemic Contraindications

Systemic factors significantly impact a patient's suitability for microsurgical procedures involving free perforator flaps.6

a. Poor Overall Health and Comorbidities

- Patients with significant comorbidities such as advanced cardiovascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), or severe renal dysfunction may be unable to tolerate the physiological stress of prolonged surgery and anesthesia.6
- Conditions such as uncontrolled diabetes mellitus can impair wound healing and increase the risk of flap failure.6
- Malnutrition or hypoalbuminemia, often seen in oncological patients, compromises tissue regeneration and flap survival.6

b. Coagulopathy and Thrombotic Disorders

- Patients with clotting abnormalities, including thrombocytopenia, disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC), or anticoagulation therapy that cannot be paused perioperatively, are at heightened risk for microvascular anastomosis failure or hematoma formation.6

c. Immunosuppression

- Patients on long-term immunosuppressive therapy, such as those with a history of organ transplantation or autoimmune conditions, may have a reduced capacity to fight infections, increasing the risk of postoperative complications.
- Active systemic infections or sepsis represent absolute contraindications until the infection is resolved.6

d. Advanced Age and Frailty

- Although not an absolute contraindication, elderly patients with significant frailty or limited life expectancy may not derive sufficient benefit from a lengthy and resource-intensive procedure like free flap reconstruction.6

2. Local Contraindications

Local factors related to the defect site, donor site, or surrounding tissues may preclude the use of free perforator flaps.6

a. Compromised Recipient Site

- Extensive scarring, fibrosis, or vascular insufficiency at the recipient site, often secondary to prior surgeries or radiotherapy, can impair the establishment of a reliable blood supply for the flap.7
- Active local infection or purulent discharge at the recipient site increases the risk of flap contamination and necrosis.7

b. Inadequate Donor Site

- Patients with insufficient adipose tissue, such as those with a low body mass index (BMI) or cachexia, may not have adequate donor site resources for DIEP, ALT, or SCIP flap harvesting.7
- Previous surgeries or trauma to the donor site that disrupt perforator anatomy or vascular integrity may render the site unsuitable. For instance, prior abdominal surgeries with extensive scarring can complicate DIEP flap dissection, while prior thigh surgeries may preclude ALT flap harvesting.7

c. Peripheral Vascular Disease (PVD)

- PVD affecting the lower extremities can compromise the vascular integrity of donor sites like the thigh (ALT) or groin (SCIP), increasing the risk of ischemia and flap failure.7

3. Psychosocial and Functional Contraindications

a. Poor Compliance with Postoperative Care

- Microsurgical procedures require meticulous postoperative monitoring and patient adherence to care protocols. Non-compliant patients, due to psychological conditions, cognitive impairments, or social barriers, are at risk of poor outcomes.
- Patients unable to attend regular follow-ups or adhere to activity restrictions during the healing period may not be ideal candidates.8

b. Unrealistic Expectations

- Patients with unrealistic aesthetic or functional expectations may not be satisfied with the results of reconstructive surgery, despite achieving optimal technical outcomes. This is particularly relevant in cases involving visible defects, such as head and neck reconstructions.8

4. Procedural and Technical Contraindications

a. Lack of Microsurgical Expertise

- Free perforator flap procedures require advanced microsurgical expertise and appropriate infrastructure. Institutions or surgeons lacking sufficient experience or resources may opt for alternative reconstructive techniques, such as pedicled flaps or simpler skin grafts, to mitigate risks.8

b. Prolonged Operative Time

- Patients unable to tolerate prolonged operative times due to medical instability may require shorter reconstructive procedures, such as local flaps or skin grafting.8

c. Inadequate Recipient Vessels

- Absence of suitable recipient vessels for anastomosis, often due to prior vascular surgeries or local vascular damage, can preclude successful free flap transfer.8

5. Relative Contraindications and Special Considerations

a. Obesity

- While not an absolute contraindication, obese patients undergoing DIEP or ALT flap procedures may face challenges due to increased surgical complexity, higher rates of donor-site morbidity, and potential complications such as seroma or delayed wound healing.8

b. Smoking

- Active smoking is a well-known risk factor for poor wound healing and microvascular complications. While not always a contraindication, patients are strongly advised to cease smoking preoperatively to optimize outcomes.9

c. Prior Radiation Therapy

- Radiation-induced damage to the vasculature and soft tissues may compromise both donor and recipient sites. However, this is often addressed with careful preoperative planning and the use of well-vascularized flaps.9

The contraindications for the use of DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps in post-oncological reconstruction reflect a complex interplay of systemic, local, psychosocial, and technical factors. Comprehensive preoperative evaluation, multidisciplinary collaboration, and patient-centered planning are essential to mitigate risks and ensure the judicious application of these advanced reconstructive techniques.9

Surgical Technique for the Use of Free Perforator Flaps in Complex Post-Oncological Reconstruction

Free perforator flaps, such as the deep inferior epigastric perforator (DIEP), anterolateral thigh (ALT), and superficial circumflex iliac perforator (SCIP) flaps, are sophisticated microsurgical options for reconstructing defects after oncological resections. Their successful application depends on meticulous surgical planning, detailed knowledge of vascular anatomy, and precise microsurgical technique. Each flap requires tailored dissection and intraoperative management to address the unique challenges of the recipient site while minimizing donor-site morbidity.10

1. Preoperative Planning

a. Patient Evaluation

- **Vascular Assessment:** Preoperative imaging, such as computed tomography angiography (CTA) or Doppler ultrasound, is essential for mapping the vascular anatomy of both donor and recipient sites. This helps identify suitable perforators and recipient vessels.10
- **Donor Site Selection:** The choice between DIEP, ALT, or SCIP flaps depends on defect size, tissue requirements, patient anatomy, and prior surgeries.10
- **Nutritional and Systemic Optimization:** Ensuring the patient's fitness for prolonged microsurgical procedures is critical, especially in those with comorbidities or poor nutritional status.10

b. Marking and Positioning

- The patient is positioned to allow simultaneous access to the donor and recipient sites. For the DIEP flap, supine positioning is standard. ALT and SCIP flaps may require supine or lateral positioning depending on surgeon preference and defect location.
- Perforator mapping with Doppler ultrasound is performed intraoperatively to confirm preoperative findings and guide incision planning.10

2. Deep Inferior Epigastric Perforator (DIEP) Flap Technique

a. Incision and Flap Harvesting

- A lower abdominal transverse incision is made, similar to that used in abdominoplasty. Skin and subcutaneous tissue are carefully elevated to preserve perforating vessels.
- Meticulous dissection is performed around the perforators arising from the deep inferior epigastric artery and vein. Care is taken to avoid injury to the rectus abdominis muscle, minimizing donor-site morbidity.10

b. Vascular Dissection

- The deep inferior epigastric artery and vein are traced proximally to their origins at the external iliac vessels to ensure sufficient pedicle length for anastomosis.
- Perforator selection is based on vessel caliber, flow dynamics, and proximity to the defect's tissue requirements.10

c. Flap Transfer

- Once harvested, the flap is transferred to the recipient site, where microsurgical anastomosis is

performed with recipient vessels, typically the internal mammary or thoracodorsal vessels for breast reconstruction.10

3. Anterolateral Thigh (ALT) Flap Technique

a. Incision and Flap Design

- The ALT flap is designed on the anterior aspect of the thigh. The flap can be tailored to include skin, fascia, or even muscle if required.10
- A longitudinal incision is made, and dissection proceeds to identify perforators from the descending branch of the lateral circumflex femoral artery.10

b. Vascular Isolation

- Perforators are dissected through the vastus lateralis muscle, ensuring preservation of critical vascular structures.10
- If multiple perforators are identified, one or two are selected based on size, location, and ease of harvest.10

c. Flap Elevation and Transfer

- The pedicle is isolated and divided, providing a sufficient length for microsurgical transfer. The ALT flap is versatile and suitable for reconstruction of defects in the head, neck, trunk, or extremities.11

4. Superficial Circumflex Iliac Perforator (SCIP) Flap Technique

a. Flap Design and Incision

- The SCIP flap is designed over the groin area, with preoperative imaging guiding the location of the superficial circumflex iliac vessels.11
- A skin incision is made, and dissection proceeds in a subfascial plane to identify and isolate the perforators.11

b. Vascular Pedicle Dissection

- The superficial circumflex iliac artery and vein are carefully dissected to their origin, providing a reliable pedicle length for anastomosis. The SCIP flap's thin profile makes it ideal for smaller defects requiring delicate coverage.11

c. Transfer and Inset

- After harvesting, the flap is transferred to the recipient site, where microvascular anastomosis is performed. The SCIP flap is particularly suited for head and neck defects or extremity reconstructions requiring minimal bulk.11

5. Microvascular Anastomosis

- **Recipient Vessel Preparation:** The recipient vessels are exposed and prepared for anastomosis, ensuring adequate flow and diameter matching. Common vessels include the internal mammary artery, thoracodorsal artery, or superficial temporal artery, depending on the defect's location.12
- **Techniques:** Microsurgical anastomosis is performed using interrupted or continuous sutures under high magnification. End-to-end or end-to-side configurations may be employed depending on vessel anatomy.12
- **Intraoperative Monitoring:** Indocyanine green (ICG) angiography or Doppler ultrasound is used to confirm adequate perfusion through the anastomosed vessels.13

6. Flap Inset and Closure

- **Flap Shaping:** The flap is contoured to match the defect's dimensions and ensure aesthetic and functional restoration. Excess tissue is trimmed as needed.11
- **Donor Site Closure:** The donor site is closed primarily if possible or with skin grafting for larger defects. Measures are taken to minimize tension and reduce the risk of complications such as seroma or dehiscence.14
- **Drain Placement:** Closed suction drains are placed at both donor and recipient sites to manage postoperative fluid accumulation.14

7. Postoperative Management

- **Monitoring:** The flap is monitored closely for signs of ischemia, venous congestion, or infection. Clinical examination and Doppler ultrasound are used to assess flap viability.
- **Anticoagulation:** Low-dose heparin or antiplatelet agents may be administered to prevent thrombosis.14,15
- **Physical Therapy:** Early mobilization and physical therapy are initiated to enhance recovery and reduce complications.15

The surgical technique for free perforator flap reconstruction demands precision, expertise, and interdisciplinary collaboration. The success of DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps hinges on thorough preoperative planning, meticulous dissection, and vigilant postoperative care, making them invaluable tools in complex post-oncological reconstructions.15

CONCLUSIONS

The utilization of free perforator flaps, including the deep inferior epigastric perforator (DIEP), anterolateral thigh (ALT), and superficial circumflex iliac perforator (SCIP) flaps, represents a pinnacle of reconstructive microsurgery, offering unparalleled versatility, precision, and functional restoration in the context of complex post-oncological reconstructions. These advanced techniques provide robust solutions for addressing the unique challenges posed by extensive defects following oncologic resections, ensuring both aesthetic and functional outcomes while minimizing donor-site morbidity.

1. Efficacy and Versatility

Free perforator flaps have demonstrated their efficacy in a wide range of reconstructive scenarios, from breast reconstruction after mastectomy to coverage of extensive

head, neck, trunk, and extremity defects. The tailored selection of DIEP, ALT, or SCIP flaps enables surgeons to address defects of varying sizes, contours, and tissue requirements with precision. The inherent vascular reliability and adaptability of these flaps have made them the gold standard for complex reconstructions.

2. Patient-Centric Benefits

By preserving underlying musculature and minimizing functional impairment at the donor site, perforator flaps significantly reduce postoperative morbidity compared to traditional musculocutaneous flaps. This preservation aligns with the principles of patient-centered care, enhancing recovery, and improving quality of life post-surgery. Furthermore, the ability to contour the flaps to match the defect ensures superior aesthetic outcomes, particularly in regions with high visibility or functional demands.

3. Surgical Challenges and Solutions

The successful execution of perforator flap reconstructions requires extensive microsurgical expertise, meticulous preoperative planning, and advanced intraoperative techniques. While challenges such as perforator identification, vascular dissection, and microvascular anastomosis can be significant, the integration of preoperative imaging modalities (e.g., computed tomography angiography) and intraoperative tools (e.g., indocyanine green angiography) has substantially improved outcomes. Moreover, the refinement of surgical techniques and increasing experience among microsurgeons have reduced complication rates and enhanced flap viability.

4. Indications and Limitations

The application of free perforator flaps is broad but must be carefully considered in the context of individual patient factors. Optimal candidates are those with suitable vascular anatomy, sufficient donor tissue availability, and the physical resilience to withstand the demands of microsurgical reconstruction. Conversely, certain contraindications, such as poor vascular status or significant comorbidities, may limit the feasibility of these procedures. However, ongoing advancements in surgical techniques and perioperative management are continually expanding the pool of eligible patients.

5. Future Perspectives

The future of perforator flap surgery is poised for further innovation, with emerging technologies such as robotic-assisted dissection, three-dimensional printing for preoperative planning, and regenerative medicine approaches enhancing the precision and applicability of these flaps. Additionally, the integration of enhanced recovery protocols and patient-specific customization will likely continue to improve outcomes, making these procedures more accessible and effective.

6. Broader Implications for Reconstructive Surgery

The success of DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps underscores the broader evolution of reconstructive surgery toward techniques that prioritize functionality, aesthetics, and patient satisfaction. These advancements not only address the immediate reconstructive needs of patients recovering from oncologic interventions but also contribute to their long-term physical, emotional, and psychological well-being.

In conclusion, the use of free perforator flaps for complex post-oncological reconstruction represents a remarkable convergence of technical expertise, anatomical understanding, and patient-centered care. The DIEP, ALT, and SCIP flaps have proven to be invaluable in achieving superior reconstructive outcomes while minimizing donor-site morbidity, redefining standards in microsurgery. Continued innovation, education, and interdisciplinary collaboration will undoubtedly advance the field, ensuring that these sophisticated techniques remain at the forefront of reconstructive surgery for decades to come.

REFERENCES

I. Toth BA, Elliott LF. Aesthetic refinements in reconstructive microsurgery. Ann Plast Surg. 1989; 22:117-125.

II. Ariyan S. The pectoralis major myocutaneous flap. A versatile flap for reconstruction in the head and neck. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1979; 63:73-81.

III. Robinson DW. The deltopectoral flap in chest wall reconstruction. Br J Plast Surg. 1976; 29:22-26.

IV. Schneider WJ, Hill HL Jr, Brown RG. Latissimus dorsi myocutaneous flap for breast reconstruction. Br J Plast Surg. 1977; 30:277-281.

V. Daniel RK, Taylor GI. Distant transfer of an island flap by microvascular anastomoses. A clinical technique. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1973; 52:111-117.

VI. Harii K, Omori K, Torii S, Murakami F, Kasai Y. Free groin skin flaps. Br J Plast Surg. 1975; 28:225-237.

VII. Drever JM. The lower abdominal transverse rectus abdominis myocutaneous flap for breast reconstruction. Ann Plast Surg. 1983; 10:179-185.

VIII. Blondeel PN, Van Landuyt KH, Monstrey SJ, Hamdi M, Matton GE, Allen RJ, Dupin C, Feller AM, Koshima I, Kostakoglu N, Wei FC. The "Gent" consensus on perforator flap terminology: preliminary definitions. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2003; 112:1378-1383.

IX. Koshima I, Soeda S. Inferior epigastric artery skin flaps without rectus abdominis muscle. Br J Plast Surg. 1989; 42:645-648.

X. Yamamoto T, Matsuda N, Doi K, Oshima A, Yoshimatsu H, Todokoro T, Ogata F, Mihara M, Narushima M, Iida T, Koshima I. The earliest finding of indocyanine green lymphography in asymptomatic limbs of lower extremity

lymphedema patients secondary to cancer treatment: the modified dermal backflow stage and concept of subclinical lymphedema. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011; 128:314e-321e.

XI. Koshima I. Free anterolateral thigh flap for reconstruction of head and neck defects following cancer ablation. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2000; 105:2358-2360.

XII. Angrigiani C, Grilli D, Siebert J. Latissimus dorsi musculocutaneous flap without muscle. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1995; 96:1608-1614.

XIII. Allen RJ, Tucker C Jr. Superior gluteal artery perforator free flap for breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1995; 95:1207-1212.

XIV. Koshima I, Yamamoto T, Narushima M, Mihara M, Iida T. Perforator flaps and supermicrosurgery. Clin Plast Surg. 2010; 37:683-689.

XV. 15. Yamamoto T, Narushima M, Yoshimatsu H, Seki Y, Yamamoto N, Oka A, Hara H, Koshima I. Minimally invasive lymphatic supermicrosurgery (MILS): indocyanine green lymphography-guided simultaneous multisite lymphaticovenular anastomoses via millimeter skin incisions. Ann Plast Surg. 2014; 72:67-70.