Reply to comment to “A comparison of Progrid[®] and Adhesix[®] self-adhering hernia meshes in an onlay model in the rat” M. Tabbara, C. Barrat (DOI: 10.1007/s10029-014-1258-0)

A. Petter-Puchner¹

Received: 27 March 2015 / Accepted: 11 April 2015 / Published online: 19 April 2015
© Springer-Verlag France 2015

We thank the authors for their elucidating letter to the editor. In reply, we have two remarks to make.

First, the defect size of 0.5 mm is small, but the setting led to sufficient results in terms of adherence with meshes fixed with fibrin sealant, synthetic glues, sutures, micro-grips. In consequence, even if inherent in the concept of Adhesix, the frequent dislocation is an inferior finding. We are aware of the manufacturer's recommendation of how to use Adhesix and have also pointed it out in the publication. However, if it is the Adhesix fixative gel or the fact that the mesh cannot dislocate much in confined anatomical spaces such as in Lichtenstein repair or Sublay remains speculative as there is no evidence.

Second, the thickness of the mesh was no problem in our opinion. Integration, as stated, was very good and we do not think that reducing thickness would have improved the outcome.

In conclusion, we stick with our recommendation not to use Adhesix in mesh positions allowing substantial lateral movement and to the concern of having encountered a fixation technique with limited efficacy.

Alexander Petter-Puchner

Conflict of interest Dr. Petter-Puchner has nothing to disclose.

This reply refers to the article available at doi:[10.1007/s10029-015-1366-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10029-015-1366-5).

✉ A. Petter-Puchner
alexander.petter@trauma.lbg.ac.at

¹ Vienna, Austria