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Abstract: Background and objective: Immediate breast reconstruction not only reduces the number of surgeries for patients after mastectomy but also decreases psychological and physical trauma, making it increasingly popular. However, there is currently no consensus on the integration of post-mastectomy radiotherapy (PMRT) with reconstruction techniques. This review evaluates the impact of PMRT on complications following immediate breast reconstruction, providing guidance for clinical treatment decisions. Methods: PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, and other databases were searched for studies published in the past 15 years on outcomes of implant-based breast reconstruction in the context of radiotherapy to identify articles for analysis. RevMan 5.4 software was used to analyze the risks of seroma, infection, wound dehiscence, flap necrosis, implant exposure, capsule contracture, and reconstruction failure. Results: A total of 11 relevant studies were included, comprising 6323 cases of immediate breast reconstruction. It was found that breasts receiving postoperative irradiation had a significantly increased risk of complications, with statistically significant differences in seroma ($P = 0.004$), infection ($P < 0.00001$), wound dehiscence ($P = 0.04$), implant exposure ($P < 0.00001$), capsule contracture ($P < 0.00001$), and reconstruction failure ($P < 0.00001$). There was no statistically significant difference in flap necrosis ($P = 0.88$). Conclusion: The results indicate that postoperative radiotherapy significantly increases the risk of complications for patients undergoing immediate implant-based reconstruction. Preventive measures may be taken in advance with the assistance of healthcare providers if necessary.
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1. Introduction

For women worldwide, breast cancer has become the highest incidence of cancer. In 2022 alone, the number of new cases of female breast cancer in the world exceeded 2.3 million (23.85%), far more than lung cancer (9.4%) and colorectal cancer (8.9%). At the same time, approximately 665,000 people die from breast cancer, making it the leading cause of death among women worldwide [1]. Some studies have speculated that the burden of breast
cancer will continue to rise due to population growth and aging \[2\]. More than 3 million new cases and 1 million deaths are expected to occur each year after 2040. Although the incidence of breast cancer has never decreased, due to the application of various anti-tumor therapies, the survival rate and period of patients have been significantly improved. Therefore, the current concern is improving the quality of life of the patients. Mastectomy is a common treatment option for patients with early-stage breast cancer \[3\]. In addition, prophylactic mastectomy may be a good option for patients with inherited breast cancer who are at risk for \(BRCA1\) or \(BRCA2\) gene mutations \[4\]. However, it is worth noting that mastectomy may have an impact on the patient’s appearance and psychology, so techniques such as breast reconstruction and breast endoscopy are increasingly popular.

In women with locally advanced breast cancer, post-mastectomy radiotherapy (PMRT) has been shown to reduce local recurrence and improve survival in patients with node-positive disease \[5\]. Despite its therapeutic advantages, PMRT increases the risk of complications and generally has poor cosmetic results for women undergoing breast reconstruction. Current NCCN guidelines recommend auto-reconstruction or tissue dilator implantation in patients receiving PMRT \[6\]. A study based on trends in breast reconstruction over the past decade confirmed that more women are currently undergoing implant reconstruction than autologous tissue reconstruction \[7\]. While these reconstruction options have their limitations, immediate breast reconstruction based on dilators or prostheses is gaining in popularity as it reduces the psychological trauma of losing a breast while avoiding a second surgery. The effect of PMRT on immediate breast reconstruction has been extensively studied, however, there is a lack of relevant reviews or meta-analyses. In this study, 11 pieces of literature on relevant topics were retrospectively analyzed, and the effects of PMRT on postoperative complications after immediate breast reconstruction were described. This study provides insight into reconstruction surgery and the risks and complications of postoperative adjuvant radiotherapy so that patients can make a better choice in terms of treatment options.

2. Data and methods

2.1. Search method
We conducted a systematic electronic search on PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, Cochrane Library, CNKI, Wanfang Database, and Vip.com from December 2023 to February 2024. The Chinese keywords were “post-operative breast cancer,” “prosthesis implantation,” and “radiotherapy.” The keywords searched were “breast cancer,” “prosthesis implantation” and “radiation therapies.” The Boolean operator and or is used between keywords and medical subject words “breast cancer” (MeSH), “radiation therapy” (MeSH), “immediate” (MeSH), and “pseudoweight reconstruction” (MeSH).

2.2. Determination of inclusion and exclusion criteria
The inclusion or exclusion of a study was determined by reviewing the title and abstract by two researchers, followed by a thorough reading of the entire article for additional screening based on the following criteria: (1) literature on radiation therapy for breast reconstruction in the last 15 years; (2) all patients had breast cancer; all patients underwent skin-sparing mastectomy, regardless of whether the nipple-areola complex was preserved; (3) the reconstruction method was either immediate one-stage fake weight reconstruction or immediate two-stage expander reconstruction; (4) and there was sufficient raw data in the study to calculate the number of cases in each group and the number of cases with complications. Studies were excluded if they were conference guidelines, animal experiments, literature reviews, meta-analyses, lacked a comparison between the postoperative radiotherapy group and the non-radiotherapy group, or had repeated publication, incomplete data, or too many patients lost to follow-up.
2.3. Data extraction

The main complications of concern in this study were seroma, infection, incision rupture, flap necrosis, implant exposure, capsular contracture, and reconstruction failure. Infections include those requiring oral antibiotics, those requiring intravenous antibiotics, and those requiring surgical procedures. Flap necrosis can range from partial necrosis that is cured with conservative treatment to complete necrosis that requires additional surgery. Capsular contracture was introduced into the Spear-Baker classification \[^8\], which included category III breast reconstruction with moderate hardness and category IV severe capsular contracture with unacceptable aesthetic results and/or requiring surgical intervention. Reconstruction failure is defined as the loss of a tissue expander or implant, without regard to replacement outcomes. Data extracted from the 11 selected papers included the first author, year of publication, study design, duration of follow-up, patient information (number of breast reconstruction cases, age, body mass index), specific reconstruction method (phase 1 with direct implantation or phase 2 with tissue expander), radiotherapy protocol including technique, dose, and frequency, and whether acellular dermal matrix (ADM) was used, expander state. The NOS scale \[^9\] was used to evaluate the literature, with a full score of 9.

2.4. Data processing and analysis

We evaluated the effect of radiation therapy on the outcome of immediate breast prosthesis/expander reconstruction and compared the combined risk of 7 complications, including seroma, infection, incision rupture, flap necrosis, implant exposure, capsular contracture, and reconstruction failure, in patients who received and did not receive radiation after immediate reconstruction. The relative risk (RR) with the corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) was calculated using the Mantel-Haenszel test in RevMan 5.4. In each analysis, the Cochrane Q test and the \( I^2 \) test were used to assess inter-study heterogeneity. \( 50 < I^2 < 75\% \) is moderately heterogeneous, and if \( P > 0.1 \) and \( I^2 \) value \( \leq 50\% \), the study is considered homogeneous and a fixed-effect model is used. Otherwise, a random effects model is used. The possibility of publication bias was assessed by generating funnel plots.

3. Result

3.1. Literature search results

A total of 627 references were found in the first screening. After screening by two researchers, a total of 11 studies met the criteria and were included for subsequent analysis (Figure 1). All studies were cohort studies, of which 4 were retrospective studies \[^{10-13}\] (level III evidence) and the rest were prospective studies (level II evidence). A total of 6323 cases of immediate breast reconstruction were analyzed (Table 1), of which 1583 received postoperative radiotherapy and 4740 did not. Six studies \[^{12,14-18}\] used tissue dilators for two-stage pseudo-weight reconstruction, four studies \[^{10,11,13,19}\] used two methods for immediate reconstruction, including one-stage direct implantation and two-stage dilator reconstruction, and one study \[^{20}\] added results for auto implantation. All cases in the two studies \[^{13,15}\] used the acellular dermal matrix (ADM), and three studies \[^{17,19,20}\] used ADM selectively. Six of the 11 studies \[^{12-16,20}\] described detailed information on PMRT. Although there was some heterogeneity in chest wall enhancement or high dose use, the PMRT regimen was generally consistent across all studies, including the dose per segmentation, the frequency of segmentation, and the total dose administered. Two studies \[^{17,20}\] all used 3D conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT), two studies \[^{10,11}\] used 3D-CRT and intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT), and the remaining studies did not specify the radiotherapy technique. When patients received radiotherapy, 5 studies had fully dilated dilators \[^{13-16,18}\], while 2 studies had partially dilated dilators \[^{10,12}\] (Table 2).
Search for literature related to postoperative radiotherapy after breast implant reconstruction surgery on China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang, VIP, PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library (n=627).

Records after removing duplicate data (n=669).

Exclude:
1. Meta-analyses (n=20)
2. Literature reviews (n=59)
3. Conference guidelines (n=8)
4. Animal experiments (n=2)
5. Not meeting criteria (n=240)

Obtain literature (n=450).

Full-text articles assessed as eligible (n=121).

Exclude literature that does not align with the topic by reading the abstracts (n=70).

Obtain literature (n=51).

Exclude literature with incomplete data, high loss to follow-up, and unclear documentation of the number of cases of complications (n=40).

Eleven articles were ultimately used for a meta-analysis.

Figure 1. Flow chart of the literature search

Table 1. Characteristics of included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year of publication</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study type (cohort study)</th>
<th>Median follow-up time (month)</th>
<th>Radiotherapy group</th>
<th>Non-radiotherapy group</th>
<th>A way to rebuild immediately</th>
<th>NOS score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George (2022) [15]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langshuang (2022) [12]</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>36.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine (2020) [18]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George (2019) [13]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>46.5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessia (2017) [20]</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horatiu (2016) [17]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year of publication</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study type (cohort study)</th>
<th>Median follow-up time (month)</th>
<th>Radiotherapy group</th>
<th>Non-radiotherapy group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of breast reconstruction</td>
<td>Age (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter (2015) [13]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>46.1(b) 26.3(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelyn (2014) [14]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>46.1(b) 23.2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hani (2014) [19]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43.9(b) 23.9(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (2012) [11]</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.9(b) 25.8(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica (2011) [14]</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.0(b) -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a, median; b, mean value; BMI, body mass index

Table 2. Radiotherapy regimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year of publication</th>
<th>The use of LD flap</th>
<th>Use of ADM</th>
<th>Radiotherapy technique</th>
<th>Total number (GY)</th>
<th>Chest wall enhancement</th>
<th>Expander state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langshuang (2022) [12]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3D-CRT/IMRT</td>
<td>25–28</td>
<td>50–50.4</td>
<td>Selectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine (2020) [18]</td>
<td>All use</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>EBRT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessia (2017) [20]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>All use</td>
<td>EBRT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horatiu (2016) [17]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3D-CRT/IMRT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelyn (2014) [18]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>EBRT</td>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hani (2014) [19]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Selective use</td>
<td>EBRT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (2012) [11]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All use</td>
<td>EBRT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica (2011) [14]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EBRT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: LD flap, latissimus dorsi flap; ADM, acellular dermal matrix; 3D-CRT, three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy; IMRT, intensity modulated radiation therapy; EBRT, external beam radiotherapy

3.2. Effect of radiation therapy on complications after immediate breast reconstruction

3.2.1. Serum tumor

Eight studies were included for heterogeneity test, and the results showed that $I^2 = 0\% (< 50\%), P = 0.58 (> 0.1)$, the heterogeneity was small, and the fixed-effect model was used for analysis. The results of the meta-analysis

68
showed that radiotherapy increased the risk of seroma after immediate breast reconstruction, with a significantly increased risk of 1.77 times in patients who received radiotherapy after reconstruction compared with those who did not receive radiotherapy (95% CI: 1.20–2.61), and the difference was statistically significant ($P = 0.004$). Further details are shown in Figure 2.

### 3.2.2. Infection

Nine studies were included for heterogeneity test, and the results showed that $I^2 = 18\% (< 50\%)$, $P = 0.29 (> 0.1)$, the heterogeneity was small, and the fixed-effect model was used for analysis. The results of the meta-analysis showed that radiotherapy increased the risk of infection after immediate breast reconstruction, and the risk of seroma was significantly increased by 2.07 times (95% CI: 1.77–2.42) in patients who received radiotherapy after reconstruction compared with those who did not receive radiotherapy, and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.00001$). Further details are shown in Figure 3.

### 3.2.3. Disruption of wound

Four studies were included for heterogeneity test, and the results showed that $I^2 = 33\% (< 50\%)$, and Q-test $P = 0.21 (> 0.1)$, the heterogeneity was small, and the fixed-effect model was used to combine the effect size. Meta-analysis results showed that radiotherapy increased the risk of incision dehiscence after immediate reconstruction, and the risk of incision dehiscence was significantly increased by 1.8 times (95% CI: 1.02–3.17), and the difference was statistically significant ($P = 0.04$). Further details are shown in Figure 4.
3.2.4. Flap necrosis

Four studies were included for heterogeneity test, and the results showed that $I^2 = 0\% (< 50\%)$, and Q-test $P = 0.72 (> 0.1)$, the heterogeneity was small, and the fixed-effect model was used to combine the effect size. Meta-analysis results showed that radiotherapy increased the risk of flap necrosis after immediate reconstruction (RR: 1.05; 95% CI: 0.88–1.90), however, the difference was not statistically significant ($P = 0.88$). Further details are shown in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. Forest plot for the impact of PMRT on flap necrosis](image)

3.2.5. Exposure

Seven studies were included for heterogeneity testing. The results showed: $I^2 = 61\% (> 50\%)$, and Q-test $P = 0.02 (< 0.1)$, indicating that the heterogeneity among the included literature was statistically significant and required further exploration. Sensitivity analysis of the seven included studies revealed that Sun et al.’s study [12] had a significant impact on heterogeneity. After excluding this study, heterogeneity testing was conducted again, and the results showed that there was no heterogeneity among the remaining six studies [$I^2 = 45\% (< 50\%), P = 0.11 (> 0.1)$]. Only after removing Sun et al.’s study [12] was a fixed-effect model used for analysis. The final meta-analysis results showed that compared to cases that did not receive radiotherapy, cases that received post-reconstruction radiotherapy had a significantly increased risk of implant exposure by 4.13 times (95% CI: 2.68–6.38), and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.00001$). Further details are shown in Figure 6.

![Figure 6. Forest plot for the impact of PMRT on implant exposure](image)
3.2.6. Capsular contracture

Five studies were included for heterogeneity test, and the results showed that $I^2 = 48\% (< 50\%)$, and $P = 0.1$ for Q-test, indicating small heterogeneity, and the fixed-effect model was used to combine effect sizes. The results of the meta-analysis showed that the risk of capsular contracture was significantly increased by 3.16 times (95% CI: 2.22–4.48) in patients who received post-reconstructive radiotherapy compared with those who did not receive radiotherapy, and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.00001$). Further details are shown in Figure 7.

![Figure 7. Forest plot for the impact of PMRT on capsule contracture](image)

3.2.7. Reconstruction failure

Eight studies were included for heterogeneity test, and the results showed that $I^2 = 24\% (< 50\%)$, and Q-test $P = 0.24$, indicating small heterogeneity, and the fixed-effect model was used to combine effect sizes. The results of the meta-analysis showed that the risk of reconstructive failure was significantly increased by 4.18 times (95% CI: 3.26–5.38) in patients who received post-reconstructive radiotherapy compared with those who did not receive radiotherapy, and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.00001$). See the forest map (Figure 8) for details.

![Figure 8. Forest plot for the impact of PMRT on reconstruction failure](image)

3.3. Evaluation of publication bias

The funnel plot showed a relatively high concentration and basic symmetry in the analysis of seroma, infection, implant exposure, and reconstruction failure, suggesting that publication bias may be low for these outcomes. However, in the analysis of incision dehiscence, flap necrosis, and capsular contracture, there were fewer studies, fewer cases, and noticeable asymmetries, indicating potential publication bias.
Figure 9. Funnel plots. (a) Seroma; (b) Infection; (c) Wound dehiscence; (d) Flap necrosis; (e) Implant exposure; (f) Capsule contracture; (g) Reconstruction failure.
4. Discussion

The surgical treatment of breast cancer has been evolving over the last decade, with a growing global trend towards breast reconstruction immediately after mastectomy and breast-conserving surgery. For these women with early invasive breast cancer, plastic surgeons may offer reconstruction as an option [21]. Immediate reconstruction surgery reduces the psychological trauma and appearance satisfaction of women after mastectomy by restoring the contour of the breast. With the widespread use of radiation therapy, the number of breast cancer patients receiving radiation is increasing, and the survival rate is also improving. Radiation therapy has become an important pillar of treatment for breast cancer. In women with locally advanced breast cancer as well as positive lymph node biopsy [22], post-mastectomy radiation therapy (PMRT) may reduce the risk of local recurrence and breast cancer death. Despite its therapeutic advantages, PMRT increases the risk of complications and generally has poor cosmetic results for women undergoing breast reconstruction. Immediate reconstruction may affect the implementation of the PMRT program, resulting in increased doses to the heart and lungs [23]. In delayed breast reconstruction after PMRT, much of the skin at the surgical incision usually develops severe fibrosis, making breast scars more difficult to hide [24]. However, these problems have been reduced over the past decade by advances in plastic surgery and radiation therapy, which have led to the increasing integration of radiation therapy with breast reconstruction protocols. Minimizing complications without compromising oncology outcomes remains a key goal in the treatment of women who receive immediate reconstruction and who undergo PMRT. A cohort study [25] of 725 breast cancer patients undergoing implantable immediate breast reconstruction (IBR) found that the 5-year IBR failure rate was estimated to be 10.4% in the non-radiotherapy group and 25.2% in the postoperative radiotherapy group ($P < 0.001$). At least 44% of patients in the group that did not receive radiotherapy had re-surgery, compared with 59% in the group that received postoperative radiotherapy ($P < 0.001$). Radiation therapy significantly increased the rate of reconstruction failure and decreased the rate of BreastQ scores (a standardized assessment tool used to assess the effectiveness and patient satisfaction of breast reconstruction surgery). Lee and Mun [26] found that compared with the control group, adjuvant radiotherapy resulted in a significantly higher rate of reconstruction failure in immediate two-stage prosthetic breast reconstruction (18.6% v.s. 3.1%, $P < 0.00001$). Radiotherapy after stage 1 (dilators) (29.7% v.s. 5%, $P < 0.00001$) and stage 2 (permanent implants) (7.7% v.s. 1.5%, $P = 0.0003$) in particular increased the failure rate. Severe capsular contracture was also increased in irradiated patients, with less cosmetic results. Ho et al. [16] compared 113 irradiated breasts with 339 unirradiated breasts after immediate two-stage tissue dilator/implant reconstruction and found a 4.2-fold increase in major complications in the irradiated group (OR: 4.2; $P = 0.001$). Compared with the control group, the rate of capsular contracture in grade III and IV was significantly higher in the irradiated group (21.7% v.s. 10%; $P < 0.008$). This is despite these previous studies showing that the use of PMRT leads to significantly higher complication rates in patients undergoing immediate breast reconstruction. In general, however, some researchers [25,26] consider immediate tissue dilator/implant reconstruction to be a reasonable surgical option in the case of post-mastectomy radiotherapy. Jagsi et al. [27] found that an increased risk of infection was observed in exposed patients who received immediate implant reconstruction only within 7 to 24 months of surgery, but not within the first 6 months of surgery, considering that these infections may not be related to radiation therapy, but to revision surgery performed after completion of radiation therapy Wang and colleagues [28] followed 776 immediate two-stage dilator/implant reconstruction cases for a median follow-up of 26 months and found that axillary lymph node dissection increased the risk of implant loss compared to sentinel lymph node biopsy, independent of radiation therapy. When possible, patients who require axillary lymph node dissection are encouraged to undergo breast preservation or autoreconstruction.

For this meta-analysis, 11 well-controlled cohort studies published over the past 15 years were selected,
including a total of 6,323 immediate reconstruction cases. These studies evaluated breast cancer patients who underwent mastectomy and immediate breast reconstruction treatment and compared various complications in patients who received and did not receive PMRT. The results showed that the risk of seroma, infection, incision rupture, and implant exposure in patients receiving reconstructive radiotherapy was significantly increased by 1.77 times, 2.07 times, 1.8 times, and 4.13 times, respectively, compared with those who did not receive radiotherapy, with statistical significance. There was no significant difference in the risk of flap necrosis between the two groups. In addition, we observed a higher incidence of grade III/IV capsular contracture and reconstruction failure in patients undergoing reconstruction with PMRT that required capsulotomy. Based on the evidence from this meta-analysis, we conclude that patients who receive PMRT after immediate breast reconstruction are at a higher risk of various complications than those who do not receive PMRT, but radiation therapy remains the standard of choice for these patients. We recommend that postoperative PMRT is still acceptable. At the same time, our meta-analysis has some limitations. First of all, the literature we included lacked randomized trials and the level of evidence was not enough. Second, we analyzed immediate primary prosthesis and secondary dilator implantation reconstruction together and did not explore the possible influence of radiotherapy timing on complications, although meta-analyses [28] suggest that there may be no difference in the risk of serious complications, including reconstruction failure. In addition, many of these studies were limited by radiotherapy techniques, doses, and times of exposure.

5. Conclusion

This study found that PMRT in patients undergoing immediate breast reconstruction resulted in a higher risk of seroma, infection, incision rupture, implant exposure, capsular contracture, and reconstruction failure. However, this meta-analysis can help patients understand the comprehensive plan of breast cancer treatment and be consulted about these possible complications before surgery, if necessary, with the help of a doctor to take preventive measures in advance. Due to the lack of well-controlled large-scale studies, we may need further comparative studies to draw more definitive conclusions and provide a basis for future research.
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