INTRODUCTION

Meshes have been applied in abdominal hernia repair for lower recurrence rate and less postoperative pain. According to several guidelines, tension-free repair has been considered the gold standard for hernia repair. However, complications related to mesh implantation still exist, such as late-onset deep mesh infection. This rare complication was first defined by Mann et al. in 1998. Since then, similar cases have been reported.

Late-onset mesh infection is defined as acute inflammatory response in surgical area within months or years after operation. It is diagnosed by the presence of infection symptoms and imaging examinations. Classic symptoms include chronic pain, visible operation scars, and red and swollen skin with tenderness. In some situations, pus is visible and fistulas were accessible via physical examination. In ultrasound imaging, a mixed echogenic mass is located between muscle layers even deeper. Computed tomography reveals abnormal density of soft tissue with fuzzy space appearance around the patch site. In cases with fistulas, fistulography can be used.

In cases of late-onset deep mesh infection from 2666 consecutive patients with abdominal wall hernia repairs, we analyzed eight cases from our department. The incidence was 0.30% in total with 0.24% of inguinal hernia repair and 0.78% of incisional hernia repair. For the six inguinal hernia repairs, four underwent Lichtenstein mesh repair (mesh was placed in front of the transverse fascia) and one underwent preperitoneal space mesh repair (mesh was placed in the preperitoneal space). For the two incisional hernia cases, meshes were placed in the deep side of the rectus abdominis. The median time between hernia repair and mesh infection was 17 months (from 3 to 43 months). Physical examination showed that all cases had visible operation scars and red and swollen skin with tenderness. Six cases had foul-smelling pus outflow and extruded fistulas. The results of this is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.
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bacterial culture of the pus were *Staphylococcus aureus* in four cases, *Enterobacter cloacae* in one case, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in one case.

All eight patients received at least 2-week conservative management (from 2 to 4 weeks), including consistent wound drainage, systemic antibiotic therapy using cefotetan, and abscess puncture if necessary. Aztreonam was used if patients were allergic to cephalosporins. In patients with visible pus, antibiotics were used according to the bacteriological culture results. Only one patient completely recovered. Seven patients finally underwent debridement for mesh removal.

In all seven cases requiring debridement, the mesh was visible [Figure 1]. The meshes were shrunk and formed a local abscess in six cases. In case 2, the plug had adhered to the intestinal lining and caused a fistula. Pathological examinations revealed that there was nonspecific inflammation in all the cases. The formation of granuloma, infiltration of inflammatory cell, purulent inflammation of soft tissue, and fibrosis with degeneration were seen in the surrounding tissue of mesh. Bacterial culture of the mesh showed that *S. aureus* was detected in four cases, *E. cloacae* in two, and *P. aeruginosa* in one. An at least 12-month follow-up showed that all patients had good outcomes without recurrence or reinfection after treatment.

**Table 1: Clinical features of patients with late-onset deep mesh infection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Gender and age (years)</th>
<th>Type of hernia</th>
<th>Surgery method</th>
<th>Date of onset (months after operation)</th>
<th>Type of bacteria</th>
<th>Histology</th>
<th>Follow-up (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male (69)</td>
<td>Right groin hernia</td>
<td>Lichtenstein repair</td>
<td>60</td>
<td><em>S. aureus</em></td>
<td>Nonspecific inflammation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male (67)</td>
<td>Left groin hernia</td>
<td>Lichtenstein repair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>E. cloacae</em></td>
<td>Nonspecific inflammation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female (72)</td>
<td>Incisional hernia</td>
<td>Sublay repair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td><em>S. aureus</em></td>
<td>Nonspecific inflammation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female (54)</td>
<td>Incisional hernia</td>
<td>Sublay repair</td>
<td>36</td>
<td><em>P. aeruginosa</em></td>
<td>No pathological examination</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male (72)</td>
<td>Right groin hernia</td>
<td>Lichtenstein repair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>S. aureus</em></td>
<td>Nonspecific inflammation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male (55)</td>
<td>Right groin hernia</td>
<td>Lichtenstein repair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>S. aureus</em></td>
<td>Formation of granulation tissue with inflammatory cell infiltration</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male (56)</td>
<td>Left groin hernia</td>
<td>Lichtenstein repair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>S. aureus</em></td>
<td>Proliferation of fibrous tissue with inflammatory cell infiltration</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male (68)</td>
<td>Left groin hernia</td>
<td>Preperitoneal space repair</td>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>E. cloacae</em></td>
<td>Nonspecific inflammation</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S. aureus*: *Staphylococcus aureus*; *E. cloacae*: *Enterobacter cloacae*; *P. aeruginosa*: *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

**Figure 1:** Removed mesh of seven patients with late-onset deep mesh infection. This picture shows the removed meshes after the failure of conservative management. (a-g) The meshes in cases 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. (c) Taken during the operation. The mesh was adhered to the issue and was emphasized by the arrow. (f) Mesh was colored by methylene blue.

**DISCUSSION**

Nowadays, tension-free hernia repair is the most common surgical approach for patients with hernia. Late-onset deep prosthetic infection is a relatively rare complication. However, with the increasing use of synthetic materials in hernia repair, the number of patients with late-onset deep prosthetic infection is rising. The overall incidence of late-onset deep prosthetic infection in our study was 0.30% (8/2666), which is similar to previously published data.[3]

Late-onset deep prosthetic infection is related to aseptic technique, antibiotic prophylaxis, previous superficial wound infection, the type of mesh inserted, and/or the fixation material.[4] According to our experience, the presence of bacteria does not inevitably lead to late-onset deep prosthetic infection. The likelihood of infection might be affected by the following factors: bacterial number, bacterial virulence, and wound microenvironment. It is not difficult to diagnose late-onset deep mesh infection by its typical symptoms and imaging examination. Differential diagnosis includes local skin infections (furuncle, carbuncle, or cellulitis), superficial wound infection after hernia repair, and infection caused by intestinal leakage.

By abscess puncture and antibiotic therapy, one patient in our reported series was cured without mesh removal. Seven patients had good outcomes after removing the mesh.
Greenberg\cite{5} has reported their success in salvaging meshes by conservative treatment of deep prosthetic infection. Wound vacuum assist devices, for example, vacuum sealing drainage, have also been reported in dealing with infected wounds. However, meshes with bacteria as source of infection exist permanently in deep wounds and cannot be eliminated completely by vacuum sealing drainage. The results of our case series suggested that once the diagnosis of late-onset deep prosthetic infection is established, mesh should be removed if no improvement after a 2-week conservative management.
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