

Breast Cancer Reconstruction: *More Than Skin Deep*

Daniel J. Ceradini, MD, and Jamie P. Levine, MD

ABSTRACT

Breast cancer often leads to significant alteration of body image and disfigurement of the breast. Reconstruction for breast cancer defects can provide the patient with a restored breast contour. The potential benefit of breast cancer reconstructive surgery is to increase the patient's post-surgical quality of life and alleviate the posttraumatic psychological sequelae of breast cancer surgery. Time of breast cancer diagnosis is an important point of access for patients to receive information on breast reconstruction. Access to this information and plastic surgeons in the early phases of diagnosis is critical to a patient's decision to undergo reconstructive surgery, but is currently underutilized in the United States. Breast cancer reconstruction is a complex process that should be treated in a multidisciplinary fashion. This process must begin with the identification and treatment of psychological issues preceding or accompanying breast cancer diagnosis. These psychological problems should be addressed immediately and can significantly influence a patient's decision toward and level of satisfaction with breast cancer reconstruction. Breast reconstruction continues to be an essential element in helping patients recover from the diagnosis and treatment for breast cancer.

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of surgical decision making in breast cancer treatment has created a challenging environment for breast cancer reconstruction. Breast cancer is the most common form of cancer diagnosed in women. In 2007, it was the second leading

Needs Assessment: Breast cancer reconstruction is powerful in helping patients recover from breast cancer therapy, but it remains underutilized in the United States healthcare system. It is essential for clinicians involved in the early phases of breast cancer diagnosis to understand factors involved in breast cancer reconstruction and to be able to provide access to information or specialists who can adequately educate patients during their decision-making process.

Learning Objectives:

- Identify the practical, psychological, and clinical factors involved in a woman's decision to undergo breast cancer reconstruction
- Summarize the types of breast reconstruction and their advantages/disadvantages
- Evaluate the available data regarding the psychological impact of breast cancer reconstruction and determine how this can be helpful in counseling patients

Target Audience: Primary care physicians and psychiatrists.

CME Accreditation Statement: This activity has been planned and implemented in accordance with the Essentials and Standards of the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) through the joint sponsorship of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine and MBL Communications, Inc. The Mount Sinai School of Medicine is accredited by the ACCME to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

Credit Designation: The Mount Sinai School of Medicine designates this educational activity for a maximum of 3 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credit(s)*[™]. Physicians should only claim credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Faculty Disclosure Policy Statement: It is the policy of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine to ensure objectivity, balance, independence, transparency, and scientific rigor in all CME-sponsored educational activities. All faculty participating in the planning or implementation of a sponsored activity are expected to disclose to the audience any relevant financial relationships and to assist in resolving any conflict of interest that may arise from the relationship. Presenters must also make a meaningful disclosure to the audience of their discussions of unlabeled or unapproved drugs or devices. This information will be available as part of the course material.

This activity has been peer-reviewed and approved by Eric Hollander, MD, chair and professor of psychiatry at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, and Norman Sussman, MD, editor of *Primary Psychiatry* and professor of psychiatry at New York University School of Medicine. Review Date: August 21, 2008.

Drs. Hollander and Sussman report no affiliation with or financial interest in any organization that may pose a conflict of interest.

To receive credit for this activity: Read this article and the two CME-designated accompanying articles, reflect on the information presented, and then complete the CME posttest and evaluation found on page 81. To obtain credits, you should score 70% or better. Early submission of this posttest is encouraged: please submit this posttest by October 1, 2010 to be eligible for credit. Release date: October 1, 2008. Termination date: October 31, 2010. The estimated time to complete all three articles and the posttest is 3 hours.

Dr. Ceradini is chief resident at the Institute of Reconstructive Plastic Surgery at New York University (NYU) Langone Medical Center. Dr. Levine is assistant professor of surgery, director of microsurgery, and director of Bellevue Hospital Plastic Surgery at the Institute of Reconstructive Plastic Surgery at NYU Langone Medical Center.

Disclosures: Drs. Ceradini and Levine report no affiliation with or financial interest in any organization that may pose a conflict of interest.

Please direct all correspondence to: Jamie P. Levine, MD, New York University Langone Medical Center, TH-169, 550 1st Avenue, New York, NY 10016; Tel: 212-263-8452; Fax: 212-263-7002; E-mail: Jamie.Levine@nyumc.org.

cause of cancer mortality. Current data suggests that one in eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer in their lifetime. While the incidence of breast cancer has progressively increased in the United States over the past 2 decades, the mortality from breast cancer has declined largely due to better detection and improved therapeutic interventions.¹ Unlike the vast majority of cancers, breast cancer is unique in that the treatment often leads to significant alteration of body image^{2,3} and disfigurement of the breast, which is considered to be a major symbol of femininity and sexuality.^{4,5} There has been a trend over the past decade toward therapeutic interventions attempting to preserve as much of the native breast as possible to avoid these issues, particularly breast conservation therapy (BCT).

Along with these changes in the approach to breast cancer therapy, the indications, options, and ultimate aesthetic outcomes of breast cancer reconstruction have changed. It is estimated that 57,102 breast reconstructions were performed in 2007 compared to 80,908 performed in 2000.⁶ This reduction in the rate of breast reconstruction likely reflects the trend toward earlier detection and BCT for smaller tumors. The theoretical advantage of breast cancer reconstruction is to recreate the patient's breast contour following mastectomy, thereby restoring the feminine form, increasing quality of life (QOL), and alleviating the posttraumatic psychological sequelae of breast cancer surgery. Indeed, while there is tremendous interest in and investigation into the psychological issues of breast cancer, the study of the psychology of breast cancer reconstruction is in its infancy. This article reviews clinical data and specific psychological issues in breast cancer reconstruction to facilitate counseling of these patients during their treatment.

PREOPERATIVE DECISION MAKING IN BREAST CANCER RECONSTRUCTION: PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT OF THE BREAST CANCER DIAGNOSIS

The diagnosis of breast cancer frequently leads to significant psychological problems that can interfere with patients' course of treatment.⁷ Patients often learn of their diagnosis from their primary care physician or gynecologist who refers them to a surgical oncologist. Prior to their surgical consultation, >40% of newly diagnosed breast cancer patients rate their psychological distress as clinically significant resulting in practical, family-related, emotional, and physical problems. In addition, rates of major depressive disorder (11%) and posttraumatic stress disorder (10%) in these patients significantly interfere with their activities of daily function.⁷ Despite these statistics, many women are reluctant to discuss psychological distress⁸ and few are screened for distress during their surgical work up and

treatment.⁹ These problems can persist over 10 years following treatment,¹⁰ indicating that early identification and treatment is critical to long-term psychological well being. Furthermore, early intervention may facilitate a patient's decision making for breast reconstruction and ultimately influence her satisfaction with the final appearance. Examination of women with higher levels of preoperative affective distress, depression, anxiety, and somatic preoccupation revealed they were significantly less satisfied with both the general and aesthetic outcome of their breast reconstruction.¹¹ This suggests that mental healthcare providers have an integral role in the pre- and postoperative treatment of breast cancer. In most multidisciplinary cancer centers, psychological evaluation and support play an important role in both the initial evaluation and the patient's long-term care.

PATIENT DECISION MAKING AND ACCESS TO BREAST RECONSTRUCTION

Within 2 weeks following diagnosis, patients may have up to four medical or surgical consultations, including those by radiation oncologists and a reconstructive plastic surgeon, who will outline a treatment plan collectively. The oncologic treatment algorithm is largely driven by data and requires very few choices by the patient; that is, given the imaging findings and clinical stage of breast cancer, the survival of various operative approaches, surgical margins, and adjuvant therapy have been well studied and guide patients' decision making. However, one of the few critical decisions a patient needs to make regarding oncologic therapy in early breast cancer is whether to have a mastectomy or undergo BCT. This decision is usually reserved for patients with stage I or II disease, and data from multiple studies has established that the long-term survival between these two treatment modalities is equivalent up to 20 years post-therapy.^{12,13} Furthermore, emerging neoadjuvant treatment protocols may facilitate BCT in select patients who would otherwise require a formal mastectomy. This is usually a discussion between the patient and an oncologic surgeon, and it does not necessarily involve a reconstructive surgery consultation. This is unfortunate, as plastic surgeons utilize numerous approaches to local tumor resection to minimize the aesthetic impact of breast excision frequently overlooked by oncologic surgeons. In fact, early discussion of reconstruction may also allow patients to more comfortably choose mastectomy over BCT. The aesthetic consequences of a lumpectomy excision in a relatively small breast with postoperative radiation (ie, BCT) must be weighed against a total mastectomy with reconstruction (Figure 1). In certain circumstances, the mastectomy with reconstruction will actually provide a better aesthetic outcome. Therefore, involvement of the reconstructive surgeon during

the treatment planning process may facilitate decision making by providing patients with a reasonable expectation of aesthetic outcome, regardless of the mode of therapy selected.

Despite the potential advantages offered by BCT, mastectomy remains the treatment of choice for a select number of early cancers and the vast majority of more advanced cancers. The rate of breast reconstruction following mastectomy in the US has increased over the past 3 decades from 3.4% in the mid 1980s, to 8.3% in the early 1990s, to nearly 40% in the 2000s.^{14,15} Younger age seems to be the most powerful predictive factor for breast cancer reconstruction. Higher income, higher levels of education, race, and tumor stage also play a significant role. The seemingly low global rate of reconstruction following mastectomy may be explained by a failure to adequately inform patients of their reconstructive options at the time of clinical decision making. A population-based study by Morrow and colleagues¹⁵ demonstrated that while 78% of breast cancer patients report some discussion of breast reconstruction, <12% could answer three basic questions on breast reconstruction that would be required for informed consent. In addition, more recent data suggest that only 33% of general surgeons discuss breast reconstruction with patients during consultation.¹⁸ Patients who understand their reconstructive options were four times more likely to opt for mastectomy with reconstruction than those who were not counseled on reconstruction. The desire to avoid more surgery and the belief that breast reconstruction was not important were the most common reasons to avoid reconstruc-

tion.¹⁸ This loss of first-line counseling is clearly a major barrier to informed decision making in breast cancer reconstruction. These data become even more interesting when compared to a healthcare system where breast reconstruction is universally proposed during the surgical oncology consultation. Under these conditions, investigators in France report that 81% of breast cancer patients evaluated for mastectomy selected breast reconstruction, more than double the number of US women in the busiest centers.¹⁹ These data strongly suggest that one's being adequately informed about breast cancer reconstruction and having access to reconstructive options significantly impacts a patient's decision on breast cancer reconstruction.

IMMEDIATE VERSUS DELAYED RECONSTRUCTION

In the majority of cases, immediate breast reconstruction following mastectomy is considered the standard of care and affords a number of psychological benefits compared to delayed reconstruction, including a decrease in post-mastectomy anxiety and depression as well as improved self-esteem and sexual satisfaction.²⁰ In addition, prospective studies suggest that the QOL 1 year following immediate reconstruction approaches that of age-matched control subjects without breast cancer.²¹ However, after 1 year, there appears to be no difference in the general and aesthetic satisfaction with reconstruction between immediate and delayed reconstruction.²²

There is still a significant role for delayed reconstruction, particularly in patients with advanced cancers who will require postoperative radiation therapy. Radiation causes progressive fibrosis and microvascular obliteration that manifests as poor wound healing and scar contracture, compromising the tissue health and the ultimate aesthetic outcome of the breast reconstruction. Due to these potential complications, most surgeons would defer reconstruction in this patient population until after radiotherapy when the rate of complications approaches that of non-irradiated patients (Figure 2).²³

AUTOLOGOUS TISSUE VERSUS IMPLANT-BASED RECONSTRUCTION

There are two broad classifications of breast reconstruction following mastectomy. One is the use of prosthetic implants inserted under the skin and muscle of the mastectomy flaps, and the other is transfer of the patient's own autologous tissue into the mastectomy defect to recreate the contour of the breast mound (Figures 3 and 4). The choice of reconstructive methodology depends on numerous factors, including patient preferences, surgical expertise, stage of disease, poten-

FIGURE 1
SIGNIFICANT BREAST DEFORMITY AFTER BCT WITH A LARGE RESECTION AND EXTERNAL BEAM RADIATION TREATMENT



BCT=breast conservation therapy.

Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

tial for postoperative radiation, availability of donor tissue, and general medical health of the patient preoperatively. The potential advantages and disadvantages of these reconstructive options are summarized in the Table.

Implant-based reconstruction has evolved significantly over the past decade and, according to 2007 American Society of Plastic Surgeons statistics, accounts for approximately 75% of breast reconstruction performed in 2007.⁶ Typically, this reconstruction can be performed either as a single immediate procedure with insertion of a long-term prosthesis at the time of mastectomy or more commonly as a two-stage procedure, wherein a temporary tissue expander

TABLE.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF BREAST RECONSTRUCTION

Autologous Breast Reconstruction	
<u>Advantages</u>	<u>Disadvantages</u>
More "natural" texture and appearance of the breast	Longer operative time, more complicated surgery
Easier to make breast symmetrical to the other	Longer initial hospital stay
Will "droop" (become ptotic) over time like a normal breast	Potential donor site morbidity
Single stage procedure in most cases	Longer recovery
	More scars (abdomen)
	Risk of flap failure
	Postoperative radiation will potentially shrink the reconstruction
Implant-based Breast Reconstruction	
<u>Advantages</u>	<u>Disadvantages</u>
Shorter operative time and simpler surgical procedure	Less natural texture and appearance of breast with decreased natural breast ptosis
Shorter hospital stay	Temporary prosthesis; will need further surgery, making it a two-staged procedure
Quicker recovery	Less desirable if postoperative radiation needed due to skin thinning and contracture
No donor site morbidity	Risk of capsular contracture, rupture, rippling
Fewer scars	Tissue expander requires filling over 1-2 months
Possibility of one stage when skin is spared and patient can tolerate a size reduction	More difficult to make look like the other breast without operating on the contralateral side

Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

is inserted at time of mastectomy, expanded in an office setting over 1–2 months, and then replaced with a long-term prosthesis (Figures 5 and 6). Very high levels of patient satisfaction have been reported using these techniques.²⁴ The down side of this approach is that it requires a two-

FIGURE 2

EXAMPLE OF A BREAST MASTECTOMY WITHOUT RECONSTRUCTION



Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

FIGURE 3

EARLY POSTOPERATIVE RESULT WITH TRAM FLAP, NOTE SYMMETRY TO NON-OPERATED RIGHT SIDE AND NO NIPPLE RECONSTRUCTION



Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

stage approach, as noted above, and the implants need to be exchanged at regular intervals based on the approximate 10-year lifespan of the implant device.

Autologous breast reconstruction utilizes a patient's own tissue to recreate the breast shape, most often involving the transfer of excess skin, fat, and sometimes muscle from a patient's

FIGURE 4
LEFT TRAM WITH NIPPLE RECONSTRUCTION AND TATOOING



Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

FIGURE 5
PATIENT WITH TWO STAGED IMPLANT RECONSTRUCTION WITH SUBSEQUENT NIPPLE RECONSTRUCTION. TATOOING HAS NOT YET OCCURRED



Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

abdomen to the mastectomy defect. Compared to implant-based reconstruction, the operative time and hospital stay following these procedures is significantly longer. While this reconstruction creates a more natural breast, removal of this "donor tissue" from its native location can weaken the abdominal wall. This has not been found to affect health-related and physical QOL using standardized measures, but it may limit more strenuous physical exercise.²⁵ Based on prospective studies, women selecting autologous reconstruction are aesthetically more satisfied with their reconstruction than women who opt for implant-based reconstruction while the levels of general satisfaction were comparable 2 years postoperatively.^{22,26,27}

In either method, the final stage of reconstruction is the re-creation of the nipple-areolar complex (Figure 7). This typically occurs in a staged fashion under minimal anesthetic. Local skin flaps are re-arranged in such a way to create a projecting nipple. Finally, the surrounding skin and reconstructed nipple can be tattooed to match the areolar color of the contralateral side to complete the breast reconstruction.

IMPACT OF POST-MASTECTOMY RADIATION

Another important preoperative consideration in breast reconstruction relates to the increasing role of post-mastectomy radiation in breast cancer therapy.²⁸ Frequently, the ultimate oncologic stage is uncertain at the time of mastectomy as definitive pathologic analysis is required to

FIGURE 6
BILATERAL ONE STAGE IMPLANT PLACEMENT WITH COMPLETED NIPPLE RECONSTRUCTION AND TATOOING



Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

determine the involvement of the axillary lymph nodes. This presents several issues with clinical decision making for breast reconstruction. First, and most importantly, the patient will not know the extent of postoperative adjuvant therapy required (ie, radiation and/or chemotherapy). While breast reconstruction has not been shown to impact the administration of postoperative chemotherapy, radiation, or the ability to detect locoregional recurrence,²⁹⁻³³ complications of the reconstruction, including problems with wound healing can delay adjuvant therapy, which is a source of anxiety for both patient and physician.

Second, whether or not the patient will require radiation potentially changes the optimal reconstructive plan. If this is ultimately determined 1 week following mastectomy after the pathology has been finalized, it presents an obvious clinical dilemma. When it is certain that a patient will not require postoperative radiation, all reconstructive options are available to him or her. Alternatively, if it is known that the patient will definitely require postoperative radiation, then most surgeons would alter their reconstructive plan to either delay reconstruction all together or offer a very limited number of options due to the known increase in complications related to reconstruction after radiation therapy. One such option may be the temporary placement of a tissue expander to maximize skin stretch prior to radiation, which is converted to another form of reconstruction after radiation treatment is completed. However, there is no consensus among plastic surgeons on the use of this particular technique.

FIGURE 7
CLOSEUP VIEW OF EARLY NIPPLE RECONSTRUCTION IN A PATIENT WITH A LATISSIMUS FLAP AND IMPLANT PRIOR TO AREOLAR TATOING



Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

In patients presenting with intermediate-sized tumors and clinically negative axillary lymph nodes, it is unknown at the time of mastectomy whether the patient will receive postoperative radiation therapy. Sentinel lymph node biopsy has become the standard tool used to detect involvement in the clinically negative axilla. A negative sentinel node in experienced hands has a 5% to 10% false-negative rate on intraoperative evaluation, making the likelihood of post-mastectomy radiation very low when the sentinel node is negative.³⁴ Conversely, a positive sentinel node mandates a formal axillary dissection to quantify the number of nodes involved determined by pathologic diagnosis several days later. Currently, ≥ 4 positive nodes are an indication for radiotherapy. Again, the uncertainty of postoperative radiotherapy in this situation and how reconstruction should be managed has been the topic of much debate.^{35,36}

PSYCHOLOGICAL OUTCOMES OF BREAST CANCER RECONSTRUCTION

Breast reconstruction is powerful in helping patients cope with and recover from the sequelae of breast cancer. The most important measures of success in reconstruction are the level of improvement in QOL and patient satisfaction. In studying these outcomes, it is difficult to utilize prospectively randomized trials to evaluate breast cancer reconstruction, as patient decision making is essential and serves as the basis for this elective procedure. As a result, there are a variety of studies with varied designs and endpoints that must be interpreted wholly rather than individually.

Rubino and colleagues³⁷ retrospectively examined QOL, sexual function, anxiety, and depression of healthy women, mastectomy-only patients, and mastectomy with reconstruction patients at 1 year postoperatively in Italy. They found that after one year there was no statistical difference between healthy patients and reconstructed patients using measures of social and sexual relationships as well as overall QOL. Further, they found that indicators of depression were less severe in reconstructed patients compared to mastectomy-only patients, while levels of anxiety remained similar between these groups. Although reporting relatively few numbers, they identified that a pre-existing psychological disorder was an indicator for postoperative dissatisfaction with reconstruction. They did not demonstrate any significant difference between the type and timing of breast reconstruction. While these data suggest a significant benefit to breast reconstruction, it is unclear whether there were baseline psychological differences between the two groups preoperatively (ie, patients with higher QOL

standards may opt to undergo breast reconstruction more frequently). Nonetheless, these data provide strong evidence that patients benefit from breast reconstruction.

Elder and colleagues²¹ prospectively compared QOL in a broad range of categories under the Medical Outcome Study 36-Item short form in Swedish women who underwent immediate implant-based reconstruction compared to a healthy reference population at 1 year. These investigators found that, like others before them, the QOL measures were lower pre-operatively in the breast cancer group than the reference population. However, 1 year following surgery, they found that QOL measures of patients who underwent immediate breast reconstruction returned to levels comparable to that of the reference population with a high rate of reconstruction satisfaction. While this study did not analyze a group that underwent mastectomy-only or breast-conserving surgery, these data seem to support the psychological benefits of immediate breast reconstruction.

Ananian and colleagues¹⁹ prospectively examined factors involved in patient decision making for breast cancer reconstruction in a French healthcare system that universally offers reconstruction (without added cost) to mastectomy patients. This is important because reconstruction is not a universally discussed topic during oncologic consultation in the US. They found a strikingly high rate of breast reconstruction following mastectomy (81%). Greater awareness of body image was an important factor in the decision to reconstruct while fears of additional surgery prevented most women who did not choose to have reconstruction from choosing this pathway. Patients selecting reconstruction were more often younger, active, and more educated patients who were with a partner. Furthermore, 83% of patients who chose to have reconstruction selected immediate reconstruction, most often predicted by breast symptoms, greater preoperative appetite loss, lower body mass index, and a more patient-centered doctor-patient relationship. Due to the nature of the healthcare system, this study essentially excluded issues of patient access to reconstruction information and economic restraints, focusing primarily on patient decision making. The higher rate of reconstruction (over twice that observed in the US) indicates the great influence that patient access to reconstruction information has on decision making in breast cancer reconstruction. These data suggest that when patients have access and are offered the option of reconstruction in a multidisciplinary and non-biased fashion, reconstructive rates will be high.

Harcourt and colleagues³⁸ prospectively compared QOL indicators in women in the United Kingdom undergoing mastectomy alone, mastectomy with immediate reconstruction, and mastectomy with delayed reconstruction. Based

on their data, they failed to identify a consistent benefit of immediate breast reconstruction in QOL and psychological variables but noted a significant improvement in a small sample of delayed reconstruction patients. However, there was a notable difference in the mean age of the mastectomy-only group compared to the two reconstructed groups (approximately 10 years), and as noted previously, age is the most powerful predictor of the decision to reconstruct. It has been suggested that possible reasons why older women are less likely to undergo reconstruction include the reluctance to undergo multiple additional procedures to complete the reconstruction, decreased importance of body image compared to younger patients, and the bias of surgeon selection of younger healthier patients who would tolerate a prolonged procedure.¹⁵

Based on the above studies, although somewhat disparate in terms of study designs and goals, it would seem that women's attitudes toward breast reconstruction vary according to geographic and cultural differences. Mullan and colleagues³⁹ specifically addressed this question, prospectively comparing the QOL of women from different countries undergoing mastectomy with reconstruction to healthy controls. They also observed an improvement in the psychological profile of women undergoing reconstruction but noted that country of origin and cross-cultural factors do not seem to contribute to the QOL benefit to breast reconstruction in these populations. As with earlier studies, however, there was no comparison to a mastectomy without reconstruction group. It has been reported that breast cancer patients experience some degree of improvement of QOL and psychological measures during the first year following mastectomy.

The Michigan Breast Reconstruction Outcome Study^{26,40} is a large prospective study underway examining patient satisfaction and QOL outcomes in patients undergoing different types of breast reconstruction. These investigators did not include a mastectomy-only group or a healthy reference population, as their goal was to compare procedure choice. Although still in data collection, patients who underwent autologous tissue reconstruction were more aesthetically satisfied 2 years postoperatively than patients who underwent implant-based reconstruction. The levels of general satisfaction with the reconstructive procedure were comparable at 2 years. It will be interesting to follow the outcome of this study to see if patient preference for autologous reconstruction persists beyond 5 years.

Parker and colleagues⁴¹ prospectively compared outcomes in patients with early breast cancer (stage I or II) who underwent mastectomy alone, mastectomy with reconstruction, and breast-conserving therapy. They found no differences in the majority of QOL and psychological outcomes 2 years

following treatment. Specifically, they provided evidence that all three groups experience significant improvement in psychological functioning at two years, often returning to preoperative levels (ie, post-cancer diagnosis) but did not find that reconstruction differed from BCT significantly in level and rate of improvement. They found that patients reconstructed with autologous tissue were somewhat more satisfied with the appearance of their abdominal area (Figure 8) and that there was less of a decline in sexual function. While this study seems to conclude that BCT and reconstruction are equivalent in terms of outcomes, it is unclear how each patient was presented with their surgical options and how decision making was influenced by the surgeons. For example, in patients with large breasts, a small peripherally located tumor would likely have good to excellent cosmesis following BCT, and most plastic surgeons would agree that a formal "reconstruction" would not be required. Alternatively, in patients with small breasts for whom a significant percentage of the breast will be taken with the specimen, reconstruction would likely provide a better cosmetic outcome than BCT. The relationship between tumor size and the percent of breast parenchyma required for resection is an important factor that is often overlooked in outcome studies. It is unclear how these factors influenced the results reported in this study.

CONCLUSION

Breast cancer reconstruction is a complex process that should begin with the identification and treatment of psychological issues preceding or accompanying the diag-

FIGURE 8
EXAMPLE OF ABDOMINAL INCISION AFTER A TRAM FLAP



Ceradini DJ, Levine JP. *Primary Psychiatry*. Vol 15, No 10. 2008.

nosis of breast cancer. Access and delivery of breast cancer reconstruction information to eligible patients remains widely underutilized. The time of breast cancer diagnosis is an important point of access for patients to either receive actual information or to be instructed on where to find information on breast reconstruction. Early consultation with a reconstructive plastic surgeon may facilitate patient decision making, optimizing the aesthetic outcome of breast reconstruction. Thus, a close collaboration between primary providers, oncologic surgeons, and plastic surgeons is essential. Several studies demonstrate positive psychological and QOL outcomes following breast cancer reconstruction and, in some cases, near normalization of these parameters when compared to healthy individuals. Breast cancer reconstruction continues to be an essential element in helping patients recover from breast cancer diagnosis and therapy. **PP**

REFERENCES

1. American Cancer Society. *Cancer Facts & Figures*. 2007. Atlanta, GA: American Cancer Society; 2007.
2. Bard M, Sutherland AM. Psychological impact of cancer and its treatment. IV. Adaptation to radical mastectomy. *Cancer*. 1955;8(4):656-672.
3. Bard M. The sequence of emotional reactions in radical mastectomy patients. *Public Health Rep*. 1952;67(11):1144-1148.
4. Goin MK, Goin JM. Psychological reactions to prophylactic mastectomy synchronous with contralateral breast reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 1982;70(3):355-359.
5. Steinberg MD, Juliano MA, Wise L. Psychological outcome of lumpectomy versus mastectomy in the treatment of breast cancer. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1985;142(1):34-39.
6. American Society of Plastic Surgeons. 2007 Reconstructive Surgery Procedures. Arlington Heights, IL: American Society of Plastic Surgeons; 2007.
7. Hegel MT, Moore CP, Collins ED, et al. Distress, psychiatric syndromes, and impairment of function in women with newly diagnosed breast cancer. *Cancer*. 2006;107(12):2924-2931.
8. Koopman C, Angell K, Turner-Cobb JM, et al. Distress, coping, and social support among rural women recently diagnosed with primary breast cancer. *Breast J*. 2001;7(1):25-33.
9. Fallowfield L, Ratcliffe D, Jenkins V, Saul J. Psychiatric morbidity and its recognition by doctors in patients with cancer. *Br J Cancer*. 2001;84(8):1011-1015.
10. Kornblith AB, Herndon JE 2nd, Weiss RB, et al. Long-term adjustment of survivors of early-stage breast carcinoma, 20 years after adjuvant chemotherapy. *Cancer*. 2003;98(4):679-689.
11. Roth RS, Lowery JC, Davis J, Wilkins EG. Psychological factors predict patient satisfaction with postmastectomy breast reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2007;119(7):2008-2015.
12. Fisher B, Anderson S, Redmond CK, Wolmark N, Wickerham DL, Cronin WM. Reanalysis and results after 12 years of follow-up in a randomized clinical trial comparing total mastectomy with lumpectomy with or without irradiation in the treatment of breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;333(22):1456-1461.
13. Veronesi U, Cascinelli N, Mariani L, et al. Twenty-year follow-up of a randomized study comparing breast-conserving surgery with radical mastectomy for early breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347(16):1227-1232.
14. Rowland JH, Desmond KA, Meyerowitz BE, Belin TR, Wyatt GE, Ganz PA. Role of breast reconstructive surgery in physical and emotional outcomes among breast cancer survivors. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2000;92(17):1422-1429.
15. Morrow M, Mujahid M, Lantz PM, et al. Correlates of breast reconstruction: results from a population-based study. *Cancer*. 2005;104(11):2340-2346.
16. Morrow M, Scott SK, Menck HR, Mustoe TA, Winchester DP. Factors influencing the use of breast reconstruction postmastectomy: a National Cancer Database study. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2001;192(1):1-8.
17. Christian CK, Niland J, Edge SB, et al. A multi-institutional analysis of the socioeconomic determinants of breast reconstruction: a study of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network. *Ann Surg*. 2006;243(2):241-249.
18. Alderman AK, Hawley ST, Waljee J, Mujahid M, Morrow M, Katz SJ. Understanding the impact of breast reconstruction on the surgical decision-making process for breast cancer. *Cancer*. 2008;112(3):489-494.
19. Ananian P, Houvenaeghel G, Protière C, et al. Determinants of patients' choice of reconstruction with mastectomy for primary breast cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2004;11(8):762-771.
20. Al-Ghazal SK, Sully L, Fallowfield L, Blamey RW. The psychological impact of immediate rather than delayed breast reconstruction. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2000;26(1):17-19.
21. Elder EE, Brandberg Y, Bjorklund T, et al. Quality of life and patient satisfaction in breast cancer patients after immediate breast reconstruction: a prospective study. *Breast*. 2005;14(3):201-208.
22. Alderman AK, Wilkins EG, Lowery JC, Kim M, Davis JA. Determinants of patient satisfaction in postmastectomy breast reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2000;106(4):769-776.
23. Williams JK, Bostwick J 3rd, Bried JT, Mackay G, Landry J, Benton J. TRAM flap breast reconstruction after radiation treatment. *Ann Surg*. 1995;221(6):756-764.
24. Cordeiro PG, McCarthy CM. A single surgeon's 12-year experience with tissue expander/implant breast reconstruction: part II. An analysis of long-term complications, aesthetic outcomes, and patient satisfaction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2006;118(4):832-839.

25. Dian D, Schwenn K, Mylonas I, Janni W, Friese K, Jaenicke F. Quality of life among breast cancer patients undergoing autologous breast reconstruction versus breast conserving therapy. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*. 2007;133(4):247-252.
26. Alderman AK, Kuhn LE, Lowery JC, Wilkins EG. Does patient satisfaction with breast reconstruction change over time? Two-year results of the Michigan Breast Reconstruction Outcomes Study. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2007;204(1):7-12.
27. Cederna PS, Yates WR, Chang P, Cram AE, Ricciardelli EJ. Postmastectomy reconstruction: comparative analysis of the psychosocial, functional, and cosmetic effects of transverse rectus abdominis musculocutaneous flap versus breast implant reconstruction. *Ann Plast Surg*. 1995;35(5):458-468.
28. Recht A, Edge SB, Solin LJ, et al. Postmastectomy radiotherapy: clinical practice guidelines of the American Society of Clinical Oncology. *J Clin Oncol*. 2001;19(5):1539-1569.
29. Kroll SS, Khoo A, Singletary SE, et al. Local recurrence risk after skin-sparing and conventional mastectomy: a 6-year follow-up. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 1999;104(2):421-425.
30. Huang CJ, Hou MF, Lin SD, et al. Comparison of local recurrence and distant metastases between breast cancer patients after postmastectomy radiotherapy with and without immediate TRAM flap reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2006;118(5):1079-1086.
31. Singletary SE. Skin-sparing mastectomy with immediate breast reconstruction: the M. D. Anderson Cancer Center experience. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 1996;3(4):411-416.
32. Noone RB, Frazier TG, Noone GC, Blanchet NP, Murphy JB, Rose D. Recurrence of breast carcinoma following immediate reconstruction: a 13-year review. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 1994;93(1):96-106.
33. Eberlein TJ, Crespo LD, Smith BL, Hergueter CA, Douville L, Eriksson E. Prospective evaluation of immediate reconstruction after mastectomy. *Ann Surg*. 1993;218(1):29-36.
34. Cody HS 3rd, Hill AD, Tran KN, Brennan MF, Borgen PI. Credentialing for breast lymphatic mapping: how many cases are enough? *Ann Surg*. 1999;229(5):723-726.
35. Pomahac B, Recht A, May JW, Hergueter CA, Slavin SA. New trends in breast cancer management: is the era of immediate breast reconstruction changing? *Ann Surg*. 2006;244(2):282-288.
36. McCarthy CM, Pusic AL, Disa JJ, McCormick BL, Montgomery LL, Cordeiro PG. Unilateral postoperative chest wall radiotherapy in bilateral tissue expander/implant reconstruction patients: a prospective outcomes analysis. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2005;116(6):1642-1647.
37. Rubino C, Figus A, Loretto L, Sechi G. Post-mastectomy reconstruction: a comparative analysis on psychosocial and psychopathological outcomes. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. 2007;60(5):509-518.
38. Harcourt DM, Rumsey NJ, Ambler NR, et al. The psychological effect of mastectomy with or without breast reconstruction: a prospective, multicenter study. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2003;111(3):1060-1068.
39. Mullan MH, Wilkins EG, Goldfarb S, et al. Prospective analysis of psychosocial outcomes after breast reconstruction: cross-cultural comparisons of 1-year postoperative results. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. 2007;60(5):503-508.
40. Wilkins EG, Cederna PS, Lowery JC, et al. Prospective analysis of psychosocial outcomes in breast reconstruction: one-year postoperative results from the Michigan Breast Reconstruction Outcome Study. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2000;106(5):1014-1025.
41. Parker PA, Youssef A, Walker S, et al. Short-term and long-term psychosocial adjustment and quality of life in women undergoing different surgical procedures for breast cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2007;14(11):3078-3089.