

Outcomes analysis of breast reduction in Brazilian women using the BREAST-Q[®] questionnaire: a cross-sectional controlled study

Adriana Corbolan Andrade,¹ Daniela Francescato Veiga,^{1,*} Isabella de Carvalho Aguiar,¹ Yara Juliano,¹¹ Miguel Sabino-Neto,¹ Lydia Masako Ferreira¹

¹Programa de Pós-graduação em Cirurgia Translacional, Universidade Federal de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, SP, BR. ¹¹Departamento de Bioestatística, Universidade do Vale do Sapucaí, Pouso Alegre, MG, BR.

Andrade AC, Veiga DF, Aguiar IC, Juliano Y, Sabino-Neto M, Ferreira LM. Outcomes analysis of breast reduction in Brazilian women using the BREAST-Q[®] questionnaire: a cross-sectional controlled study. *Clinics*. 2018;73:e313

*Corresponding author. E-mail: danielaveiga@gmail.com

OBJECTIVE: The aim of this study was to analyse patient-reported outcomes of reduction mammoplasty among Brazilian women.

METHODS: A total of 100 women were enrolled in this cross-sectional controlled study, 50 with breast hypertrophy (Hypertrophy Group) and 50 who had undergone breast reduction at least six and up to 12 months before (Mammoplasty Group). The Brazilian version of the BREAST-Q[®] was applied to assess patient-reported outcomes. The module reduction/mastopexy was used, and the preoperative and postoperative versions were applied to the hypertrophy and mammoplasty groups, respectively.

RESULTS: The mammoplasty group presented higher scores for the subscales satisfaction with breasts, psychosocial well-being, sexual well-being and physical well-being ($p=0.0001$ for all of these subscales).

CONCLUSION: These results suggest that patients submitted to reduction mammoplasty are satisfied with the outcomes and present better quality of life scores compared with women with breast hypertrophy.

KEYWORDS: Breast; Mammoplasty; Patient's Satisfaction; Evaluation of Results; Quality of Life.

■ INTRODUCTION

The concept of breast hypertrophy goes beyond the simple characterization of breast size. Breast hypertrophy can be defined as an increase of the mammary gland beyond the physiological limits, with the exception of increases caused by injuries, haemorrhages, inflammation and pregnancy (1,2).

Patients seeking breast reduction do so with the hope of obtaining a better quality of life, with less social and sexual embarrassment and greater ease in performing physical activities and in finding suitable clothes (3). Women with breast hypertrophy may suffer from low self-esteem and seek surgery to alleviate physical and emotional discomfort (3). Reduction mammoplasty is very effective in improving functional, aesthetic and psychological problems, and several studies have demonstrated its effectiveness in improving quality of life (3-7).

According to the International Society of Aesthetic Plastic Surgery (ISAPS), in 2016, Brazil ranked second in the *ranking* of plastic surgery procedures in the world, with 1,450,020 surgeries performed. Specifically, breast reduction was the eighth most performed surgery by plastic surgeons worldwide, with 465,665 mammoplasties total. Of these, 78,815 were performed in Brazil. Therefore, it is important to evaluate the satisfaction results of Brazilian women undergoing reduction mammoplasty (8). However, the benefits of this procedure have rarely been quantified in an objective and standardized manner (3,5,7).

BREAST-Q[®] was developed for the evaluation of results in breast surgery, aiming to identify the best procedures for a given patient and the procedures that provide the greatest satisfaction (9,10). The objective of this controlled cross-sectional study was to evaluate the effects of reduction mammoplasty in Brazilian women with breast hypertrophy from the perspective of the patients. To the best of our knowledge, this study is unique because it used BREAST-Q[®] to compare the satisfaction and quality of life of women submitted to reduction mammoplasty with women with breast hypertrophy who did not seek the procedure for any reason.

■ METHODS

This cross-sectional study was approved by the Ethics on Research Committee of the Universidade Federal de

Copyright © 2018 CLINICS – This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium or format, provided the original work is properly cited.

No potential conflict of interest was reported.

Received for publication on August 6, 2017. **Accepted for publication on** December 11, 2017

DOI: 10.6061/clinics/2018/e313



São Paulo under protocol 165302/12, and all participants signed a free and informed consent form. The sample size was estimated based on studies of other outcomes in reduction mammoplasty and was sufficient to obtain significant results (11-13).

Fifty women with breast hypertrophy (Hypertrophy Group, HG) defined by the criteria of Sacchini et al. and Franco & Rebello and 50 women previously submitted to reduction mammoplasty (Mammoplasty Group, MG) at least six months and at most one year prior to the study's initiation were selected from the plastic surgery outpatient clinics of a university hospital (Hospital São Paulo), between January 2014 and January 2015 (16,17).

Inclusion criteria for both groups were age between 18 and 45 years and body mass index (BMI) between 19 and 29.9 kg/m², without restrictions regarding ethnicity, schooling or social class. In the HG, patients with previous breast surgeries were not included, and in the MG, patients who underwent mammoplasty less than six months or more than one year prior to the study's initiation were not included. The exclusion criteria for both groups were illiteracy or inability to read and understand the applied questionnaire, pregnancy or childbirth less than one year ago and currently being investigated for or diagnosis of breast disorders.

Women who met the eligibility criteria were informed about the study and were invited to participate. After signing the informed consent, sociodemographic and clinical data were collected, and the Brazilian version of BREAST-Q[®] was self-administered.

BREAST-Q[®] was developed in 2009 to assess the impact and effectiveness of breast surgeries from the patient's perspective. It was translated and validated for use in Brazil in 2013 (18). The questionnaire consists of five modules – augmentation mammoplasty, reduction mammoplasty, mastectomy, breast reconstruction and conservative treatment – and there is one version for the pre- and one for the postoperative period. Each module is composed of independent subscales: Physical well-being, Psychosocial well-being, Sexual well-being, Satisfaction with breasts, Satisfaction with nipples, Satisfaction with the overall outcome and Satisfaction with the care process. The answers are transformed using

Q-Score[®] scoring software, with total scores ranging from zero to 100. The higher the score is, the greater the satisfaction or the better the quality of life (19).

Statistical analysis

For the statistical analysis, the *software* BioEstat 5.0 (Instituto de Desenvolvimento Sustentável Mamirauá, Belém, PA, Brazil) was used. The non-parametric Mann-Whitney test was used to compare the two independent groups for the numerical variables studied. We also performed a simple linear regression analysis to study relationships between BMI (independent variable) and the subscale "Satisfaction with breasts" (dependent variable). The level of significance was set at 0.05 or 5%.

RESULTS

The groups were age-matched ($p=0.284$, Figure 1). MG patients had a higher BMI ($p=0.050$, Figure 2), but there was no important relationship between BMI and "Satisfaction with breasts" (Figures 3 and 4). In the MG, the total weight of resected breast tissue ranged from 280 to 3,750g (median: 830g; mean \pm standard deviation: 1107 ± 834 g).

Figures 5 to 8 present the comparisons between the HG and MG with regard to the scores obtained for the four subscales of BREAST-Q[®] applied to both groups (Satisfaction with breasts, Physical well-being, Psychosocial well-being and Sexual well-being). The MG presented better outcomes in all of these subscales. Figure 9 presents the range and median scores obtained for the subscales of BREAST-Q[®] applied to the MG only.

DISCUSSION

The results in plastic surgery are evaluated in terms of not only morbidity and mortality, but mainly patient satisfaction, and the surgeon's perception of the outcome is often different from the patient's perception (20-22). The importance of understanding the patient's perception about the surgical outcome and the impact that plastic surgery can have on the patient's quality of life is being increasingly recognized. This recognition has led to the development of




Figure 1 - Age of women in both groups and comparison by the Mann-Whitney test.




Figure 2 - Body Mass Index (BMI) of women in both groups and comparison by the Mann-Whitney test.




Figure 3 - Simple linear regression for BMI (independent variable) and “Satisfaction with breasts” (dependent variable) in the HG.

instruments called PROs - Patient Reported Outcomes, which can provide important information for health policy decision-making (23).

The present study proposed to use a widely applied PRO instrument, the Breast-Q, to evaluate the results of reduction mammoplasty. Women between 18 and 45 years of age were selected for the study. The cut-off of 18 years was chosen to include only adult patients who could spontaneously participate in the study and with their own consent. The 45-year age cut-off was chosen because it was not intended to include perimenopausal or menopausal patients because these patients present hormonal changes that are characteristic of this period and that may lead to alterations in sexual function, thus interfering in the outcomes of study (24).

The BMIs of patients with breast hypertrophy are usually higher than those of patients without hypertrophy, and the

patient’s BMI tends to be higher the greater the hypertrophy (25,26). It was decided not to include women with BMIs above 30 kg/m² in any of the groups in this study, and this eligibility criterion was the main excluding factor in the study, which made selection difficult. However, the criterion was maintained to minimize bias because patients with larger BMIs present changes in their centre of gravity and alterations in bone joints that can cause discomfort and pain, which could be confounding factors in the results (2). In the current study, women in the MG had higher BMIs than those in the HG. However, the linear regression showed no important relationships between BMI and satisfaction with breasts in both groups.

The choice of the sixth postoperative month as the minimum time to evaluate the patients in the MG was because the eventual complications and discomfort characteristic of




Figure 4 - Simple linear regression for BMI (independent variable) and “Satisfaction with breasts” (dependent variable) in the MG.




Figure 5 - Scores of BREAST-Q[®] subscale “Satisfaction with breasts” in both groups and comparison by the Mann-Whitney test.

the postoperative period have already been overcome after this period. After six months, the euphoria and the overestimation of the outcomes that usually occur soon after surgery have stabilized (3,4,14,15). The cut-off of one year postoperatively was established to avoid the possibility that, in a very late evaluation, the patient no longer remembered details of the treatment they received.

The MG presented large variations in the total weight of resected breast tissue (280 to 3,750g). Studies have shown that patients with breast hypertrophy usually show improvement of symptoms, regardless of the volume of resected breast tissue (15,28-30). GONZALES *et al.* used the BREAST-Q[®] to evaluate the results of 600 patients submitted to reduction mammoplasty. They observed, as in the present study, better outcomes in all BREAST-Q[®] subscales, and more than

95% of the surveyed patients were satisfied with the surgery and would have it performed again. In addition, they observed that BMI and breast size had no influence on outcome (31).

The high scores of the physical well-being scale observed in this study support what has been observed by other authors, who verified that reduction mammoplasty was able to promote improvements in functional capacity, back pain, work capacity and productivity among women with breast hypertrophy (2,27,32).

In the present study, high scores were also obtained for the “satisfaction with nipple-areolar complex” scale. Garcia *et al.* reported that reduction mammoplasty reduced the sensitivity of the nipple-areolar complex, but did not influence sexual function (33). Beraldo *et al.* observed a positive impact of




Figure 6 - Scores of BREAST-Q[®] subscale “Psychosocial well-being” in both groups and comparison by the Mann-Whitney test.




Figure 7 - Scores of BREAST-Q[®] subscale “Sexual well-being” in both groups and comparison by the Mann-Whitney test.




Figure 8 - Scores of BREAST-Q[®] subscale “Physical well-being” in both groups and comparison by the Mann-Whitney test.




Figure 9 - Scores of BREAST-Q[®] subscales applied to the MG only.

reduction mammoplasty on the sexual function of women with breast hypertrophy, a result also corroborated by the high scores in the sexual well-being scale found in the present study (24). A significant portion of the Brazilian population depends on the Brazilian public health system (Sistema Único de Saúde - SUS), which is often the only option for women with breast hypertrophy. Araújo et al. studied the cost-utility relationship of reduction mammoplasty performed by the SUS and found that there was a positive relationship, justifying the need to mobilize resources for this type of procedure (34).

This study has some limitations. The main limitation is the cross-sectional design. A prospective study, with pre and postoperative assessment, would be able to detect the real impact of breast reduction on patients quality of life. Another limitation is the lack of a group of women with normal-sized breasts for comparison to women with breast hypertrophy and breast reduction. However, no other study was found in the literature using BREAST-Q[®] to compare the satisfaction and quality of life of women submitted to reduction mammoplasty with women with breast hypertrophy who did not undergo the procedure for any reason, making this study unique.

Our results suggest that patients submitted to reduction mammoplasty are satisfied with the outcomes and present better quality of life scores when compared with women with breast hypertrophy. However, prospective studies are needed to confirm these findings.

■ AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Andrade AC and Aguiar IC were responsible for data collection and preparation of the manuscript. Veiga DF and Juliano Y were responsible for data analysis and preparation of the manuscript. Veiga DF and Sabino-Neto M edited the manuscript. Veiga DF and Ferreira LM supervised the study and were responsible for manuscript editing. All of the authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

■ REFERENCES

- Araújo CD, Gomes HC, Veiga DF, Hochman B, Fernandes PM, Novo NF, et al. Influence of breast hypertrophy in the women's functional capacity. *Rev Bras Reumatol.* 2007;47(2):91-6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0482-50042007000200003>.
- Freire M, Neto MS, Garcia EB, Quaresma RM, Ferreira LM. Functional capacity and postural pain outcomes after reduction mammoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2007;119(4):1149-56, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000254358.55104.9f>.
- Sabino Neto M, Demattê MF, Freire M, Garcia EB, Quaresma M, Ferreira LM. Self-esteem and functional capacity outcomes following reduction

- mammoplasty. *Aesthet Surg J.* 2008;28(4):417-20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asj.2008.04.006>.
- Freire M, Neto MS, Garcia EB, Quaresma MR, Ferreira LM. Quality of life after reduction mammoplasty. *Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg.* 2004;38(6):335-9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02844310410034295>.
- Okoro SA, Barone C, Bohnenblust M, Wang HT. Breast reduction trend among plastic surgeons: a national survey. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2008;122(5):1312-20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181818dd7>.
- Henry SL, Crawford JL, Puckett CL. Risk factors and complications in reduction mammoplasty: novel associations and preoperative assessment. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2009;124(4):1040-6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181b45410>.
- Setala L, Papp A, Joukainen S, Martikainen R, Berg L, Mustonen P, et al. Obesity and complications in breast reduction surgery: are restrictions justified? *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* 2009;62(2):195-9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bjps.2007.10.043>.
- International Society of Aesthetic Plastic Surgery. Available from <http://www.isaps.org/Media/Default/Current%20News/GlobalStatistics2016.pdf>. Accessed on 07/31/2017.
- Pusic AL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ. Use of the BREAST-Q in clinical outcomes research. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2012;129(1):166e-167e, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3182362e65>.
- Hammond DC. Discussion. The BREAST-Q: further validation in independent clinical samples. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2012;129(2):303-4, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3182417261>.
- Beraldo FN, Veiga DF, Veiga-Filho J, Garcia ES, Vilas-Bôas GS, Juliano Y, et al. Sexual function and depression outcomes among breast hypertrophy patients undergoing reduction mammoplasty: randomized controlled trial. *Ann Plast Surg.* 2016;76(4):379-82, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0000000000000380>.
- Brown AP, Hill C, Khan K. Outcome of reduction mammoplasty – a patients' perspective. *Br J Plast Surg.* 2000;53(7):584-7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1054/bjps.2000.3380>.
- Coriddi M, Nadeau M, Taghizadeh M, Taylor A. Analysis of satisfaction and well-being following breast reduction using a validated survey instrument: The BREAST-Q. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2013;132(2):285-90, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e31829587b5>.
- Blomqvist L, Brandberg Y. Three-year follow-up on clinical symptoms and health-related quality of life after reduction mammoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2004;114(1):49-54, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.PRS.0000127794.77267.14>.
- Spector JA, Singh SP, Karp NS. Outcomes after breast reduction: does size really matter? *Ann Plast Surg.* 2008;60(5):505-9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0b013e31816f76b5>.
- Sacchini V, Luini A, Tana S, Lozza L, Galimberti V, Merson M, et al. Quantitative and qualitative cosmetic evaluation after conservative treatment for breast cancer. *Eur J Cancer.* 1991;27(11):1395-400, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0277-5379\(91\)90019-A](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0277-5379(91)90019-A).
- Franco T. *Princípios de Cirurgia Plástica.* SP Editora Atheneu, RJ. 2002, 1st ed:671-697.
- Sbalchiero JC, Cordanto-Nopoulos FR, Silva CH, Caiado-Neto BR, Derchain S. Breast-Q questionnaire, translation process to Portuguese language and their application on breast cancer patients. *Rev Bras Cir Plast.* 2013;28(4):548-51.
- Pusic AL, Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Scott A, McCarthy C, Cano SJ. Measuring patient outcomes in breast augmentation: introducing the BREAST-Q Augmentation module. *Clin Plast Surg.* 2009;36(1):23-32, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cps.2008.07.005>.
- Malay S, Chung KC. How to use outcome questionnaires: pearls and pitfalls. *Clin Plast Surg.* 2013;40(2):261-9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cps.2012.10.002>.



21. Veiga DF, Neto MS, Garcia EB, Filho JV, Juliano Y, Ferreira LM, et al. Evaluations of the aesthetic results and patient satisfaction with the late pedicled TRAM flap breast reconstruction. *Ann Plast Surg.* 2002;48(5): 515-20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00000637-200205000-00012>.
22. Makboul M, Abdelhamid MS, Al-Attar GS. Long-term follow-up and patient satisfaction after reduction mammoplasty: Superomedial versus inferior pedicle. *Indian J Plast Surg.* 2016;49(2):214-9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0970-0358.191299>.
23. Pusic, AL, Lemaire V, Klassen AF, Scott AM, Cano SJ. Patient-reported outcome measures in plastic surgery: use and interpretation in evidence-based medicine. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2011;127(3):1361-7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3182063276>.
24. Guimarães PA, Resende VC, Sabino Neto M, Seito CL, de Brito MJ, Abila LE, et al. Sexuality in Aesthetic Breast Surgery. *Aesthetic Plast Surg.* 2015;39(6):993-9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00266-015-0574-9>.
25. Zhang MX, Chen CY, Fang QQ, Xu JH, Wang XF, Shi BH, et al. Risk factors for complications after reduction mammoplasty: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(12):e0167746, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167746>.
26. Chadbourne EB, Zhand S, Gordon MJ, Ro EY, Ross SD, Schnur PL, et al. Clinical outcomes in reduction mammoplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis of published studies. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2001;76(5):503-10, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4065/76.5.503>.
27. Fernandes PM, Sabino Neto M, Veiga DF, Abila LE, Mundim CD, Juliano Y, et al. Back pain: an assessment in breast hypertrophy patients. *Acta Ortop Bras.* 2007;15(4):227-30, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-78522007000400011>.
28. Fino P, Di Taranto G, Toscani M, Scuderi N.. Surgical therapy of breast hypertrophy: a comparison of complications and satisfaction rate in large and small superior pedicle custom-made reduction mammoplasty. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci.* 2016;20(21):4411-5.
29. Collins ED, Kerrigan CL, Kim M, Lowery JC, Striplin DT, Cunningham B, et al. The effectiveness of surgical and nonsurgical interventions in relieving the symptoms of macromastia. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2002;109(5): 1556-66, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00006534-200204150-00011>.
30. Thoma A, Sprague S, Veltri K, Duku E, Furlong W. A prospective study of patients undergoing breast reduction surgery: health-related quality of life and clinical outcomes. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2007;120(1):13-26, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000263370.94191.90>.
31. Gonzales MA, Glickman LT, Aladegbami B, Simpson RL. Quality of life after breast reduction surgery: a 10-year retrospective analysis using the Breast Q questionnaire: does breast size matter? *Ann Plast Surg.* 2012;69(4):361-3, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0b013e31824a218a>.
32. Cabral IV, Garcia ED, Sobrinho RN, Pinto NL, Juliano Y, Veiga-Filho J, et al. Increased capacity for work and productivity after breast reduction. *Aesthet Surg J.* 2017;37(1):57-62, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjw175>.
33. Garcia ES, Veiga DF, Sabino-Neto M, Beraldo Cardoso FN, Batista IO, Leme RM, et al. Sensitivity of the Nipple-Areola Complex and Sexual Function Following Reduction Mammoplasty. *Aesthet Surg J.* 2015;35(7): NP193-202, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjv034>.
34. Araújo CD, Veiga DF, Hochman BS, Abila LE, Oliveira AC, Novo NF, et al. Cost-utility of reduction mammoplasty assessed for the Brazilian public health system. *Aesthet Surg J.* 2014;34(8):1198-204, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1090820X14539972>.