

# BMJ Open

## Dead space closure with quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage for the prevention of seroma after mastectomy for breast cancer (QUISERMAS): protocol for a multicentre randomised controlled trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2015-009903
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Sep-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Ouldamer, Lobna; CHRU de Tours, Gynecology Bonastre, Julia; Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie; CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiologie and Population Health INSERM U1018 Paris-Sud Univ Brunet-Houdard, solene; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique Body, Gilles; CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, Giraudeau, Bruno; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC 1415 Caille, Agnès; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC 1415
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, Epidemiology < ONCOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Dead space closure with quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage for**  
4 **the prevention of seroma after mastectomy for breast cancer (QUISERMAS): protocol**  
5 **for a multicentre randomised controlled trial**  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **Lobna Ouldamer**<sup>1,2</sup>, **Julia Bonastre**<sup>3,4</sup>, **Solène Brunet-Houdard**<sup>5,6</sup>, **Gilles Body**<sup>1,5</sup>, **Bruno**  
12 **Girardeau**<sup>5,7</sup>, **Agnès Caille**<sup>5,7</sup>  
13  
14

15  
16 <sup>1</sup> CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology, Tours, France  
17

18 <sup>2</sup> INSERM unit 1069, Tours, France  
19

20 <sup>3</sup> Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie, Villejuif, F-94805, France  
21

22 <sup>4</sup> CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health, INSERM U1018, Paris-  
23 Sud Univ., Villejuif France  
24  
25

26 <sup>5</sup> Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre-Val de Loire Université, Tours, France  
27  
28

29 <sup>6</sup> CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique, Tours, France  
30

31 <sup>7</sup> CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC1415, Tours, France  
32  
33

34 **Corresponding author:**

35  
36 Lobna Ouldamer

37  
38 Service de Gynécologie. CHU Bretonneau

39  
40 2 Boulevard Tonnellé

41  
42 37000 TOURS (France)

43  
44 Phone: +33 (0) 2 47 47 47 41

45  
46 Fax: +33 (0) 2 47 47 92 73

47  
48 Email: l.ouldamer@chu-tours.fr  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

### Introduction

Postoperative wound seromas is common after mastectomy. This complication is associated with significant impact on patient outcomes and healthcare costs. The optimal closure approach for seroma prevention remains unknown but some evidence suggests that quilting suture of the dead space could lower the incidence of seroma. The aim of this trial is to compare seroma formation using quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage in patients undergoing mastectomy.

### Methods and analysis

This is a multicentre, randomised controlled trial in women undergoing mastectomy with or without axillary involvement. Exclusion criteria include indication of bilateral mastectomy or immediate reconstruction and any physical or psychiatric condition that could impair patient's ability to cooperate with postoperative data collection or that do not allow an informed consent. Three hundred and twenty participants will be randomised in a 1:1 ratio to receive either quilting suture or conventional wound closure with drain. The primary outcome is seroma requiring either aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following mastectomy. Secondary outcomes include seroma regardless of whether or not it requires an intervention, surgical site infection, pain score, cosmetic result, patient's quality of life, costs and cost-effectiveness. The primary analysis will be an intention-to treat analysis performed with a  $\chi^2$  test (or Fisher's exact test).

### Ethics and dissemination:

Written informed consent will be obtained from all participants. This study was approved by Tours Research ethics committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1, 2014-R20,

1  
2  
3 16/12/2014). Study findings will be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at  
4  
5 relevant national and international breast cancer conferences.  
6

7 **Trial registration number:**  
8

9 The QUISERMAS trial is registered with [clinicaltrials.gov](http://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT02263651).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009903 on 4 April 2016. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- QUISERMAS is the first multicentre randomised controlled trial to assess quilting suture of the dead space after mastectomy on seroma prevention
- Cosmetic result will be assessed by an independent adjudication committee.
- An economic evaluation will be conducted alongside the trial.
- Surgeons and patients cannot be blinded to the surgical arms, there is a risk of bias in the assessment of outcomes and decisions to perform seroma aspiration.

For peer review only

## Introduction

Breast cancer is the most common cancer worldwide. Surgical treatment is the preferred option and about 14.000 mastectomies are performed each year in France.<sup>1</sup> Postoperative seroma is a common complication after mastectomy.<sup>2-9</sup> This complication is secondary to the disruption of lymphatic channels that inevitably complicates extensive surgical dissection and disruption of tissue planes creating a "dead space". Excessive fluid accumulation in a seroma stretches the skin, resulting in patient discomfort, impaired homolateral shoulder function and higher risk of surgical site infection (SSI). In rare cases, a fibrous encapsulated seroma forms that is resistant to conservative treatment and requires subsequent surgical resection. Thus, this complication may also impact healthcare costs requiring prolongation of hospital stay or unplanned outpatient visits and may delay adjuvant therapy.

Conventional wound closure commonly uses suction drain after mastectomy to prevent seroma despite seroma frequently occurs after drain removal.<sup>10</sup> Studies on seroma prevention have focused on the obliteration of the dead space through, fibrinogen, thrombin sealants and glues or Tetracyclin with poor results.<sup>11-20</sup> Some recent evidence suggests that quilting suture reduces the incidence of seroma.<sup>21-23</sup> Quilting suture consists in suturing the skin flaps to the underlying musculature to reduce "dead space"<sup>24</sup>. It aims to restore the integrity of tissue planes. Ten Wolde et al, retrospectively analysed 176 consecutive patients who underwent mastectomy and/or axillary lymph node dissection (ALND), this included patients undergoing an ALND with lumpectomy in whom only the axilla was quilted. All patients had a drain in the quilted area that was removed on the day of discharge, at least within 36 h following surgery. The incidence of seroma decreased significantly from 80.5% to 22.5 % in the quilted group (n=89), p<0.01 and the volume of aspirations from 1660 ml to 611ml (p=0.05).<sup>22</sup> Quilting closure technique was also assessed in an observational study based on 119 consecutive patients in our tertiary breast cancer unit whose fifty-nine received quilting suture (without drain) and 60 received conventional closure with drainage. The results showed a

1  
2  
3 significant reduction in seroma for patients with quilting suture as compared to patients with  
4 conventional closure with drain (odds ratio [OR] = 0.26, 95% Confidence Interval = 0.08-  
5 0.86; p=0.03) The hypothesis around quilting efficacy is that dead space is the major  
6 contributor to seroma formation, and that this surgical technique applied to obliterate the dead  
7 space might reduce the incidence of this complication.<sup>23</sup>  
8  
9

10  
11 As recommended in the IDEAL framework describing the stages for development of  
12 innovation in surgery, quilting suture now needs to be assessed in a controlled randomised  
13 trial.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the aim of our project is to assess, in a randomised controlled trial, quilting  
14 suture of the “dead space” without drainage at the pectoral area as compared to conventional  
15 closure with drainage on seroma prevention within 21 days following mastectomy for breast  
16 cancer.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Study objectives**

28  
29 Our primary objective is to assess the impact of quilting on rates of wound seroma requiring  
30 ponction or surgical intervention within 21 days following mastectomy.  
31  
32

33  
34 Secondary objectives are to compare quilting suture of the “dead space” without drainage  
35 of the pectoral area to conventional closure with drainage after mastectomy for breast cancer  
36 regarding wound-related complications, surgical morbidity, pain, shoulder movement,  
37 cosmesis results, health related quality of life, costs and cost-effectiveness.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Methods and analysis**

#### 44 **Study design**

45  
46  
47 QUISERMAS is a multicentre randomised controlled trial with parallel groups comparing  
48 quilting suture with conventional closure with drain in the prevention of seroma in patients  
49 undergoing mastectomy with or without axillary surgery.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

#### 56 **Setting**

57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The trial will be conducted in four French university hospitals (Tours, Nantes, Poitiers,  
4  
5 Rennes). The study will be conducted in the Breast surgery Departments of these academic  
6  
7 centres.  
8

## 9 **Participants**

### 10 **Inclusion criteria**

11  
12 The inclusion criteria are: (1) Patients with operable breast cancer (invasive carcinoma and/or  
13  
14 ductal carcinoma in situ) for whom mastectomy is recommended or preferred by the patient  
15  
16 either alone or in association with axillary clearance either sentinel lymph node biopsy or  
17  
18 standard level I/II axillary node dissection, (2) Aged  $\geq 18$  years and  $\leq 85$  years,  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **Exclusion criteria**

23  
24 The exclusion criteria are: (1) Patients with an indication of bilateral mastectomy or  
25  
26 immediate reconstruction, (2) Planned outpatient surgery, (3) Patients with known  
27  
28 degenerative neuromuscular disease with thoracic muscular damage, (4) Patients with any  
29  
30 physical or psychiatric condition that could impair with outcome assessment and maintaining  
31  
32 follow-up.  
33  
34

35  
36 Study participants are patients who meet the selection criteria and are willing and able to sign  
37  
38 written informed consent.  
39

### 40 **Recruitment**

41  
42 The first patient was randomised on October 2014. Enrolment is ongoing at the time of  
43  
44 publication.  
45

46  
47 The recruitment process is planned to fit with routine practice. Potential participants to the  
48  
49 trial are identified at the time they attend for diagnosis and treatment choice for their breast  
50  
51 cancer in one of the four involved tertiary-care centres. Patients who meet selection criteria  
52  
53 receive a brief study presentation and full participant information sheet by a clinician. After  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 selection criteria confirmation and answering to potential further patient questions about the  
4 trial, written informed consent is obtained before surgery by the patient's surgeon.  
5  
6

7 Baseline data are collected following consent during the preoperative period.  
8

### 9 **Randomisation**

10 Randomisation is undertaken by the surgeon (investigator) via a centralized secure web-based  
11 randomisation system. Randomisation in a 1:1 ratio is computer generated by an independent  
12 statistician from the INSERM CIC 1415 statistical unit. The allocation sequence is generated  
13 with a random permuted block design. Varying block sizes will not be revealed to ensure  
14 concealment. To avoid prognostic imbalance between the two groups, randomisation is  
15 stratified by recruiting centre and planned surgical procedure: mastectomy without axillary  
16 surgery, mastectomy with sentinel lymph node biopsy or mastectomy with standard level I/II  
17 axillary node dissection.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **Study interventions**

30 Mastectomies are performed by experienced breast surgeons using a standardized technique.  
31  
32 The skin incision must include the tumor biopsy site, any invaded or oedematous skin, plus  
33 the nipple-areola complex. For dissecting the upper and lower skin flaps, finding the  
34 bloodless plane between the smaller lobules of the subcutaneous fat, and the larger lobules of  
35 the fat in the breast proper is required. Finally, the whole of the posterior aspect of the breast  
36 from the pectoralis major is freed. This study addresses the type of wound closure in  
37 mastectomy. So, only wound closure will be different between the two groups.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 Conventional closure with drain

48 In the conventional closure with drain group, the skin flaps are not fixed subcutaneously but  
49 sutured at the edges, a closed suction drain is inserted under the flaps in the dead space  
50 created by the dissection at the pectoral area. The drain is stitched to the skin. The skin is  
51 closed in two layers with absorbable sutures, a deep layer of 2.0 or 3.0 vicryl sutures or  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 equivalent, and a subcuticular closure with absorbable 3.0 or 4.0 Monocryl sutures or  
4  
5 equivalent. The drain is removed on the day of discharge either when drain volume is less  
6  
7 than 50 ml over 24 hours regardless of time elapsed after surgery or at 5 days following  
8  
9 surgery.

### 10 11 Quilting suture

12  
13 In the quilting suture group, the skin flaps are sutured to the underlying pectoralis major with  
14  
15 multiple parallel rows of 0/0 vicryl or equivalent. Running sutures at periodic intervals  
16  
17 (<2cm) are placed from the skin flaps to the underlying muscle. Minor dimpling is considered  
18  
19 acceptable and is expected to resolve. If severe dimpling is observed, stitches are removed  
20  
21 and replaced. Efficiency of quilting suture relies on a rigorous repartition of the sutures with a  
22  
23 special attention taken to the obliteration of the largest potential dead spaces and the empty  
24  
25 axillary apex. The skin edges are sutured as for the control group. Closed suction will not be  
26  
27 used for draining the pectoral area.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 If an axillary lymph node dissection is required in any group (quilting suture or conventional  
35  
36 closure), the same skin incisions used for the mastectomy are used. The axillary area is closed  
37  
38 with vicryl sutures after the insertion of a suction drain to create a separation with the dead  
39  
40 space, quilted or not, at the pectoral area. The drain is connected to a single suction bottle  
41  
42 which is changed every day and the daily drain volume is monitored. The axillary drain is  
43  
44 removed on the day of discharge either when drain volume is less than 50 ml over 24 hours  
45  
46 regardless of time elapsed after surgery or at 5 days following surgery. Patients with axillary  
47  
48 lymph node dissection have two drains and two bottles in the conventional closure group and  
49  
50 only one axillary drain and one bottle in the quilting suture group.  
51

### 52 53 Surgeon expertise and intervention standardisation

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The licensed French doctors who will be involved in this trial as practitioners have all been  
4 certified by the French ministry of health, have at least one year of surgical experience (senior  
5 with at least one year of fellowship validated), and will have taken a course to ensure that they  
6 adhere strictly to the study protocol and are familiar with quilting suture. To standardize  
7 quilting suture across centres and surgeons, a training period of at least 2 months have been  
8 realized. This intervention has been standardized during a 2 months training period as  
9 recommended in the Randomised Trials of Non pharmacologic Treatment extension of  
10 CONSORT Statement.<sup>26</sup>  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **Study outcomes**

### 24 Primary study outcome

25  
26  
27 The primary outcome is wound seroma requiring aspiration or surgical evacuation within 21  
28 days following mastectomy. A seroma is defined as a postoperative fluid collection via  
29 palpation on clinical examination. The Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events  
30 (CTCAE) 4.0 which is a descriptive terminology that can be used for adverse event reporting,  
31 provide a grading scale for seromas (lymphoceles): (1) grade 1: asymptomatic, clinical or  
32 diagnostic observation only, intervention not indicated, (2) grade 2: symptomatic, medical  
33 intervention indicated, (3) grade 3: severe symptoms, radiologic endoscopic or elective  
34 operative intervention indicated. Only grade 2 and 3 seromas i.e. seromas requiring one or  
35 more aspirations or a surgical intervention will be considered as primary outcome.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 This outcome was chosen as the primary outcome for three reasons. First, this outcome  
48 measure was the most used as primary outcome in reported published trials evaluating and  
49 comparing the efficacy of different methods in reducing the incidence of seromas when  
50 drainage wasn't used for all patients<sup>27-31</sup>. It reflects both patient morbidity and additional  
51 medical costs. Focusing on seromas requiring interventions (aspiration or surgical  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 intervention) is a more objective criterion than the simple presence of seroma (on physical  
4 exam or ultrasound finding). This allows to take into account only seromas having important  
5 consequences for the patient, indeed some authors discovered that 92% of their patients had  
6 seromas noted on ultrasound, but only less than half (42%) required aspiration of the seroma.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12<sup>32-33</sup>. Second, we did not wish to use the total inpatient drainage volume as a primary  
13 outcome, because it implies to use suction drains in dead space in both study groups. Using  
14 such a drain at the pectoral area while quilting the dead space is not the innovative technique  
15 we wished to test because we believe that drains themselves encourage drainage by  
16 stimulating tissue reactions or by suction. Moreover, even if we used suction drains in both  
17 groups, the patients will not be blinded because quilting suture technique is responsible of  
18 minor skin dimpling effect expected to resolve which does not exist with the conventional  
19 closure technique. Finally, the only outcome that could be blind assessed is the cosmetic  
20 result by an adjudication committee. However, this outcome is not as medically relevant as  
21 seroma requiring intervention. We therefore chose to study the cosmetic result as a secondary  
22 outcome.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 In most cases, a patient will return to her initial centre if an aspiration or surgical intervention  
37 for wound seroma is needed. These interventions will be collected in the patient medical  
38 record. Nevertheless, each patient will be asked, at day 21 visit about seroma and the need for  
39 aspiration or intervention since hospital discharge. In rare cases where patients will mention  
40 seroma requiring aspiration or intervention in another centre or by their family practitioner,  
41 the physician will be contacted to validate the patient report (the same procedure will be done  
42 for other wound related complications).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

#### 51 Secondary outcomes measurement

52  
53  
54 Secondary outcomes include:

#### 55 (1) Wound-related complications:

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 - Wound seromas that necessitate ponction or surgical intervention within 9 months following  
4 mastectomy.  
5

6  
7 - For each patient presenting a seroma which necessitates aspiration, the total volume of  
8 aspiration and number of aspiration will be recorded.  
9

10  
11 - Wound seromas whatever their grade at day 21 and 9 months after surgery.  
12

13 - Other wound- related complications such as hematoma, skin flap necrosis, surgical site  
14 infection at day 21 and 9 months  
15

16  
17 (2) Surgical morbidity: Duration of the surgical procedure and intraoperative blood loss,  
18 length of hospital stay after surgery (days), number of outpatient visits (related to  
19 mastectomy) needed following participant's discharge within the 9 months follow-up.  
20

21  
22 (3) Pain: Patient self reported pain measured with the Visual Analogue Scale pain scoring  
23 system from 0 (no pain) to 10 (unbearable pain) recorded before surgery, daily during  
24 hospitalisation and at 21 days and 9 months after surgery.  
25

26  
27 (4) Shoulder movement: The range of arm movement scored from 1 to 4 according to  
28 estimated angles of arm abduction as 1 (less than 90°), 2 (90-134°), 3 (135-179°) and 4  
29 (180°). It will be measured by the surgeon before surgery and also at 21 days and 9 months  
30 visits.  
31

32  
33 (5) Cosmesis results: Both patient and surgeon assessments of the cosmetic results will be  
34 documented during follow-up at day 21 and 9 months, with possible response categories as  
35 follows: poor, acceptable, good and excellent. Digital photographs of the mastectomy area  
36 will be taken with standardized angles of incidence at 9 months. Results will be rated at the  
37 end of the study, by an adjudication committee blinded to treatment allocation (blinded  
38 outcome assessment) in order to obtain a blinded medical cosmetic-assessment.  
39

40  
41 (6) Health related quality of life: the EuroQoL-5D (EQ-5D)-5L will be collected at baseline,  
42 21 days and 9 months visits. The EQ-5D-5L is an update of the 3L version. It still consists of  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2 pages – the EQ-5D-5L descriptive system and the EQ visual Analogue scale. The  
4  
5 descriptive system comprises the same 5 dimensions as the EQ-5D-5D-3L (mobility, self  
6  
7 care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression). However, each dimension now has  
8  
9 5 levels: no problems, slight problems, moderate problems, severe problems, and extreme  
10  
11 problems. The respondent is asked to indicate his/her health state by ticking in the box against  
12  
13 the most appropriate statement in each of the 5 dimensions. This decision results in a 1-digit  
14  
15 number expressing the level selected for that dimension. The digits for 5 dimensions can be  
16  
17 combined in a 5-digit number describing the respondent's health state.  
18  
19

#### 20 21 (7) Direct medical costs and cost-effectiveness.

#### 22 23 24 25 **Follow-up**

26  
27 All patients are followed for a 9-month period, with follow-up visit at 21 days and 9 months  
28  
29 following surgery. Those visits fit in with routine follow-up after mastectomy in the  
30  
31 participating centres.  
32  
33

#### 34 35 36 **Blinding**

37  
38 It is not possible to blind patients or surgeons in our trial because of the nature of the studied  
39  
40 intervention (surgical intervention which depends on care provider). Blinding is of great  
41  
42 difficulty in non pharmacologic randomised trials<sup>34-35</sup>. Moreover, blinding of outcome  
43  
44 assessor is not feasible for the primary outcome: seroma which require aspiration or surgical  
45  
46 evacuation within 21 days following mastectomy. Indeed, after discharge, patients can visit at  
47  
48 any time (in emergency or not) for a seroma or another postoperative complication. It is not  
49  
50 possible to ensure that the gynecologist who will examine the patient is not the same as the  
51  
52 surgeon who operated this patient. Moreover, as the patients cannot be blinded of the  
53  
54 treatment allocation, it is difficult to ensure that they will not disclose it to the gynecologist  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (outcome assessor of the trial). An adjudication committee blinded to treatment allocation  
4  
5 aiming to *a posteriori* validates the indication of aspiration or surgical evacuation of a seroma  
6  
7 is not relevant in this study because the decision depends on criteria that cannot be assessed  
8  
9 retrospectively by photographs and medical records only.  
10

### 11 12 13 14 **Data management**

15  
16 Data is recorded on study specific case report forms (CRFs) via an electronic data capture  
17  
18 system (CS Online). To maintain participant's anonymity, CRFs are identified only by a  
19  
20 coded patient number and initials. All records that contain patient names or other identifying  
21  
22 information will be stored separately from the study records and can be identified only by the  
23  
24 coded patient number and initials. A data manager from the INSERM CIC 1415 biometry unit  
25  
26 verifies the data and sends queries for missing or inconsistent data.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **Sample size**

33  
34 The study sample size is based on a comparison of quilting suture versus conventional wound  
35  
36 closure with drainage on seroma prevention. In our observational study data, 22% (n = 13/60)  
37  
38 of patients undergoing mastectomy with conventional wound suture developed a seroma that  
39  
40 required ponction or surgical intervention within 21 days following surgery. Because of the  
41  
42 multicentric profile of our study, the rate of seroma could be greater. So we assume a rate of  
43  
44 30 % in the control group. In the quilting suture, we expect to observe a rate of patients  
45  
46 developing a seroma of 15 %. With these assumptions, a two-sided type I error of 5% and  
47  
48 90% power, a sample size of 160 patients per group is needed. Therefore, we plan to enroll a  
49  
50 total of 320 patients.  
51  
52

53  
54 To recruit this number of patients a 24-month inclusion period is anticipated.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Statistical analyses

The statistical analyses will follow an intention-to-treat approach. Analyses will be conducted using two sided significance tests at the 5% significance level. A participant flow diagram will be reported. Group characteristics at baseline will be studied with descriptive analysis. No statistical test will be performed on baseline characteristics.

The primary outcome will be assessed as a rate, defined as the number of patients who experienced a seroma requiring aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following mastectomy divided by the number of patients randomised into this group. To compare the incidence rates between the two randomised groups, we will use a  $\chi^2$  test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.

Giving the patient profile, loss to follow-up is very unlikely. Generally, patients continue their follow-up in their original centre even if they move. However, if the case does occur, imputation of missing outcomes will be performed at least in a sensitivity analysis.

For secondary analysis, qualitative outcomes such as other postoperative wound-related complications, cosmetic results and shoulder movement will also be compared between the two arms using a  $\chi^2$  test or a Fisher's exact test. The duration of the surgical procedure, length of hospital stay, intraoperative blood loss, will be compared using Wilcoxon tests or Student t tests, as appropriate. Repeated measures such as pain evaluation and health-related quality of life will be analyzed using linear mixed-effects models to take into account the correlation of data from a given subject.

### Economic evaluation

A cost-effectiveness study will be performed on the basis of resource use and HRQOL data collected alongside the trial.

Direct medical costs will be assessed from the hospital and the payer perspectives in both groups and during the whole follow-up period i.e. 9 months after randomization. For each



1  
2  
3 patient, we collect the healthcare resource use both in the hospital setting and primary care  
4  
5 services. This covers the initial surgical stay (duration of the surgical procedure, number of  
6  
7 consumables (drains and sutures), length of stay), subsequent hospital stays due to  
8  
9 complications/infections, general practitioners and gynaecologist visits (over a 21-day period  
10  
11 only), and home nursing care visits (over a 21-day period only).

12  
13  
14 To value resources, we will use the following unit costs information:

- 15  
16 - Hospital stays: diagnosis related group payment per discharge in the French prospective  
17  
18 payment scheme.
- 19  
20 - Visits: General fee classification (Nomenclature Générale des Actes Professionnels) and the  
21  
22 reimbursement rate at the date of analysis.

23  
24  
25 Health states will be valued into utility coefficients using data from the EuroQoL group  
26  
27 (European value set). This will allow computing QALYs for each patient in both groups.

28  
29  
30 Costs and QALYs will be compared between the two groups using non parametric tests.  
31  
32 Means and 95 % confidence intervals for costs, QALYS and incremental net monetary benefit  
33  
34 will be estimated using the non parametric bootstrap method. Differences in costs and  
35  
36 differences in QALYs observed in the bootstrap replicates will be represented in the cost-  
37  
38 effectiveness plane. A cost-effectiveness acceptability curve will be computed.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **Ethics and dissemination**

This protocol was approved by local ethic research committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1, 2014-R20, 16/12/2014).

In conformity with the Declaration of Helsinki, all participants will sign a written informed consent form that describes this study and provides sufficient information for patients to make an informed decision about their participation. Consent will be obtained from patients before they undergo any study procedure. Participants may withdraw from the study at any time during the clinical trial without any impact on their care. Data collected prior to participant withdrawal will be used in the trial analysis except if a participant requests removal of all her data from the database.

Reports will follow international guidelines: CONSORT Statement and Extension of the CONSORT Statement to Randomised Trials of Nonpharmacologic Treatment. Research findings will be submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals regardless of whether or not there are statistically significant. The study findings will also be presented at relevant national and international breast cancer conferences.

### **Discussion**

Previous reports in the literature have addressed the effect of quilting versus conventional closure with drainage after mastectomy for breast cancer on patient outcome. However, the studies reported to date are limited by small sample sizes, lack of randomization, the concomitant use of drainage with quilting suture, and most studies were single centre initiatives that lacked sufficient power to inform surgical practice. Breast cancer surgeons appear to currently favour conventional wound closure with drainage, although current evidence suggests superior patients outcomes with quilting suture. The QUISERMAS trial will aim to resolve these controversies by establishing the effectiveness of each method of

1  
2  
3 mastectomy closure. This will have important clinical implications, as each wound closure  
4 type is easily applicable and already performed by breast cancer surgeons. A key limitation of  
5 the QUISERMAS trial is that surgeons and patients cannot be blinded to the surgical arms.  
6  
7 This leaves the assessment of outcomes and decisions to intervene on seroma vulnerable to  
8 bias. A strength of our study is that it is designed to be a feasible, comparative effectiveness  
9 trial design that is similar to common clinical situations. Additionally, this clinical trial  
10 protocol was conducted to conform strictly to the CONSORT statement. The results of the  
11 QUISERMAS trial will be an important contribution in breast cancer surgery literature and  
12 are likely to lead changes in mastectomy closure. We expect that this study will provide the  
13 clinical basis and evidence that is required to perform quilting suture in routine when  
14 performing mastectomies.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **Author affiliations**

30  
31 <sup>1</sup> CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology, Tours, France

32  
33 <sup>2</sup> INSERM unit 1069, Tours, France

34  
35 <sup>3</sup> Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre-Val de Loire Université, Tours, France

36  
37 <sup>4</sup> Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie, Villejuif, F-94805, France

38  
39 <sup>5</sup> CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health, INSERM U1018, Paris-  
40 Sud Univ., Villejuif France

41  
42 <sup>6</sup> INSERM, CIC1415, Tours, France

43  
44 <sup>7</sup> CHRU de Tours, Tours, France

45  
46 <sup>8</sup> CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique, Tours, France  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

### 56 **Acknowledgements**

57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The authors acknowledge Carine Coffre, Aurélie Darmaillacq and Rachel Fontenay for their  
4  
5 constructive support during preparation and conduct of the trial.  
6

7  
8 The authors would also like to express appreciation for the contributions from patients with  
9  
10 breast cancer who will participate in this trial.  
11

### 12 13 14 **Contributors**

15  
16 LO and AC helped to conceive and design the trial and wrote the manuscript. JB, BG and GB  
17  
18 helped to conceive the trial and revised the manuscript. LO and GB will be investigators and  
19  
20 will recruit patients and conduct the trial. AC planned the statistical analysis. LO and AC will  
21  
22 supervise the trial. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.  
23  
24

### 25 26 27 **Funding**

28  
29 This trial is supported by a grant from the French Ministry of Health (PHRC 2013).  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 **Competing interests** None.  
35  
36

37  
38  
39 **Ethics approval** Tours Research Ethics Committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1,  
40  
41 2014-R20, 16/12/2014).  
42

43  
44  
45 **Open Access** This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative  
46  
47 Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to  
48  
49 distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work noncommercially, and license their derivative  
50  
51 works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-  
52  
53 commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

1. HCL, Invs, INCa, Francim, Inserm. Projections de l'incidence et de la mortalité par cancer en France en 2010. Rapport technique 2012.
2. Tejler G, Aspegren K. Complications and hospital stay after surgery for breast cancer: a prospective study of 385 patients. *Br J Surg*. 1985 juill;72(7):542–4.
3. Tadych K, Donegan WL. Postmastectomy seromas and wound drainage. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*. 1987 déc;165(6):483–7.
4. Bryant M, Baum M. Postoperative seroma following mastectomy and axillary dissection. *Br J Surg*. 1987 déc;74(12):1187.
5. Aitken DR, Hunsaker R, James AG. Prevention of seromas following mastectomy and axillary dissection. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*. 1984 avr;158(4):327–30.
6. Hayes JA, Bryan RM. Wound healing following mastectomy. *Aust N Z J Surg*. 1984 févr;54(1):25–7.
7. Boostrom SY, Throckmorton AD, Boughey JC, Holifield AC, Zakaria S, Hoskin TL, et al. Incidence of clinically significant seroma after breast and axillary surgery. *J. Am. Coll. Surg*. 2009 janv;208(1):148–50.
8. Agrawal A, Ayantunde AA, Cheung KL. Concepts of seroma formation and prevention in breast cancer surgery. *ANZ J Surg*. 2006 déc;76(12):1088–95.
9. Pogson CJ, Adwani A, Ebbs SR. Seroma following breast cancer surgery. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2003 nov;29(9):711–7.
10. Barton A, Blitz M, Callahan D, Yakimets W, Adams D, Dabbs K. Early removal of postmastectomy drains is not beneficial: results from a halted randomized controlled trial. *Am. J. Surg*. 2006 mai;191(5):652–6.

11. Kuroi K, Shimosuma K, Taguchi T, Imai H, Yamashiro H, Ohsumi S, et al. Evidence-based risk factors for seroma formation in breast surgery. *Jpn. J. Clin. Oncol.* 2006 avr;36(4):197–206.
12. Schwabegger AH, Ninkovic MM, Anderl H. Fibrin glue to prevent seroma formation. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1998 mai;101(6):1744.
13. Saltz R, Sierra D, Feldman D, Saltz MB, Dimick A, Vasconez LO. Experimental and clinical applications of fibrin glue. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1991 déc;88(6):1005–15; discussion 1016–7.
14. Harada RN, Pressler VM, McNamara JJ. Fibrin glue reduces seroma formation in the rat after mastectomy. *Surg Gynecol Obstet.* 1992 nov;175(5):450–4.
15. Sanders RP, Goodman NC, Amiss LR Jr, Pierce RA, Moore MM, Marx G, et al. Effect of fibrinogen and thrombin concentrations on mastectomy seroma prevention. *J. Surg. Res.* 1996 févr 15;61(1):65–70.
16. Kulber DA, Bacilious N, Peters ED, Gayle LB, Hoffman L. The use of fibrin sealant in the prevention of seromas. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1997 mars;99(3):842–9; discussion 850–1.
17. Butler CE. Treatment of refractory donor-site seromas with percutaneous instillation of fibrin sealant. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 2006 mars;117(3):976–85.
18. Jain PK, Sowdi R, Anderson ADG, MacFie J. Randomized clinical trial investigating the use of drains and fibrin sealant following surgery for breast cancer. *Br J Surg.* 2004 janv;91(1):54–60.
19. Taghizadeh R, Shoaib T, Hart AM, Weiler-Mithoff EM. Triamcinolone reduces seroma re-accumulation in the extended latissimus dorsi donor site. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* 2008 juin;61(6):636–42.

- 1  
2  
3 20. Rice DC, Morris SM, Sarr MG, Farnell MB, van Heerden JA, Grant CS, et al.  
4  
5 Intraoperative topical tetracycline sclerotherapy following mastectomy: a prospective,  
6  
7 randomized trial. *J Surg Oncol*. 2000 avr;73(4):224–7.  
8
- 9  
10 21. Kuroi K, Shimozuma K, Taguchi T, Imai H, Yamashiro H, Ohsumi S, et al. Effect of  
11  
12 mechanical closure of dead space on seroma formation after breast surgery. *Breast*  
13  
14 *Cancer*. 2006;13(3):260–5.  
15
- 16 22. Ten Wolde B, Van Den Wildenberg FJ, Keemers-Gels ME, polat F, Strobbe LJ. Quilting  
17  
18 prevents seroma formation following breast cancer surgery: closing the dead space by  
19  
20 quilting prevents seroma following axillary lymph node dissection and mastectomy. *Ann*  
21  
22 *Surg Oncol* 2014;21(3): 802-7.  
23
- 24 23. Ouldamer L, Caille A, Giraudeau B, Body G. Quilting suture of mastectomy dead space  
25  
26 compared with conventional closure with drain. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015 mars 18 (epub  
27  
28 ahead of print).  
29
- 30 24. Ouldamer L, Trefoux-Bourdet A, Duquesne M, Body G. [How I do ... quilting suture of  
31  
32 dead space after mastectomy]. *Gynecol Obstet Fertil*. 2011 nov;39(11):663–4.  
33
- 34 25. Ergina PL, Barkun JS, McCulloch P, Cook JA, Altman DG, IDEAL group. IDEAL  
35  
36 framework for surgical innovation 2: observational studies in the exploration and  
37  
38 assessment stages. *BMJ*. 2013;346:f3011.  
39
- 40 26. Boutron I, Moher D, Altman DG, Schulz KF, Ravaud P. Extending the CONSORT  
41  
42 statement to randomized trials of nonpharmacologic treatment: explanation and  
43  
44 elaboration. *Ann. Intern. Med*. 2008 févr 19;148(4):295–309.  
45  
46
- 47 27. Daltrey I, Thomson H, Hussien M, Krishna K, Rayter Z, Winters ZE. Randomized  
48  
49 clinical trial of the effect of quilting latissimus dorsi flap donor site on seroma  
50  
51 formation. *Br J Surg*. 2006 juill;93(7):825–30.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
28. Gisquet H, Delay E, Paradol P-O, Toussoun G, Delaporte T, Perol D. [Prevention of seroma by quilting suture after harvesting latissimus dorsi flap. The « Chippendale » technic]. *Ann Chir Plast Esthet*. 2010 avr;55(2):97–103.
  29. Dancey AL, Cheema M, Thomas SS. A prospective randomized trial of the efficacy of marginal quilting sutures and fibrin sealant in reducing the incidence of seromas in the extended latissimus dorsi donor site. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg*. 2010 mai;125(5):1309–17.
  30. Sakkary MA. The value of mastectomy flap fixation in reducing fluid drainage and seroma formation in breast cancer patients. *World Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2012 janv 11;10(1):8.
  31. Gonzalez EA, Saltzstein EC, Riedner CS, Nelson BK. Seroma formation following breast cancer surgery. *Breast J*. 2003 oct;9(5):385–8.
  32. Jeffrey SS, Goodson WH 3rd, Ikeda DM, Birdwell RL, Bogetz MS. Axillary lymphadenectomy for breast cancer without axillary drainage. *Arch Surg*. 1995 août;130(8):909–12; discussion 912–3.
  33. Soon PSH, Clark J, Magarey CJ. Seroma formation after axillary lymphadenectomy with and without the use of drains. *Breast*. 2005 avr;14(2):103–7.
  34. Boutron I, Tubach F, Giraudeau B, Ravaud P. Blinding was judged more difficult to achieve and maintain in nonpharmacologic than pharmacologic trials. *J. Clin. Epidemiol*. 2004 Jun;57(6):543–50.
  35. Jacquier I, Boutron I, Moher D, Roy C, Ravaud P. The reporting of randomized clinical trials using a surgical intervention is in need of immediate improvement: a systematic review. *Ann. Surg*. 2006 Nov;244(5):677–83.





## CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomised trial\*

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
<b>Title and abstract</b>			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	1
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	2
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	5
	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	6/7
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	6/7
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	7
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	7/8
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	8 to 10
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	10
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	NA
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	14
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	NA
<b>Randomisation:</b>			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	8 and 14
	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	8
Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	8
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those	13/14

		assessing outcomes) and how	
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	15/16
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	
<b>Results</b>			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome	NA
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	NA
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	NA
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	NA
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	NA
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	NA
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	NA
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	NA
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	NA
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	NA
<b>Discussion</b>			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	17/18
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	17/18
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	17/18
<b>Other information</b>			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	3
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	NA
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	19

\*We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see [www.consort-statement.org](http://www.consort-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Dead space closure with quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage for the prevention of seroma after mastectomy for breast cancer (QUISERMAS): protocol for a multicentre randomised controlled trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2015-009903.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Oct-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Ouldamer, Lobna; CHRU de Tours, Gynecology Bonastre, Julia; Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie; CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiologie and Population Health INSERM U1018 Paris-Sud Univ Brunet-Houdard, solene; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique Body, Gilles; CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, Giraudeau, Bruno; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC 1415 Caille, Agnès; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC 1415
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, Epidemiology < ONCOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Dead space closure with quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage for**  
4 **the prevention of seroma after mastectomy for breast cancer (QUISERMAS): protocol**  
5 **for a multicentre randomised controlled trial**  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **Lobna Ouldamer**<sup>1,2</sup>, **Julia Bonastre**<sup>3,4</sup>, **Solène Brunet-Houdard**<sup>5,6</sup>, **Gilles Body**<sup>1,5</sup>, **Bruno**  
12 **Girardeau**<sup>5,7</sup>, **Agnès Caille**<sup>5,7</sup>  
13  
14

15  
16 <sup>1</sup> CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology, Tours, France  
17

18 <sup>2</sup> INSERM unit 1069, Tours, France  
19

20 <sup>3</sup> Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie, Villejuif, F-94805, France  
21

22 <sup>4</sup> CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health, INSERM U1018, Paris-  
23 Sud Univ., Villejuif France  
24  
25

26 <sup>5</sup> Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre-Val de Loire Université, Tours, France  
27  
28

29 <sup>6</sup> CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique, Tours, France  
30

31 <sup>7</sup> CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC1415, Tours, France  
32  
33

34 **Corresponding author:**

35  
36 Lobna Ouldamer

37  
38 Service de Gynécologie. CHU Bretonneau

39  
40 2 Boulevard Tonnellé

41  
42 37000 TOURS (France)

43  
44 Phone: +33 (0) 2 47 47 47 41

45  
46 Fax: +33 (0) 2 47 47 92 73

47  
48 Email: l.ouldamer@chu-tours.fr  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

### Introduction

Postoperative wound seroma is common after mastectomy. This complication is associated with significant impact on patient outcomes and healthcare costs. The optimal closure approach for seroma prevention remains unknown but some evidence suggests that quilting suture of the dead space could lower the incidence of seroma. The aim of this trial is to compare seroma formation using quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage in patients undergoing mastectomy.

### Methods and analysis

This is a multicentre, superiority, randomised controlled trial in women undergoing mastectomy with or without axillary involvement. Exclusion criteria include indication of bilateral mastectomy or immediate reconstruction and any physical or psychiatric condition that could impair patient's ability to cooperate with postoperative data collection or that do not allow an informed consent. Three hundred and twenty participants will be randomised in a 1:1 ratio to receive either quilting suture or conventional wound closure with drain. The primary outcome is seroma requiring either aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following mastectomy. Secondary outcomes include seroma regardless of whether or not it requires an intervention, surgical site infection, pain score, cosmetic result, patient's quality of life, costs and cost-effectiveness. The primary analysis will be an intention-to treat analysis performed with a  $\chi^2$  test (or Fisher's exact test).

### Ethics and dissemination:

Written informed consent will be obtained from all participants. This study was approved by Tours Research ethics committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1, 2014-R20,

1  
2  
3 16/12/2014). Study findings will be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at  
4  
5 relevant national and international breast cancer conferences.  
6

7 **Trial registration number:**  
8

9 The QUISERMAS trial is registered with [clinicaltrials.gov](http://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT02263651).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009903 on 4 April 2016. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- QUISERMAS is the first multicentre randomised controlled trial to assess quilting suture of the dead space after mastectomy on seroma prevention.
- Surgeons and patients cannot be blinded to the surgical arm. Consequently, to reduce the risk of bias, we decided to consider for primary outcome only seroma requiring aspiration or surgical intervention.
- Cosmetic results will be assessed by an independent adjudication committee.
- An economic evaluation will be conducted alongside the trial.

peer review only

## Introduction

Breast cancer is the most common cancer worldwide. Surgical treatment is the preferred option and about 14.000 mastectomies are performed each year in France.<sup>1</sup> Postoperative seroma is a common complication after mastectomy.<sup>2-9</sup> This complication is secondary to the disruption of lymphatic channels that inevitably complicates extensive surgical dissection and disruption of tissue planes creating a dead space. Excessive fluid accumulation in a seroma stretches the skin, resulting in patient discomfort, impaired ipsilateral shoulder function and higher risk of surgical site infection (SSI). In rare cases, a fibrous encapsulated seroma forms that is resistant to conservative treatment and requires subsequent surgical resection. Thus, this complication may also impact healthcare costs requiring prolongation of hospital stay or unplanned outpatient visits and may delay adjuvant therapy.

Conventional wound closure commonly uses suction drain after mastectomy to prevent seroma despite seroma frequently occurs after drain removal.<sup>10</sup> Studies on seroma prevention have focused on the obliteration of the dead space through fibrinogen, thrombin sealants, glues or Tetracyclin with poor results.<sup>11-20</sup> Some recent evidence suggests that quilting suture reduces the incidence of seroma.<sup>21-23</sup> Quilting suture consists in suturing the skin flaps to the underlying musculature to reduce “dead space”<sup>24</sup>. It aims to restore the integrity of tissue planes. Ten Wolde et al<sup>22</sup>, retrospectively analysed 176 patients (87 who underwent conventional closure and 89 quilted patients) from two consecutive groups who underwent mastectomy and/or axillary lymph node dissection (ALND), this also included patients undergoing an ALND with lumpectomy in whom only the axilla was quilted. All patients had a drain in the pectoral area that was removed on the day of discharge, at least within 36 h following surgery. The incidence of seroma decreased significantly from 80.5% to 22.5 % in the quilted group,  $p < 0.01$  and the volume of aspirations from 1660 ml to 611ml ( $p = 0.05$ ). Quilting closure technique was also assessed in an observational study based on 119



1  
2  
3 consecutive patients in our tertiary breast cancer unit whose fifty-nine received quilting suture  
4 (without drain) and 60 received conventional closure with drainage. The results showed a  
5 significant reduction in seroma for patients with quilting suture as compared to patients with  
6 conventional closure with drain (odds ratio [OR] = 0.26, 95% Confidence Interval = 0.08-  
7 0.86; p=0.03) The hypothesis around quilting efficacy is that dead space is the major  
8 contributor to seroma formation, and that this surgical technique applied to obliterate the dead  
9 space might reduce the incidence of this complication.<sup>23</sup>

10  
11  
12 As recommended in the IDEAL framework describing the stages for development of  
13 innovation in surgery, quilting suture now needs to be assessed in a controlled randomised  
14 trial.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the aim of our project is to assess, in a randomised controlled trial, quilting  
15 suture of the dead space without drainage at the pectoral area as compared to conventional  
16 closure with drainage on seroma prevention within 21 days following mastectomy for breast  
17 cancer.

### 31 **Study objectives**

32  
33 Our primary objective is to assess the impact of quilting on rates of wound seroma requiring  
34 aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following mastectomy.

35  
36 Secondary objectives are to compare quilting suture of the dead space without drainage of the  
37 pectoral area to conventional closure with drainage after mastectomy for breast cancer  
38 regarding wound-related complications, surgical morbidity, pain, shoulder movement,  
39 cosmetic results, health related quality of life, costs and cost-effectiveness.

### 47 **Methods and analysis**

#### 49 **Study design**

50  
51 QUISERMAS is a multicentre, superiority, randomised controlled trial with parallel groups  
52 comparing quilting suture with conventional closure with drain in the prevention of seroma in  
53 patients undergoing mastectomy with or without axillary surgery.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Setting

The trial is ongoing at the time of publication in four French university hospitals (Tours, Nantes, Poitiers, Rennes). The study is conducted in the breast surgery departments of these academic centres.

## Participants

### Inclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria are: (1) Female patients with operable breast cancer (invasive carcinoma and/or ductal carcinoma in situ) for whom mastectomy is recommended or preferred by the patient either alone or in association with axillary clearance either sentinel lymph node biopsy or standard level I/II axillary node dissection, (2) Age  $\geq 18$  years and  $\leq 85$  years,

### Exclusion criteria

The exclusion criteria are: (1) Patients with an indication of bilateral mastectomy or immediate reconstruction, (2) Planned outpatient surgery, (3) Patients with known degenerative neuromuscular disease with thoracic muscular damage, (4) Patients with any physical or psychiatric condition that could impair with outcome assessment and intended follow-up.

Study participants are patients who meet the selection criteria and are willing and able to sign written informed consent.

## Recruitment

The first patient was randomised on October 2014. Enrolment is ongoing at the time of publication.

The recruitment process is planned to fit with routine practice. Potential participants to the trial are identified at the time they attend for diagnosis and treatment choice for their breast

1  
2  
3 cancer in one of the four involved tertiary-care centres. Patients who meet selection criteria  
4 receive a brief study presentation and full participant information sheet by a clinician. After  
5 selection criteria confirmation and answering to potential further patient questions about the  
6 trial, written informed consent is obtained before surgery by the patient's surgeon.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 Baseline data are collected following consent during the preoperative period.  
12

### 13 **Randomisation**

14  
15 Randomisation is undertaken by the surgeon (investigator) via a centralized secure web-based  
16 randomisation system. Randomisation in a 1:1 ratio is computer generated by an independent  
17 statistician from the INSERM CIC 1415 statistical unit. The allocation sequence is generated  
18 with a random permuted block design. Varying block sizes will not be revealed to ensure  
19 concealment. To avoid prognostic imbalance between the two groups, randomisation is  
20 stratified by recruiting centre and planned surgical procedure, either (A) mastectomy without  
21 axillary surgery, (B) mastectomy with sentinel lymph node biopsy or (C) mastectomy with  
22 standard level I/II axillary node dissection.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **Study interventions**

34  
35 Mastectomies are performed by experienced breast surgeons using a standardized technique.  
36  
37 The skin incision must include the tumor biopsy site, any invaded or oedematous skin, plus  
38 the nipple-areola complex. For dissecting the upper and lower skin flaps, finding the  
39 bloodless plane between the smaller lobules of the subcutaneous fat, and the larger lobules of  
40 the fat in the breast proper is required. Finally, the whole of the posterior aspect of the breast  
41 from the pectoralis major is freed. This study addresses the type of wound closure in  
42 mastectomy. So, only wound closure will differ between the two groups.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 Conventional closure with drain

52  
53 In the conventional closure with drain group, the skin flaps are not fixed subcutaneously but  
54 sutured at the edges, a closed suction drain is inserted under the flaps in the dead space  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 created by the dissection at the pectoral area. The drain is stitched to the skin. The skin is  
4 closed in two layers with absorbable sutures, a deep layer of 2.0 or 3.0 vicryl sutures or  
5 equivalent, and a subcuticular closure with absorbable 3.0 or 4.0 Monocryl sutures or  
6 equivalent. The drain is connected to a single suction bottle, which is changed every day, and  
7 the daily drain volume is monitored. The drain is removed on the day of discharge either  
8 when drain volume is less than 50 ml over 24 hours, regardless of time elapsed after surgery  
9 or at 5 days following surgery.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

### 18 Quilting suture

19  
20 In the quilting suture group, the skin flaps are sutured to the underlying pectoralis major with  
21 multiple parallel rows of 0/0 vicryl or equivalent. Running sutures at periodic intervals  
22 (<2cm) are placed from the skin flaps to the underlying muscle. Minor dimpling is considered  
23 acceptable and is expected to resolve. If severe dimpling is observed, stitches are removed  
24 and replaced. Efficiency of quilting suture relies on a rigorous repartition of the sutures with a  
25 special attention taken to the obliteration of the largest potential dead spaces and the empty  
26 axillary apex. The skin edges are sutured in the same way as for the control group. Closed  
27 suction is not used for draining the pectoral area.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 If an axillary lymph node dissection is required in any group (quilting suture or conventional  
42 closure), skin incisions performed for the mastectomy are used. After the insertion of a  
43 suction drain, the axillary area is closed with vicryl sutures to create a separation with the  
44 dead space, quilted or not, at the pectoral area. The drain is connected to a single suction  
45 bottle which is changed every day and the daily drain volume is monitored. The axillary drain  
46 is removed on the day of discharge either when drain volume is less than 50 ml over 24 hours  
47 regardless of time elapsed after surgery or at 5 days following surgery. Consequently, patients  
48 with axillary lymph node dissection have two drains and two suction bottles in the  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 conventional closure group and only one axillary drain and one suction bottle in the quilting  
4  
5 suture group.  
6

### 7 Surgeon expertise and intervention standardisation

8  
9  
10 The licensed French doctors who are involved in this trial as practitioners have all been  
11 certified by the French ministry of health, have at least one year of surgical experience (senior  
12 with at least one year of fellowship validated), and will have taken a course to ensure that they  
13 adhere strictly to the study protocol and are familiar with quilting suture. To standardize  
14 quilting suture across centres and surgeons, a training period of at least 2 months is required  
15 as recommended in the Randomised Trials of Non pharmacologic Treatment extension of  
16 CONSORT Statement.<sup>26</sup>  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **Study outcomes**

### 26 Primary outcome

27  
28  
29 The primary outcome is wound seroma requiring aspiration or surgical evacuation within 21  
30 days following mastectomy. A seroma is defined as a postoperative fluid collection via  
31 palpation on clinical examination. The Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events  
32 (CTCAE) 4.0 which is a descriptive terminology used for adverse event reporting, provides a  
33 grading scale for seromas (lymphoceles): (1) grade 1: asymptomatic, clinical or diagnostic  
34 observation only, intervention not indicated, (2) grade 2: symptomatic, medical intervention  
35 indicated, (3) grade 3: severe symptoms, radiologic endoscopic or elective operative  
36 intervention indicated. Only grade 2 and 3 seromas i.e. seromas requiring one or more  
37 aspirations or a surgical intervention will be considered as primary outcome.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 This outcome was chosen as the primary outcome for three reasons. First, this outcome  
52 measure was the most used as primary outcome in reported published trials evaluating and  
53 comparing the efficacy of different methods in reducing the incidence of seromas when  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 drainage wasn't used for all patients<sup>27-31</sup>. It reflects both patient morbidity and additional  
4  
5 medical costs. Focusing on seromas requiring interventions (aspiration or surgical  
6  
7 intervention) is a more objective criterion than the simple presence of seroma (on physical  
8  
9 exam or ultrasound finding). This allows to take into account only seromas having important  
10  
11 consequences for the patient, indeed some authors discovered that 92% of their patients had  
12  
13 seromas noted on ultrasound, but only less than half (42%) required aspiration of the seroma.  
14  
15<sup>32-33</sup>. Second, we did not wish to use the total inpatient drainage volume as a primary  
16  
17 outcome, because it implies to use suction drains in dead space in both study groups. Using  
18  
19 such a drain at the pectoral area while quilting the dead space is not the innovative technique  
20  
21 we wished to test because we believe that drains themselves encourage drainage by  
22  
23 stimulating tissue reactions or by suction. Moreover, even if we used suction drains in both  
24  
25 groups, the patients will not be blinded because quilting suture technique is responsible of  
26  
27 minor skin dimpling effect expected to resolve which does not exist with the conventional  
28  
29 closure technique. Finally, the only outcome that could be blind assessed is the cosmetic  
30  
31 result by an adjudication committee. However, this outcome is not as medically relevant as  
32  
33 seroma requiring intervention. We therefore chose to study the cosmetic result as a secondary  
34  
35 outcome. We therefore chose to study the cosmetic result as a secondary  
36  
37 outcome.  
38  
39

40  
41 In most cases, a patient will return to her initial centre if an aspiration or surgical intervention  
42  
43 for wound seroma is needed. These interventions will be collected in the patient medical  
44  
45 records. Nevertheless, each patient will be asked, at day 21 visit about seroma and the need  
46  
47 for aspiration or intervention since hospital discharge. In rare cases where patients will  
48  
49 mention seroma requiring aspiration or intervention in another centre or by their family  
50  
51 practionner, a physician will be contacted (either by phone or email) to validate the patient  
52  
53 report (the same procedure will be done for other wound related complications).  
54  
55

#### 56 Secondary outcomes

57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Secondary outcomes include:

4  
5 (1) Wound-related complications:

- 6  
7 - Wound seromas that necessitate aspiration or surgical intervention within 9 months  
8 following mastectomy.  
9  
10  
11 - For each patient presenting a seroma that necessitates aspiration, the total volume of  
12 aspiration and number of aspirations will be recorded.  
13  
14  
15 - Wound seroma whatever the grade at day 21 and 9 months after surgery.  
16  
17  
18 - Other wound- related complications such as hematoma, skin flap necrosis, surgical site  
19 infection at day 21 and 9 months after surgery.  
20  
21

22  
23 (2) Surgical morbidity: Duration of the surgical procedure and intraoperative blood loss,  
24 length of hospital stay after surgery (days), number of outpatient visits (related to  
25 mastectomy) needed following participant's discharge within the 9 months follow-up.  
26  
27

28  
29 (3) Pain: Patient self reported pain measured with the Visual Analogue Scale pain scoring  
30 system from 0 (no pain) to 10 (unbearable pain) recorded before surgery, daily during  
31 hospitalisation and at 21 days and 9 months after surgery.  
32  
33

34  
35 (4) Shoulder movement: The range of arm movement scored from 1 to 4 according to  
36 estimated angles of arm abduction as 1 (less than 90°), 2 (90-134°), 3 (135-179°) and 4  
37 (180°). It will be measured by the surgeon before surgery and also at 21 days and 9 months  
38 after surgery.  
39  
40

41  
42 (5) Cosmetic results: Both patient and surgeon assessments of the cosmetic results will be  
43 documented at day 21 and 9 months after surgery, with possible response categories as  
44 follows: poor, acceptable, good and excellent. Digital photographs of the mastectomy area  
45 will be taken with standardized angles of incidence at 9 months. Results will be rated at the  
46 end of the study, by an adjudication committee blinded to treatment allocation in order to  
47 obtain a blinded surgical cosmetic-assessment.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (6) Health related quality of life: the EuroQoL-5D (EQ-5D)-5L will be collected at baseline,  
4  
5 21 days and 9 months visits. The EQ-5D-5L is an update of the 3L version. It still consists of  
6  
7 2 pages – the EQ-5D-5L descriptive system and the EQ visual Analogue scale. The  
8  
9 descriptive system comprises the same 5 dimensions as the EQ-5D-5D-3L (mobility, self  
10  
11 care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression). However, each dimension now has  
12  
13 5 levels: no problems, slight problems, moderate problems, severe problems, and extreme  
14  
15 problems. The respondent is asked to indicate his/her health state by ticking in the box against  
16  
17 the most appropriate statement in each of the 5 dimensions. This decision results in a 1-digit  
18  
19 number expressing the level selected for that dimension. The digits for 5 dimensions can be  
20  
21 combined in a 5-digit number describing the respondent's health state.  
22  
23

24  
25 (7) Direct medical costs and cost-effectiveness.  
26  
27

### 28 29 **Follow-up**

30  
31 During follow-up, patients will receive usual care. All patients are followed for a 9-month  
32  
33 period, with follow-up visit at 21 days and 9 months following surgery. Those visits fit in  
34  
35 with routine follow-up after mastectomy in the participating centres.  
36  
37

### 38 39 **Blinding**

40  
41 It is not possible to blind patients or surgeons in our trial because of the nature of the studied  
42  
43 intervention, surgical intervention that depends on care provider, as for a large part of other  
44  
45 non pharmacologic interventions<sup>34-35</sup>. Moreover, blinding of outcome assessor is not feasible  
46  
47 for the primary outcome: seroma that require aspiration or surgical evacuation within 21 days  
48  
49 following mastectomy. Indeed, after discharge, patients can visit at any time (in emergency or  
50  
51 not) for a seroma or another postoperative complication. It is not possible to ensure that the  
52  
53 clinician who will examine the patient is not the same as the surgeon who operated this  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 patient. Moreover, as the patients cannot be blinded to the treatment allocation, it is difficult  
4  
5 to ensure that they will not disclose it to the surgeon (outcome assessor of the trial). An  
6  
7 adjudication committee blinded to treatment allocation aiming to *a posteriori* validates the  
8  
9 indication of aspiration or surgical evacuation of a seroma is not relevant in this study because  
10  
11 the decision depends on criteria that cannot be assessed retrospectively by photographs and  
12  
13 medical records only.  
14  
15

### 16 17 18 **Data management**

19  
20 Data is recorded on study specific case report forms (CRFs) via an electronic data capture  
21  
22 system (CS Online). To maintain participant's anonymity, CRFs are identified only by a  
23  
24 coded patient number and initials. All records that contain patient names or other identifying  
25  
26 information will be stored separately from the study records and can be identified only by the  
27  
28 coded patient number and initials. A data manager from the INSERM CIC 1415 biometry unit  
29  
30 verifies the data and sends queries for missing or inconsistent data.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 37 **Sample size**

38  
39 The study sample size is based on a comparison of quilting suture versus conventional wound  
40  
41 closure with drainage on seroma prevention. In our observational study data, 22% (n = 13/60)  
42  
43 of patients undergoing mastectomy with conventional wound suture developed a seroma that  
44  
45 required aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following surgery. Because of the  
46  
47 multicentre profile of our study, the rate of seroma could be greater. We thus assume a rate of  
48  
49 30 % in the control group. In the quilting suture, we expect to observe a rate of patients  
50  
51 developing a seroma of 15 %. With these assumptions, a two-sided type I error of 5% and  
52  
53 90% power, a sample size of 160 patients per group is needed. Therefore, we plan to enroll a  
54  
55 total of 320 patients.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

To recruit this number of patients a 24-month inclusion period is anticipated.

### **Statistical analyses**

The statistical analyses will follow an intention-to-treat approach. Analyses will be conducted using two sided significance tests at the 5% significance level. A participant flow diagram will be reported. Group characteristics at baseline will be studied with descriptive statistics. No statistical tests will be performed on baseline characteristics.

The primary outcome will be assessed as a rate, defined as the number of patients who experienced a seroma requiring aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following mastectomy divided by the number of patients randomised into this group. To compare the incidence rates between the two randomised groups, we will use a  $\chi^2$  test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.

Giving the patient profile, loss to follow-up is very unlikely. Generally, patients continue their follow-up in their original centre even if they move. However, if the case does occur, imputation of missing outcomes will be performed at least in a sensitivity analysis.

For secondary analysis, qualitative outcomes such as other postoperative wound-related complications, cosmetic results and shoulder movement will also be compared between the two arms using a  $\chi^2$  test or a Fisher's exact test. The duration of the surgical procedure, length of hospital stay, intraoperative blood loss, will be compared using Wilcoxon tests or Student t tests, as appropriate. Repeated measures such as pain evaluation and health-related quality of life will be analyzed using linear mixed-effects models to take into account the correlation of repeated measures from a given subject.

### **Economic evaluation**

A cost-effectiveness study will be performed on the basis of resource use and HRQOL data collected alongside the trial.

1  
2  
3 Direct medical costs will be assessed from the hospital and the payer perspectives in both  
4  
5 groups and during the whole follow-up period i.e. 9 months after surgery. For each patient,  
6  
7 we will collect the healthcare resource use both in the hospital setting and primary care  
8  
9 services. This covers the initial surgical stay (duration of the surgical procedure, number of  
10  
11 consumables (drains and sutures), length of stay), subsequent hospital stays due to  
12  
13 complications/infections, general practitioners and gynaecologist visits (over a 21-day period  
14  
15 following surgery only), and home nursing care visits (over a 21-day period only).

16  
17 To value resources, we will use the following unit costs information:

- 18  
19 - Hospital stays: diagnosis related group payment per discharge in the French prospective  
20  
21 payment scheme.  
22  
23 - Visits: General fee classification (Nomenclature Générale des Actes Professionnels) and the  
24  
25 reimbursement rate at the date of analysis.  
26  
27

28  
29 Health states will be valued into utility coefficients using data from the EuroQoL group  
30  
31 (European value set). It will allow computing QALYs for each patient in both groups.  
32

33  
34 Costs and QALYs will be compared between the two groups using non parametric tests.  
35  
36 Means and 95 % confidence intervals for costs, QALYS and incremental net monetary benefit  
37  
38 will be estimated using the non-parametric bootstrap method. Differences in costs and  
39  
40 differences in QALYs observed in the bootstrap replicates will be represented in the cost-  
41  
42 effectiveness plane. A cost-effectiveness acceptability curve will be computed.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **Ethics and dissemination**

This protocol was approved by local ethic research committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1, 2014-R20, 16/12/2014).

In conformity with the Declaration of Helsinki, all participants will sign a written informed consent form that describes this study and provides sufficient information for patients to make an informed decision about their participation. Consent will be obtained from patients before they undergo any study procedure. Participants may withdraw from the study at any time during the clinical trial without any impact on their care. In that event, data collected prior to participant withdrawal will be used in the trial analysis except if a participant requests removal of all her data from the database. Sponsor of the study may audit trial conduct as deemed appropriate. A formal amendment to the local research ethics committee will be required for any amendments to the study protocol which may impact the conduct of the study, or the potential safety of or benefits to patients will require, if needed an amendment will also be required from the National regulatory Agency for Security of Medicines and healthcare products (ANSM). Any protocol amendments will be communicated to investigators and oversight authority but also to trial participants and registries, if deemed necessary.

Reports will follow international guidelines: CONSORT Statement and Extension of the CONSORT Statement to Randomised Trials of Non pharmacologic Treatment. Research findings will be submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals regardless of whether or not they are statistically significant.. Authors will be individuals who have made key contributions to study design and conduct. Trial findings will also be submitted for presentation at scientific meetings. The study findings will also be presented at relevant national and international breast cancer conferences.

## Discussion

Previous reports in the literature have addressed the effect of quilting versus conventional closure with drainage after mastectomy for breast cancer on patient outcome. However, the studies reported to date are limited by small sample sizes, absence of randomization, concomitant use of drainage with quilting suture, and most studies were single centre initiatives that lacked sufficient power to inform surgical practice. Breast cancer surgeons appear to currently favour conventional wound closure with drainage, although current evidence suggests better patient outcomes with quilting suture. The QUISERMAS trial will aim to resolve these controversies by establishing the effectiveness of each method of mastectomy closure. This will have important clinical implications, as each wound closure type is easily applicable and already performed by breast cancer surgeons. A key limitation of the QUISERMAS trial is that surgeons and patients cannot be blinded to the surgical arms. This leaves the assessment of outcomes and decisions to intervene on seroma vulnerable to bias. A strength of our study is that it is designed to be a feasible, comparative effectiveness trial design that is similar to common clinical situations. Additionally, this clinical trial protocol was conducted to conform strictly to the CONSORT statement. The results of the QUISERMAS trial will be an important contribution in breast cancer surgery literature and are likely to lead changes in mastectomy closure. We expect that this study will provide the clinical basis and evidence that is required to perform quilting suture in routine when performing mastectomies.

## Author affiliations

<sup>1</sup> CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology, Tours, France

<sup>2</sup> INSERM unit 1069, Tours, France

<sup>3</sup> Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie, Villejuif, F-94805, France

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<sup>4</sup> CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health, INSERM U1018, Paris-Sud Univ., Villejuif France

<sup>5</sup> Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre-Val de Loire Université, Tours, France

<sup>6</sup> CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique, Tours, France

<sup>7</sup> CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC1415, Tours, France

### Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge Carine Coffre (data manager), Aurélie Darmaillacq (clinical research associate) and Rachel Fontenay (health economist) for their constructive support during preparation and conduct of the trial.

The authors would also like to express appreciation for the contributions from patients with breast cancer who will participate in this trial.

### Contributors

LO and AC helped to conceive and design the trial and wrote the manuscript. JB, BG and GB helped to conceive the trial and revised the manuscript. LO and GB will be investigators and will recruit patients and conduct the trial. AC planned the statistical analysis. LO and AC will supervise the trial. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

### Funding

This trial is supported by a grant from the French Ministry of Health (PHRC 2013).

1  
2  
3 **Competing interests** No, there are no competing interests.  
4  
5

6  
7 **Ethics approval** Tours Research Ethics Committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1,  
8  
9 2014-R20, 16/12/2014).  
10  
11

12  
13  
14 **Open Access** This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative  
15  
16 Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to  
17  
18 distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work noncommercially, and license their derivative  
19  
20 works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-  
21  
22 commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **References**

- 30  
31  
32 1. HCL, Invs, INCa, Francim, Inserm. Projections de l'incidence et de la mortalité par  
33  
34 cancer en France en 2010. Rapport technique 2012.  
35
- 36  
37 2. Tejler G, Aspegren K. Complications and hospital stay after surgery for breast cancer: a  
38  
39 prospective study of 385 patients. *Br J Surg.* 1985 july;72(7):542–4.  
40
- 41  
42 3. Tadych K, Donegan WL. Postmastectomy seromas and wound drainage. *Surg Gynecol*  
43  
44 *Obstet.* 1987 dec;165(6):483–7.  
45
- 46  
47 4. Bryant M, Baum M. Postoperative seroma following mastectomy and axillary  
48  
49 dissection. *Br J Surg.* 1987 dec;74(12):1187.  
50
- 51  
52 5. Aitken DR, Hunsaker R, James AG. Prevention of seromas following mastectomy and  
53  
54 axillary dissection. *Surg Gynecol Obstet.* 1984 apr;158(4):327–30.  
55
- 56  
57 6. Hayes JA, Bryan RM. Wound healing following mastectomy. *Aust N Z J Surg.* 1984  
58  
59 feb;54(1):25–7.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 7. Boostrom SY, Throckmorton AD, Boughey JC, Holifield AC, Zakaria S, Hoskin TL, et  
4 al. Incidence of clinically significant seroma after breast and axillary surgery. *J. Am.*  
5 *Coll. Surg.* 2009 jan;208(1):148–50.  
6  
7
- 8  
9 8. Agrawal A, Ayantunde AA, Cheung KL. Concepts of seroma formation and prevention  
10 in breast cancer surgery. *ANZ J Surg.* 2006 dec;76(12):1088–95.  
11  
12
- 13 9. Pogson CJ, Adwani A, Ebbs SR. Seroma following breast cancer surgery. *Eur J Surg*  
14 *Oncol.* 2003 nov;29(9):711–7.  
15  
16
- 17 10. Barton A, Blitz M, Callahan D, Yakimets W, Adams D, Dabbs K. Early removal of  
18 postmastectomy drains is not beneficial: results from a halted randomized controlled  
19 trial. *Am. J. Surg.* 2006 may;191(5):652–6.  
20  
21
- 22 11. Kuroi K, Shimozuma K, Taguchi T, Imai H, Yamashiro H, Ohsumi S, et al. Evidence-  
23 based risk factors for seroma formation in breast surgery. *Jpn. J. Clin. Oncol.* 2006  
24 apr;36(4):197–206.  
25  
26
- 27 12. Schwabegger AH, Ninkovic MM, Anderl H. Fibrin glue to prevent seroma formation.  
28 *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1998 may;101(6):1744.  
29  
30
- 31 13. Saltz R, Sierra D, Feldman D, Saltz MB, Dimick A, Vasconez LO. Experimental and  
32 clinical applications of fibrin glue. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1991 dec;88(6):1005–15;  
33 discussion 1016–7.  
34  
35
- 36 14. Harada RN, Pressler VM, McNamara JJ. Fibrin glue reduces seroma formation in the rat  
37 after mastectomy. *Surg Gynecol Obstet.* 1992 nov;175(5):450–4.  
38  
39
- 40 15. Sanders RP, Goodman NC, Amiss LR Jr, Pierce RA, Moore MM, Marx G, et al. Effect  
41 of fibrinogen and thrombin concentrations on mastectomy seroma prevention. *J. Surg.*  
42 *Res.* 1996 feb 15;61(1):65–70.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



16. Kulber DA, Bacilious N, Peters ED, Gayle LB, Hoffman L. The use of fibrin sealant in the prevention of seromas. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1997 mars;99(3):842–9; discussion 850–1.
17. Butler CE. Treatment of refractory donor-site seromas with percutaneous instillation of fibrin sealant. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 2006 mars;117(3):976–85.
18. Jain PK, Sowdi R, Anderson ADG, MacFie J. Randomized clinical trial investigating the use of drains and fibrin sealant following surgery for breast cancer. *Br J Surg.* 2004 jan;91(1):54–60.
19. Taghizadeh R, Shoaib T, Hart AM, Weiler-Mithoff EM. Triamcinolone reduces seroma re-accumulation in the extended latissimus dorsi donor site. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* 2008 june;61(6):636–42.
20. Rice DC, Morris SM, Sarr MG, Farnell MB, van Heerden JA, Grant CS, et al. Intraoperative topical tetracycline sclerotherapy following mastectomy: a prospective, randomized trial. *J Surg Oncol.* 2000 apr;73(4):224–7.
21. Kuroi K, Shimozuma K, Taguchi T, Imai H, Yamashiro H, Ohsumi S, et al. Effect of mechanical closure of dead space on seroma formation after breast surgery. *Breast Cancer.* 2006;13(3):260–5.
22. Ten Wolde B, Van Den Wildenberg FJ, Keemers-Gels ME, polat F, Strobbe LJ. Quilting prevents seroma formation following breast cancer surgery: closing the dead space by quilting prevents seroma following axillary lymph node dissection and mastectomy. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2014;21(3): 802-7.
23. Ouldamer L, Caille A, Giraudeau B, Body G. Quilting suture of mastectomy dead space compared with conventional closure with drain. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015 marsh 18 (epub ahead of print).

- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10
  - 11
  - 12
  - 13
  - 14
  - 15
  - 16
  - 17
  - 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - 21
  - 22
  - 23
  - 24
  - 25
  - 26
  - 27
  - 28
  - 29
  - 30
  - 31
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34
  - 35
  - 36
  - 37
  - 38
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41
  - 42
  - 43
  - 44
  - 45
  - 46
  - 47
  - 48
  - 49
  - 50
  - 51
  - 52
  - 53
  - 54
  - 55
  - 56
  - 57
  - 58
  - 59
  - 60
24. Ouldamer L, Trefoux-Bourdet A, Duquesne M, Body G. [How I do ... quilting suture of dead space after mastectomy]. *Gynecol Obstet Fertil*. 2011 nov;39(11):663–4.
25. Ergina PL, Barkun JS, McCulloch P, Cook JA, Altman DG, IDEAL group. IDEAL framework for surgical innovation 2: observational studies in the exploration and assessment stages. *BMJ*. 2013;346:f3011.
26. Boutron I, Moher D, Altman DG, Schulz KF, Ravaud P. Extending the CONSORT statement to randomized trials of nonpharmacologic treatment: explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med*. 2008 feb 19;148(4):295–309.
27. Daltrey I, Thomson H, Hussien M, Krishna K, Rayter Z, Winters ZE. Randomized clinical trial of the effect of quilting latissimus dorsi flap donor site on seroma formation. *Br J Surg*. 2006 july;93(7):825–30.
28. Gisquet H, Delay E, Paradol P-O, Toussoun G, Delaporte T, Perol D. [Prevention of seroma by quilting suture after harvesting latissimus dorsi flap. The « Chippendale » technic]. *Ann Chir Plast Esthet*. 2010 apr;55(2):97–103.
29. Dancey AL, Cheema M, Thomas SS. A prospective randomized trial of the efficacy of marginal quilting sutures and fibrin sealant in reducing the incidence of seromas in the extended latissimus dorsi donor site. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2010 may;125(5):1309–17.
30. Sakkary MA. The value of mastectomy flap fixation in reducing fluid drainage and seroma formation in breast cancer patients. *World Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2012 jan 11;10(1):8.
31. Gonzalez EA, Saltzstein EC, Riedner CS, Nelson BK. Seroma formation following breast cancer surgery. *Breast J*. 2003 oct;9(5):385–8.
32. Jeffrey SS, Goodson WH 3rd, Ikeda DM, Birdwell RL, Bogetz MS. Axillary lymphadenectomy for breast cancer without axillary drainage. *Arch Surg*. 1995 aug;130(8):909–12; discussion 912–3.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
33. Soon PSH, Clark J, Magarey CJ. Seroma formation after axillary lymphadenectomy with and without the use of drains. *Breast*. 2005 apr;14(2):103–7.
  34. Boutron I, Tubach F, Giraudeau B, Ravaud P. Blinding was judged more difficult to achieve and maintain in nonpharmacologic than pharmacologic trials. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 2004 Jun;57(6):543–50.
  35. Jacquier I, Boutron I, Moher D, Roy C, Ravaud P. The reporting of randomized clinical trials using a surgical intervention is in need of immediate improvement: a systematic review. *Ann. Surg.* 2006 Nov;244(5):677–83.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents\*

Section/item	Item No	Description	Addressed on page number
<b>Administrative information</b>			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	___1___
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	___1,3___
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	_____
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	_____
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	___19___
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	___1___
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	___1,19___
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	___The funder have no role in the cites actions___
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	___7,8,14 to 17___

1  
2  
3 **Introduction**  
4

5	Background and	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant	_____5,6_____
6	rationale		studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	
7				
8		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	_____6_____
9				
10	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	_____6, 10 to 13_____
11				
12	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group),	
13			allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	_____2,6_____
14				
15				
16	<b>Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes</b>			
17				
18	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will	_____7_____
19			be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	
20				
21	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and	_____7_____
22			individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	
23				
24	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be	_____8 to 10_____
25			administered	
26				
27		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose	_____NA_____
28			change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	
29				
30		11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence	_____10_____
31			(eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	
32				
33		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	_____13_____
34				
35	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood	_____10 to 13_____
36			pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg,	
37			median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen	
38			efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	
39				
40	Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for	_____7,8_____
41			participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				

1				
2				
3	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	____14,15____
4				
5				
6	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	____7, 14, 15_
7				

### 8 **Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)**

#### 9 Allocation:

10				
11				
12	Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions	____8____
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18	Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned	____8____
19				
20				
21				
22	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions	____8____
23				
24				
25	Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	____13,14____
26				
27				
28		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial	____NA____
29				
30				
31				

### 32 **Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis**

33				
34	Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	____14 to 16
35				
36				
37				
38				
39		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols	____13____
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				

1				
2				
3	Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	_____14_____
4				
5				
6				
7	Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol	_____15,16__
8				
9				
10		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)	____NA_____
11				
12		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)	_____1, 15_____
13				
14				
15				

### 16 **Methods: Monitoring**

17				
18	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed	_the trial does not require a DMC because we are only evaluating the closure technique and both techniques are known to be of minimal risk for patients_____
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial	_____NA_____
31				
32				
33	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	_____12_____
34				
35				
36	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor	_____17_____
37				
38				
39				

### 40 **Ethics and dissemination**

1				
2				
3	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	_____17_____
4				
5				
6	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	_____17_____
7				
8				
9				
10	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	_____8_____
11				
12				
13		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	_____NA_____
14				
15				
16	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	_____14_____
17				
18				
19	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	_____19_____
20				
21				
22	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	__The chief investigator will be given an access to the cleaned data set_____
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29	Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	_____NA_____
30				
31				
32	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	_____17_____
33				
34				
35				
36		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	_____17_____
37				
38		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	_____17_____
39				
40				

## Appendices



Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	___Available from request to the first author_____
Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	___NA___ -

\*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "[Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported](#)" license.

peer review only

# BMJ Open

## Dead space closure with quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage for the prevention of seroma after mastectomy for breast cancer (QUISERMAS): protocol for a multicentre randomised controlled trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2015-009903.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Oct-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Ouldamer, Lobna; CHRU de Tours, Gynecology Bonastre, Julia; Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie; CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiologie and Population Health INSERM U1018 Paris-Sud Univ Brunet-Houdard, solene; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique Body, Gilles; CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, Giraudeau, Bruno; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC 1415 Caille, Agnès; Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre Val de Loire Université, ; CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC 1415
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, Epidemiology < ONCOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Dead space closure with quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage for the prevention of seroma after mastectomy for breast cancer (QUISERMAS): protocol for a multicentre randomised controlled trial**

**Lobna Ouldamer<sup>1,2</sup>, Julia Bonastre<sup>3,4</sup>, Solène Brunet-Houdard<sup>5,6</sup>, Gilles Body<sup>1,5</sup>, Bruno Giraudeau<sup>5,7</sup>, Agnès Caille<sup>5,7</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology, Tours, France

<sup>2</sup> INSERM unit 1069, Tours, France

<sup>3</sup> Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie, Villejuif, F-94805, France

<sup>4</sup> CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health, INSERM U1018, Paris-Sud Univ., Villejuif France

<sup>5</sup> Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre-Val de Loire Université, Tours, France

<sup>6</sup> CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique, Tours, France

<sup>7</sup> CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC1415, Tours, France

**Corresponding author:**

Lobna Ouldamer

Service de Gynécologie. CHU Bretonneau

2 Boulevard Tonnellé. 37000 TOURS (France). Phone: +33 (0) 2 47 47 47 41

Fax: +33 (0) 2 47 47 92 73. Email: l.ouldamer@chu-tours.fr

Trial Sponsor :

University hospital of Tours

2 Boulevard Tonnellé

37044 Tours cedex 9. FRANCE

Mrs Violaine MIZZI

02 47 47 47 47

1  
2  
3 Abstract  
4  
5  
6

7  
8 **Introduction**

9  
10 Postoperative wound seroma is common after mastectomy. This complication is associated  
11 with significant impact on patient outcomes and healthcare costs. The optimal closure  
12 approach for seroma prevention remains unknown but some evidence suggests that quilting  
13 suture of the dead space could lower the incidence of seroma. The aim of this trial is to  
14 compare seroma formation using quilting suture versus conventional closure with drainage in  
15 patients undergoing mastectomy.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 **Methods and analysis**

24  
25 This is a multicentre, superiority, randomised controlled trial in women undergoing  
26 mastectomy with or without axillary involvement. Exclusion criteria include indication of  
27 bilateral mastectomy or immediate reconstruction and any physical or psychiatric condition  
28 that could impair patient's ability to cooperate with postoperative data collection or that do  
29 not allow an informed consent. Three hundred and twenty participants will be randomised in a  
30 1:1 ratio to receive either quilting suture or conventional wound closure with drain. The  
31 primary outcome is seroma requiring either aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days  
32 following mastectomy. Secondary outcomes include seroma regardless of whether or not it  
33 requires an intervention, surgical site infection, pain score, cosmetic result, patient's quality of  
34 life, costs and cost-effectiveness. The primary analysis will be an intention-to treat analysis  
35 performed with a  $\chi^2$  test (or Fisher's exact test).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 **Ethics and dissemination:**

51  
52 Written informed consent will be obtained from all participants. This study was approved by  
53 Tours Research ethics committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1, 2014-R20,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 16/12/2014). Study findings will be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at  
4  
5 relevant national and international breast cancer conferences.  
6

7 **Trial registration number:**  
8

9 The QUISERMAS trial is registered with [clinicaltrials.gov](http://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT02263651).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- QUISERMAS is the first multicentre randomised controlled trial to assess quilting suture of the dead space after mastectomy on seroma prevention.
- Surgeons and patients cannot be blinded to the surgical arm. Consequently, to reduce the risk of bias, we decided to consider for primary outcome only seroma requiring aspiration or surgical intervention.
- Cosmetic results will be assessed by an independent adjudication committee.
- An economic evaluation will be conducted alongside the trial.

peer review only

## Introduction

Breast cancer is the most common cancer worldwide. Surgical treatment is the preferred option and about 14.000 mastectomies are performed each year in France.<sup>1</sup> Postoperative seroma is a common complication after mastectomy.<sup>2-9</sup> This complication is secondary to the disruption of lymphatic channels that inevitably complicates extensive surgical dissection and disruption of tissue planes creating a dead space. Excessive fluid accumulation in a seroma stretches the skin, resulting in patient discomfort, impaired ipsilateral shoulder function and higher risk of surgical site infection (SSI). In rare cases, a fibrous encapsulated seroma forms that is resistant to conservative treatment and requires subsequent surgical resection. Thus, this complication may also impact healthcare costs requiring prolongation of hospital stay or unplanned outpatient visits and may delay adjuvant therapy.

Conventional wound closure commonly uses suction drain after mastectomy to prevent seroma despite seroma frequently occurs after drain removal.<sup>10</sup> Studies on seroma prevention have focused on the obliteration of the dead space through fibrinogen, thrombin sealants, glues or Tetracyclin with poor results.<sup>11-20</sup> The comparator in these studies was almost always conventional wound closure with suction drains as it is the most common practice. Some recent evidence suggests that quilting suture reduces the incidence of seroma.<sup>21-23</sup> Quilting suture consists in suturing the skin flaps to the underlying musculature to reduce “dead space”.<sup>24</sup> It aims to restore the integrity of tissue planes. Ten Wolde et al<sup>22</sup>, retrospectively analysed 176 patients (87 who underwent conventional closure and 89 quilted patients) from two consecutive groups who underwent mastectomy and/or axillary lymph node dissection (ALND), this also included patients undergoing an ALND with lumpectomy in whom only the axilla was quilted. All patients had a drain in the pectoral area that was removed on the day of discharge, at least within 36 h following surgery. The incidence of seroma decreased significantly from 80.5% to 22.5 % in the quilted group,  $p < 0.01$  and the volume of aspirations

1  
2  
3 from 1660 ml to 611ml (p=0.05). Quilting closure technique was also assessed in an  
4  
5 observational study based on 119 consecutive patients in our tertiary breast cancer unit whose  
6  
7 fifty-nine received quilting suture (without drain) and 60 received conventional closure with  
8  
9 drainage. The results showed a significant reduction in seroma for patients with quilting  
10  
11 suture as compared to patients with conventional closure with drain (odds ratio [OR] = 0.26,  
12  
13 95% Confidence Interval = 0.08-0.86; p=0.03) The hypothesis around quilting efficacy is that  
14  
15 dead space is the major contributor to seroma formation, and that this surgical technique  
16  
17 applied to obliterate the dead space might reduce the incidence of this complication.<sup>23</sup> As  
18  
19 recommended in the IDEAL framework describing the stages for development of innovation  
20  
21 in surgery, quilting suture now needs to be assessed in a controlled randomised trial.<sup>25</sup> Thus,  
22  
23 the aim of our project is to assess, in a randomised controlled trial, quilting suture of the dead  
24  
25 space without drainage at the pectoral area as compared to conventional closure with drainage  
26  
27 on seroma prevention within 21 days following mastectomy for breast cancer.  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Study objectives**

32  
33 Our primary objective is to assess the impact of quilting on rates of wound seroma requiring  
34  
35 aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following mastectomy.  
36  
37

38  
39 Secondary objectives are to compare quilting suture of the dead space without drainage of the  
40  
41 pectoral area to conventional closure with drainage after mastectomy for breast cancer  
42  
43 regarding wound-related complications, surgical morbidity, pain, shoulder movement,  
44  
45 cosmetic results, health related quality of life, costs and cost-effectiveness.  
46  
47

### 48 **Methods and analysis**

#### 49 **Study design**

50  
51 QUISERMAS is a multicentre, superiority, randomised controlled trial with parallel groups  
52  
53 comparing quilting suture with conventional closure with drain in the prevention of seroma in  
54  
55 patients undergoing mastectomy with or without axillary surgery.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Setting

The trial is ongoing at the time of publication in four French university hospitals (Tours, Nantes, Poitiers, Rennes). The study is conducted in the breast surgery departments of these academic centres.

## Participants

### Inclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria are: (1) Female patients with operable breast cancer (invasive carcinoma and/or ductal carcinoma in situ) for whom mastectomy is recommended or preferred by the patient either alone or in association with axillary clearance either sentinel lymph node biopsy or standard level I/II axillary node dissection, (2) Age  $\geq 18$  years and  $\leq 85$  years,

### Exclusion criteria

The exclusion criteria are: (1) Patients with an indication of bilateral mastectomy or immediate reconstruction, (2) Planned outpatient surgery, (3) Patients with known degenerative neuromuscular disease with thoracic muscular damage, (4) Patients with any physical or psychiatric condition that could impair with outcome assessment and intended follow-up.

Study participants are patients who meet the selection criteria and are willing and able to sign written informed consent.

## Recruitment

The first patient was randomised on October 2014. Enrolment is ongoing at the time of publication.

The recruitment process is planned to fit with routine practice. Potential participants to the trial are identified at the time they attend for diagnosis and treatment choice for their breast

1  
2  
3 cancer in one of the four involved tertiary-care centres. Patients who meet selection criteria  
4 receive a brief study presentation and full participant information sheet by a clinician. After  
5 selection criteria confirmation and answering to potential further patient questions about the  
6 trial, written informed consent is obtained before surgery by the patient's surgeon.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 Baseline data are collected following consent during the preoperative period.  
12

### 13 **Randomisation**

14  
15 Randomisation is undertaken by the surgeon (investigator) via a centralized secure web-based  
16 randomisation system. Randomisation in a 1:1 ratio is computer generated by an independent  
17 statistician from the INSERM CIC 1415 statistical unit. The allocation sequence is generated  
18 with a random permuted block design. Varying block sizes will not be revealed to ensure  
19 concealment. To avoid prognostic imbalance between the two groups, randomisation is  
20 stratified by recruiting centre and planned surgical procedure, either (A) mastectomy without  
21 axillary surgery, (B) mastectomy with sentinel lymph node biopsy or (C) mastectomy with  
22 standard level I/II axillary node dissection.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **Study interventions**

34  
35 Mastectomies are performed by experienced breast surgeons using a standardized technique.  
36  
37 The skin incision must include the tumor biopsy site, any invaded or oedematous skin, plus  
38 the nipple-areola complex. For dissecting the upper and lower skin flaps, finding the  
39 bloodless plane between the smaller lobules of the subcutaneous fat, and the larger lobules of  
40 the fat in the breast proper is required. Finally, the whole of the posterior aspect of the breast  
41 from the pectoralis major is freed. This study addresses the type of wound closure in  
42 mastectomy. So, only wound closure will differ between the two groups.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 Quilting suture

52  
53 In the quilting suture group, the skin flaps are sutured to the underlying pectoralis major with  
54 multiple parallel rows of 0/0 vicryl or equivalent. Running sutures at periodic intervals  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (<2cm) are placed from the skin flaps to the underlying muscle. Minor dimpling is considered  
4 acceptable and is expected to resolve. If severe dimpling is observed, stitches are removed  
5 and replaced. Efficiency of quilting suture relies on a rigorous repartition of the sutures with a  
6 special attention taken to the obliteration of the largest potential dead spaces and the empty  
7 axillary apex. The skin edges are sutured in the same way as for the control group. Closed  
8 suction is not used for draining the pectoral area.  
9

### 16 Conventional closure with drain

17  
18 In the conventional closure with drain group, the skin flaps are not fixed subcutaneously but  
19 sutured at the edges, a closed suction drain is inserted under the flaps in the dead space  
20 created by the dissection at the pectoral area. The drain is stitched to the skin. The skin is  
21 closed in two layers with absorbable sutures, a deep layer of 2.0 or 3.0 vicryl sutures or  
22 equivalent, and a subcuticular closure with absorbable 3.0 or 4.0 Monocryl sutures or  
23 equivalent. The drain is connected to a single suction bottle, which is changed every day, and  
24 the daily drain volume is monitored. The drain is removed on the day of discharge either  
25 when drain volume is less than 50 ml over 24 hours, regardless of time elapsed after surgery  
26 or at 5 days following surgery. Conventional closure with drain was chosen as the comparator  
27 group as it is the current practice in the centres where the study is conducted and more  
28 generally in European countries.<sup>10</sup>  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 If an axillary lymph node dissection is required in any group (quilting suture or conventional  
46 closure), skin incisions performed for the mastectomy are used. After the insertion of a  
47 suction drain, the axillary area is closed with vicryl sutures to create a separation with the  
48 dead space, quilted or not, at the pectoral area. The drain is connected to a single suction  
49 bottle which is changed every day and the daily drain volume is monitored. The axillary drain  
50 is removed on the day of discharge either when drain volume is less than 50 ml over 24 hours  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 regardless of time elapsed after surgery or at 5 days following surgery. Consequently, patients  
4 with axillary lymph node dissection have two drains and two suction bottles in the  
5 conventional closure group and only one axillary drain and one suction bottle in the quilting  
6 suture group.  
7  
8  
9

### 10 Surgeon expertise and intervention standardisation

11  
12 The licensed French doctors who are involved in this trial as practitioners have all been  
13 certified by the French ministry of health, have at least one year of surgical experience (senior  
14 with at least one year of fellowship validated), and will have taken a course to ensure that they  
15 adhere strictly to the study protocol and are familiar with quilting suture. To standardize  
16 quilting suture across centres and surgeons, a training period of at least 2 months is required  
17 as recommended in the Randomised Trials of Non pharmacologic Treatment extension of  
18 CONSORT Statement.<sup>26</sup>  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 **Study outcomes**

### 33 Primary outcome

34  
35 The primary outcome is wound seroma requiring aspiration or surgical evacuation within 21  
36 days following mastectomy. A seroma is defined as a postoperative fluid collection via  
37 palpation on clinical examination. The Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events  
38 (CTCAE) 4.0 which is a descriptive terminology used for adverse event reporting, provides a  
39 grading scale for seromas (lymphoceles): (1) grade 1: asymptomatic, clinical or diagnostic  
40 observation only, intervention not indicated, (2) grade 2: symptomatic, medical intervention  
41 indicated, (3) grade 3: severe symptoms, radiologic endoscopic or elective operative  
42 intervention indicated. Only grade 2 and 3 seromas i.e. seromas requiring one or more  
43 aspirations or a surgical intervention will be considered as primary outcome.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This outcome was chosen as the primary outcome for three reasons. First, this outcome  
4  
5 measure was the most used as primary outcome in reported published trials evaluating and  
6  
7 comparing the efficacy of different methods in reducing the incidence of seromas when  
8  
9 drainage wasn't used for all patients<sup>27-31</sup>. It reflects both patient morbidity and additional  
10  
11 medical costs. Focusing on seromas requiring interventions (aspiration or surgical  
12  
13 intervention) is a more objective criterion than the simple presence of seroma (on physical  
14  
15 exam or ultrasound finding). This allows to take into account only seromas having important  
16  
17 consequences for the patient, indeed some authors discovered that 92% of their patients had  
18  
19 seromas noted on ultrasound, but only less than half (42%) required aspiration of the seroma.  
20  
21  
22<sup>32-33</sup>. Second, we did not wish to use the total inpatient drainage volume as a primary  
23  
24 outcome, because it implies to use suction drains in dead space in both study groups. Using  
25  
26 such a drain at the pectoral area while quilting the dead space is not the innovative technique  
27  
28 we wished to test because we believe that drains themselves encourage drainage by  
29  
30 stimulating tissue reactions or by suction. Moreover, even if we used suction drains in both  
31  
32 groups, the patients will not be blinded because quilting suture technique is responsible of  
33  
34 minor skin dimpling effect expected to resolve which does not exist with the conventional  
35  
36 closure technique. Finally, the only outcome that could be blind assessed is the cosmetic  
37  
38 result by an adjudication committee. However, this outcome is not as medically relevant as  
39  
40 seroma requiring intervention. We therefore chose to study the cosmetic result as a secondary  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 outcome.

46  
47 In most cases, a patient will return to her initial centre if an aspiration or surgical intervention  
48  
49 for wound seroma is needed. These interventions will be collected in the patient medical  
50  
51 records. Nevertheless, each patient will be asked, at day 21 visit about seroma and the need  
52  
53 for aspiration or intervention since hospital discharge. In rare cases where patients will  
54  
55 mention seroma requiring aspiration or intervention in another centre or by their family  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 practionner, a physician will be contacted (either by phone or email) to validate the patient  
4  
5 report (the same procedure will be done for other wound related complications).  
6

### 7 Secondary outcomes

8  
9 Secondary outcomes include:

#### 10 (1) Wound-related complications:

- 11  
12  
13 - Wound seromas that necessitate aspiration or surgical intervention within 9 months  
14 following mastectomy.  
15  
16 - For each patient presenting a seroma that necessitates aspiration, the total volume of  
17 aspiration and number of aspirations will be recorded.  
18  
19 - Wound seroma whatever the grade at day 21 and 9 months after surgery.  
20  
21 - Other wound- related complications such as hematoma, skin flap necrosis, surgical site  
22 infection at day 21 and 9 months after surgery.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 (2) Surgical morbidity: Duration of the surgical procedure and intraoperative blood loss,  
30 length of hospital stay after surgery (days), number of outpatient visits (related to  
31 mastectomy) needed following participant's discharge within the 9 months follow-up.  
32  
33

34 (3) Pain: Patient self reported pain measured with the Visual Analogue Scale pain scoring  
35 system from 0 (no pain) to 10 (unbearable pain) recorded before surgery, daily during  
36 hospitalisation and at 21 days and 9 months after surgery.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 (4) Shoulder movement: The range of arm movement scored from 1 to 4 according to  
43 estimated angles of arm abduction as 1 (less than 90°), 2 (90-134°), 3 (135-179°) and 4  
44 (180°). It will be measured by the surgeon before surgery and also at 21 days and 9 months  
45 after surgery.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 (5) Cosmetic results: Both patient and surgeon assessments of the cosmetic results will be  
51 documented at day 21 and 9 months after surgery, with possible response categories as  
52 follows: poor, acceptable, good and excellent. Digital photographs of the mastectomy area  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

will be taken with standardized angles of incidence at 9 months. Results will be rated at the end of the study, by an adjudication committee blinded to treatment allocation in order to obtain a blinded surgical cosmetic-assessment.

(6) Health related quality of life: the EuroQoL-5D (EQ-5D)-5L will be collected at baseline, 21 days and 9 months visits. The EQ-5D-5L is an update of the 3L version. It still consists of 2 pages – the EQ-5D-5L descriptive system and the EQ visual Analogue scale. The descriptive system comprises the same 5 dimensions as the EQ-5D-5D-3L (mobility, self care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression). However, each dimension now has 5 levels: no problems, slight problems, moderate problems, severe problems, and extreme problems. The respondent is asked to indicate his/her health state by ticking in the box against the most appropriate statement in each of the 5 dimensions. This decision results in a 1-digit number expressing the level selected for that dimension. The digits for 5 dimensions can be combined in a 5-digit number describing the respondent's health state.

(7) Direct medical costs and cost-effectiveness.

### Follow-up

During follow-up, patients will receive usual care. All patients are followed for a 9-month period, with follow-up visit at 21 days and 9 months following surgery. Those visits fit in with routine follow-up after mastectomy in the participating centres. Schedule of enrolment, intervention and assessments are presented in table 1.

Timepoint	Baseline (inclusion)	Surgery Day 0	Hospitalization daily	Follow-up Day 21 (+/- 5 days)	Follow-up 9 months (+/- 15 days)
ENROLMENT					
Eligibility screen	X				
Informed consent	X				
Clinical Exam	X		X	X	X
Previous medical examination	X				

(Mammogram, Breast ultrasound, Breast MRI if required)					
Randomization (as close as possible to the surgery)		X			
INTERVENTION					
Quilting suture		X			
Conventional closure with drain		X			
ASSESSMENTS					
Wound seroma evaluation			X	X	X
Other wound complications			X	X	X
Pain score	X		Day 1 after surgery only, 1 <sup>st</sup> evaluation after 6 am	X	X
Photographs (for cosmesis assessment)					X
Range of arm movement	X			X	X
EQ-5D-5L questionnaire and cost evaluation	X			X	X
Patient/ Surgeon reported cosmesis assessment				X	X
Adverse Events			X	X	X

Table 1: Schedule of enrolment, intervention and assessments

Participant retention is promoted through the eligibility criteria (exclusion of patients with any physical or psychiatric condition that could impair with outcome assessment and intended follow-up). Moreover, loss to follow is unexpected because of the nature of the disease and relatively short follow-up i.e. 9 months.

### Blinding

It is not possible to blind patients or surgeons in our trial because of the nature of the studied intervention, surgical intervention that depends on care provider, as for a large part of other non pharmacologic interventions<sup>34-35</sup>. Moreover, blinding of outcome assessor is not feasible for the primary outcome: seroma that require aspiration or surgical evacuation within 21 days following mastectomy. Indeed, after discharge, patients can visit at any time (in emergency or not) for a seroma or another postoperative complication. It is not possible to ensure that the



1  
2  
3 clinician who will examine the patient is not the same as the surgeon who operated this  
4 patient. Moreover, as the patients cannot be blinded to the treatment allocation, it is difficult  
5 to ensure that they will not disclose it to the surgeon (outcome assessor of the trial). An  
6 adjudication committee blinded to treatment allocation aiming to *a posteriori* validates the  
7 indication of aspiration or surgical evacuation of a seroma is not relevant in this study because  
8 the decision depends on criteria that cannot be assessed retrospectively by photographs and  
9 medical records only.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 **Data management**

22 Data is recorded on study specific case report forms (CRFs) via an electronic data capture  
23 system (CS Online). To maintain participant's anonymity, CRFs are identified only by a  
24 coded patient number and initials. All records that contain patient names or other identifying  
25 information will be stored separately from the study records and can be identified only by the  
26 coded patient number and initials. A data manager from the INSERM CIC 1415 biometry unit  
27 verifies the data and sends queries for missing or inconsistent data.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 39 **Sample size**

40 The study sample size is based on a comparison of quilting suture versus conventional wound  
41 closure with drainage on seroma prevention. In our observational study data, 22% (n = 13/60)  
42 of patients undergoing mastectomy with conventional wound suture developed a seroma that  
43 required aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following surgery. Because of the  
44 multicentre profile of our study, the rate of seroma could be greater. We thus assume a rate of  
45 30 % in the control group. In the quilting suture, we expect to observe a rate of patients  
46 developing a seroma of 15 %. With these assumptions, a two-sided type I error of 5% and  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 90% power, a sample size of 160 patients per group is needed. Therefore, we plan to enroll a  
4  
5 total of 320 patients.  
6

7 To recruit this number of patients a 24-month inclusion period is anticipated.  
8  
9

### 10 11 **Statistical analyses**

12 The statistical analyses will follow an intention-to-treat approach. Analyses will be conducted  
13  
14 using two sided significance tests at the 5% significance level. A participant flow diagram  
15  
16 will be reported. Group characteristics at baseline will be studied with descriptive statistics.  
17  
18 No statistical tests will be performed on baseline characteristics.  
19  
20

21 The primary outcome will be assessed as a rate, defined as the number of patients who  
22  
23 experienced a seroma requiring aspiration or surgical intervention within 21 days following  
24  
25 mastectomy divided by the number of patients randomised into this group. To compare the  
26  
27 incidence rates between the two randomised groups, we will use a  $\chi^2$  test or Fisher's exact  
28  
29 test, as appropriate.  
30  
31

32 Giving the patient profile, loss to follow-up is very unlikely. Generally, patients continue their  
33  
34 follow-up in their original centre even if they move. However, if the case does occur,  
35  
36 imputation of missing outcomes will be performed at least in a sensitivity analysis.  
37  
38

39 For secondary analysis, qualitative outcomes such as other postoperative wound-related  
40  
41 complications, cosmetic results and shoulder movement will also be compared between the  
42  
43 two arms using a  $\chi^2$  test or a Fisher's exact test. The duration of the surgical procedure, length  
44  
45 of hospital stay, intraoperative blood loss, will be compared using Wilcoxon tests or Student t  
46  
47 tests, as appropriate. Repeated measures such as pain evaluation and health-related quality of  
48  
49 life will be analyzed using linear mixed-effects models to take into account the correlation of  
50  
51 repeated measures from a given subject.  
52  
53  
54

### 55 **Economic evaluation**

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 A cost-effectiveness study will be performed on the basis of resource use and HRQOL data  
4 collected alongside the trial.  
5

6  
7 Direct medical costs will be assessed from the hospital and the payer perspectives in both  
8 groups and during the whole follow-up period i.e. 9 months after surgery. For each patient,  
9 we will collect the healthcare resource use both in the hospital setting and primary care  
10 services. This covers the initial surgical stay (duration of the surgical procedure, number of  
11 consumables (drains and sutures), length of stay), subsequent hospital stays due to  
12 complications/infections, general practitioners and gynaecologist visits (over a 21-day period  
13 following surgery only), and home nursing care visits (over a 21-day period only).  
14  
15

16 To value resources, we will use the following unit costs information:  
17

- 18 - Hospital stays: diagnosis related group payment per discharge in the French prospective  
19 payment scheme.  
20
- 21 - Visits: General fee classification (Nomenclature Générale des Actes Professionnels) and the  
22 reimbursement rate at the date of analysis.  
23

24 Health states will be valued into utility coefficients using data from the EuroQoL group  
25 (European value set). It will allow computing QALYs for each patient in both groups.  
26

27 Costs and QALYs will be compared between the two groups using non parametric tests.  
28 Means and 95 % confidence intervals for costs, QALYS and incremental net monetary benefit  
29 will be estimated using the non-parametric bootstrap method. Differences in costs and  
30 differences in QALYs observed in the bootstrap replicates will be represented in the cost-  
31 effectiveness plane. A cost-effectiveness acceptability curve will be computed.  
32

### 33 **Monitoring**

34 No Data Monitoring Committee was formed because of the short duration of patient  
35 participation and known minimal risks for both arms. We did not plan any interim analysis.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

1  
2  
3 Adverse events will be collected and reported according using the usual reported system of  
4  
5 the sponsor.  
6  
7

### 8 9 10 **Ethics and dissemination**

11 This protocol was approved by local ethic research committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre  
12 - Ouest 1, 2014-R20, 16/12/2014).  
13

14 In conformity with the Declaration of Helsinki, all participants will sign a written informed  
15 consent form that describes this study and provides sufficient information for patients to make  
16 an informed decision about their participation. Consent will be obtained from patients before  
17 they undergo any study procedure. Participants may withdraw from the study at any time  
18 during the clinical trial without any impact on their care. In that event, data collected prior to  
19 participant withdrawal will be used in the trial analysis except if a participant requests  
20 removal of all her data from the database. Sponsor of the study may audit trial conduct as  
21 deemed appropriate. A formal amendment to the local research ethics committee will be  
22 required for any amendments to the study protocol which may impact the conduct of the  
23 study, or the potential safety of or benefits to patients will require, if needed an amendment  
24 will also be required from the National regulatory Agency for Security of Medicines and  
25 healthcare products (ANSM). Any protocol amendments will be communicated to  
26 investigators and oversight authority but also to trial participants and registries, if deemed  
27 necessary. The chief investigator will be given an access to the cleaned dataset.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Reports will follow international guidelines: CONSORT Statement and Extension of the  
48 CONSORT Statement to Randomised Trials of Non pharmacologic Treatment. Research  
49 findings will be submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals regardless of whether or  
50 not they are statistically significant. Authors will be individuals who have made key  
51 contributions to study design and conduct. Trial findings will also be submitted for  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 presentation at scientific meetings. The study findings will also be presented at relevant  
4  
5 national and international breast cancer conferences.  
6

## 7 **Discussion**

8  
9 Previous reports in the literature have addressed the effect of quilting versus conventional  
10 closure with drainage after mastectomy for breast cancer on patient outcome. However, the  
11 studies reported to date are limited by small sample sizes, absence of randomization,  
12 concomitant use of drainage with quilting suture, and most studies were single centre  
13 initiatives that lacked sufficient power to inform surgical practice. Breast cancer surgeons  
14 appear to currently favour conventional wound closure with drainage, although current  
15 evidence suggests better patient outcomes with quilting suture. The QUISERMAS trial will  
16 aim to resolve these controversies by establishing the effectiveness of each method of  
17 mastectomy closure. This will have important clinical implications, as each wound closure  
18 type is easily applicable and already performed by breast cancer surgeons. A key limitation of  
19 the QUISERMAS trial is that surgeons and patients cannot be blinded to the surgical arms.  
20 This leaves the assessment of outcomes and decisions to intervene on seroma vulnerable to  
21 bias. A strength of our study is that it is designed to be a feasible, comparative effectiveness  
22 trial design that is similar to common clinical situations. Additionally, this clinical trial  
23 protocol was conducted to conform strictly to the CONSORT statement. The results of the  
24 QUISERMAS trial will be an important contribution in breast cancer surgery literature and  
25 are likely to lead changes in mastectomy closure. We expect that this study will provide the  
26 clinical basis and evidence that is required to perform quilting suture in routine when  
27 performing mastectomies.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## 51 **Author affiliations**

52  
53 <sup>1</sup> CHRU de Tours, Department of Gynecology, Tours, France

54  
55 <sup>2</sup> INSERM unit 1069, Tours, France  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<sup>3</sup> Gustave Roussy, Service de Biostatistique et d'Epidemiologie, Villejuif, F-94805, France

<sup>4</sup> CESP, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health, INSERM U1018, Paris-Sud Univ., Villejuif France

<sup>5</sup> Université François-Rabelais de Tours, PRES Centre-Val de Loire Université, Tours, France

<sup>6</sup> CHRU de Tours, Unité d'Evaluation Médico-Economique, Tours, France

<sup>7</sup> CHRU de Tours, INSERM CIC1415, Tours, France

**Acknowledgements** The authors acknowledge Carine Coffre (data manager), Aurélie Darmaillacq (clinical research associate) and Rachel Fontenay (health economist) for their constructive support during preparation and conduct of the trial.

The authors would also like to express appreciation for the contributions from patients with breast cancer who will participate in this trial.

**Contributors** LO and AC helped to conceive and design the trial and wrote the manuscript. JB, BG and GB helped to conceive the trial and revised the manuscript. LO and GB will be investigators and will recruit patients and conduct the trial. AC planned the statistical analysis. LO and AC will supervise the trial. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Funding** This trial is supported by a grant from the French Ministry of Health (PHRC 2013). The funding source has no role in the design of this trial and will not have any role during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.

**Competing interests** No, there are no competing interests.

**Ethics approval** Tours Research Ethics Committee (CPP TOURS - Region Centre - Ouest 1, 2014-R20, 16/12/2014).

**Data sharing statement** Public Access There are no plans to grant public access to the full protocol, participant-level data or statistical code.

**Open Access** This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work noncommercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

## References

1. HCL, Invs, INCa, Francim, Inserm. Projections de l'incidence et de la mortalité par cancer en France en 2010. Rapport technique 2012.
2. Tejler G, Aspegren K. Complications and hospital stay after surgery for breast cancer: a prospective study of 385 patients. *Br J Surg*. 1985 july;72(7):542–4.
3. Tadych K, Donegan WL. Postmastectomy seromas and wound drainage. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*. 1987 dec;165(6):483–7.
4. Bryant M, Baum M. Postoperative seroma following mastectomy and axillary dissection. *Br J Surg*. 1987 dec;74(12):1187.
5. Aitken DR, Hunsaker R, James AG. Prevention of seromas following mastectomy and axillary dissection. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*. 1984 apr;158(4):327–30.
6. Hayes JA, Bryan RM. Wound healing following mastectomy. *Aust N Z J Surg*. 1984 feb;54(1):25–7.
7. Boostrom SY, Throckmorton AD, Boughey JC, Holifield AC, Zakaria S, Hoskin TL, et al. Incidence of clinically significant seroma after breast and axillary surgery. *J. Am. Coll. Surg*. 2009 jan;208(1):148–50.



- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10
  - 11
  - 12
  - 13
  - 14
  - 15
  - 16
  - 17
  - 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - 21
  - 22
  - 23
  - 24
  - 25
  - 26
  - 27
  - 28
  - 29
  - 30
  - 31
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34
  - 35
  - 36
  - 37
  - 38
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41
  - 42
  - 43
  - 44
  - 45
  - 46
  - 47
  - 48
  - 49
  - 50
  - 51
  - 52
  - 53
  - 54
  - 55
  - 56
  - 57
  - 58
  - 59
  - 60
8. Agrawal A, Ayantunde AA, Cheung KL. Concepts of seroma formation and prevention in breast cancer surgery. *ANZ J Surg.* 2006 dec;76(12):1088–95.
9. Pogson CJ, Adwani A, Ebbs SR. Seroma following breast cancer surgery. *Eur J Surg Oncol.* 2003 nov;29(9):711–7.
10. Barton A, Blitz M, Callahan D, Yakimets W, Adams D, Dabbs K. Early removal of postmastectomy drains is not beneficial: results from a halted randomized controlled trial. *Am. J. Surg.* 2006 may;191(5):652–6.
11. Kuroi K, Shimozuma K, Taguchi T, Imai H, Yamashiro H, Ohsumi S, et al. Evidence-based risk factors for seroma formation in breast surgery. *Jpn. J. Clin. Oncol.* 2006 apr;36(4):197–206.
12. Schwabegger AH, Ninkovic MM, Anderl H. Fibrin glue to prevent seroma formation. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1998 may;101(6):1744.
13. Saltz R, Sierra D, Feldman D, Saltz MB, Dimick A, Vasconez LO. Experimental and clinical applications of fibrin glue. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1991 dec;88(6):1005–15; discussion 1016–7.
14. Harada RN, Pressler VM, McNamara JJ. Fibrin glue reduces seroma formation in the rat after mastectomy. *Surg Gynecol Obstet.* 1992 nov;175(5):450–4.
15. Sanders RP, Goodman NC, Amiss LR Jr, Pierce RA, Moore MM, Marx G, et al. Effect of fibrinogen and thrombin concentrations on mastectomy seroma prevention. *J. Surg. Res.* 1996 feb 15;61(1):65–70.
16. Kulber DA, Bacilious N, Peters ED, Gayle LB, Hoffman L. The use of fibrin sealant in the prevention of seromas. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 1997 mars;99(3):842–9; discussion 850–1.
17. Butler CE. Treatment of refractory donor-site seromas with percutaneous instillation of fibrin sealant. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 2006 mars;117(3):976–85.



- 1  
2  
3 18. Jain PK, Sowdi R, Anderson ADG, MacFie J. Randomized clinical trial investigating the  
4 use of drains and fibrin sealant following surgery for breast cancer. *Br J Surg*. 2004  
5 jan;91(1):54–60.  
6  
7
- 8  
9 19. Taghizadeh R, Shoaib T, Hart AM, Weiler-Mithoff EM. Triamcinolone reduces seroma  
10 re-accumulation in the extended latissimus dorsi donor site. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet*  
11 *Surg*. 2008 june;61(6):636–42.  
12  
13
- 14 20. Rice DC, Morris SM, Sarr MG, Farnell MB, van Heerden JA, Grant CS, et al.  
15 Intraoperative topical tetracycline sclerotherapy following mastectomy: a prospective,  
16 randomized trial. *J Surg Oncol*. 2000 apr;73(4):224–7.  
17  
18
- 19 21. Kuroi K, Shimozuma K, Taguchi T, Imai H, Yamashiro H, Ohsumi S, et al. Effect of  
20 mechanical closure of dead space on seroma formation after breast surgery. *Breast*  
21 *Cancer*. 2006;13(3):260–5.  
22  
23
- 24 22. Ten Wolde B, Van Den Wildenberg FJ, Keemers-Gels ME, polat F, Strobbe LJ. Quilting  
25 prevents seroma formation following breast cancer surgery: closing the dead space by  
26 quilting prevents seroma following axillary lymph node dissection and mastectomy. *Ann*  
27 *Surg Oncol* 2014;21(3): 802-7.  
28  
29
- 30 23. Ouldamer L, Caille A, Giraudeau B, Body G. Quilting suture of mastectomy dead space  
31 compared with conventional closure with drain. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015 marsh 18 (epub  
32 ahead of print).  
33  
34
- 35 24. Ouldamer L, Trefoux-Bourdet A, Duquesne M, Body G. [How I do ... quilting suture of  
36 dead space after mastectomy]. *Gynecol Obstet Fertil*. 2011 nov;39(11):663–4.  
37  
38
- 39 25. Ergina PL, Barkun JS, McCulloch P, Cook JA, Altman DG, IDEAL group. IDEAL  
40 framework for surgical innovation 2: observational studies in the exploration and  
41 assessment stages. *BMJ*. 2013;346:f3011.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 26. Boutron I, Moher D, Altman DG, Schulz KF, Ravaud P. Extending the CONSORT  
4 statement to randomized trials of nonpharmacologic treatment: explanation and  
5 elaboration. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 2008 feb 19;148(4):295–309.
- 6  
7  
8  
9  
10 27. Daltrey I, Thomson H, Hussien M, Krishna K, Rayter Z, Winters ZE. Randomized  
11 clinical trial of the effect of quilting latissimus dorsi flap donor site on seroma  
12 formation. *Br J Surg.* 2006 july;93(7):825–30.
- 13  
14  
15  
16 28. Gisquet H, Delay E, Paradol P-O, Toussoun G, Delaporte T, Perol D. [Prevention of  
17 seroma by quilting suture after harvesting latissimus dorsi flap. The « Chippendale »  
18 technic]. *Ann Chir Plast Esthet.* 2010 apr;55(2):97–103.
- 19  
20  
21  
22 29. Dancey AL, Cheema M, Thomas SS. A prospective randomized trial of the efficacy of  
23 marginal quilting sutures and fibrin sealant in reducing the incidence of seromas in the  
24 extended latissimus dorsi donor site. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 2010 may;125(5):1309–17.
- 25  
26  
27  
28 30. Sakkary MA. The value of mastectomy flap fixation in reducing fluid drainage and  
29 seroma formation in breast cancer patients. *World Journal of Surgical Oncology.* 2012  
30 jan 11;10(1):8.
- 31  
32  
33  
34 31. Gonzalez EA, Saltzstein EC, Riedner CS, Nelson BK. Seroma formation following  
35 breast cancer surgery. *Breast J.* 2003 oct;9(5):385–8.
- 36  
37  
38  
39 32. Jeffrey SS, Goodson WH 3rd, Ikeda DM, Birdwell RL, Bogetz MS. Axillary  
40 lymphadenectomy for breast cancer without axillary drainage. *Arch Surg.* 1995  
41 aug;130(8):909–12; discussion 912–3.
- 42  
43  
44  
45 33. Soon PSH, Clark J, Magarey CJ. Seroma formation after axillary lymphadenectomy with  
46 and without the use of drains. *Breast.* 2005 apr;14(2):103–7.
- 47  
48  
49  
50 34. Boutron I, Tubach F, Giraudeau B, Ravaud P. Blinding was judged more difficult to  
51 achieve and maintain in nonpharmacologic than pharmacologic trials. *J. Clin.*  
52 *Epidemiol.* 2004 Jun;57(6):543–50.
- 53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 35. Jacquier I, Boutron I, Moher D, Roy C, Ravaud P. The reporting of randomized clinical  
4 trials using a surgical intervention is in need of immediate improvement: a systematic  
5 review. *Ann. Surg.* 2006 Nov;244(5):677–83.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only



SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents\*

Section/item	Item No	Description	Addressed on page number
<b>Administrative information</b>			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	___1___
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	___1,3___
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	_____
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	_____
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	___19___
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	___1___
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	___1___
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	___20___
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	___7,8,14 to 17___

1  
2  
3 **Introduction**  
4

5	Background and	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant	_____5,6_____
6	rationale		studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	
7				
8		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	_____5,6, 11_____
9				
10	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	_____6, 10 to 13_____
11				
12	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group),	
13			allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	_____2,6_____
14				

15  
16 **Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes**  
17

18	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will	_____7_____
19			be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	
20				
21	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and	_____7_____
22			individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	
23				
24	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be	_____8 to 10_____
25			administered	
26				
27		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose	_____NA_____
28			change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	
29				
30		11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence	_____10_____
31			(eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	
32				
33		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	_____13_____
34				
35	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood	_____10 to 13_____
36			pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg,	
37			median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen	
38			efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	
39				
40	Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for	a table was added
41			participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	
42				
43				
44				
45				

1				
2				
3	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	____14,15____
4				
5				
6	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	____7, 14, 15_
7				

### 8 **Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)**

#### 9 Allocation:

10				
11				
12	Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions	____8____
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18	Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned	____8____
19				
20				
21				
22	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions	____8____
23				
24				
25	Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	____13,14____
26				
27				
28		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial	____NA____
29				
30				
31				

### 32 **Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis**

33				
34	Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	____14 to 16
35				
36				
37				
38				
39		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols	____15____
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Data management 19 Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol \_\_\_\_\_ 14 \_\_\_\_\_

Statistical methods 20a Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol \_\_\_\_\_ 15,16 \_\_\_\_\_

20b Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses) \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_

20c Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation) \_\_\_\_\_ 1, 15 \_\_\_\_\_

**Methods: Monitoring**

Data monitoring 21a Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed \_\_\_\_\_ the trial does not require a DMC because we are only evaluating the closure technique and both techniques are known to be of minimal risk for patients \_\_\_\_\_

21b Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_

Harms 22 Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct \_\_\_\_\_ 12 \_\_\_\_\_

Auditing 23 Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor \_\_\_\_\_ 17 \_\_\_\_\_

**Ethics and dissemination**

1				
2				
3	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	_____17_____
4				
5				
6	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	_____17_____
7				
8				
9				
10	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	_____8_____
11				
12				
13		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	_____NA_____
14				
15				
16	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	_____14_____
17				
18				
19	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	_____19_____
20				
21				
22	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	___17_____
23				
24				
25	Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	_____NA_____
26				
27				
28	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	_____17_____
29				
30				
31		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	_____17_____
32				
33		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	_____20_____
34				
35				
36				
37	<b>Appendices</b>			
38				
39	Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	___Available from request to the first author_____
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	_____NA_____
			-

\*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "[Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported](#)" license.

For peer review only