President’s Message

E. Antonio Mangubat, MD Seattle, Washington

It has been an honor and a privilege to have served you over the past year.
Together we have made so many strides toward bringing our Society more into the mainstream of medicine, and I assure you we will continue to press forward. With this momentum, I expect that over the next year, the ISHRS:

1. Will establish Hair Restoration Surgery (HRS) as a specialty.
   a. Our Core curriculum for HRS has been accepted for publication.
   b. The ISHRS has applied to and expects to be accepted by the American Medical Association (AMA) Specialty and Service Society (the largest caucus in the AMA House of Delegates), bringing HRS a significant step closer to becoming a recognized medical specialty.

2. Will successfully undergo accreditation by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACMCE).

3. Will develop formal HRS education for physicians and assistants.

4. Will establish a Hair Foundation with the purpose of raising public awareness of how far we have advanced the art and science of hair restoration, promoting the specialty of HRS, and increasing the overall importance of hair to the public.

My dreams for the future of the ISHRS are to expand our specialty to include a membership exceeding 2,000 physicians, to hold a voting seat in the AMA House of Delegates, to have HRS recognized as a specialty by mainstream medicine, to have formal HRS training centers for physicians and assistants, and to make HRS as universally accepted as general medicine. These lofty visions are achievable as long as we stand together with common goals.

On a personal note, I must thank my friends and colleagues for their help and support during my years serving on the Board of Governors. Your insight and advice have been instrumental in helping me make decisions in the best interest of the Society.

I would like to recognize the extraordinary contributions of our executive director, Victoria Ceh. She is instrumental in the success of our organization, helping me organize, create, and execute a forward-thinking strategic plan this year, keeping us on track with ACMCE accreditation, and monitoring our financial status with extreme acumen, and in general, she personally takes charge of the ISHRS business, ensuring our success now and in the future. We are fortunate to have her on our team.

Again, it has been an honor serving as your president this year, and I look forward to contributing to our future. Our 13th Annual Scientific Meeting in Sydney is just around the corner. We are all gathering once again to push the art and science of HRS forward, and I look forward to sharing it with you.

With warmest regards,

E. Antonio Mangubat, MD

Less than one month away...
Have you registered yet?

www.ISHRS.org/13thAnnualMeeting.html
This issue of the Forum focuses on donor harvesting, and in particular, new ways to reduce the appearance of the donor scar. When we’re presented with a new technique, how do we really know it’s better than our current technique? We often rely on personal experience, of course. But new techniques are often difficult at first, and in our specialty, the results may not be apparent for a very long time. We may prematurely conclude a technique is worthless when it’s not (and vice versa). We all tend to resist change and do what’s comfortable, for better or worse.

One good reason to adopt a new technique is because we trust the experts or opinion leaders who introduced it at a conference or published it in a journal. An interesting study published in the Archives of Surgery showed that surgeons who participated in this survey believe that surgical “opinion leaders” do exist and could in fact influence them to change their surgical practices. But, unfortunately, our opinion leaders are human, too, and are often in disagreement with each other, changing their minds, or being proven wrong with the benefit of hindsight. On an amusing note, surgeons responding to the above study could not name any “opinion leaders” locally in their own towns but could only do so at the state or national level!

Another reason to adopt a new technique is because of a study. In other words, evidence-based surgery. It’s a great idea but very difficult to implement. In a recent review on the subject, Alam recommends that when testing a new surgical technique against a standard one, at least 50 to 200 subjects should participate to reduce both the chance that a difference is found that doesn’t really exist (“type I error”) and of reporting no difference when it really does exist (“type II error”).

How many of us have the time and resources to perform such studies? Even if enough subjects are studied, all of the variables involved in doing surgery create inevitable biases. Our studies in hair restoration surgery generally lack the power and sample size to be considered valid based on these criteria.

We recently learned that even the best studies, published in well-known, peer-reviewed journals, are subsequently disproved up to a third of the time! Having said this, we should continue to rely on our personal experience, opinion leaders, and studies. But we need to hone our critical thinking skills and keep in mind the inherent limitation of each approach to learning new techniques.

Jerry Cooley, MD

This issue of the Forum devoted to donor closure? While some might feel perplexed at such a project, it in fact makes sense. The “closure” represents the best effort of much of what we do. How we close a speech or lecture, how a novel reaches its conclusion, how a movie’s plot line is brought to a conclusion, all leave us with a lasting impression of what came before. So it is with the donor closure. At times, if one spends any time reading postings on the various Web sites, it seems that we are judged more based on the appearance of the donor scar than on the growth or design of the transplants themselves. In fact, I believe that hair transplant surgeons have spent more time, effort, and creativity fine-tuning the donor scar than surgeons in any other discipline have spent on the scars associated with other procedures.

In most cosmetic procedures, including rhytidectomy, blepharoplasty, and breast augmentation, scars are either hidden in hair-bearing areas or within skin folds. Patients understand that such scars will be present, and a very small number of patients seek scar correction. Why then do our patients expect perfection? Why are linear scars that are almost undetectable scars. When we’re presented with a new technique, how do we really know it’s better than our current technique? We often rely on personal experience, of course. But new techniques are often difficult at first, and in our specialty, the results may not be apparent for a very long time. We may prematurely conclude a technique is worthless when it’s not (and vice versa). We all tend to resist change and do what’s comfortable, for better or worse.
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Tricophytic Closure
continued from front page

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26 Patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor strip taken in two pieces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All closed with continuous 4-0 Nylon. Removed at 7 days.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Scar evaluation at 7 months by MM and staff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 RHSTricho:</td>
<td>10 better than LHS non-tricho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 slightly worse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 LHS Tricoho:</td>
<td>9 better than RHS non-tricho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 slightly worse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results after seven months proved to me that while tricophytic closure is not a panacea, and we still have aspects to learn, it is by and large significantly better than the non-tricophytic traditional closure in producing a much more camouflage and, therefore, less visible scar (Table 2 and Figure 3).

We need to think of tricophytic closure as the icing on the cake because we still need to produce as thin a scar as possible in the first place. We cannot expect a few follicular units next to the edge to cover a scar that is 3mm wide or greater.

There are many questions about producing a good scar as there are surgeons. These include: What is the effect of scalp laxity? Can we take a wider strip safely in loose scalps and, conversely, do we need to take a thinner strip in tight scalps? Does the scalp get tighter with each harvest? Shall we confine our graft numbers to that produced by a donor strip 1cm wide or less? Is it best to excise the previous scar in subsequent harvests or is it best to go to a new area? If we excise the scar, do we excise the deep part of it down to the fascia or do we stay just deep to the follicles? Is it best to undermine if the closure is a little tight, and if so, superiorly or inferiorly? Is it best to tumesce or not? What about cautery? Shall we leave pools of blood in the floor of the wound or leave it dry but cooked with cautery? Shall we suture tightly or loosely? Should we use double-layer closure or single-layer closure? Are staples better than sutures? If sutured, are they removed at 7, 10, or 14 days, and what about dissolving sutures?

The basic principles of good surgical practice apply here as much as in any other area of surgery. Start small, be careful and conservative, treat the tissues with respect, and above all else, “avoid tension.”

I recommend this little added manoeuvre of the tricophytic closure to all practitioners using strip donor harvesting. It is simple, easy to master, and takes little extra time. A DVD of the technique can be downloaded from www.norwooddaysurgery.com.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Scars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✧ Accurate apposition (dermis to dermis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Avoid tension: long, thin donor strips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Avoid tension: no massive megasessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Avoid tension: no multiple alopecia reductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Add tricophytic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Paradox of Crown Transplantation

The posterior region of the scalp has numerous designated anatomical terms, such as the crown, the vertex, and the tonsure, all which represent the area commonly referred to by the lay public as “the back of the scalp.” Hair loss in this area can be of considerable consternation for men who experience male pattern hair loss. Many patients with hair loss in this area seek some type of restoration procedure or medical therapy, or contemplate the use of a hairpiece. Transplant surgeons are sympathetic to these patients’ needs and recognize the immediate benefits of grafting this area. There is a common belief among the lay public that vertex area baldness eventually stops and hair loss is stabilized. The pretense that vertex baldness becomes stagnant is false, and patients need to be educated to this fact. The vertex zone will continually expand over time. The process is unrelenting. The five-year study conducted by Merck on male pattern baldness clearly demonstrated the progressive non-relenting course of male pattern baldness.

Because of the progressive nature of male pattern hair loss, this vertex represents a true paradox to surgeons. Transplanting this area generally satisfies both the patient’s and the surgeon’s short-term goals. However, the long-term cosmesis can be quite a different matter. As hair loss progresses, a halo of baldness will form around the transplanted zone. This appearance has no counterpart in nature and can be quite bizarre. Fortunately, most cases can be restored to a natural appearance with further transplantation. The long-term solutions may be less easily addressed. Limitations of transplantation are imposed due to the requirement of a large percentage of the donor reserves. Once the donor hair reserves become depleted, the halo will continue to progress and the “black hole” or the “bottomless pit” (referencing the fact that this area can consume the entire donor area and still leave the surgeon and patient desiring more grafts) becomes a major concern. Because there is no permanent border, the peripheral border will keep migrating, which will result in an island of central hair. This isolated tuft of transplanted hair can thus become more of a concern than the original bald or thinning state. Lessons of the past have shown that scalp reductions alone will not eliminate this problem.

Taking this into consideration, can the vertex be safely transplanted? If we possessed a crystal ball to aid in determining the extent of hair loss through one’s lifetime, then the vertex area could be transplanted with complete impunity. Currently, we cannot do so. The surgeon must realize the vertex area could be transplanted with complete impu-

The Safety Net

Transplanting the crown is indeed a decision that cannot be made lightly. The dogma that no vertex should be transplanted should not go unchallenged because there certainly are patients for whom this is not an issue. A 55-year-old with dense terminal hair and a small 6 to 10 centimeter oval area of alopecia on the vertex may indeed be a candidate. But for men under the age of 30, transplanting the vertex should be viewed with extreme skepticism. The ability to utilize medical therapy to stabilize male pattern hair loss has relieved some degree of concern that future hair loss will create a condition without a surgical remedy. However, finasteride is not the ultimate safety net. Even for the patient who is currently tolerating this drug and receiving the benefits of stabilization, there are a number of factors that do not allow medical therapy to be the panacea for vertex transplantation. First, the patient may develop a side effect to finasteride and be forced to withdraw the medication. Second, the patient may also find himself in a situation where he is no longer able to afford the drug. Third, the drug may be recalled due to unforeseen long-term problems. While this last scenario is quite unlikely, the possibility cannot be ignored. Thus, ongoing therapy with finasteride while transplanting the vertex should not be considered risk-free.

It is imperative the transplant surgeon shoulder the risk of vertex transplantation with the patient. He or she should guide the patient to the best decision. The lay public cannot comprehend the eventuality of the progressive nature of hair loss, and therefore, the above arguments often give way to the desire to alleviate the anxiety of the vertex baldness.

The Dilemma of Guidelines

In an effort to do what is best for the patient, many transplant surgeons feel that it is most important to maintain a good rapport with patients and convince them that any short-term benefit may have detrimental long-term consequences. Some surgeons feel that it may be appropriate to perform a small “conservative” session so that the patient will not go elsewhere and have what could be a potentially injurious procedure. The topic of guidelines continually resurfaces at meetings and discussions among concerned surgeons. Guidelines for vertex transplantation have not been created due to the fact that dogmatic views are seldom accepted in medicine. Published guidelines are difficult to embrace by experienced surgeons who recognize the need for occasional departure. These departures are critical to the practice of medicine and should be embraced and supported. Surgeons are wary of a legal community that has neither the desire nor the ability to recognize exceptions once guidelines have been published. Thus, well-meaning guidelines will work against the good of the whole in that they could be used against all surgeons in all cases of exceptions. It is not this author’s intent to create rigid guidelines with no flexibility. Our field deserves better.
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Views of Other Surgeons

Dr. Richard Shiell, Editor Emeritus of the Forum, with over 38 years of experience and thousands of cases, states: “It must always be remembered that the crown can become a bottomless pit into which vast numbers of grafts can be poured for minimal cosmetic benefit. If you want to be 100% secure then don’t do the crown area at all. Most of us can live with a little risk, however, and in carefully selected patients of 35 or over, where history and examination show that the risk of massive expansion is small, then the surgeon may agree to graft the crown. The potential risks and contra-indications must be explained to the patient and he must sign to say that he understands these risks. Under these conditions you should have a happy patient and there should be few problems in years to come.”

Dr. Bill Parsley lends his scholarly opinion on the subject: “My present ‘guideline’ is to not transplant the vertex until age 45. This doesn’t mean that I will transplant the vertex at that time; only that I postpone my decision until then. A person’s appearance is directly related to the facial framing of hair. The vertex has very little cosmetic impact. A balding vertex can cover an area of over 100cm² while expanding into normally used donor areas. I have seen many otherwise successful transplants ruined by trying to do too much. My ideal vertex patient is over 50, and has a small bald area with abrupt borders. Also, mature patients who have had their frontal and mid-scalps restored, yet have substantial donor hair remaining, are potential good candidates. I don’t try to plant too thickly and mainly use uniform density instead of graded density, which, in my opinion, makes future commitments more difficult. View the vertex as you would sirens on the rocks.”

Dr. Bobby Limmer, the father of modern transplantation, related the following: “The most difficult task the consulting physician faces is educating and convincing the hair loss patient that the frontal and mid-scalp restoration constitutes 90% of the value while vertex (crown) restoration produces the other 10%. The youthful patient is often the most difficult to convince as well as the most likely to develop substantial progression of his alopecia. There are no fixed rules, but these principles have served us well over the past 17 years of follicular unit transplantation methodology: 1) The frontal and mid-scalp restoration will be completed first. Only after that will the crown be considered. 2) Medical therapy, combined topical minoxidil and oral finasteride, will be used while the frontal and mid-scalp restoration grows in. 3) In those less than 45 years of age, the crown will not be transplanted. In those in which the crown is transplanted, the goal is to cover the area with a cosmetically acceptable but not maximal density coverage in order to conserve donor hair for the potential future needs.”

Will crown area transplantation eventually go the way of scalp reductions? Time will tell. Until then, it is our responsibility to protect our patient’s long-term cosmesis.

Primum non nocere

Dowling B. Stough, IV, MD

FURTHER READING