



The incidence of capsular contracture after breast augmentation with the different prostheses

Qiaoqiao Guo¹, Zhijuan Zhou², Qinchun Wei¹, Anli Zhao¹, Jiangfeng Wu^{1^}

¹Department of Ultrasound, The Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Dongyang, China; ²Department of Ultrasound, Tianxiang East Hospital, Yiwu, China

Correspondence to: Jiangfeng Wu. Department of Ultrasound, The Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, No. 60 Wuning West Road, Dongyang 322100, Zhejiang, China. Email: wjfhospital@163.com.

Comment on: Zhai P, Wu Y, Yang D, *et al.* A systematic review and meta-analysis of capsular contracture rate after breast augmentation with textured and smooth breast prostheses. *Gland Surg* 2022;11:166-74.

Submitted Feb 07, 2022. Accepted for publication Apr 06, 2022.

doi: 10.21037/gS-22-93

View this article at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gS-22-93>

We read the recent published paper in this journal of *Gland Surgery* by Zhai and colleagues entitled “A systematic review and meta-analysis of capsular contracture rate after breast augmentation with textured and smooth breast prostheses” (1). They performed a meta-analysis to assess the contracture rates after breast augmentation with textured and smooth breast prostheses. We appreciate Zhai *et al.* for the valuable study, however, after a careful learning of the literature, several limitations should be noticed.

First, in the sensitivity analysis section of the study, the authors depicted that the Calobrace *et al.*' study (2) was a source of the heterogeneity showed in *Fig. 3*. However, after carefully reviewing *Fig. 3*, we found that the pooled estimate of the remaining studies was still among the range of the 95% confident interval (CI) (*Fig. 3*), and we believe that Calobrace *et al.*' study being a source of the heterogeneity could not be demonstrated.

Second, in the subgroup analysis section of this article, the authors mentioned that a random-effects model was chosen for analysis (odds ratio =0.24; 95% CI: 0.10, 0.61; P=0.03) because of the similarity of the baseline and clinical homogeneity between the 2 groups. However, we believed the depiction above was unreasonable. Actually, a random-effects model was used to combine the relevant study results, because the I^2 value was >50%.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was a standard submission to the journal. The article did not undergo external peer review.

Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <https://gs.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/gS-22-93/coif>). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with

[^] ORCID: 0000-0002-5036-799X.

the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

References

1. Zhai P, Wu Y, Yang D, et al. A systematic review and

meta-analysis of capsular contracture rate after breast augmentation with textured and smooth breast prostheses. *Gland Surg* 2022;11:166-74.

2. Calobrace MB, Stevens WG, Capizzi PJ, et al. Risk Factor Analysis for Capsular Contracture: A 10-Year Sientra Study Using Round, Smooth, and Textured Implants for Breast Augmentation. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2018;141:20S-28S.

Cite this article as: Guo Q, Zhou Z, Wei Q, Zhao A, Wu J. The incidence of capsular contracture after breast augmentation with the different prostheses. *Gland Surg* 2022;11(5):955-956. doi: 10.21037/gs-22-93