

Flaps vs. Grafts in Facial Reconstruction

Roberto Carlos Góngora Parga¹, David Rodríguez Arevalo¹, Omar González Catañeda²

¹Hospital Regional Universitario, IMSS Bienestar

²Hospital Civil Fray Antonio Alcalde

ABSTRACT

This review delineates the fundamental differences between flaps and grafts in facial reconstruction, emphasizing their distinct vascularization, indications, and clinical outcomes. Flaps maintain their own blood supply, making them suitable for complex, three-dimensional defects with exposed vital structures, and often yielding superior aesthetic and functional results in areas with intricate anatomy. Grafts, on the other hand, are simpler to harvest but depend on the recipient bed's vascularity and are primarily used for superficial, small defects. The choice between these techniques is guided by factors such as defect size, location, tissue requirements, and aesthetic considerations. Understanding the advantages and limitations of each method aids in optimizing reconstruction strategies to achieve functional and cosmetic success.

KEYWORDS: Facial reconstruction, flaps, grafts, skin transfer, vascularity, aesthetic outcomes, reconstructive surgery, tissue transfer, surgical techniques

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
27 June 2025

Available on:
<https://ijmscrs.com/>

INTRODUCTION

Flaps and grafts are both fundamental techniques in facial reconstruction, but they differ significantly in their vascular supply, indications, and clinical outcomes. A graft is a section of tissue (commonly skin) that is completely detached from its original site and transferred to a recipient site, where it relies initially on plasmatic imbibition and then revascularization from the recipient bed for survival. Grafts are classified by thickness (split-thickness vs. full-thickness) and by origin (autograft, homograft, xenograft), with only autografts achieving permanent "take" in routine clinical practice.[1] In contrast, a flap is a segment of tissue (skin, subcutaneous tissue, sometimes muscle or cartilage) that is transferred to a defect while maintaining its own intrinsic blood supply via a vascular pedicle, either as a local, regional, or distant flap.[2][1]

The primary clinical distinction is that flaps bring their own blood supply, allowing them to survive in less vascularized recipient beds and to reconstruct more complex three-dimensional defects, including those with exposed bone or cartilage. Grafts, lacking an intrinsic blood supply, require a well-vascularized recipient bed and are generally limited to resurfacing superficial defects.[2][1][3] Flaps are often preferred for facial reconstruction when optimal contour, color match, and durability are required, as they tend to yield

superior cosmetic and functional outcomes, particularly in areas with complex topography such as the nose.[4][2][5][6] However, flaps are technically more demanding and may result in donor site morbidity.

Grafts are technically simpler and can be harvested and inset quickly, but they are more prone to contour irregularities, color mismatch, and secondary contraction, especially in areas with poor vascularity or over concave surfaces.[4][2][5] Full-thickness skin grafts may be used for small, superficial defects with good vascular beds, while split-thickness grafts are reserved for larger or less cosmetically sensitive areas.[1] In some situations, hybrid techniques combining flaps and grafts may be employed to optimize both contour and surface characteristics.[5][7]

The choice between flaps and grafts in facial reconstruction is determined by several key factors, including defect size, depth, location, involvement of underlying structures, and the need for optimal aesthetic and functional outcomes. Flaps are generally indicated when there is a need for robust vascularity, coverage of exposed vital structures (such as bone, cartilage, or tendon), restoration of contour, or when superior color and texture match is required. Flaps are particularly favored for moderate to large defects, defects involving multiple facial subunits, or when the defect is located in areas with complex three-dimensional anatomy,

such as the midface or nose, where local tissue provides better integration and less contour deformity.[1][2][3][4] For example, local flaps are preferred for nasal reconstruction due to their superior cosmetic outcomes, except in the nasal ala, where certain flaps may be less successful and skin grafts may be considered as alternatives.[1][5][4]

Grafts, particularly full-thickness skin grafts, are typically reserved for smaller, superficial defects where the underlying bed is well vascularized and there is no exposure of critical structures. Grafts are also considered when local tissue is insufficient or when donor site morbidity must be minimized. However, grafts are more likely to result in contour irregularities and suboptimal color or texture match, especially in areas with complex topography or high aesthetic demand.[1][5][3]

CONCLUSION

In facial reconstruction, the choice between flaps and grafts hinges on the specific characteristics of the defect, including size, depth, location, and the involvement of underlying structures. Flaps, with their own blood supply, are preferable for large, complex, or exposed tissue defects, providing superior contour, color, and durability—particularly in anatomically intricate areas like the nose. Conversely, grafts are simpler to harvest and suitable for small, superficial defects with well-vascularized beds, though they are more prone to contour irregularities and color mismatch. The decision ultimately depends on balancing factors such as vascularity requirements, aesthetic goals, and donor site considerations, with hybrid approaches occasionally employed to optimize functional and cosmetic outcomes.

REFERENCES

- I. Classification and Pathophysiology of Skin Grafts. Andreassi A, Bilenchi R, Biagioli M, D'Aniello C. Clinics in Dermatology. 2005 Jul-Aug;23(4):332-7. doi:10.1016/j.clindermatol.2004.07.024.
- II. Skin Grafts and Local Flaps. Hallock GG, Morris SF. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery. 2011;127(1):5e-22e. doi:10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181fad46c.
- III. Comparison of Keystone Flaps and Skin Grafts for Oncologic Reconstruction: A Retrospective Review. Darrach H, Kokosis G, Bridgham K, et al. Journal of Surgical Oncology. 2019;119(7):843-849. doi:10.1002/jso.25394.
- IV. Reconstruction Methods for and Cosmetic Evaluation of External Nasal Tumour Resections: Flap Versus Graft. Tozawa A, Mori H, Ao M, et al. European Journal of Dermatology : EJD. 2023;33(5):524-529. doi:10.1684/ejd.2023.4561.
- V. Flap or Graft: The Best of Both in Nasal Ala Reconstruction. Lindsay KJ, Morton JD. Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery : JPRAS. 2015;68(10):1352-7. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2015.05.036.

- VI. Alternatives in Nasal Reconstruction ("Five Flaps and a Graft"). Tardy ME. The Laryngoscope. 1976;86(12):1824-7. doi:10.1002/lary.5540861205.
- VII. The Perichondrial Cutaneous Graft and "Flip-Flop" Flap in Facial Reconstruction: A Series of 41 Cases. Patterson AR, Brady G, Walker PD, Telfer MR. The British Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery. 2008;46(2):114-8. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2007.08.028.