Breast Cancer Res Treat (2012) 134:181–198
DOI 10.1007/s10549-011-1948-6

PRECLINICAL STUDY

Autologous microsurgical breast reconstruction and coronary artery bypass grafting: an anatomical study and clinical implications

Warren M. Rozen · Xuan Ye · Pedro L. Guio-Aguilar · Alberto Alonso-Burgos · John Goldblatt · Mark W. Ashton · Iain S. Whitaker

Received: 30 November 2011 / Accepted: 26 December 2011 / Published online: 22 January 2012

Abstract *Objective* To identify possible avenues of sparing the internal mammary artery (IMA) for coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) in women undergoing autologous breast reconstruction with deep inferior epigastric artery perforator (DIEP) flaps. *Background* Optimal autologous reconstruction of the breast and coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) are often mutually exclusive as they both require utilisation of the IMA as the preferred arterial conduit. Given the prevalence of both breast cancer and coronary artery disease, this is an important issue for women's health as women with DIEP flap reconstructions and women at increased risk of developing coronary artery disease are potentially restricted from receiving this reconstructive option should the other condition arise. *Methods* The largest clinical and cadaveric anatomical study (n = 315) to date was performed, investigating four solutions to this predicament by correlating the precise requirements of breast reconstruction and CABG against the anatomical features of the in situ IMAs. This information was supplemented by a thorough literature review. *Results* Minimum lengths of the left and right IMA needed for grafting to the left-anterior descending artery are 160.08 and 177.80 mm, respectively. Based on anatomical findings, the suitable options for anastomosis to each intercostals space are offered. In addition, 87–91% of patients have IMA perforator vessels to which DIEP flaps can be anastomosed in the first- and second-intercostal spaces. *Conclusion* We outline five methods of preserving the IMA for future CABG: (1) lowering the level of DIEP flaps to the fourth- and fifth-intercostals spaces, (2) using the DIEP pedicle as an intermediary for CABG, (3) using IMA perforators to spare the IMA proper, (4) using and end-to-side anastomosis between the DIEP pedicle and IMA and (5) anastomosis of DIEP flaps using retrograde flow from the distal IMA. With careful patient selection, we hypothesize using the IMA for autologous breast reconstruction need not be an absolute contraindication for future CABG.

Keywords IMA · Internal mammary artery · Internal thoracic artery · CABG · Coronary artery bypass grafting · Breast cancer · Breast reconstruction · DIEP · Deep inferior epigastric artery perforator flap · Recipient vessels · Anatomical study · CTA · Computer tomographic angiography

Abbreviations

BIMA	Bilateral internal mammary artery
CABG	Coronary artery bypass graft
CTA	Computer tomography angiogram
DIEP	Deep inferior epigastric artery perforator
DSEA	Deep superior epigastric artery
ICS	Intercostal space
IMA	Internal mammary artery
IMAP	Internal mammary artery perforator
IMV	Internal mammary vein

Warren M. Rozen and Xuan Ye are equal first author.

W. M. Rozen (✉) · X. Ye · P. L. Guio-Aguilar · A. Alonso-Burgos · M. W. Ashton · I. S. Whitaker
Jack Brockhoff Reconstructive Plastic Surgery Research Unit, Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, University of Melbourne, Grattan St, Parkville, VIC 3050, Australia
e-mail: warrenrozen@hotmail.com

J. Goldblatt
Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, the Royal Melbourne Hospital, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

I. S. Whitaker
Swansea University College of Medicine, Singleton Park, SA2 8PP Swansea, Wales, UK

LAD Left-anterior descending artery
LIMA Left-internal mammary artery
OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
MRI Magnetic resonance imaging
RIMA Right-internal mammary artery

Introduction

Breast cancer and coronary artery disease are two leading causes of morbidity and mortality in women. Fortunately, they are amenable to surgical intervention in the forms of mastectomy with subsequent breast reconstruction and coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG). However, the optimal techniques for autologous breast reconstruction [1–8], the deep inferior epigastric artery perforator (DIEP) flap using the internal mammary artery as the recipient vessel and the IMA-based CABG, are mutually exclusive as they both require use of the IMAs as an arterial conduit [9–15]. In theory, this may preclude women with pre-existing DIEP reconstructions from receiving CABGs (with proven survival benefit) and women at increased risk of developing coronary artery disease from receiving what many surgeons consider to be the optimal autologous breast reconstruction post-mastectomy. In the light of the prevalence of both conditions, we believe investigating potential strategies to overcome this problem is of importance to women's health.

Background

Breast cancer

Breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer in women [16–19]. Each year, more than 690,000 women are diagnosed with breast cancers in high-income countries at a rate of 83.2 new breast cancers per 100,000 population [17]. Of the women who elect for treatment, 44.3% receive mastectomy [20]. In 2010, 61.5 mastectomies were performed per 100,000 people in countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), making it one of the most common surgical procedures in women of the developed world (Table 1) [18]. Breast reconstructions

Table 1 The rates of breast cancer, mastectomy and coronary artery bypass graft procedures performed per 100,000 population in the top 25 countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2010

Country	Breast cancer [17]	Country	Mastectomy [18]	Country	CABG [18]
Belgium	109.19	Finland	89.0	Germany	131.8
Denmark	101.12	Belgium	87.0	Belgium	131.4
France	99.74	Netherlands	84.0	United States (2006)	84.5
The Netherlands	98.46	Denmark	83.0	Norway (2006)	81.0
Israel	96.77	Sweden	81.0	Denmark	80.5
Iceland	95.52	Korea	72.0	New Zealand	77.5
Ireland	93.94	Australia	71.0	Australia	71.8
Switzerland	89.38	Germany	70.0	Italy	70.7
New Zealand	89.37	Norway	70.0	Canada	68.9
United Kingdom	89.13	Luxembourg	68.0	Slovenia	62.8
Finland	86.31	United Kingdom	68.0	Czech Republic	62.4
Italy	86.29	France	61.0	Luxembourg	61.3
Australia	84.75	Switzerland	59.0	Iceland	59.7
Canada	83.17	Canada	54.0	Netherlands	58.2
Luxembourg	82.35	Austria	53.0	Finland	57.7
Germany	81.76	Italy	53.0	Israel	56.5
Sweden	79.40	New Zealand	51.0	Sweden	56.4
United States	75.99	Portugal	51.0	Poland	52.6
Norway	73.50	Israel	48.0	Austria	51.6
Czech Republic	70.85	Slovenia	46.0	United Kingdom	45.7
Slovenia	64.87	Iceland	45.0	Portugal	43.0
Croatia	63.99	Ireland	45.0	Ireland	40.5
Austria	62.13	Spain	45.0	Hungary	36.3
Spain	61.01	Hungary	43.0	France	30.9
Portugal	60.02	United States (2006)	40.0	Switzerland	30.8
OECD average	83.2	OECD average	61.5	OECD average	64.2



Fig. 1 Summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the most common methods of post-mastectomy breast reconstruction. Notably, the deep inferior epigastric artery perforator flaps deliver more superior aesthetic appearance and carry a lower risk of donor site morbidity than alternative options available

are often necessary to remodel the defect and restore quality of life. In 2009, more than 86,000 breast reconstructions were performed in the United States alone, a statistic that has exhibited a distinct upwards trend [21]. Currently, autologous tissue is the reconstructive option in suitable patients, is with autologous tissue. The DIEP flap is widely believed to yield excellent aesthetic outcomes with minimal donor site morbidity. Although the American Society of plastic surgeons (ASPS) procedural statistics in 2010 shows that implant-based breast reconstruction remains the most practiced form of breast reconstruction in the US (77%), with DIEP flap reconstruction being the third most frequent reconstruction (5.5%) behind latissimus flap reconstructions (6.8%) [21], this is not because implant reconstructions produce the best results, it is because of financial pressures imposed by health insurance providers as microsurgical procedures are time- and cost-intensive [22]. There is some evidence that this may change in the future as experienced microsurgeons argue that the relative increase in cost is worthwhile when considering superior outcomes [23] (see Fig. 1). DIEP flaps in many surgeons hands are anastomosed to the IMA, often at the second- or third-intercostals space (ICS), leaving insufficient length for subsequent CABG. This is a particular concern in the setting of bilateral mastectomies as both IMAs are used in the reconstruction. Bilateral procedures currently constitute around 10% of breast cancer operations and are becoming increasingly frequent with the greater use of BRCA gene testing and breast MRI [24–29]. Numerous studies have reported an increasing trend towards IMA-based breast reconstructions during the past 10–15 years (see Table 2) [13, 14, 30–33].

Coronary artery disease

Heart disease is the biggest cause of mortality in women worldwide. According to the World Health Organisation, 746,208 women died from ischemic events in 2008 in high-income countries and this figure is projected to increase to more than 936,000 women by 2030 [16].

The standard interventions for myocardial revascularisation are the CABG and percutaneous coronary intervention.

Table 2 Comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of the common recipient vessels for autologous breast reconstruction

Vessel	Advantages	Disadvantages
Internal mammary artery	Eliminates the need for axillary dissection and potential risk of lymphoedema and nerve damage [9].	Respiratory movement.
	Larger diameter and superior flow compared with the thoracodorsal vessels [9, 112].	Risk of pneumothorax and post-operative pulmonary complications [4, 9, 14, 32, 113].
	Consistent location that is easy to access through microsurgical means. Good positioning for surgeon and assistant [14, 113, 114].	Need for rib resection may cause contour deformities and post-operative pain although this can be avoided through an intercostal approach to accessing the IMAs [9, 14, 31, 99, 118]. Other minimally invasive approaches have also been described [82].
	Requires a shorter pedicle than axillary vessels for anastomosis [14, 115].	Precludes future CABG with IMAs [14, 15].
	Medial location of vessels allows for more flexible flap placement and superior shaping of the breast mound, especially with smaller flaps [14, 113, 115–117].	
Thoracodorsal artery	Easy access in patients who are undergoing axillary lymphadenectomy as the axilla is already exposed [14].	Primary axillary dissection for breast cancer is becoming less common because of the increasing use of sentinel lymph node biopsy. Additional dissections are to expose the thoracodorsal vessels in these cases [14].
	Consistent anatomy and adequate diameter, especially at the level of the serratus branch [14, 119].	Thoracodorsal vessels are frequently damaged by axillary lymph node clearance and post-operative radiotherapy making them suboptimal for delayed reconstructions where the incidence of unusable vessels and flap loss are 11 and 6%, respectively [14, 112, 115, 119].
	Commonly used recipient vessel with proven reliability [14, 83, 116, 120, 121].	
	Does not preclude future CABG.	Limits the options for re-operative breast reconstruction if the original flap fails or tumour recur as the pedicled latissimus dorsi and thoracodorsal artery perforator flaps are also based off the thoracodorsal vessels [10, 14].
		Patient position required for microanastomosis is difficult for the assistant, requiring them to reach across the chest [10, 14, 114].
		Aesthetically inferior to the IMA as they may result in unnaturally lateral flap placement and axillary scarring [114].
		Risk of pedicle avulsion and shoulder stiffness because of immobilisation [13, 31].
Circumflex scapular artery	Large arterial and venous diameters (1.5–3 mm) are favourable for microanastamosis to the DIEP pedicle [121].	Patient position required for microanastomosis is difficult for the assistant, requiring them to reach across the chest [14, 114].
	Rarely damaged by previous surgery or irradiation [14, 121].	Medial placement of the breast mound was restricted, and lateral fullness of the flap was a common problem [114].
	Does not preclude future CABG.	

Table 2 continued

Vessel	Advantages	Disadvantages
Internal mammary artery perforators	Decreased operative time to expose IMAPs as compared with the IMA and thoracodorsal vessels [9].	Smaller calibre vessels create uncertainty regarding the adequacy of venous outflow [9, 101].
	Less invasive dissection reduces post-operative discomfort [14].	Thin-walled veins [14].
	IMAPs in the first and second ICS may be free from irradiation or previous surgery [14].	Technically demanding procedure [14].
	Avoids need to resect costal cartilage and risk of thoracic deformity [9, 14].	Suitable IMAPs are not always present in the surgical field and are easily damaged during mastectomy depending on the level of institutional experience [9, 13].
	Superior positioning for both the surgeon and assistant [9, 14].	
	Shown to be a safe and reliable recipient site for anastomosis in selected patients [10, 12–14, 32, 98].	
	Spares the IMA for future CABG [9, 14].	

Despite the evolution of drug-eluting stents, studies show that CABG is still preferred in the management of three-vessel disease and left-anterior descending (LAD) as it is associated with lower rates of mortality, myocardial infarction and repeat revascularisation [34]. In 2010, 64.2 CABGs were performed per 100,000 people in OECD countries, one in three of which were in women [18, 35] (Table 1).

Currently, the IMAs are the gold standard CABG conduits in terms of graft patency and patient survival [36–38] (see Table 3). Unlike other arterial conduits, the IMAs appear to be immune to atherosclerosis, vasospasm and endothelial injury [38–40]. This is hypothesized to be because of the IMA's demonstrably higher rates of apoptosis, superoxide dehydrogenase activity and nitric oxide production, which allow it to actively dilate and remodel favourably in response to increases in blood flow [39, 41–43]. Overall, the left IMA (LIMA) has a patency rate of 85–92% at 15 years when grafted to the LAD [38, 44, 45] compared with around 53% for saphenous vein grafts [38, 46]. The right IMA (RIMA) demonstrates identical patency rates to the LIMA when grafted to the LAD, although this appears diminishes when grafted to a non-left-sided vessel [38]. Recent reports, however, suggest that the observed inferiority of the RIMA compared with the LIMA is likely to be because of technical factors rather than the biology of the RIMA itself [47].

At present, more than 90% of CABGs performed in the United States use at least one IMA, most commonly LIMA-LAD [37, 47, 48]. However, there is emerging evidence that the use of two IMAs in bilateral grafting (BIMA) may be superior to and supersede single IMA grafting as the gold standard procedure [38, 41, 49–58]. If this is the case, then there is an even greater imperative to preserve both IMAs. Definitive results from these trials, however, will not be available for several years [38, 41, 54]. Preserving the IMAs for future CABG is especially important to breast cancer patients as they are at an increased risk for coronary artery disease [59–61]. In fact, coronary heart disease is the main cause of non-cancer-related mortality in breast cancer patients treated with adjuvant radiotherapy. When followed up over the longer term, breast cancer patients receiving radiation, especially to the left side, are 1.0–2.2 times more likely to suffer a fatal cardiovascular event [10, 59–62]. This statistic is particularly worrisome as according to the TEAM trial, 38.8% mastectomy patients receive adjuvant radiotherapy worldwide [20]. Unfortunately, the exact magnitude of this dilemma remains elusive as there are no reliable means of estimating the precise number of women affected. On the conservative side, one retrospective study only reported an incidence of 0.8% ($n = 120$:1) for the two conditions occurring in the same patient [9]. In contrast, others have suggested that the number needed to treat to save one IMA for CABG is 61:1 and that the average surgeon can be expected to preserve 12 IMAs during their career [10, 13]. Yet another author reported 81 cases of

Table 3 Comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of the common conduits used for coronary artery bypass grafting

Conduit	Advantages	Disadvantages
Internal mammary artery	Superior long-term patency [38, 44, 45]	Currently precludes IMA being reused as a recipient vessel for autologous breast reconstruction
	1 year: 93–99%	Limited length available for bypass [38]
	5 year: 88–100%	
	10 year: 90–95%	
	15 year: 85–92%	
	Proven survival benefit [38, 48, 122]	
	Superior survival rates compared with saphenous vein grafts [123]	
	One-vessel disease—93 versus 88%	
	Two-vessel disease—90 versus 80%	
	Three-vessel disease—83 versus 71%	
	Relatively immune to atherosclerosis [38–40]	
Saphenous vein	Easily accessible [122]	Impaired ambulation [122]
	Adequate length to access every coronary vessel [122]	Limiting factor in survival in patients with both IMA and saphenous vein grafts [38]
	Correct diameter for coronary and aortic anastomosis [122]	Inferior patency rates compared with IMA [38, 44, 45, 124, 125]
		1 year: 78–86%
		5 year: 65–82%
		10 year: 57–61%
		15 year: 53%
		20 year: 20%
Radial artery	Available as a free graft [38]	Prone to intimal hyperplasia, atheroma and calcification [38]
	Good length (>20 cm) and diameter (2–3 mm) [122]	Muscular artery; prone to vasopasm [122]
	Technically less demanding because of thicker muscular wall [122]	Contraindicated in ulnar artery insufficiency, trauma, vasculitis, raynauds disease and arterial-venous fistulas [122]
	Can be harvest concurrently with other conduits [122]	Inferior patency rates compared with IMA [38, 122, 127, 128]
	Adapted to higher arterial pressures [122]	1 year: 51–90%
		5 year: 83–91%
	Good long-term patency after first post-operative year [126]	10 year: 83%
Gastro-epiploic artery	Good short-term patency [38, 122]	Thick smooth muscle media that is prone to spasm [38]
	Reliable donor when other conduits are scarce	Inferior patency rates compared with IMA [38]
		2 year: 88%
		5 year: 86–90%
		10 year: 67%
		Fragile, increased operating time and associated abdominal complications, such as discomfort and ileus



Fig. 2 Incidence of coronary artery bypass grafts and breast reconstructions performed, by age, in the United States. Significantly, there is a 20-year delay in the peak incidence between the two procedures

perioperative myocardial infarctions following breast reconstructions during a 4-year period [63]. Ultimately, these estimates are highly variable and possibly understate the true extent of this predicament as the peak incidences of the two diseases occur up to two decades apart and are thus not captured by existing studies (Fig. 2). Furthermore, selection biases exist in single-operator audits, and retrospective studies may not account for the women who choose not to receive one procedure over concerns of the other.

Since the introduction of DIEP flaps, more knowledge has come to light on its long-term survival with regard to its pedicle. A number of animal studies and case reports suggest that DIEP flaps can survive after separation from the IMA pedicle 7–9 days post-operatively [15, 64–68] if there is a cutaneous inset. Therefore, if the IMAs anastomosed to the DIEP pedicles are long enough to reach the coronary arteries, they can theoretically be disconnected from the DIEP flap and manoeuvred back into the thoracic cavity to be reused in CABG as needed. To test the feasibility of this theory, we conducted an anatomical study comparing the lengths of the IMAs at every ICS against empirical measurements of IMA length required for grafting to the LAD as reported in the literature. We hypothesise that knowledge of the IMA length at any given level of dissection may allow us to modify the way in which DIEPs are performed to preserve a sufficient length of IMA to be reused for future CABG. As a secondary objective, we summarise in the discussion a review of alternative techniques for DIEP reconstruction. From this, we explore a range of other approaches to spare the IMA to provide a comprehensive review of possible solutions to the current dilemma.

Method

Anatomical study

A combined cadaveric and clinical anatomical study of 315 hemi-thoracic walls was undertaken following ethics



Fig. 3 X-ray angiogram of the internal mammary arteries (IMAs) at each intercostals space, illustrating the course of the IMA and the reference points from which diameters and lengths were measured. *DSEA* deep superior epigastric artery

committee approval. Specimens and patients were females of mixed body habitus with mean ages of 82 years (60–98 years) for the cadaveric study and 52 years (30–75 years) for the clinical. The cadaveric study composed of 75 cadaveric hemi-thoracic walls from 39 cadavers (72 bilateral and 3 unilateral). In each case, plain X-ray angiography of the IMA was undertaken through a well-established technique of direct catheterization and injection with a radio-opaque lead oxide injectant [69] (Fig. 3).

In the clinical study, preoperative imaging was performed in 120 consenting patients before undergoing autologous breast reconstruction. Of these, 42 patients underwent computed-tomographic angiography (CTA) and 78 patients colour duplex ultrasound (Fig. 4). Arterial phase CTA scans were undertaken with intravenous contrast in all cases and composed of non-ionic iodinated contrast media: Ultravist 370 (Schering, Berlin, Germany) or Omnipaque 350 (Amersham Health, Princeton, USA). Intravenous access was obtained through an antecubital vein with an 18-gauge cannula, and injections were performed with a biphasic power injection pump at a flow rate of 4–6 ml/s. Image reformatting was achieved with either Siemens Syngo InSpace (Siemens, InSpace2004A_PRE_19) or Osirix (OsiriX Medical Imaging Software, GPL Licensing Open Source Initiative). For duplex ultrasound, a flow value was assigned to the pulsatile arterial flow to accurately identify the IMA.

The key anatomical features measured were the IMA length and diameter at each ICS. The origin of the IMA was measured from the inferior aspect of the clavicle for consistency. The first ICS was defined as the distance between the inferior aspect of the clavicle to the superior aspect of the second rib. Each subsequent ICS was defined as the space between the superior aspects of adjacent ribs (Fig. 3). The length of each IMA was measured to its bifurcation into its terminal branches, the deep superior epigastric artery (DSEA) and the musculo-phrenic



Fig. 4 Internal mammary arteries as seen by computed-tomographic angiography

artery. In addition, the presence and diameter of IMA perforators (IMAP) were recorded at each ICS.

In the cadaveric study, lengths were measured using a vernier caliper, and vessel diameters were measured with a 0.1-mm-scaled glass slide and a ×10 stereo microscope (Leica® M80 10X/23B). In the clinical study, both length and vessel diameters were measured with the aforementioned software on thin slices with contrast-filled vessels used to highlight internal vessel diameters.

Literature review

The length of IMA needed for CABG was determined through searches of Medline, Pubmed and references from relevant articles using the following terms:

- *Coronary artery bypass grafting/CABG*
- *Internal mammary/thoracic artery*
- *IMA/LIMA/RIMA*
- *ITA/LITA/RITA*
- *Length/cm/mm/pedicle*
- *Needed/required/used/measured/harvested*
- *Left-anterior descending/LAD*

The articles were then manually screened for empirical measurements of the IMA lengths used in in situ grafting to the LAD through median sternotomy or minimally invasive techniques. Non-specific measurements of the IMA, free-grafts and re-operative CABGs were excluded as were non-English and duplicate references. In total, more than 500 references and 100 full text articles were reviewed.

To explore other solutions to this dilemma, similar searches were conducted on the anatomy and clinical application of the IMAs in autologous breast reconstruction and CABG. The results identified were manually reviewed and selected based on their relevance to the present topic.



Results

Anatomical study

Measurements of the IMAs at each ICS from the 315 hemithoracic walls are shown in Table 4. On average, the RIMA (177.80 ± 44.3 mm) was shorter than the LIMA (186.90 ± 37.5 mm), and bifurcated at a higher level. Specifically, 26% of RIMAs measured bifurcated at the fifth ICS and the rest at the level of the sixth rib. In contrast, 16% of the LIMAs bifurcated at the fifth ICS, 73% in the sixth ICS and 11% in the seventh ICS.

The IMA diameter at each ICS progressively decreased as the IMA descended caudally and exhibited little difference between each side (Table 4). The mean diameters of the LIMA and RIMA were 2.8/2.8 mm (2.1–3.6 mm) at the inferior border of the clavicle and 1.7/1.8 mm at the bifurcation.

The size and number of IMAPs exhibited a similar pattern, decreasing from an average size of 1.4–1.5 mm in the first two ICS to 0.6–0.9 cm in the lower three ICS' (Table 5). The presence of perforators >1 mm was present in 87 and 91% of patients in the first two ICS, but only 3% by the sixth ICS.

Literature review

From the review on the IMAs, 11 studies quoted exact lengths of the LIMA needed to graft the LAD and are shown in Table 6 [70–81]. Of these, five used open harvesting techniques ($n = 1{,}019$) and six employed minimally invasive techniques ($n = 555$). The mean lengths weighted according to sample size were 160.08 and 152.70 mm, respectively, and correspond anatomically to the level of the fourth rib.

The exact length of the RIMA required for CABG was inconsistently reported as it depended to a large degree on the arteries bypassed and type of anastomosis used. The bulk of the literature that we reviewed harvested the RIMA from its bifurcation (177.80 mm in our study) and trimmed it to the required length intraoperatively. For the purposes of discussion, we use this more conservative figure to err on the side of safety. Furthermore, we discuss the DIEP pedicle, IMA perforators and the retrograde limb of the

Table 4 Anatomical features of the internal mammary arteries with lengths and diameters measured at each intercostal space

	Right				Left			
	Length (mm)		Diameter (mm)		Length (mm)		Diameter (mm)	
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Length	Range	Mean	Range
Origin	–	–	2.8	2.1–3.6	–	–	2.8	2.2–3.5
First ICS	54.9	44–69	2.6	2.1–3.2	58.7	42–74	2.6	2.0–3.2
Second ICS	88.1	75–118	2.4	1.6–3.1	92.9	72–119	2.4	1.7–3.1
Third ICS	119.1	100–156	2.1	1.4–2.8	121.1	101–156	2.1	1.5–2.8
Fourth ICS	148.5	120–188	1.9	1.3–2.5	148.9	121–190	2	1.2–2.6
Fifth ICS	170.8	142–210	1.8	1.2–2.4	167.1	139–208	1.8	1.2–2.5
Sixth ICS	–	–	–	–	182.1	161–202	1.7	1.4–2.5
Bifurcation	177.8	132–233	1.8	1.1–2.3	186.9	150–225	1.7	1.0–2.5

Table 5 Presence and diameter of internal mammary artery perforators at each intercostal space

	Right			Left		
	Presence of perforating branch of the IMA > 1 mm in diameter (%)	Perforator diameter (mm)		Presence of perforating branch of the IMA > 1 mm in diameter (%)	Perforator diameter (mm)	
		Mean	Range		Mean	Range
First ICS	87	1.4	0.8–2.1	88	1.4	0.8–2.5
Second ICS	91	1.5	0.9–2.5	92	1.6	0.9–2.9
Third ICS	65	0.9	0.5–1.8	70	0.9	0.5–2.8
Fourth ICS	6	0.6	0.3–1.5	13	0.6	0.3–1.4
Fifth ICS	5	0.6	0.3–1.3	9	0.6	0.3–1.0
Sixth ICS[3]	–	–	–	3	0.5	0.3–1.0

Table 6 Lengths of internal mammary arteries required for coronary artery bypass grafting to the left-anterior descending artery, as quoted in the literature

Study	Year	LIMA-LAD	*N*
Median sternotomy			
Calafiore et al. [70]	1998	161.00	14
		177.00	14
Deja et al. [71]	1999	170.00	287
		177.00	70
Calafiore et al. [72]	1999	164.00	304
Bonacchi et al. [57]	2005	142.00	310
Gwozdziewicz [75]	2008	166.90	20
Minimally invasive CABG (MICABG)			
Boonstra et al. [76]	1997	140.00	20
Lazarra et al. [77]	1999	153.00	16
		143.00	10
Zenati et al. [78]	1999	150.00	27
Cremer et al. [79]	1999	150.00	205
Trehan et al. [80]	2000	156.00	267
Ishikawa et al. [81]	2007	162.00	10
Weighted average standard CABG		160.08	1,019
Weighted average MICABG		152.70	555

IMA as the most relevant and novel approaches of using the IMA for DIEP flaps and CABGs.

Discussion

Comparing the anatomical features of the in situ IMAs at each ICS will assist in bridging an elusive gap between reconstructive and cardiothoracic techniques. Based on the results of our study and literature review, there are five methods of modifying the DIEP to allow future reuse of IMA for CABG.

Technique 1: lowering the site of DIEP anastomosis

Our anatomical study (Table 4) shows the ICS' at which DIEP reconstructions can be safely performed to preserve these IMA lengths for pedicled grafting to be the fifth for the left and sixth on the right. If the IMAs are harvested in a skeletonised fashion, the additional length gained permits DIEP reconstructions to be anastomosed one level higher in the fourth and fifth ICS' (Fig. 5). These conclusions correlate well with the only other study on this technique which also supports the fourth and fifth ICS as being suitable for leaving a sufficient length of IMA for future CABG [15]. Some surgeons have raised concerns regarding the diameter of the IMA below the fourth ICS and that the fifth to seventh costal cartilages are very narrow and sometimes fused. Our study indicated that the mean diameter of the LIMA was 2.0 mm (1.2–2.6) at the fourth ICS that is sufficient for an end-to-end anastomosis. The RIMA was also of sufficient calibre, averaging 1.8 mm (1.2–2.4) at the fifth ICS. A standard rib resection or minimally invasive approach can be used to access the IMA should the interspaces be narrow [82].

The main limitation of this technique is the relative inconsistency of the internal mammary vein (IMV) below the third ICS. The IMVs are almost universally present and accompany the IMA as they descend caudally lateral to the sternum. However, around 70% of IMVs (types 1 and 3) bifurcate by the fourth rib to form two vessels of reduced internal diameter [83]. Accordingly, there is a significant degree of variability in the diameters available for anastomosis at the fifth ICS (1.0–3.9 mm), creating a degree of uncertainty regarding the availability of adequate venous drainage at that level [83]. This is an understandable concern to surgeons as venous congestion is a major cause of flap failure, complicating up to 10% of conventional DIEP reconstructions with up to 5% requiring reoperation [84–87]. Fortunately, the majority of IMVs at this level are of suitable calibre (1.7–2.5 mm) and can be accurately assessed through radiological means. Although this technique may not be an option for every patient, suitable candidates can be readily identified through careful preoperative imaging. If the IMVs are small, then it is important to consider the superficial epigastric veins (SIEVs) [84, 86, 88–90]. Flap congestion has been noted to occur when the SIEV exceeds 1.5 mm in diameter as this is postulated to be associated with inadequate venous communication between the two systems [86, 91]. Therefore, a popular solution for overcoming venous complications takes the form of routinely exposing the SIEV when



Fig. 5 *Technique 1: lowering the site of DIEP anastomosis*. A deep inferior epigastric artery perforator flap that is anastomosed at the fifth intercostal space leaves a sufficient length of the internal mammary artery for direct reuse in coronary artery bypass grafting

raising the DIEP flap for either prophylactic creation of an additional venous outflow or as a 'lifeboat' for salvaging congested flaps in the post-operative period [84, 91–94]. The SIEV can then be anastomosed to augment the blood flow from the superficial to deep systems to the DIEV or its vena comitantes, or as an alternative outflow to other venous networks such as the IMV (retrograde limb or perforator vessels) [95, 96], lateral thoracic, thoracodorsal, circumflex scapula, intercostal, cephalic or basilic veins. Regardless of the choice of anastomosis, there is some evidence that the use of an additional venous outflow option can reduce the incidence of flap congestion without affecting flap survival or operating time [84, 90].

Technique 2: using IMA perforators

Several studies have suggested that DIEP flaps can be anastomosed to IMAPs to spare the IMA proper for future use in CABG [9, 12–14, 31–33, 97, 98]. The additional advantages of using IMAPs compared with the IMAs include avoidance of the need to excise the ribs or costal cartilage to gain access the IMA, and in doing so also minimises operating time, post-operative pain, pulmonary complications and contour deformities (Table 2) [13, 14, 31, 99, 100]. The disadvantages of IMAPs centre on concerns over their reliability, availability, calibre and venous drainage. These factors have limited the widespread uptake of IMAP as recipient vessels, however, new studies are now clarifying much of the uncertainty surrounding this technique. Recent clinical series by Follmar et al. [13] and Saint-Cyr et al. [32] have both shown that with careful patient selection and adequate clinical experience, DIEP flaps can be safely anastomosed to IMAPs without increasing the incidence of flap loss or fat necrosis compared with the IMA or thoracodorsal vessels. Several studies, this study included, show that such a procedure is anatomically feasible in the majority of women given the high incidence of usable perforators in the first and second ICS (87–91%) [12, 33]. Interesting however, the proportion of breast reconstructions with suitable IMAPs reported ranges from 9 to 39% depending on the institutional selection criteria (Table 7) [12–14, 31, 32, 98]. A major factor limiting the uptake of IMAPs is perforator damage during mastectomy and/or radiotherapy. If the breast surgeon is vigilant, this should not be a problem, and in selected cases, a more proximal segment of the undamaged IMA or an interspace spared radiation may be used [14, 32]. As with any new procedure, a learning curve exists within the surgical unit and uptake rates increase with the number of DIEP-IMAPs performed. A prospective study of 100 consecutive DIEP flaps clearly demonstrated increasing IMAP rates with every 20 reconstructions performed, as IMAP vessels were increasingly spared by the general surgeons during mastectomy and used for subsequent reconstruction. By the end of this study, an use rate of 45% ($n = 9/20$) was achieved without a statistical increase in the number of complications [13].

In terms of IMAP calibre, previous studies have reported values of between 1.0 and 1.83 mm with the largest or 'principle' perforator lying in the second or third ICS (Tables 7 and 8) [12–14, 31–33, 101]. This is in keeping with our findings that show the highest incidence of usable perforators (>1 mm) to be in the second ICS (91%) with a mean internal diameter of 1.5 mm (0.9–2.5 mm) on the right IMA and 1.6 mm (0.9–2.9 mm) on the left. Any mismatch between the DIEP pedicle and the IMAP can be overcome through traditional microsurgical techniques. Our analysis of 315 hemi-thoracics is the largest study to date and all measurements were accurate to 0.1 mm.

Some authors have expressed concern over the venous drainage of DIEP-IMAP reconstructions. Given the aforementioned rates of venous complications in conventional DIEP flaps, it is understandable, therefore, to assume that DIEP-IMAP flaps may experience at least an equivalent if not higher rate of venous inadequacy given the smaller calibre of perforator vessels. However, this does not appear

Table 7 Clinical studies that have used the internal mammary artery perforators as recipient vessels in autologous breast reconstruction as a means of sparing the internal mammary artery for coronary artery bypass grafting

Study	Year	*n*	Suitable cases (%)	Mean vessel diameter (mm)	ICS used	Flaps performed	Flap necrosis (%)	Follow up (months)
Hamdi et al. [14]	2003	30	9.0	Artery = 1.0 (0.5–1.3) Vein = 1.7 (1.0–3.0)	Second = 30% Third = 70%	DIEP = 26 SGAP = 3 SIEA = 1	3.3	1–26
Hayward et al. [125]	2003	21	39.0	–	Second and third	DIEP, SGAP, SIEA	0	–
Park et al. [98]	2003	5	–	Artery = 1.56 (1.2–2.5) Vein = 1.4 (1.0–2.2)	– –	TRAM	20	6–14
Munhoz et al. [12]	2004	40	32.5	–	–	DIEP = 38	0	–
Saint-Cyr et al. [32]	2007	38	27.0	Artery = 1.9 (1.5–2.0) Vein = 2.9 (1.7–4.0)	Second = 41% Third = 53% Fourth = 6%	MS-TRAM = 12 DIEP = 10 TRAM = 9 SIEA = 7	1	–
Follmar et al. [13]	2008	23	23	–	–	DIEP = 23	4	0.25–46.75

Table 8 Anatomical studies that have investigated the presence and diameter of internal mammary artery perforators for the purpose of assessing its suitability as a recipient vessel in autologous breast reconstruction

Study	Year	*n*	IMAP present in second or third ICS (%)	Mean vessel diameter (mm)
Park et al. [98]	2003	5	–	Artery = 1.56 (1.2–2.5) Vein = 1.4 (1.0–2.2)
Munhoz et al. [12]	2004	32	86	Artery = 0.85 (0.6–1.0)
Rosson et al. [101]	2005	20	–	Artery = 1.14 (0.3–2.7) Vein = 1.14 (0.25–3.5)
Schmidt et al. [33]	2008	20	95	Artery = 1.3 (0.4–2.9)
This study	2011	315	91	Artery = 1.27 (0.3–2.5)

to be the case in the studies to date and intra-operative measurements by Saint-Cyr et al. found that IMV and IMVP have similar diameters (2.8 vs. 2.9 mm) after reversing vessel spasm and mechanical dilation [32]. Furthermore, DIEP-IMAP flaps can be supercharged with additional venous outflows as described in Technique 1.

Using our review of the cardiothoracic literature, we propose two ways in which a 'DIEP-IMAP' flap can be performed to preserve the IMA for CABG. First, it may be possible to separate the IMAP from its parent vessel after a period of delay in the process of skeletonising the IMA for CABG (Fig. 6a). The advantage of this method is that it enables IMAs to be harvested through a standard cardiothoracic technique without a need for increased operating time. Alternatively, the LIMA may be harvested without disconnecting the DIEP-IMAP (Fig. 6b) by skeletonising the LIMA from the level of the flap, beyond its bifurcation, to the first 2–3 cm of the DSEA, a technique similar to harvesting an extended RIMA for grafting to non-LAD arteries. This method may permit both the DIEP and LAD to be perfused with the same IMA.

Technique 3: end-to-side anastomosis of the DIEP flap to the IMA

End-to-side arterial anastomosis is a well-described technique in microsurgical free flap reconstructions and has been shown to be as consistent and reliable as traditional end-to-end anastomosis in both clinical and experimental studies [10, 11, 102–107]. A recent series by Apostolides et al. comparing 15 end-to-side anastomosis with and equivalent number of end-to-end anastomosis in 30 consecutive DIEP and SIEA reconstructions demonstrated that the only statistically significant difference between the two techniques was longer ischemia in the end-to-side group (20 min) [10]. These were not associated with increased flap complications or the no-reflow phenomenon.

Technique 4: using the DIEP pedicle as a composite graft

Recent studies have shown that the average DIEP pedicle processes a similar diameter to the IMA (2.0–3.6 vs.



Fig. 6 *Technique 2: using IMA perforators*. Two methods of performing coronary artery bypass grafting options for a deep inferior epigastric artery perforator (DIEP) flap that is anastomosed to the internal mammary artery perforators at the second intercostal space. **a** Shows the separation of the DIEP flap during harvesting of the internal mammary artery. **b** Shows the DIEP flap left in situ for shared perfusion with the left-anterior descending artery

1.7–2.8 mm) [108]. Therefore, if a CABG is necessary, a segment of the DIEP pedicle can be used as a composite graft to obtain the length required (Fig. 7). In fact, the DIEP's parent vessel, the inferior epigastric artery, has been used as a composite graft with excellent patency rates (85% during 81 months), possibly because of the downstream effect of cytokine secretion by the IMAs [38, 109]. The advantage of this method is that it enables women with pre-existing DIEP flaps to receive IMA-based CABGs if needed. To facilitate this, reconstructive surgeons should aim to harvest the DIEP in its entirety (8–15 cm) and tunnel the pedicle to the anastomotic site to



Fig. 7 *Technique 4: using the DIEP pedicle as a composite graft*. The deep inferior epigastric artery perforator (DIEP) pedicle can be used to extend the internal mammary artery for coronary artery bypass grafting in patients with conventional DIEP flaps anastomosed at the third intercostal space



Fig. 8 *Technique 5: the retrograde DIEP flap*. A deep inferior epigastric artery perforator flap that is anastomosed to the retrograde limb of the internal mammary artery (IMA), leaving the proximal IMA undisturbed for coronary artery bypass grafting

minimise handling of the IMA [108]. Most patients with pre-existing DIEP flaps are amenable to this technique and the patency of the DIEP pedicle can be imaged pre-operatively to assess patency and flow rates before CABG.

Technique 5: the retrograde DIEP flap

Retrograde flow from the distal limb of the IMAs has been used on rare occasions for CABG and salvage of breast reconstructions with compromised arterial supply [110, 111]. Historically, studies from the 1980s intra-operatively measured the retrograde flow from the distal IMA to be as high as 60 ml/min [110]. Retrograde CABGs, however, did not become mainstream because of the unpredictable and highly variable vascular anatomy between individuals. Now, advances in imaging technology enable surgeons to accurately visualise anatomical variations. Therefore, we hypothesise that under the guidance of careful preoperative imaging, a 'retrograde DIEP' flap anastomosed to the distal IMA may be a feasible recipient vessel for DIEP flaps in select individuals (Fig. 8), especially as the distal limbs of the IMV have also been used successfully as an outflow option for DIEP flaps.

The 'retrograde DIEP flap' is untested although personal experience of some surgeons suggest that the technique of anastomosing the DIEP flap in a retrograde fashion is not always predictable and often requires a need to maintain a mean systolic pressure of above 130 mmHg; and is therefore a suboptimal strategy in women with strong cardiovascular risk factors. Nonetheless, further investigations are warranted as this approach may preserve the operative field entirely undisturbed for future CABG. Further and importantly, the metabolic requirements needed to support a DIEP flap are unlikely to be as demanding as those of a coronary artery to which the distal IMA has already been successfully grafted.

Impact of findings

The findings of this study support the theory that using the IMA for autologous breast reconstruction is not an absolute contraindication for CABG as there are a number of procedures that can be used to accommodate high-risk patients. The optimal techniques for reconstruction following mastectomy and coronary artery bypass grafting are not necessarily mutually exclusive and affects two major patient populations: women who require reconstruction after bilateral mastectomy (10% and growing)

and women who derive a survival benefit from BIMA that, pending results of current trials, may be the majority of CABG candidates. The full impact of these findings is likely to be under-appreciated because of the age gap between the two conditions (Fig. 2), the projected increase in both conditions and the fact that current statistics on breast reconstruction exclude women turned away from DIEP flaps for fear of its prohibitive effect on future heart surgery. The concepts brought forward in this study aim to catalyse further discussion and collaboration between cardiothoracic surgeons and plastic surgeons, to potentially improve women's health.

Acknowledgments Funding Iain S. Whitaker was supported by the Dowager Countess Eleanor Peel Research Trust, London, UK.

Conflict of interest The authors declare that there is no source of financial or other support, or any financial or professional relationships that may pose a competing interest.

Ethical approval Institutional ethical approval was obtained prospectively, and conforms to the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki in 1995. The subject gave informed consent and patient anonymity has been preserved.

References

1. Garvey PB, Buchel EW, Pockaj BA, Casey WJ 3rd, Gray RJ, Hernández JL, Samson TD (2006) DIEP and pedicled TRAM flaps: a comparison of outcomes. Plast Reconstr Surg 117(6):1711–1719
2. Tachi M, Yamada A (2005) Choice of flaps for breast reconstruction. Int J Clin Oncol 10(5):289–297
3. Selber JC, Nelson J, Fosnot J et al (2010) A prospective study comparing the functional impact of SIEA, DIEP, and muscle-sparing free TRAM flaps on the abdominal wall: part I. unilateral reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 126(4):1142–1153
4. Nahabedian MY, Momen B, Galdino G, Manson PN (2002) Breast reconstruction with the free TRAM or DIEP flap: patient selection, choice of flap, and outcome. Plast Reconstr Surg 110:466–475
5. Kaplan JL, Allen RJ (2000) Cost-based comparison between perforator flaps and TRAM flaps for breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 105:943–948
6. Kroll SS, Sharma S, Koutz C, Langstein HN et al (2001) Postoperative morphine requirements of free TRAM and DIEP flaps. Plast Reconstr Surg 107:338–341
7. Atisha D, Alderman AK (2009) A systematic review of abdominal wall function following abdominal flaps for postmastectomy breast reconstruction. Ann Plast Surg 63(2):222–230
8. Yap YL, Lim J, Yap-Asedillo C et al (2010) The deep inferior epigastric perforator flap for breast reconstruction: is this the ideal flap for Asian women? Ann Acad Med Singapore 39(9):680–686
9. Nahabedian MY (2004) The internal mammary artery and vein as recipient vessels for microvascular breast reconstruction: are we burning a future bridge? Ann Plast Surg 53(4):311–316
10. Apostolides JG, Magarakis M, Rosson GD (2011) Preserving the internal mammary artery: end-to-side microvascular arterial anastomosis for DIEP and SIEA flap breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 128(4):225e–232e
11. Hemphill AF, de Jesus RA, McElhaney N, Ferrari JP (2008) End-to-side anastomosis to the internal mammary artery in free flap breast reconstruction: preserving the internal mammary artery for coronary artery bypass grafting. Plast Reconstr Surg 122(5):149e–150e
12. Munhoz AM, Ishida LH, Montag E et al (2004) Perforator flap breast reconstruction using internal mammary perforator branches as a recipient site: an anatomical and clinical analysis. Plast Reconstr Surg 114:62–68
13. Follmar KE, Prucz RB, Manahan MA, Magarakis M, Rad AN, Rosson GD (2011) Internal mammary intercostal perforators instead of the true internal mammary vessels as the recipient vessels for breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 127(1):34–40
14. Hamdi M, Blondeel P, Van Landuyt K, Monstrey S (2004) Algorithm in choosing recipient vessels for perforator free flap in breast reconstruction: the role of the internal mammary perforators. Br J Plast Surg 57(3):258–265
15. Greer-Bayramoglu RJ, Chu MW, Fortin AJ (2011) Feasibility of internal mammary vessel use in breast reconstruction versus coronary artery bypass surgery: an anatomic, cadaveric evaluation. Plast Reconstr Surg 127(5):1783–1789
16. World Health Organization (2008) The global burden of disease: 2004 update. WHO, Geneva
17. Ferlay J, Shin HR, Bray F et al (2010) Estimates of worldwide burden of cancer in 2008: GLOBOCAN 2008. Int J Cancer 127(12):2893–2917
18. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2010) OECD health data 2010: statistics and indicators for 30 countries. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. http://www.ecosante.org/index2.php?base=OCDE&langh=ENG&langs=ENG&sessionid. Accessed 25 Jan 2011
19. Desantis C, Siegel R, Bandi P, Jemal A (2011) Breast cancer statistics, 2011. CA Cancer J Clin 61(4):212–236
20. Van Nes JG, Seynaeve C, Jones S et al (2010) Variations in locoregional therapy in postmenopausal patients with early breast cancer treated in different countries. Br J Surg 97:671–679
21. American Society of Plastic Surgeons (2010) National clearinghouse of plastic surgery statistics, 2010 report of the 2009 statistics. Arlington Heights, IL: American Society of Plastic Surgeons. http://www.plasticsurgery.org/Documents/Media/statistics/2009-US-cosmeticreconstructiveplasticsurgeryminimally-invasive-statistics.pdf. Accessed 26 Jan 2011
22. Damen TH, Wei W, Mureau MA et al (2011) Medium-term cost analysis of breast reconstructions in a single Dutch centre: a comparison of implants, implants preceded by tissue expansion, LD transpositions and DIEP flaps. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 64(8):1043–1053
23. Marchac A, Bosc R, Benjoar MD, Hivelin M, Lepage C, Lantieri L (2011) A cost analysis of DIEP flap in breast reconstruction. Ann Chir Plast Esthet 56(4):275–279
24. Stucky CC, Gray RJ, Wasif N, Dueck AC, Pockaj BA (2010) Increase in contralateral prophylactic mastectomy: echoes of a bygone era? Surgical trends for unilateral breast cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 17(3):330–337
25. Han E, Johnson N, Glissmeyer M, Wagie T, Carey B, DeLaMelena T, Nelson J (2011) Increasing incidence of bilateral mastectomies: the patient perspective. Am J Surg 201(5):615–618
26. Mislowsky A, Domchek S, Stroede C, Bergey MR, Sonnad SS, Wu L, Tchou J (2011) Breast cancer surgery trend changes since the introduction of BRCA1/2 mutation screening: a retrospective cohort analysis of 158 mutation carriers treated at a single institution. Ann Surg Oncol 18(3):745–751

27. Tuttle TM, Jarosek S, Habermann EB, Arrington A, Abraham A, Morris TJ, Virnig BA (2009) Increasing rates of contralateral prophylactic mastectomy among patients with ductal carcinoma in situ. J Clin Oncol 27(9):1362–1367
28. Yao K, Stewart AK, Winchester DJ, Winchester DP (2010) Trends in contralateral prophylactic mastectomy for unilateral cancer: a report from the National Cancer Data Base, 1998–2007. Ann Surg Oncol 17(10):2554–2562
29. Arrington AK, Jarosek SL, Virnig BA, Habermann EB, Tuttle TM (2009) Patient and surgeon characteristics associated with increased use of contralateral prophylactic mastectomy in patients with breast cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 16(10):2697–2704
30. Saint-Cyr M, Youssef A, Bae HW, Robb GL, Chang DW (2007) Changing trends in recipient vessel selection for microvascular autologous breast reconstruction: an analysis of 1483 consecutive cases. Plast Reconstr Surg 119(7):1993–2000
31. Haywood RM, Raurell A, Perks AG, Sassoon EM, Logan AM, Phillips J (2003) Autologous free tissue breast reconstruction using the internal mammary perforators as recipient vessels. Br J Plast Surg 56(7):689–691
32. Saint-Cyr M, Chang DW, Robb GL, Chevray PM (2007) Internal mammary perforator recipient vessels for breast reconstruction using free TRAM, DIEP, and SIEA flaps. Plast Reconstr Surg 120(7):1769–1773
33. Schmidt M, Aszmann OC, Beck H, Frey M (2010) The anatomic basis of the internal mammary artery perforator flap: a cadaver study. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 63(2):191–196
34. Hannan EL, Wu C, Walford G et al (2008) Drug-eluting stents vs. coronary-artery bypass grafting in multivessel coronary disease. New Eng J Med 358(4):2641–2644
35. Movahed MR, Hashemzadeh M, Khoynezhad A, Jamal M, Ramaraj R (2010) Sex and ethnic group specific nationwide trends in the use of coronary artery bypass grafting in the United States. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 139:1545–1547
36. Kitamura S (2011) Physiological and metabolic effects of grafts in coronary artery bypass surgery. Circ J 75(4):766–772
37. Schmitto JD, Rajab TK, Cohn LH (2010) Prevalence and variability of internal mammary graft use in contemporary multivessel coronary artery bypass graft. Curr Opin Cardiol 25(6):609–612
38. Buxton BF, Newcomb AE, Moten S, Seevanayagam S, Gordon I (2009) Choice of conduits for coronary artery bypass grafting: craft or science? Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 35(4):658–670
39. Frischknecht K, Greuter H, Weisshaupt C et al (2006) Different vascular smooth muscle cell apoptosis in the human internal mammary artery and the saphenous vein. J Vasc Res 43:338–346
40. Zulli A, Hare DL, Horrigan M, Buxton BF (2003) The resistance of the IMA to atherosclerosis might be associated with its higher eNOS, ACE and ET-A receptor immunoreactivity. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol 23(7):1308
41. Kurlansky P (2010) Thirty-year experience with bilateral internal thoracic artery grafting: where have we been and where are we going? World J Surg 34(4):646–651
42. Walpoth BH, Schmid M, Schwab A et al (2008) Vascular adaptation of the internal thoracic artery graft early and late after bypass surgery. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 136(4):876–883
43. Tarr FI, Sasvári M, Tarr M, Rácz R (2005) Evidence of nitric oxide produced by the internal mammary artery graft in venous drainage of the recipient coronary artery. Ann Thorac Surg 80(5):1728–1731
44. Sabik JF III, Lytle BW, Blackstone EH, Houghtaling PL, Cosgrove DM (2005) Comparison of saphenous vein and internal thoracic artery graft patency by coronary system. Ann Thorac Surg 79:544–551
45. Goldman S, Zadina K, Moritz T et al (2004) Long-term patency of saphenous vein and left internal mammary artery grafts after coronary artery bypass surgery: results from a Department of Veterans Affairs Cooperative Study. J Am Coll Cardiol 44:2149–2156
46. Shah P, Gordon I, Fuller J et al (2003) Factors affecting saphenous vein graft patency: clinical and angiographic study in 1,402 symptomatic patients operated between 1977 and 1999. J Thor Cardiovasc Surg 126(6):1972–1977
47. Tatoulis J, Buxton BF, Fuller JA (2011) The right internal thoracic artery: the forgotten conduit—5,766 patients and 991 angiograms. Ann Thorac Surg 92(1):9–15 Discussion: 15–7
48. O'Brien SM, Shahian DM, DeLong ER et al (2007) Quality measurement in adult cardiac surgery: part 2—statistical considerations in composite measure scoring and provider rating. Ann Thorac Surg 83:S13–S26
49. Taggart DP, D'Amico R, Altman DG (2001) Effect of arterial revascularisation on survival: a systematic review of studies comparing bilateral and single internal mammary arteries. Lancet 358(9285):870–875
50. Pick AW, Orszulak TA, Anderson BJ, Schaff HV (1997) Single versus bilateral internal mammary artery grafts: 10-year outcome analysis. Ann Thorac Surg 64(3):599–605
51. Tatoulis J (2011) Giant leaps in surgical myocardial revascularisation. Heart Lung Circ 20(3):149–156
52. Lytle BW, Blackstone EH, Loop FD et al (1999) Two internal thoracic artery grafts are better than one. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 117(5):855–872
53. Kinoshita T, Asai T, Nishimura O, Suzuki T, Kambara A, Matsubayashi K (2010) Off-pump bilateral versus single skeletonized internal thoracic artery grafting in patients with diabetes. Ann Thorac Surg 90(4):1173–1179
54. Taggart DP, Altman DG, Gray AM et al (2010) Randomized trial to compare bilateral vs. single internal mammary coronary artery bypass grafting: 1-year results of the arterial revascularisation trial (ART). Eur Heart J 31(20):2470–2481
55. Stevens LM, Carrier M, Perrault LP et al (2004) Single versus bilateral internal thoracic artery grafts with concomitant saphenous vein grafts for multivessel coronary artery bypass grafting: effects on mortality and event-free survival. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 127(5):1408–1415
56. Lytle BW, Blackstone EH, Sabik JF, Houghtaling P, Loop FD, Cosgrove DM (2004) The effect of bilateral internal thoracic artery grafting on survival during 20 postoperative years. Ann Thorac Surg 78(6):2005–2012 2012-4
57. Bonacchi M, Prifti E, Maiani M, Giunti G, Leacche M (2005) Skeletonized bilateral internal mammary arteries for non-elective surgical revascularization in unstable angina. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 28(1):120–126
58. Berreklouw E, Rademakers PP, Koster JM, van Leur L, van der Wielen BJ, Westers P (2001) Better ischemic event-free survival after two internal thoracic artery grafts: 13 years of follow-up. Ann Thorac Surg 72(5):1535–1541
59. Giordano SH, Kuo YF, Freeman JL, Buchholz TA, Hortobagyi GN, Goodwin JS (2005) Risk of cardiac death after adjuvant radiotherapy for breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 97(6):419–424
60. Hooning MJ, Aleman BM, van Rosmalen AJ, Kuenen MA, Klijn JG, van Leeuwen FE (2006) Cause-specific mortality in long-term survivors of breast cancer: a 25-year follow-up study. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 64(4):1081–1091
61. Patnaik JL, Byers T, Diguiseppi C, Dabelea D, Denberg TD (2011) Cardiovascular disease competes with breast cancer as the leading cause of death for older females diagnosed with breast cancer: a retrospective cohort study. Breast Cancer Res 13(3):R64

62. Correa CR, Litt HI, Hwang WT, Ferrari VA, Solin LJ, Harris EE (2007) Coronary artery findings after left-sided compared with right-sided radiation treatment for early-stage breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 25(21):3031–3037
63. Greer-Bayramoglu RJ, Chu MW, Fortin AJ (2011) Feasibility of internal mammary vessel use in breast reconstruction versus coronary artery bypass surgery: an anatomic, cadaveric evaluation. Plast Reconstr Surg 127(5):1783–1789
64. Black MJ, Chait L, O'Brien BM, Sykes PJ, Sharzer LA (1978) How soon may the axial vessels of a surviving free flap be safely ligated: a study in pigs. Br J Plast Surg 31(4):295–299
65. Heymans O, Lemaire V, Preud'Homme L, Nélissen X, Verhelle N (2003) Free flap pedicle loss: clinical study on 8 cases. Ann Chir Plast Esthet 48(4):205–210
66. Khoo CT, Bailey BN (1982) The behaviour of free muscle and musculocutaneous flaps after early loss of axial blood supply. Br J Plast Surg 35(1):43–46
67. Salgado CJ, Smith A, Kim S, Higgins J, Behnam A, Herrera HR, Serletti JM (2002) Effects of late loss of arterial inflow on free flap survival. J Reconstr Microsurg 18(7):579–584
68. Wise SR, Harsha WJ, Kim N, Hayden RE (2011) Free flap survival despite early loss of the vascular pedicle. Head Neck 33(7):1068–1071
69. Rees MJ, Taylor GI (1986) A simplified lead oxide cadaver injection technique. Plast Reconstr Surg 77(1):141–145
70. Calafiore AM, Teodori G, Di Giammarco G et al (1997) Minimally invasive coronary artery bypass grafting on a beating heart. Ann Thorac Surg 63:S72–S75
71. Deja MA, Wos S, Gołba KS et al (1999) Intraoperative and laboratory evaluation of skeletonized versus pedicled internal thoracic artery. Ann Thorac Surg 68:2164–2168
72. Calafiore AM, Vitolla G, Iaco AL et al (1999) Bilateral internal mammary artery grafting: midterm results of pedicled vs. skeletonised conduits. Ann Thorac Surg 67(6):1637–1642
73. Higami T, Yamashita T, Nohara H, Iwahashi K, Shida T, Ogawa K (2001) Early results of coronary grafting using ultrasonically skeletonized internal thoracic arteries. Ann Thorac Surg 71:1224–1228
74. Bonacchi M, Battaglia F, Prifti E et al (2005) Early and late outcome of skeletonised bilateral internal mammary arteries anastomosed to the left coronary system. Heart 91:195–202
75. Gwozdziewicz M (2008) Left internal thoracic artery harvesting: measurement of the length required for coronary bypass surgery. Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg 7:1160–1161
76. Boonstra PW, Grandjean JG, Mariani MA (1997) Improved method for direct coronary grafting without CPB via anterolateral small thoracotomy. Ann Thorac Surg 63:567–569
77. Lazzara RR, Kidwell FE (1999) Minimally invasive direct coronary bypass versus cardiopulmonary technique: angiographic comparison. Ann Thorac Surg 67:500–503
78. Zenati M, Cohen HA, Griffith BP (1999) Alternative approach to multivessel coronary disease with integrated coronary revascularization. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 117(3):439–446
79. Cremer J, Mügge A, Wittwera T et al (1999) Early angiographic results after revascularization by minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass (MIDCAB). Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 15:383–388
80. Trehan N, Malhotra R, Misrha Y, Shrivastva S, Kohli V, Mehta Y (2000) Comparison of ministernotomy with minithoracotomy regarding postoperative pain and internal mammary artery characteristics. Heart Surg Forum 3(4):300–306
81. Ishikawa N, Wanatabe G, Iino K et al (2007) Robotic internal thoracic artery harvesting. Surg Today 37:944–946
82. Malata CM, Moses M, Mickute Z, Di Candia M (2011) Tips for successful microvascular abdominal flap breast reconstruction utilizing the "total rib preservation" technique for internal mammary vessel exposure. Ann Plast Surg 66(1):36–42
83. Arnez ZM, Valdatta L, Tyler MP, Planinsek F (1995) Anatomy of the internal mammary veins and their use in free TRAM flap breast reconstruction. Br J Plast Surg 48(8):540–545
84. Enajat M, Rozen WM, Whitaker IS, Smit JM, Acosta R (2010) A single center comparison of one versus two venous anastomoses in 564 consecutive DIEP flaps: investigating the effect on venous congestion and flap survival. Microsurgery 30(3): 185–191
85. Liu TS, Ashjian P, Festekjian J (2007) Salvage of congested deep inferior epigastric perforator flap with a reverse flow venous anastomosis. Ann Plast Surg 59(2):214–217
86. Tran NV, Buchel EW, Convery PA (2007) Microvascular complications of DIEP flaps. Plast Reconstr Surg 119(5): 1397–1405
87. Momeni A, Lee GK (2010) A case of intraoperative venous congestion of the entire DIEP-flap: a novel salvage technique and review of the literature. Microsurgery 30(6):443–446
88. Taylor GI, Caddy CM, Watterson PA, Crock JG (1990) The venous territories (venosomes) of the human body: experimental study and clinical implications. Plast Reconstr Surg 86(2): 185–213
89. Moon HK, Taylor GI (1988) The vascular anatomy of rectus abdominis musculocutaneous flaps based on the deep superior epigastric system. Plast Reconstr Surg 82(5):815–832
90. Eom JS, Sun SH, Lee TJ (2011) Selection of the recipient veins for additional anastomosis of the superficial inferior epigastric vein in breast reconstruction with free transverse rectus abdominis musculocutaneous or deep inferior epigastric artery perforator flaps. Ann Plast Surg 67(5):505–509
91. Blondeel PN, Arnstein M, Verstraete K et al (2000) Venous congestion and blood flow in free transverse rectus abdominis myocutaneous and deep inferior epigastric perforator flaps. Plast Reconstr Surg 106(6):1295–1299
92. Villafane O, Gahankari D, Webster M (1999) Superficial inferior epigastric vein (SIEV): "lifeboat" for DIEP/TRAM flaps. Br J Plast Surg 52(7):599
93. Tutor EG, Auba C, Benito A, Rábago G, Kreutler W (2002) Easy venous superdrainage in DIEP flap breast reconstruction through the intercostal branch. J Reconstr Microsurg 18(7): 595–598
94. Ali R, Bernier C, Lin YT, Ching WC et al (2010) Surgical strategies to salvage the venous compromised deep inferior epigastric perforator flap. Ann Plast Surg 65(4):398–406
95. Kerr-Valentic MA, Gottlieb LJ, Agarwal JP (2009) The retrograde limb of the internal mammary vein: an additional outflow option in DIEP flap breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 124(3):717–721
96. Mohebali J, Gottlieb LJ, Agarwal JP (2010) Further validation for use of the retrograde limb of the internal mammary vein in deep inferior epigastric perforator flap breast reconstruction using laser-assisted indocyanine green angiography. J Reconstr Microsurg 26(2):131–135
97. Guzzetti T, Thione A (2001) Successful breast reconstruction with a perforator to deep inferior epigastric perforator flap. Ann Plast Surg 46(6):641–643
98. Park MC, Lee JH, Chung J, Lee SH (2003) Use of internal mammary vessel perforator as a recipient vessel for free TRAM breast reconstruction. Ann Plast Surg 50(2):132–137
99. Schwabegger AH, Gschnitzer C, Ninkovic MM (1999) Contour deformity at the internal mammary recipient site. Br J Plast Surg 52(8):674
100. Dupin CL, Allen RJ, Glass CA, Bunch R (1996) The internal mammary artery and vein as a recipient site for free-flap breast

reconstruction: a report of 110 consecutive cases. Plast Reconstr Surg 98(4):685–689 Discussion: 690–692
101. Rosson GD, Holton LH, Silverman RP, Singh NK, Nahabedian MY (2005) Internal mammary perforators: a cadaver study. J Reconstr Microsurg 21(4):239–242
102. Albertengo JB, Rodriguez A, Buncke HJ, Hall EJ (1981) A comparative study of flap survival rates in end-to-end and end-to-side microvascular anastomosis. Plast Reconstr Surg 67(2):194–199
103. Dotson RJ, Bishop AT, Wood MB, Schroeder A (1998) End-to-end versus end-to-side arterial anastomosis patency in microvascular surgery. Microsurgery 18(2):125–128
104. Frodel JL, Trachy R, Cummings CW (1986) End-to-end and end-to-side microvascular anastomoses: a comparative study. Microsurgery 7(3):117–123
105. Miyamoto S, Okazaki M, Ohura N, Shiraishi T, Takushima A, Harii K (2008) Comparative study of different combinations of microvascular anastomoses in a rat model: end-to-end, end-to-side, and flow-through anastomosis. Plast Reconstr Surg 122(2):449–455
106. Miyamoto S, Takushima A, Okazaki M, Ohura N, Momosawa A, Harii K (2009) Comparative study of different combinations of microvascular anastomosis types in a rat vasospasm model: versatility of end-to-side venous anastomosis in free tissue transfer for extremity reconstruction. J Trauma 66(3):831–834
107. Ueda K, Harii K, Nakatsuka T, Asato H, Yamada A (1996) Comparison of end-to-end and end-to-side venous anastomosis in free-tissue transfer following resection of head and neck tumors. Microsurgery 17(3):146–149
108. Clemens MW, Davison SP (2009) Buried deep inferior epigastric perforator flaps for complex head and neck contour defects. J Reconstr Microsurg 25(2):81–88
109. Puig LB, Sousa AH, Cividanes GV et al (1997) Eight years experience using the inferior epigastric artery for myocardial revascularization. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 11:243–247
110. Cohen AJ, Ameika JA, Briggs RA, Grishkin BA, Helsel RA (1987) Retrograde flow in the internal mammary artery. Ann Thorac Surg 45(1):48–49
111. Livi U, Bortolotti U, Mazzucco A, Miotto D, Gallucci V (1990) Coronary artery bypass with inverted internal mammary artery: angiographic evidence of late graft patency. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 4(2):107–108
112. Temple CL, Strom EA, Youssef A, Langstein HN (2005) Choice of recipient vessels in delayed TRAM flap breast reconstruction after radiotherapy. Plast Reconstr Surg 115(1):105–113
113. Ninković MM, Schwabegger AH, Anderl H (1998) Internal mammary vessels as a recipient site. Clin Plast Surg 25(2):213–221
114. Dupin CL, Allen RJ, Glass CA, Bunch R (1996) The internal mammary artery and vein as a recipient site for free-flap breast reconstruction: a report of 110 consecutive cases. Plast Reconstr Surg 98(4):685–689 Discussion: 690–692
115. Moran SL, Nava G, Behnam AB, Serlettie JM (2003) An outcome analysis comparing the thoracodorsal and internal mammary vessels as recipient sites for microvascular breast reconstruction: A prospective study of 100 patients. Plast Reconstr Surg 111(6):1876–1882
116. Feng LJ (1997) Recipient vessels in free-flap breast reconstruction: a study of the internal mammary and thoracodorsal vessels. Plast Reconstr Surg 99(2):405–416
117. Majumder S, Batchelor AG (1999) Internal mammary vessels as recipients for free TRAM breast reconstruction: aesthetic and functional considerations. Br J Plast Surg 52(4):286–289
118. Darcy CM, Smit JM, Audolfsson T, Acosta R (2011) Surgical technique: the intercostal space approach to the internal mammary vessels in 463 microvascular breast reconstructions. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 64(1):58–62
119. Serletti JM, Moran SL, Orlando GS, Fox I (1999) Thoracodorsal vessels as recipient vessels for the free TRAM flap in delayed breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 104(6):1649–1655
120. Robb GL (1998) Thoracodorsal vessels as a recipient site. Clin Plast Surg 25(2):207–211
121. Lantieri LA, Mitrofanoff M, Rimareix F, Gaston E, Raulo Y, Baruch JP (1999) Use of circumflex scapular vessels as a recipient pedicle for autologous breast reconstruction: a report of 40 consecutive cases. Plast Reconstr Surg 104(7):2049–2053
122. Verma S, Szmitko PE, Weisel RD, Bonneau D, Latter D, Errett L, LeClerc Y, Fremes SE (2004) Should radial arteries be used routinely for coronary artery bypass grafting? Circulation 110(5):e40–e46
123. Loop FD, Lytle BW, Cosgrove DM et al (1986) Influence of the internal-mammary-artery graft on 10-year survival and other cardiac events. N Engl J Med 314(1):1–6
124. Desai ND, Cohen EA, Naylor CD, Fremes SE (2004) Radial artery patency study investigators. A randomized comparison of radial-artery and saphenous-vein coronary bypass grafts. N Engl J Med 351(22):2302–2309
125. Hayward PA, Buxton BF (2007) Contemporary coronary graft patency: 5-year observational data from a randomized trial of conduits. Ann Thorac Surg 84(3):795–799
126. Achouh P, Isselmou KO, Boutekadjirt R et al (2011) Reappraisal of a 20-year experience with the radial artery as a conduit for coronary bypass grafting. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg (Epub ahead of print)
127. Achouh P, Boutekadjirt R, Toledano D et al (2010) Long-term (5- to 20-year) patency of the radial artery for coronary bypass grafting. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 140(1):73–79 79. e1–2
128. Cameron J, Trivedi S, Stafford G, Bett JH (2004) Five-year angiographic patency of radial artery bypass grafts. Circulation 110(11 Suppl 1):II23–II26
129. Cordeiro PG (2008) Breast reconstruction after surgery for breast cancer. N Engl J Med 359(15):1590–1601
130. Serletti JM, Fosnot J, Nelson JA, Disa JJ, Bucky LP (2011) Breast reconstruction after breast cancer. Plast Reconstr Surg 127(6):124e–135e
131. Marín-Gutzke M, Sánchez-Olaso A (2010) Reconstructive surgery in young women with breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 123(Suppl 1):67–74
132. Ahmed S, Snelling A, Bains M, Whitworth IH (2005) Breast reconstruction. BMJ 330(7497):943–948
133. Kroll SS, Evans GR, Reece GP et al (1996) Comparison of resource costs between implant-based and TRAM flap breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 97(2):364–372
134. Spear SL, Mardini S, Ganz JC (2003) Resource cost comparison of implant-based breast reconstruction versus TRAM flap breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 112(1):101–105
135. Kroll SS, Schusterman MA, Reece GP, Miller MJ, Robb G, Evans G (1995) Abdominal wall strength, bulging, and hernia after TRAM flap breast reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg 96(3):616–619
136. Selber JC, Samra F, Bristol M, Sonnad SS, Vega S, Wu L, Serletti JM (2008) A head-to-head comparison between the muscle-sparing free TRAM and the SIEA flaps: is the rate of flap loss worth the gain in abdominal wall function? Plast Reconstr Surg 122(2):348–355
137. Hall MJ, DeFrances CJ, Williams SN, Golosinskiy A, Schwartzman A, Division of Health Statistics (2010) National Hospital Discharge Survey: 2007 summary. National Health Statistics Reports. http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr029.pdf. Accessed 25 Jan 2011