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Abstract

Objectives:

The technique of meshed skin grafting is known since 1960s. It was shown that there is a difference between the declared and real expansion ratio of the skin meshed graft. We hypothesize that the orientation of the Langer’s lines in a split thickness skin graft is a key parameter in the resulting expansion ratio.

Methods:

The skin graft meshing process was analysed in two steps. In the first step, *ex vivo* uniaxial tests of human skin were performed. This served as an input for the constitutive model used for numerical simulations. In the second step, finite element analyses were performed so that stress distributions and expansion ratios could be determined.

Results:

It was shown that peaks of true stress tended to be concentrated around the vertex of the mesh pattern region for all cases. The declared expansion was impossible to obtain for all expansion ratios having the meshing incision perpendicular to the Langer’s lines. The highest difference between declared and real expansion ratio reaches 37%.

Conclusions:

With regard to literature dealing with expansion of skin grafts by meshing, a high scatter amongst data results is observed. This finding was also explained by our research, demonstrating the significance of Langer’s lines and their relative orientation to the direction of meshing.
1. Introduction

Split thickness skin grafting is a mainstay surgical technique for soft tissue reconstruction worldwide. In cases of large defects or limited donor site availability, the classic example being major burn injuries, skin grafts may be expanded beyond their original geometry. This permits a smaller graft to reconstruct a larger defect. Principally, there are two techniques used for skin expansion: tissue expansion, and skin graft meshing [1,2]. The first technique consists of overstretcheding the skin by gradual mechanical distention, usually in the form of a surgically inserted underlying silicone implant that is progressively expanded. This procedure is slow and usually takes several weeks, but allows skin to be expanded without significant attenuation of thickness [3]. The biomechanics of tissue expansion have also been studied through the use of computational models [4,5]. In contrast, meshing consists of the patterned placement of innumerable uniform short parallel incisions into a sheet of graft, usually through a specialized roller device. The incisions open upon application of perpendicular stretch, producing a regular pattern of rhomboid interstices. These two approaches therefore utilize fundamentally different biomechanical principles. The first creates new tissue through a slow, guided biological process, while the second one simply maximises the use of existing tissue through immediate mechanical means. While tissue expansion is well documented in the medical literature, there is a relative dearth of research on skin expansion through meshing.

The technique of meshed skin grafting was first introduced by Tanner et al. in 1964 [6,7]. While the original principles remain to this day, time and innovation have allowed modifications and refinements to the technique; variable expansion ratios can be achieved by utilizing longer incisions, while convenience has advanced through innovations such as electrical devices. Henderson et al. performed a detailed comparison of declared and real
expansion ratios [8]. While a large difference (up to 46 %) was found, they did not propose a specific reason for this difference. The clarification of this phenomena was not solved elsewhere [9,10].

Human skin is a stratified tissue with a highly nonlinear and anisotropic behavior, Langer’s lines correspond to the natural orientation of collagen fibers in the dermis and are generally parallel to the orientation of the underlying muscle fibers [11]. So that it is favorable to use this natural orientation in the following hypothesis. It is clear that skin graft orientation may play a role in the expansion achievable by meshing.

The following study introduces the dependency of skin mesh expansion ratio as a function of Langer’s lines orientation. We hypothesize that the orientation of the Langer’s lines in a split thickness skin graft is a parameter playing a key role in the resulting expansion ratio.

2. Materials and methods
The skin graft meshing process was analysed in two steps. In the first step, ex vivo uniaxial tests of human skin were performed. This served as an input for the constitutive model used for numerical simulations. In the second step, finite element analyses were performed so that stress distributions and expansion ratios could be determined. The finite element method (FEM) is a standardized tool in biomechanics used for solving different tasks [12], and has been successfully used in the field of plastic and reconstructive surgery [13-16].

2.1 Ex vivo experiments
All the ex vivo experiments were carried out under ethical approval in accordance with Czech Republic laws and medical regulations. Skin was harvested from the discarded abdominoplasty specimen of a 44-year-old female. The skin graft was visually without any colour changes. The orientation of Langer’s lines was recorded prior to graft harvest. The skin
was then manually tensioned to its original size, and eight rectangular grafts were harvested using a powered Dermatome (Zimmer Czech, Czech Republic) set. The grafts were planned to be 0.75 mm thick. Consistency of graft thickness was inspected using an optical microscope (Nikon, Czech Republic). The effective dimensions of the test specimens were 8 x 20 mm. Specimens were obtained in two orientations: parallel and perpendicular to the direction of the Langer’s lines, figure 1. Tensile tests were performed using a universal tensile test machine Testometric M350-5CT with 10 N force gauge. The samples were pre-tensioned by a force 0.1 N, and then tested to failure with a stretch rate of 20 mm/min.

**Finite element models**

The proposed computational model was based on the geometry of a standard skin graft mesher (Zimmer Czech, Czech Republic) with expansion ratios of 1.5:1, 2:1 and 3:1, and graft dimensions of 24 x 47 mm. The finite element model was created in the software MSC.Marc 2016.0 (MSC.Software, Czech Republic). The FEM mesh was created semi-automatically and was defined by four node planar elements (38 750 elements). The thickness of elements was 0.75mm. The slits were modelled by coincident nodes that were not connected, so that the free edges could open in the loading direction. The convergence error was minimized by using the adaptive mesh refinement Zienkiewitz-Zhu stress criterion in the location with the highest field gradient. The behaviour of the skin graft was assumed to be isotropic elastic and nonlinear [17]. The nonlinear elastic Yeoh phenomenological model was used [18]. The material constants for the constitutive law were estimated by using Matlab (Humusoft Ltd., Czech Republic), tab.1. The curve fit is shown on figure 2. The following boundary conditions were taken into consideration for numerical purposes, figure 3:

- The left edge of the domain was constrained kinematically in all degrees of freedom.
• Nodes corresponding to the right edge of the graft were connected via rigid body (RB) linked to a control node that was positioned further right.

• A displacement (X axis) of 36, 48 and 72 mm, corresponding to the theoretical declared directional expansion, was prescribed to the control node.

• In cases where the maximal true stress exceeded the ultimate strength of tested samples for declared expansions, the displacement of the control node was updated in such a way that the maximal true stress reached only 95 % of ultimate strength. The ultimate strength is the maximum stress that a material is capable of sustaining.

The models were loaded according to the above mentioned boundary conditions for grafts taken parallel and perpendicular to the Langer’s lines and for three different expansion ratios. After expanding the graft, the resultant overall meshed area was analysed by the software Geomagic (Geomagic Ltd., USA) and compared to the unexpanded graft geometry. Shrinkage was defined as the transversal maximal displacement measured according to figure 4. The distribution of true stress, shrinkage, expansion force, expanded surface and expansion ratio were calculated for each numerical model, corresponding to the different expansion ratios of the skin grafts.

3. Results

The mean thickness of skin samples gained in the parallel and perpendicular directions was in accordance with the setting on the skin graft mesher (0.75 mm). The measured stress-strain curves exhibited regular shapes for human soft tissues, with low stiffness for low stretch values, rapidly increasing stiffness with higher stretches, and a sudden stress decrease at failure [19]. Specimens meshed with incisions perpendicular to the Langer’s lines achieved up to 18.3 % higher extensibility than those oriented parallel to Langer’s lines.
The resultant values of true stress, shrinkage, expansion force, expanded surface and expansion ratio for each numerical model (corresponding to different expansion ratio of the skin graft) are summarized in Appendix (A1, A2 and A2). The resultant shape of the mesh interstices were either spindle shaped (1.5:1 and 2:1) or S-shaped (3:1). The peaks of true stress tended to be concentrated around the vertex of the mesh pattern region for all cases, figure 5. The maximal shrinkage was highest at 1.7 mm for 3:1 (declared expansion), and lowest at 0.3 mm for 1.5:1 (declared expansion). The expansion force for declared expansion was highest at 3.3 N for 3:1 and lowest at 0.3 N for 1.5:1.

For all expansion ratios, the declared expansion was impossible to obtain through stretching the graft in the X axis while having the meshing incision perpendicular to the Langer’s lines. The maximal true stress exceeded the ultimate strength for all specimens with meshing incisions oriented perpendicular to Langer’s lines. In other words, it would fail, table 2. The opposite was observed for those specimens meshed with incisions parallel to Langer’s lines. For expansion ratios of 2:1 and 3:1, the true stress exceeded the ultimate strength of the skin. For expansion 1.5:1 the true stress was lower than ultimate strength. This meant that the declared expansion was reached. Having calculated the maximal expansion corresponding to ultimate strength (in both directions) the differences between declared and calculated expansions are demonstrated in figure 6.

4. Discussion

The use of skin graft meshing, with expansion ratios from 1.5:1 to 3:1, is common and routine in clinical practice (especially burns care). Faced with insufficient skin graft expansion, some technical modifications were proposed [20, 21]. The presence of Langers’s lines is well
known and widely applied in plastic and reconstructive surgery [22,23]. The dependency of skin behavior according to these lines has been proven by several authors [24-26]. Donor site availability is the ultimate factor limiting split thickness skin graft harvest quantity. Nevertheless, the local Langer’s line orientation may explain the huge scatter in the expansion ratios achieved in practice. The technical expertise of the surgical practitioner may also play a significant role.

Our study demonstrated that the orientation of meshing incisions in a split thickness skin graft, relative to Langer’s lines, plays a crucial role in the achieved expansion ratios after meshing. The difference in declared and achieved expansion ratios according to the Langer’s lines orientation ranged from 0 % (1.5:1) up to 21 % (3:1). In general, greater expansion ratios were achieved when the applied stretch was perpendicular to the Langer’s lines. This was due to such grafts exhibiting sufficient tensile strength to withstand expansion up to the specified ratio – we hypothesise that this strength was due to preservation of collagen integrity, in keeping with the underlying principle of Langer’s lines.

The most detailed studies regarding skin expansion were performed by Lyons et al. and Kamolz et al. Lyons demonstrated that for all expansion ratios greater than 1:1, the extent of actual expansion was significantly less than that expected for each device [27]. Moreover, for larger expansion ratios, there were increasingly greater discrepancies between the area predicted by the device manufacturer and the actual area obtained in practice. Kamolz showed that skin meshers with ratios 1.5:1 and 3:1 did not achieve their claimed values (84.7% and 53.1% of the claimed expansion respectively).

When compared to these studies, our results were generally consistent. The finite element analyses demonstrated that the most loaded area of the expanded graft is the vertex of the mesh pattern. Lyons demonstrated that maximum graft areas obtained were less than the manufacturer’s declared ratio by 11.28 % (1.5:1) and 22.81 % (3:1). Our results showed that
the range of error between the declared ratio and the FEM results was wider, depending on the orientation relative to Langer’s lines.

With regard to literature dealing with expansion of skin grafts by meshing, a high scatter amongst data results is observed. This finding was also explained by our research, demonstrating the significance of Langer’s lines and their relative orientation to the direction of meshing. In this way, surgical technique with respect to both harvesting and meshing may strongly influence the resulting expansion ratio.

We recognize certain limitations of our methodology. Our conclusions derive from a skin grafts gained from a single donor, in the setting of elective abdominoplasty – the collagen may therefore have been subject to prior injury through pregnancy or obesity. Repeating our study with specimens from multiple patients may introduce a wider scatter in mechanical properties observed. This fact further aids the explanation of scatter in gained results after meshing the skin grafts. The computer model of the skin was assumed to be isotropic, which means the skin load response is independent on load direction. Both mentioned limits should be clarified.
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Fig. 1. Orientation of skin samples according to Langer’s lines on abdomen

Fig. 2. Mathematical extrapolation of measured tensile tests of ex vivo skin

Fig. 3. Boundary conditions of finite element model

Fig. 4. Schema of meshed graft shrinkage measurement

Fig. 5. Location of true stress concentration around mesh interstices

Fig. 6. Differences between declared and calculated expansions ratios

Table 1. Material constants used for Yeoh nonlinear elastic model

Table 2. Binary comparative table of declared and computed expansions ratio: □ (●) - reached, :-( - not reached

Appendix

A1 – Summarized results for expansion rate 3:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declared expansion parallel to LL</th>
<th>Max expansion parallel to LL</th>
<th>Declared expansion perpendicular to LL</th>
<th>Max expansion perpendicular to LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max true stress (MPa)</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion force (N)</td>
<td>Expanded surface (mm²)</td>
<td>Shrinkage (mm)</td>
<td>Exp. ratio FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2933</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2684</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A2** – Summarized results for expansion rate 2:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declared expansion parallel to LL</th>
<th>Max expansion parallel to LL</th>
<th>Declared expansion perpendicular to LL</th>
<th>Max expansion perpendicular to LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max true stress (MPa)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion force (N)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded surface (mm²)</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>2154</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrinkage (mm)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp ratio FEM</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>No-fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>No-fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A3** – Summarized results for expansion rate 1.5:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declared expansion parallel to LL</th>
<th>Max expansion parallel to LL</th>
<th>Declared expansion perpendicular to LL</th>
<th>Max expansion perpendicular to LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max true stress (MPa)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion force (N)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded surface (mm²)</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrinkage (mm)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp ratio FEM</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>No-fail</td>
<td>No-fail</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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