Phoenix Children's®

Background

- Inguinal hernia repair (IHR) varies between children and adults, with adults commonly undergoing mesh placement by laparoscopic or robotic approaches.
- There are few large or multicenter studies on mesh use and hernia recurrence in adolescents.
- Contemporary mesh use by pediatric general surgeons in adolescent inguinal hernia repair remains unclear.

Objectives

- The aims of this study were to evaluate mesh use and hernia recurrence in pediatric, adolescent-aged patients who underwent IHR and to compare the characteristics of those who did and did not have mesh placed.
- The primary outcomes were incidence of mesh placement and incidence of hernia recurrence.

Study Design

- This was a retrospective review at 20 children's hospitals in the United States of patients aged 12 to 17 years who underwent their first IHR by a pediatric general surgeon from 2017 to 2019. Patients had follow-up through the end of 2022 for a minimum 3-year follow-up.
- We calculated the incidence of mesh placement and recurrence and compared the characteristics of patients in the no-mesh and mesh groups.
- Data points included sex, age (years), weight (kg), BMI (kg/m²), comorbidity[†], concomitant procedure, hernia incarceration, bilateral or unilateral repair, and open or laparoscopic repair.
- Comparison of groups was by Chi-square and Mann-Whitney U test with statistical significance set at p<0.05. SPSS (Version) 29.0) was used for analysis.

Evaluation of Mesh Placement in Adolescents Undergoing Inguinal Hernia Repair: A Multicenter Retrospective Cohort Study Brielle Ochoa, MD, R. Scott Eldredge, MD, Benjamin Padilla, MD; Pediatric Inguinal Hernia Collaborative Group*

The cohort included 708 patients:

- 78.1% male
- Median age 15 years [IQR 13-16]
- Median BMI 20.6 kg/m² [IQR 18.2-23.4]
- 2.5% comorbidity
- 8.2% concomitant procedure
- 6.2% incarcerated hernia
- 90.8% unilateral repair
- 77.8% open repair

Primary outcomes:

- **7.8%** (55/708) underwent mesh placement.
- **1.3%** (9/708) had hernia recurrence.

Comparison of No mesh and Mesh placement groups

- Sex, age, weight, and BMI were significantly associated with having undergone mesh placement
- Of the 55 patients who had mesh placed, 47 (85%) underwent an open repair..
- *placement* groups.

- adequate in adolescents.

*Ann and Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago – Amir Alhajjat, Steven Papastefan; Children's Healthcare of Atlanta – Matt Clifton, Cynthia Ramazani; Children's Hospital Colorado – Jose Diaz-Miron, Nell Weber; Children's Hospital of Los Angeles – Lorraine Kelley-Quon, Olivia Keane; Children's Hospital of Orange County – Yigit Guner; Children's Hospital of Philadelphia – Pablo Laje, Zaid Haddadin; Cincinnati Children's – Juan Gurria, Raphael Parrado; Lucile Packard Children's Hospital – Stephanie Chao, Blynn Shideler; Medical University of South Carolina – Aaron Lesher, Nathaniel Westbrook; Oregon Health & Science University - Elizabeth Fialkowski, Leigh Selesner; Orlando Health Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children - Cristine S. Velazco, Warren Rehrer; Phoenix Children's - Justin Lee, Daniel Ostlie; UC Davis Children's Hospital – Emily Byrd, Minna Wieck; UC San Francisco – Aaron Jensen, Alexandra Highet, Caroline Q. Stephens; University of Chicago – Bethany Slater, Saunders Lin; University of Miami/Jackson Health System – Eduardo Perez, Carlos Huerta; University of Utah – Katie Russell, Christopher Clinker; University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston – KuoJen Tsao, Krysta Sutyak; University of Texas Southwestern - Samir Pandya, Lauren Templeton; University of Wisconsin-Madison – Hau Le, Michael Stellon

Results

Variable	No mesh (n=653)		Mesh placement (n=55)			
					p-value	OR [95% CI]
	n	%	n	%		
Male	498	90.1	55	9.9	<0.001	1.11 [1.08-1.14]
Female	155	100.0	0	0.0		
Age (years)	14 [13-16]		16 [15-17]		<0.001	
Weight (kg)	56.0 [47.0-67.1]		72.9 [62.4-86.8]		<0.001	
BMI (kg/m ²)	20.3 [18.0-22.9]		23.5 [21.4-27.3]		<0.001	
Had major diagnosis	15	83.3	3	16.7	0.158*	2.45 [0.69-8.75]
No major diagnosis	638	92.5	52	7.5		
Concomitant procedure	53	91.4	5	8.6	0.797*	1.13 [0.43-2.96]
Hernia repair only	600	92.3	50	7.7		
Incarcerated	38	86.4	6	13.6	0.142*	1.98 [0.80-4.92]
Reducible	615	92.6	49	7.4		
Open repair	504	91.5	47	8.5	0.161	1.73 [0.80-3.73]
Laparoscopic repair	148	94.9	8	5.1		
Hernia recurrence	8	88.9	1	11.1	0.519*	1.49 [0.18-12.16]
No hernia recurrence	645	92.3	54	7.7		

Table 1. Comparison of characteristics of patients in the no mesh and mesh placement groups.

Comorbidity, concomitant procedure, hernia incarceration, and surgical approach were not statistically different between the no mesh and mesh

All but one hernia recurrence occurred in the no-mesh group, though this did not reach statistical significance.

Discussion

This study is somewhat limited by follow-up time. The older patients had a shorter follow-up time due to likely transitioning out of pediatric care and were lost to follow-up. This is an area of difficulty in research of adolescent aged patients, particularly those aged 17 years and under. • There was an overall low event rate for mesh placement and hernia recurrence, which precluded additional analysis. We did not specifically study robotic approaches, but these inguinal hernia repairs would have been included under laparoscopic repairs. Less than 8% of adolescents who underwent inguinal hernia repair by pediatric general surgeons had mesh placed. Recurrence with minimum three-year follow-up was low at 1.3%, which may reflect that high ligation of the hernia sac without mesh placement is

⁺ Comorbidities included omphalocele, pulmonary hypertension, congenital heart disease with repair, peritoneal dialysis catheter, connective tissue disorder, ventriculoperitoneal shunt, and tracheostomy.