# Improved Anchoring Mechanism for Hernia Repair Mesh

David S. Ruppert, PhD[1], Mohammad Ibrahim, MD[1], Jeff Everitt, DVM[2], Jason L. Green, BS[3], Howard Levinson, MD[1]

DukeSurgery

1. Division of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Surgery, Duke Medical Center; 2. Department of Pathology, Duke Medical Center; 3. Duke University School of Medicine, Duke Medical Center.

## INTRODUCTION

Approximately 345,000 ventral hernia repairs are performed annually in the US and recurrence is the leading complication (~30% ten-year recurrence rate)[1,2]. While the exact mechanisms of hernia recurrence are unknown, anchor point failure at the mesh, suture, tissue interface from mechanical forces is believed to be a leading cause, leading to mesh migration, mesh contraction, and mesh tearing from tissue.[3] To overcome this problem, we developed a hernia mesh (T-line Hernia Mesh) with integrated anchoring mesh extensions, akin to suture, that are 30cm long, 2 cm on center, **Figure 1**. The mesh extensions are sewn into tissue and distribute forces better than narrow suture. In benchtop testing, extensions lead to ~275% stronger hernia mesh fixation. This study investigates T-line Hernia Mesh anchor point fixation in the peri-operative period compared to a predicate mesh when mesh anchoring is most susceptible to failure. We also tested bio-incorporation for safety according to FDA standards to demonstrate substantial equivalence to a predicate mesh.




**Figure 1. T-line Hernia Mesh and predicate control mesh.** (A) T-line: 0.5cm wide extensions emanating from body of textile w/ GS21 needles swaged on the ends of extensions. (B) Predicate polypropylene mesh and #0 prolene sutures w/ GS21 needles for anchoring mesh to fascia with interrupted stitches. Scale bar = 1 cm, ——→= GS-21 needle, and - - -→= extension/suture.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

- T-line Hernia Mesh was warp knitted from polypropylene and evaluated for physical and mechanical characteristics
- Implanted in swine as ventral hernia onlay, **Figure 2**, (n=4/group: 1, 30 and 90 days)
- 1 day postoperative anchoring strength evaluated by distraction to failure @100mm/min on servo-hydraulic materials testing system
- Gross pathologic observations by board-certified veterinary pathologist on ventral wall containing hernia repair
- H&E staining to evaluate inflammation, bio-incorporation, & fibrosis




**Figure 2. Application techniques for onlay placement.** (A) T-line mesh placement, body extends 2 cm beyond fascia incision on both sides for adequate overlap onto healthy fascia. Extensions are sewn into fascia for up-to an additional 3 cm (total mesh body + extensions ≥5 cm overlap away from the fascia incision). (B) Predicate mesh placed directly over incision and body of mesh extends 5 cm beyond fascia incision on both sides and is secured with #0 polypropylene suture. **40% less T-line mesh is needed.**

## RESULTS

### T-Line Hernia Mesh Physical & Mechanical Characterization

- T-line mesh = moderate-weight, macroporous mesh (**Table 1**)
- T-line mesh outperforms predicate in benchtop mechanical tests (**Table 2**)

**Table 1. T-line Hernia Mesh Physical Characteristics (mean ± SD).**

| Dimension | T-line Mesh | Predicate Mesh | Predicate Suture |
|---|---|---|---|
| Thickness (mm) | 0.55 ± 0.01 | 0.50 ± 0.01 | NA |
| Pore Area ($mm^2$) | 2.82 ± 0.19 | 0.56 ± 0.06 | NA |
| Areal Density ($g/m^2$) | 90.40 ± 0.50 | 36.80 ± 0.35 | NA |
| Extension Interspace Distance-center to center (cm) | 2 | NA | NA |
| Extension Width (mm) | 11 | NA | 0.38 ± 0.01 |
| Equivalent Needle Size | GS21 | NA | GS21 |

**Table 2. Benchtop Mechanical Performance of T-line Hernia Mesh (mean ± SD).**

| | T-line Mesh | Predicate Mesh | Predicate Suture |
|---|---|---|---|
| Suture Retention Strength (N) | 26.09 ± 5.24 | 9.15 ± 3.72 | NA |
| Ball Burst (N) | 474.41 ± 23.75 | 233.92 ± 15.38 | NA |
| Tongue Tear Resistance (N) | 14.46 ± 1.74 | 11.71 ± 0.61 | NA |
| Tensile Strength (N) | 691.93 ± 73.48 | 111.92 ± 7.50 | NA |
| Extension Tensile Strength (N) | 217.39 ± 6.87 | NA | 50.46 ± 0.60 |

Acknowledgements:
This work was supported by grants: 1 R41 GM117657-01 and 4UL1TR001117-04 from the National Institutes of Health (NIH); an NC Biotechnology Center Technology Enhancement Grant; a MedBlue Translational Grant; and an NC Biotechnology Center Small Business Research Loan. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH or other funding agencies. Dr. Levinson is a founder of Deep Blue Medical Advances Inc (DBMA) which has licensed the technology from Duke University. Dr. Ruppert is employed by DBMA and is an equity stakeholder.

## RESULTS (cont.)

### Bio-Mechanical Analysis in Perioperative Period

- T-line mesh ~275% (P<0.001) stronger anchoring **Figure 3**
- T-line mesh consistent failure mode / predicate multiple failure modes




**Figure 3. Perioperative mechanical analysis – day 1.** (A) Gross images of representative samples during bio-mechanical testing for T-line mesh (left) and predicate mesh (right). Meshes outlined in black, standard of care #0 sutures outlined with red circles. (B) T-line mesh ~275% stronger per unit length (P<0.001) than standard of care on peak load performance with no significant difference between cranial and caudal locations. (C) Failure modes; T-line mesh demonstrated one failure mode (extensions pulled out of fascia), while predicate mesh demonstrated two failure modes (one suture pulled out of fascia and other out of mesh; or both sutures pulled out of mesh.

### Bio-incorporation Analysis at day 30 & 90

- No significant macroscopic differences between T-line mesh and predicate mesh
- No significant differences found through H&E, **Figure 4**
- Same decrease in inflammation seen from 30 to 90 days




**Figure 4. Histological analysis of inflammation, bio-incorporation and fibrosis of the T-line and the predicate control mesh.** Microscopic images demonstrating inflammation and bio-incorporation after (A) 30 days and (C) 90 days. Quantification of the average scores of inflammation, bio-incorporation and fibrosis of the T-line mesh and the control predicate mesh after (B) 30 days and (D) 90 days. There was no statistically significant difference between T-line and control mesh (P>0.05).

## CONCLUSION

- T-line Hernia Mesh exhibits supra-physiologic anchoring strength overcoming the most common failure mode of current hernia meshes

| Maximum Physiologic Force | T-line Hernia Mesh Anchor Strength | Predicate Mesh Anchor Strength |
|---|---|---|
| 16 N/cm | 26.9 N/cm | 9.8 N/cm |

- Meets early safety standards for implantation in humans
- Results support ongoing commercial development of a novel T-line mesh with enhanced tension-free repair for durable hernia repair and prevention

References:
1. Hernia, US Market Report. Smart TRAK, 2017. (Accessed Oct 9th, 2017, 2017, at https://app.smarttrak.com/markets/qs/6561.)
2. Peralta R, Latifi R. Long-term outcomes of abdominal wall reconstruction. What are the real numbers? J World journal of surgery 2012;36:534-8
3. Lanier ST, Dumanian GA, Jordan SW, Miller KR, Ali NA, Stock SR. Mesh Sutured Repairs of Abdominal Wall Defects. Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open. 2016; 4(9): e1060
4. Klinge U, Klosterhalfen B, Conze J, et al. Modified mesh for hernia repair that is adapted to the physiology of the abdominal wall. 1998;164:951-60