



RESEARCH

Open Access

# Use of gluteus maximus adipomuscular sliding flaps in the reconstruction of sacral defects after tumor resection

Yao Weitao<sup>\*</sup>, Cai Qiqing, Gao Songtao and Wang Jiaqiang

## Abstract

**Background:** While performing sacrectomy from a posterior approach enables the en bloc resection of sacral tumors, it can result in deep posterior peritoneal defects and postoperative complications. We investigated whether defect reconstruction with gluteus maximus (GLM) adipomuscular sliding flaps would improve patient outcomes.

**Methods:** Between February 2007 and February 2012, 48 sacrectomies were performed at He Nan Cancer Hospital, Zhengzhou City, China. We retrospectively examined the medical records of each patient to obtain the following information: demographic characteristics, tumor location and pathology, oncological resection, postoperative drainage and complications. Based on the date of the operation, patients were assigned to two groups on the basis of closure type: simple midline closure (group 1) or GLM adipomuscular sliding reconstruction (group 2).

**Results:** We assessed 21 patients in group 1 and 27 in group 2. They did not differ with regards to gender, age, tumor location, pathology or size, or fixation methods. The mean time to last drainage was significantly longer in group 1 compared to group 2 (28.41 days (range 17–43 days) vs. 16.82 days (range 13–21 days,  $P < 0.05$ )) and the mean amount of fluid drained was higher (2,370 mL (range 2,000–4,000 mL) vs. 1,733 mL (range 1,500–2,800 mL)). The overall wound infection rate (eight (38.10%) vs. four (14.81%),  $P < 0.05$ ) and dehiscence rate (four (19.05%) vs. three (11.11%),  $P < 0.05$ ) were significantly higher in group 1 than in group 2. The rate of wound margin necrosis was lower in group 1 than in group 2 (two (9.82%) vs. three (11.11%),  $P < 0.05$ ).

**Conclusions:** The use of GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps for reconstruction after posterior sacrectomy can significantly reduce the risk of infection and improve outcomes.

**Keywords:** Sacral tumors, Surgery, Gluteus maximus adipomuscular sliding flaps

## Background

Sacral tumors include benign subtypes, such as giant-cell tumors [1] and aneurysmal bone cysts [2], as well as malignant subtypes, including chordomas, multiple myelomas and metastatic tumors [3]. These tumors are often asymptomatic or involve vague signs and symptoms [4], such as backache with or without numbness, leg weakness or bowel and/or bladder dysfunction. Therefore, diagnosis is frequently delayed by several months to up to 6 years [5]. During the interim, the tumors can become very large and may destroy most segments of the sacrum.

Treatment ranges from intralesional curettage [6] to ablation to *en bloc* excision [7]. Surgical resection can result in large defects that extend to the rectum ventrally or to the sacroiliac joints laterally. Defects can disrupt the posterior pelvic wall and often present a reconstructive challenge to surgeons [8]. The musculature over the sacrum can become weakened or of insufficient volume to fill large defects. Simple midline closures usually fail, which can lead to infection [9], wound breakdown, parasacral herniation or a combination of these complications, which may delay adjuvant treatment [10].

Good results have been reported with the use of vertical rectus abdominis myocutaneous flaps [11]. Other methods have involved meshes [12], omental mobilization [13] and free flaps [14]; however, some of these methods

\* Correspondence: ywtwhm@163.com

Bone and soft tumor department, He Nan Cancer Hospital, The Affiliated Hospital of Zheng Zhou University, 127 Dong Ming Road, Zheng Zhou City 450000, China

have been associated with additional injuries to patients and/or dangerous complications, such as necrosis [15]. We performed a retrospective study to assess whether reconstruction with gluteus maximus (GLM) adipomuscular sliding flaps would improve outcomes after sacral tumor excision.


### Methods

We assessed patients who had undergone sacrectomy because of sacral tumors between February 2007 and February 2012. All patients, or guardians when appropriate, gave informed consent before surgery. The authors obtained approval from the ethics committee of our hospital before doing the study.

During sacrectomy, complete spondylectomies to the appropriate levels and sectioning of the bilateral piriform muscles and of the bilateral sacrospinous and sacrotuberous ligaments were carried out. The sacral nerve

roots (above sacral vertebra S3) of involved segments on both sides were separated and protected (Figure 1a). If total sacrectomy was performed, complex lumbopelvic reconstruction and arthrodesis were undertaken with autologous iliac crest bone grafts and instrumentation (for example, bilateral lumbar vertebrae L4 and L5 pedicle screws and iliac screws). Blood loss was controlled by temporary abdominal aorta block during sacrectomy of S1.

Based on the date of the operation, from February 2007 to December 2010, patients who underwent simple midline closure by two-layer suture of the fascia and skin comprised group 1. From January 2011 to January 2013, patients were chosen for GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps reconstruction if they had undergone resection of a sacral tumor via an exclusively posterior approach, had no tumor invasion on either side of the GLM muscle on MRI before surgery (Figure 2a), had adequate blood supply to the GLM flap and had not undergone



**Figure 1** Reconstruction of the sacral defect caused by tumor resection with bilateral gluteus maximus (GLM) adipomuscular sliding flaps. A huge defect is left after sacral tumor resection (a). Separation of the GLM adipomuscular flap on one side (b). Separation of another side of the GLM adipomuscular flap (c). The defect is eliminated by advancement of the bilateral GLM adipomuscular flaps (d).



**Table 1 Characteristics of patients grouped by closure method**

|                         | Group 1     | Group 2     | P-value |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|
| Gender                  |             |             |         |
| Male                    | 13 (61.90%) | 19 (70.37%) | 0.85    |
| Female                  | 8 (38.10%)  | 8 (29.63%)  |         |
| Age, years              |             |             |         |
| 20 to 40                | 3 (14.29%)  | 5 (18.52%)  | 0.06    |
| 40 to 60                | 11 (52.38%) | 16 (59.26%) |         |
| 60 to 80                | 7 (33.33%)  | 6 (22.22%)  |         |
| Segment of sacrum       |             |             |         |
| S4 to S5                | 1 (4.76%)   | 1 (3.70%)   | 0.06    |
| S4 to S3                | 2 (9.82%)   | 4 (14.81%)  |         |
| S2 to S3                | 6 (28.57%)  | 7 (25.93%)  |         |
| S1 to S2                | 7 (33.33%)  | 10 (37.04%) |         |
| L5 to S1                | 5 (23.81%)  | 5 (18.52%)  |         |
| Pathology               |             |             |         |
| Chordomas               | 12 (57.14%) | 14 (51.85%) | 0.05    |
| Multiple myelomas       | 2 (9.52%)   | 3 (11.11%)  |         |
| Metastatic tumors       | 2 (9.52%)   | 5 (18.52%)  |         |
| Giant-cell tumor        | 4 (19.05%)  | 3 (11.11%)  |         |
| Others                  | 1 (4.67%)   | 1 (3.70%)   |         |
| Size of tumor, diameter |             |             |         |
| <10 cm                  | 11 (52.38%) | 6 (22.22%)  | 0.11    |
| 10 to 20 cm             | 7 (33.33%)  | 14 (51.85%) |         |
| >20 cm                  | 3 (14.29%)  | 7 (25.93%)  |         |
| Resection methods       |             |             |         |
| Radical resection       | 10 (47.62%) | 14 (51.85%) | 0.02    |
| Marginal resection      | 6 (28.57%)  | 9 (33.33%)  |         |
| Intradural curettage    | 5 (23.81%)  | 4 (14.81%)  |         |
| Fixation                |             |             |         |
| Yes                     | 10 (47.62%) | 14 (51.85%) | 0.84    |
| No                      | 11 (52.38%) | 13 (48.15%) |         |

Data are number (%).

The groups did not differ significantly with regards to demographic or pathological characteristics, size of tumor or fixation (Table 1). The mean diameter of sacral defects was 17.4 cm (range 6.5 to 35.8 cm). In group 2, bilateral GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps were used in 23 patients, while unilateral GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps were used in 4 patients. The flaps enabled the successful reconstruction of the posterior peritoneal defect, and the volume of the flap was well maintained behind the rectum on postoperative MRI in all cases (Figure 2b).

Four patients died as a result of the primary disease within 9 to 24 months, and seven patients had a relapse at the site of the operation during the 10 to 32 month

follow up period in the two groups. The mean time to final drainage and the mean amount of fluid drained differed significantly between the two groups, with better outcomes seen in group 2 (Table 2). Eight patients in group 1 and four patients in group 2 developed wound infections 2 to 4 weeks after surgery, and this difference was statistically significant (Table 2). The rate of wound dehiscence was lower in group 2 than in group 1 (three (11.11%) versus four (19.05%),  $P < 0.05$ ). However, margin necrosis was more frequent in group 2 than in group 1 (three (11.11%) versus two (9.82%),  $P < 0.05$ ). Gait and hip joint movement were preserved in all cases, irrespective of closure method.

## Discussion

As sacral tumors are often asymptomatic or the symptoms are vague (low-back pain with or without numbness, leg weakness or bowel and/or bladder dysfunction), diagnosis is frequently delayed by several months to several years, depending on the rate of tumor growth [5]. Thus, at the time of diagnosis, the sacral roots might be involved or even have been destroyed. Tumors can become very large and extend into the surrounding soft tissue, including the GLM muscles, the presacral space and beyond the sacroiliac joints to the ileum.

The first-line treatment for sacral tumors is surgery, and is often radical, or may involve marginal surgical excision. Extensive resection, however, always leaves a large defect, usually with a diameter of 6.5 to 35.8 cm that extends laterally from the sagittal lumbar spine to the sacroiliac joints. In these cases, simple midline closures generally fail and have a high risk of wound infection or dehiscence. Development of successful techniques for reconstruction of these defects is, therefore, important to lower the risk of complications.

Many techniques have been used for reconstruction after sacrectomy, including myocutaneous flaps, free flaps and mesh. The most commonly used is trans-pelvic vertical rectus abdominis myocutaneous flaps, which involves a circumferential approach. This method has several advantages, including the ease of the procedure, providing suitable bulk, a long pedicle, adequate blood supply and re-creation of the pelvic floor [16]. Use of this method in conjunction with a laparotomy or

**Table 2 Surgical outcomes according to treatment group**

| Drainage and complications  | Group 1       | Group 2      | P-value |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------|
| Time to last drainage, days | 28.41 ± 11.05 | 16.82 ± 7.38 | 0.02    |
| Amount of fluid drained, mL | 2370 ± 284    | 1733 ± 326   | 0.00    |
| Wound infection             | 8 (38.10%)    | 4 (14.81%)   | 0.00    |
| Wound margin necrosis       | 2 (9.82%)     | 3 (11.11%)   | 0.00    |
| Wound dehiscence            | 4 (19.05%)    | 3 (11.11%)   | 0.00    |

Data are mean ± SD or number (%).

ostomy, however, potentially weakens the anterior abdominal wall and causes incisional hernia [17]. The use of free flaps has been described for lumbosacral reconstruction when local flaps are destroyed. The first-choice recipient vessels are the superior or inferior gluteal vessels because they lay in or beside the defect [18]. If these vessels are unavailable, the femoral and thoracodorsal vessels may be used; however, this approach requires long vein grafts and potentially increases the risk of skin-flap necrosis [19]. Koh PK *et al.* [20] have reported the use of the GLM muscle turnover flaps for reconstruction of sacral chordoma defects. The advantages of using the GLM muscle are its bulk, proximity to the defect and robust blood supply. The disadvantages of this approach include the necessity of an additional incision, destruction of some of the GLM blood supply and the risk of gluteal gait.

The blood supply of the GLM muscle consists of the superior and inferior gluteal arteries, which communicate with perforating branches from the femoral system and the medial femoral circumflex arteries to form an intricate cruciate anastomosis around the hip. Because of this rich blood supply, the use of GLM flaps is feasible for defect reconstruction in selected patients. With the adipomuscular sliding flaps technique, the muscles are not elevated but are simply advanced toward the midline, which leaves their insertions untouched. The suturing of each muscle to its contralateral counterpart creates a strong posterior peritoneal repair that employs the blood supply of both the superior and inferior pedicles. During the operation, none of the blood vessels need to be exposed or elevated, which makes this flap operation safe and easy. This method, however, yields less flap volume and less moving distance than the other GLM flap approaches reported previously [20], and is only suitable for defects less than 30 cm in diameter. This type of flap surgery was performed in all group 2 patients in this study because of its convenience and because most sacral tumors have less invasion to the GLM muscle.

The use of GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps has many advantages over other reconstruction and closure approaches. As well as the robust blood supply mentioned above, the GLM muscle is large and the anatomic location is proximal to the sacrum. Moreover, no additional intraoperative incisions or repositioning of the patient are required. When a sacrectomy is performed from a posterior approach, the three main blood supply routes are not routinely sacrificed. The retention of a native and robust blood supply may be central to the long-term durability and viability of flaps. The separation and movement of flaps is much easier than other kinds of GLM flap approaches, such as the use of antegrade or retrograde GLM rotation flaps described by Koh *et al.*

and Vogt *et al.* [19,20]. The bulk achieved with GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps helps protect the blood supply and makes these approaches ideal for sacral defects.

Our results show that in group 2, both the time to final drainage and the amount of fluid drained were significantly reduced compared to group 1. The rates of infection and wound dehiscence were also significantly lower in group 2 relative to group 1. GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps appear, therefore, to form a protective layer while also absorbing cavity effusion, which may be the reasons underlying the reduced rate of perianal infection. Because of the poor blood circulation in subcutaneous tissue of the gluteal groove, however, flap necrosis cannot be improved.

Since the GLM muscle is the primary extensor of the hip, the potential drawbacks of using GLM flaps are functional disturbance in ambulation, especially when walking upstairs or straightening from a bending position, and pelvic instability [21]. We found no difference between the two groups with regards to ambulatory status. This finding might have arisen because the bilateral advancement flap technique was used in most patients, which does not hinder active extension of the hip and is compensated by gradual hypertrophy of the hamstring muscle and the adductor magnus. Other potential adverse side effects that come with use of GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps include poor extensibility, which can lead to excessive traction on the flap. Additionally, the flaps may not have enough bulk to cover the defect, especially if most of the GLM muscle on one side needs to be removed.

## Conclusions

Our experience suggests that reconstruction with GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps improves outcomes after sacrectomy. The use of unilateral or bilateral GLM adipomuscular sliding flaps should therefore be considered in patients who have not undergone prior radiation therapy, who have intact GLM muscles with gluteal vessels on one or both sides and who have defects less than 30 cm in diameter. This technique had low rates of complications and morbidity, was easy to perform, and had high success rates.

## Competing interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## Authors' contribution

All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Received: 20 February 2013 Accepted: 16 May 2013

Published: 23 May 2013

## References

1. Balke M, Henrichs MP, Gosheger G, Ahrens H, Streitbueger A, Koehler M, Bullmann V, Harges J: **Giant cell tumors of the axial skeleton.** *Sarcoma* 2012, **2012**:410973.

2. Donati D, Frisoni T, Dozza B, DeGroot H, Albisinni U, Giannini S: **Advance in the treatment of aneurysmal bone cyst of the sacrum.** *Skeletal Radiol* 2011, **40**:1461–1466.
3. Syed R, Bishop JA, Ali SZ: **Sacral and presacral lesions: cytopathologic analysis and clinical correlates.** *Diagn Cytopathol* 2012, **40**:7–13.
4. Ferraresi V, Nuzzo C, Zoccali C, Marandino F, Vidiri A, Salducca N, Zeuli M, Giannarelli D, Cognetti F, Biagini R: **Chordoma: clinical characteristics, management and prognosis of a case series of 25 patients.** *BMC Cancer* 2010, **10**:22.
5. Lee J, Bhatia NN, Hoang BH, Ziogas A, Zell JA: **Analysis of prognostic factors for patients with chordoma with use of the California Cancer Registry.** *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2012, **94**:356–363.
6. Quraishi NA, Giannoulis KE, Edwards KL, Boszczyk BM: **Management of metastatic sacral tumours.** *Eur Spine J* 2012, **21**:1984–1993.
7. Clarke MJ, Dasenbrock H, Bydon A, Sciubba DM, McGirt MJ, Hsieh PC, Yassari R, Gokaslan ZL, Wolinsky JP: **Posterior-only approach for en bloc sacrectomy: clinical outcomes in 36 consecutive patients.** *Neurosurgery* 2012, **71**:357–364.
8. Garvey PB, Rhines LD, Feng L, Gu X, Butler CE: **Reconstructive strategies for partial sacrectomy defects based on surgical outcomes.** *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2011, **127**:190–199.
9. Ruggieri P, Angelini A, Pala E, Mercuri M: **Infections in surgery of primary tumors of the sacrum.** *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2012, **3**:420–428. 1.
10. Asavamongkolkul A, Waikakul S: **Wide resection of sacral chordoma via a posterior approach.** *Int Orthop* 2012, **36**:607–612.
11. Horch RE, D'Hoore A, Holm T, Kneser U, Hohenberger W, Arkudas A: **Laparoscopic abdominoperineal resection with open posterior cylindrical excision and primary transpelvic VRAM flap.** *Ann Surg Oncol* 2012, **19**:502–503.
12. Dasenbrock HH, Clarke MJ, Bydon A, Witham TF, Sciubba DM, Simmons OP, Gokaslan ZL, Wolinsky JP: **Reconstruction of extensive defects from posterior en bloc resection of sacral tumors with human acellular dermal matrix and gluteus maximus myocutaneous flaps.** *Neurosurgery* 2011, **69**:1240–1247.
13. Unal C, Eren GG, Isil E, Alponat A, Sarlak A: **Utility of the omentum in sacral reconstruction following total sacrectomy due to recurrent and irradiated giant cell tumour of the spine.** *Indian J Plast Surg* 2012, **45**:140–143.
14. Stechl NM, Baumeister S, Grimm K, Kraus TW, Bockhorn H, Exner KE: **Microsurgical reconstruction of the pelvic floor after pelvic exenteration. Reduced morbidity and improved quality of life by an interdisciplinary concept.** *Chirurg* 2011, **82**:625–630.
15. Diaz J, McDonald WS, Armstrong M, Eismont F, Hellinger M, Thaller S: **Reconstruction after extirpation of sacral malignancies.** *Ann Plast Surg* 2003, **51**:126–129.
16. Glatt BS, Disa JJ, Mehrara BJ, Pusic AL, Boland P, Cordeiro PG: **Reconstruction of extensive partial or total sacrectomy defects with a transabdominal vertical rectus abdominis myocutaneous flap.** *Ann Plast Surg* 2006, **56**:526–531.
17. Daigeler A, Simidjijska-Belyaeva M, Drücke D, Goertz O, Hirsch T, Soimaru C, Lehnhardt M, Steinau HU: **The versatility of the pedicled vertical rectus abdominis myocutaneous flap in oncologic patients.** *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2011, **396**:1271–1279.
18. Park S: **Muscle-splitting approach to superior and inferior gluteal vessels: versatile source of recipient vessels for free-tissue transfer to sacral, gluteal, and ischial regions.** *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2000, **106**:81–86.
19. Vogt PM, Kall S, Lahoda LU, Spies M, Muehlberger T: **The free "mutton chop" flap: a fascio-musculocutaneous flap for the reconstruction of the entire sacral and perineal area.** *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2004, **114**:1220–1224.
20. Koh PK, Tan BK, Hong SW, Tan MH, Tay AG, Song C, Tan KC: **The gluteus maximus muscle flap for reconstruction of sacral chordoma defects.** *Ann Plast Surg* 2004, **53**:44–49.
21. Haapamäki MM, Pihlgren V, Lundberg O, Sandzén B, Rutegård J: **Physical performance and quality of life after extended abdominoperineal excision of rectum and reconstruction of the pelvic floor with gluteus maximus flap.** *Dis Colon Rectum* 2011, **54**:101–106.

doi:10.1186/1477-7819-11-110

**Cite this article as:** Weitao et al.: Use of gluteus maximus adipomuscular sliding flaps in the reconstruction of sacral defects after tumor resection. *World Journal of Surgical Oncology* 2013 **11**:110.

**Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and take full advantage of:**

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at  
www.biomedcentral.com/submit

