

ROMANIAN NEUROSURGERY

Vol. XXXX | No. 2

June 2026

Outcomes of cranioplasty using
autologous bone or titanium mesh
following decompressive craniectomy:
differences in complications

R. Padshala,
N. Imam,
V. Shah,
K. Soladhra,
D. Velani,
A. Verma,
J. Modh,
Kushal Shah,
Kalpesh Shah



Outcomes of cranioplasty using autologous bone or titanium mesh following decompressive craniectomy: differences in complications

R. Padshala¹, N. Imam¹, V. Shah¹, K. Soladhra¹, D. Velani¹,
A. Verma¹, J. Modh¹, Kushal Shah¹, Kalpesh Shah²

¹ Department of Neurosurgery, Smt. NHL Municipal Medical College, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

² Department of Neurosurgery, Zydus Hospital, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

ABSTRACT

Background: Decompressive craniectomy (DC) is a life-saving procedure for neurocritical patients with conditions such as severe traumatic brain injury (TBI), ischemic stroke, and subarachnoid hemorrhage. However, it results in cranial defects that necessitate cranioplasty to restore skull integrity, protect brain function, and address cosmetic concerns. The choice of material — autologous bone (AB) or artificial materials like titanium mesh (TM) — remains controversial due to varying complication rates.

Methods: This comparative cross-sectional study evaluated 23 patients who underwent cranioplasty with AB (n=5) or TM (n=18) between January 2022 and March 2025 at SVP Hospital and NHL Medical College, Ahmedabad. Data on demographics, surgical timing, complications, and outcomes were analyzed. Complications included infections, bone flap resorption (BFR), wound dehiscence, and cosmetic outcomes.

Results: The overall complication rate was 43.47% (AB group: 80%, TM group: 33.33%). BFR occurred exclusively in the AB group (40%), while TM-related complications included surgical site infections, wound dehiscence, and persistent tenderness. Wound dehiscence and multiple bone fragments were significant risk factors for post-cranioplasty infections and BFR, respectively. Cosmetic satisfaction was comparable between groups (82.60% overall), but TM demonstrated shorter operation times, reduced bleeding, and shorter hospital stays.

Conclusion: Cranioplasty using TM showed advantages over AB in terms of lower complication rates, reduced operative time, and improved hospitalization outcomes. However, TM was associated with higher minor complications like wound dehiscence. For patients with larger bone defects, artificial materials may reduce BFR risks. Further prospective randomized trials are needed to validate these findings and optimize cranioplasty outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

In the last 2 decades, decompressive craniectomy (DC) has played an important role in saving neurocritical patients such as those sustaining severe traumatic brain injury (TBI), ischemic

Keywords

Autograft,
Bone resorption,
Cranioplasty,
Hematoma, Infection,
Titanium mesh



Corresponding author:
Renish Padshala

Department of Neurosurgery, Smt.
NHL Municipal Medical College,
Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

Copyright and usage. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>) which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is unaltered and is properly cited.

The written permission of the Romanian Society of Neurosurgery must be obtained for commercial re-use or in order to create a derivative work.

ISSN 2344-4959 (online)
ISSN 1220-8841 (print)

© Romanian Society of
Neurosurgery



First published
June 2026 by
London Academic Publishing
www.london-ap.uk

stroke, subarachnoid hemorrhage (SAH), severe intracranial infection, and intracranial tumor. As some trials have demonstrated the efficacy of decompressive hemicraniectomy (DC) for severe TBI in terms of reducing mortality and improving functional outcomes, it has been widely used as salvage treatment for malignant edema of the brain^{1,2,3,17,18,19,21,22}. Cranial defects cause not only irreversible damage to the neurological function and cognition of patients but also self-image issues^{4,5}. Therefore, cranioplasty has become a common procedure for patients with cranial defects. Cranial reconstruction can not only restore the esthetic contour of the skull to meet the psychological needs of patients, but also alleviate trephine syndrome, protect brain function, relieve abnormal cerebrospinal fluid circulation, and restore intracranial pressure adaptations^{6,7,77-80}.

Several materials, including autologous bone and various artificial materials, have been introduced for CP, but which material is best for CP still remains unclear^{16,20,23}. However, many factors such as the timing of surgical intervention, choice of different materials, and area of the calvarial defect can affect the treatment outcomes of cranioplasty and the occurrence of postoperative complications. One of the most debated factors is the choice of cranioplasty material. Biological compatibility should be considered when selecting materials, and there must be sufficient strength, stiffness, and durability that can protect brain function and restore skull shape and hair growth patterns²⁴.

In many cases, CP was performed using autologous bone (AB), which was obtained at the time of DC. AB is inexpensive and biocompatible, without any risk of disease transmission, and perfectly fits the skull defect. Among materials, autologous bone flaps are usually the first choice at most institutions^{13,14}. Autologous bone also has the potential to grow and fuse with bone at the surgical site and is psychologically acceptable to patients and their relatives¹⁵. However, complications such as surgical site infection and bone flap resorption (BFR) always remain possible^{13,14}. Cranioplasty is usually performed 2-3 months after craniectomy, so bone preservation should be considered in advance. Autologous bone flaps can be preserved by cryopreservation (placing the bone flap in a special refrigerator according to a pre-planned protocol) or

by placing the bone flap in a subcutaneous compartment in the abdominal wall.

Various artificial materials (e.g., polymethyl methacrylate, titanium, ceramics, and carbon fiber-reinforced polymers) have been produced to reduce these bioactive complications^{10,12,29}. Of these artificial materials, titanium mesh is generally considered the material of choice in moderate-sized to large craniectomy defects because it is biologically inert, strong, lightweight, and inexpensive to produce^{9,30}. These materials are malleable substitutes and require intraoperative molding, resulting in increased operation time. Additionally, depending on the surgeon's dexterity, it may result in poor cosmetic outcomes in patients with large defects. Furthermore, as advances in technology and imaging processes have enabled the production of large three-dimensional (3D) custom-made prefabricated plates, 3D customized titanium has been widely used¹⁰.

Titanium is characterized by strength, high biocompatibility, lack of corrosion, biological inertness, and satisfactory cosmesis³¹⁻³⁴, and the long-term outcome of patients who underwent CP with titanium mesh is more favorable compared with patients treated with CP using AB³³. A randomized controlled trial in Australia showed that patients using titanium mesh were less likely to undergo a second operation than those using autologous cranioplasty, and another study reported similar results^{37,38}. However, several studies have reported that CP with titanium material is strongly associated with wound or cosmetic complications^{8,9,11}.

The purpose of this study is to compare the complications of cranioplasty using autologous bone graft with titanium mesh implants. It also aims to show which cranioplasty method is effective, has the least complications, and provides the best results. Furthermore, a subgroup analysis to identify risk factors for complications in each group was performed.

METHODS

This is a comparative prospective study conducted between January 2022 and March 2025 in the Department of Neurosurgery, SVP Hospital and Smt. NHL Medical College, Ahmedabad.

Population Group: Patients over 18 years of age who underwent autologous bone/titanium mesh cranioplasty in our hospital were included. A total of

23 patients (5 patients who underwent CP using an autologous bone flap and 18 patients who underwent CP using a titanium mesh) were enrolled. A patient who had multiple bone fragments due to trauma (5), who had a smaller autologous bone than the craniotomy size defect (6), and who had infected autologous bone (2) underwent titanium mesh cranioplasty.

Data Collection Process: For patients who were posted for cranioplasty, previous clinical data on patients' demographic characteristics and possible risk factors — including age, sex, reason for primary operation, operative time for CP, and the interval between DC and CP — were collected. Based on the cause of DC, the patients were divided into two groups: 1) TBI including acute subdural hemorrhage, epidural hemorrhage, and traumatic intracranial hemorrhage (T-ICH); and 2) cerebrovascular accidents (CVA) including major infarction, subarachnoid hemorrhage, and spontaneous ICH. Patients who were less than 18 years and underwent DC at other hospitals were excluded. Patients who underwent DC due to infection and brain tumor were also excluded because of the small number of patients. Based on timing, CP was classified into early CP (<90 days after DC) and late CP (≥ 90 days after DC). Timing of the CP depended on the surgeon's decision according to the patient's condition.

Various complications after CP (e.g., postoperative surgical infections, wound dehiscence, and persistent pain after wound healing) were evaluated.

Surgical infection was defined clinically and radiologically by any evidence of infection, including fever, erythema, swelling, and elevated levels of inflammatory markers with evidence of infection on computed tomography (CT) using contrast medium. Mesh extrusion was defined as severe thinning of the soft tissue and skin to show implanted mesh patterns without wound dehiscence. Persistent tenderness at the surgical site was defined as severe pain caused by a gentle touch at the surgical site after the wound had totally healed without any dehiscence. Cosmetic outcome was categorized into two categories: 1) complete satisfaction, satisfied with appearance; 2) partial satisfaction, satisfied with appearance but not ideal (e.g., temporal dimple). Postoperative hemorrhage was defined as ipsilateral symptomatic hemorrhage on immediate postoperative CT scan after CP warranting

reoperation. Wound dehiscence was defined by the rupture or splitting of a previously closed surgical site, resulting in exposure of the implant. Overall complications were defined as all kinds of complications after CP.

We performed risk factor analysis both for overall complications in both groups and for specific complications (surgical site infection in the autologous bone flap group, and surgical site infection, extrusion, wound dehiscence, and persistent tenderness at the surgical site in the titanium mesh group). To summarize, age, sex, operative time for CP, flap size (autologous bone flap size or titanium mesh size), and the interval between DC and CP were analyzed as independent variables, and various complications (surgical infection and other problems) after CP in both groups were analyzed as dependent variables.

DC and CP Procedures

We performed DC when patients showed clinical deterioration resulting from refractory increased intracranial pressure despite the best possible medical treatment. All patients underwent standard unilateral frontotemporal-parietal craniectomy. The removed bone flap was separated from the adherent tissue and packed after sterilisation. The choice of material for CP depended on the surgeon's preference and the interval between DC and CP. We used autologous bone or titanium mesh. A patient who had multiple bone fragments, infected bone, or a smaller bone than the craniectomy size underwent titanium mesh cranioplasty.

Before performing CP, the patient's hair was completely removed with an aseptic medical shaver. The scalp was then washed with an aqueous solution, after which povidone-iodine solution was applied several times to the patient's entire head and left to dry. The previous skin incision was re-opened, and the fibrous layer between the artificial dura and galea was dissected and prepared for insertion of the autologous bone or titanium mesh. After the bone flap was washed several times with povidone-iodine and normal saline solution, the flap was re-implanted. A negative drain (no. 12) was placed. In the final step, the skin was closed with vicryl subcutaneous sutures and nylon skin sutures.

Statistical Analysis

Frequencies or percentages of variables and means and standard deviations for continuous variables

were used to present data. Data were presented as the mean and standard deviation for continuous variables and as the frequency or percentage for categorical variables. The analysis was carried out using the independent t-test and Fisher's exact test. A $p \leq 0.05$ was considered to indicate statistical significance. The confidence interval (CI) was set at 95%.

RESULTS

Between January 2022 and March 2025, 23 patients underwent CP with autologous bone and titanium mesh material at our institution. CP with AB was conducted in 5 patients; CP with titanium mesh was conducted in 18 patients. The mean clinical and radiological follow-up was 28.1 ± 5.1 months (range, 12-45). The patients included 19 males and 4 females. The mean age of patients at the time of CP was 41.5 ± 22.5 years (range, 19-64). The causes of DC were as follows: trauma (11 patients, 47.82%) and CVA (12 patients, 52.17%). The demographic data of the 23 patients are summarized in Table 1, and the two groups were well matched at baseline. No statistically significant difference in demographics was observed among the groups.

Table 1. Characteristics of 23 patients undergoing cranioplasty.

	AB Group (n=5)	TM Group (n=18)	p-value
Mean age (at cranioplasty)	32 ± 11.34 years	41.5 ± 22.5 years	0.73
Sex ratio (M/F)	4/1	15/3	0.12
Reason – Trauma	03 (4.13)	16 (14.87)	0.13
Reason – Cerebrovascular accident	02 (0.87)	02 (3.13)	
Timing – Early surgery (<90 d)	04 (2.39)	07 (8.61)	0.10
Timing – Late surgery (≥ 90 d)	01 (2.61)	11 (9.39)	
Site of DC – Right	04 (3.48)	12 (12.52)	0.5
Site of DC – Left	01 (1.52)	06 (5.48)	
Mean follow-up (months)	28.8 ± 9.4	29.1 ± 8.6	0.38




Figure 1. Autologous bone cranioplasty (AB). (a) Intraoperative image. (b) CT image.




Figure 2. Titanium mesh cranioplasty (TM). (a) Intraoperative image. (b) CT image.

The cosmetic outcomes in the AB group, including 4 patients, were completely satisfactory and 1 was partially satisfactory. The corresponding cosmetic outcomes in the TM group were 15 completely satisfactory and 3 partially satisfactory. No significant differences were observed between the two groups (χ^2 test: AB vs. TM, $p=0.75$). Duration of hospitalization and intraoperative parameters were also evaluated. The TM group demonstrated the shortest in-hospital stay compared with the AB group (one-way ANOVA with post-hoc analysis, $p=0.00$). Regarding the intraoperative parameters, patients in the AB group experienced a shorter operation time than those in the TM group (one-way ANOVA with post-hoc analysis, $p=0.00$). Clinical outcomes are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Outcomes of patients who underwent primary cranioplasty according to material.

	AB Group (n=5)	TM Group (n=18)	p-value
Time interval from DC to CP (days)	80.7 ± 58.6	87 ± 53.7	0.84
Cosmetic – Complete satisfaction	04 (4.13)	15 (14.87)	0.8
Cosmetic – Partial satisfaction	01 (0.87)	03 (3.13)	
Complication – Infection	01	03	0.00*
Complication – Bone flap resorption	02	00	
Complication – Wound dehiscence	00	02	
Complication – Implant displacement	00	00	
Complication – Postoperative hemorrhage	01	01	
Mean operation time (min)	188.3 ± 53.0	201.2 ± 55.5	0.00*
Average hospital stay (days)	16.7 ± 7.8	15.1 ± 5.8	0.01*

During the follow-up period, overall postoperative complications occurred in 10 (43.47%) of 23 patients (4 patients [17.39%] in the AB group, 6 patients [26.08%] in the TM group). Complications are summarized in Table 2.

Factors Affecting Post-CP Infection

A total of 4 cases (17.39%) of post-CP infection were observed among the 23 patients: 1 post-CP infection in the AB group (4.34%) and 3 post-CP infections in the TM group (13.04%). One infected implant was removed (Figure 3). Patient groups without post-CP infection were compared with those diagnosed with post-CP infection (Table 3).

Table 3. Univariate analysis comparing the no-infection and infection groups after cranioplasty.

Clinical parameter	No infection (n=19)	Infection (n=4)	p-value
Age $\geq$ 60 years	04 (5.78)	03 (1.22)	0.33
Age < 60 years	15 (13.22)	1 (2.78)	
Sex – Male	16 (15.7)	03 (3.3)	0.65
Sex – Female	03 (3.3)	01 (0.7)	
Timing – Early (<90 d)	09 (9.09)	2 (1.91)	0.92
Timing – Late ($\geq$ 90 d)	10 (9.91)	2 (2.09)	
Location – Right	14 (13.22)	02 (2.78)	0.34
Location – Left	05 (5.78)	02 (1.22)	
Cause – Trauma	18 (15.7)	01 (3.3)	0.0008*
Cause – Vascular accident	01 (3.3)	03 (0.7)	
Implant – Autologous bone	03 (4.13)	02 (0.87)	0.13
Implant – Titanium mesh	16 (14.87)	02 (3.13)	
Wound dehiscence – No	03 (4.13)	02 (0.87)	0.13
Wound dehiscence – Yes	16 (14.87)	02 (3.13)	
Operation time (min)	184.6 $\pm$ 48.3	241.7 $\pm$ 55.6	0.07




Figure 3. Exposed mesh in an operated case of titanium mesh cranioplasty. (a) First site, over the frontal region. (b) Second site, over the parietal region.

Wound dehiscence was a significant risk factor only for post-CP infection. The type of implant and the timing of surgery were not associated with a higher infection rate after CP. The cause of DC trended toward statistical significance.

DISCUSSION

Cranial defects are a common cause of neurocognitive decline and are caused by a variety of mechanisms, such as craniocerebral pressure fluctuations, decreased cerebral blood flow, and changes in cerebrospinal fluid dynamics and brain metabolism⁶⁴. In addition, symptoms of epilepsy, brain atrophy, and brain subsidence caused by skull defects seriously affect the physiological and psychological health of patients^{4,65}. Therefore, cranioplasty, as a secondary operation for the treatment of skull defects, not only reconstructs the physical protection of brain tissue but also restores the contour of the skull, which is helpful for patients to maintain their societal and family functions⁶⁶.

However, with continuous improvements in cranioplasty techniques and technology, the surgical effect on patients with skull defects mainly depends on the repair materials. Various complications after CP were found, and regardless of which material was used, the rate of complications was relatively high^{8,9,30,39,40}. In patients treated with CP using an autologous bone flap, the rate of complications after CP was 80% (4/5), almost half of which consisted of BFR. The rate of complications in the titanium mesh group was also high, reaching 33.33%. However, a greater variety of complications was observed in patients who underwent CP with an autologous bone flap.

Titanium mesh plates have been introduced as an alternative material for autologous bone flap, with advantages including a low risk of tissue reaction and biological inertness, especially in patients with large bone defects¹¹. However, in this study, the risk of minor complications — including mainly cosmetic problems, such as extrusion, dehiscence, and exposure of the titanium mesh — was relatively high, reaching 55%.

There are some limitations of this study. The small sample size with a relatively short-term follow-up period and missing values due to loss to follow-up are important limitations in drawing generalizable conclusions. Furthermore, our study had a cross-sectional design and enrolled patients at

a single center. Hence, selection bias was not avoided.

Cosmetic Outcomes and Parameters

Regardless of the implanted material, the majority of patients (82.60%) were satisfied with the cosmetic results. AB or TM is user-friendly and perfectly matches the skull defect. Nevertheless, no significant differences in cosmetic outcomes were observed between the two groups. Unsatisfactory cosmetic outcome is mostly attributed to temporal hollowing resulting in atrophy of the frontal and temporalis muscle following the initial DC, rather than implant material. Additionally, other factors of cosmetic outcome unrelated to implant material include hair length, location of the defect, and skin thickness. In the present study, cosmetic outcome was not associated with the implant material, and synthetic materials represent an attractive alternative option comparable to AB.

The TM group showed a shorter operation time and less bleeding loss than the AB group. Theoretically, the parameters should be similar in the AB and TM groups, since both implants require an intraoperative molding process. It is assumed that the additional operation time and bleeding are caused by differences in timing of surgery between the two groups. In the present study, the number of patients undergoing early CP in the TM group was higher than in the AB group. The longer the time interval separating DC from CP, the greater the time needed for dissection of scalp from the dura. Moreover, in cases of multiple skull fractures in the AB group, the additional operation time corresponds to the time needed for skull fixation with screws. The additional bleeding loss in the AB group is probably related to the timing of surgery and the longer operation time.

Factors Affecting Post-CP Infection

Considering the overall infection rate in cranial procedures varying between 1% and 2%, the overall infection rate of CP (10 cases, 43.47%) in this study demonstrated a high infection rate, consistent with other reports^{14,17}. A recent meta-analysis reported a lack of significant difference in infection rate between AB and titanium materials³⁴. There was a trend toward lower postoperative complication rates following PEEK cranioplasty versus autologous

grafts, and lower implant failure rates with PEEK versus titanium mesh implants⁶⁷.

In this study, the TM group showed a higher post-CP infection rate than the AB group. We speculated that TM contains a porous structure, which may induce bacterial proliferation. The timing of CP appears to be an important factor underlying post-CP infection and is still disputed⁵¹⁻⁵⁷. In this study, our results showed that the timing of CP had no effect on the incidence of post-CP infection (early CP, 18.18% vs. late CP, 16.66%; $p=0.92$). Although we did not statistically confirm that early CP had a lower infection rate than late CP, we were inclined to perform early CP if subsidence of brain edema was confirmed. Early CP facilitates dissection of the tissue planes with reduced intraoperative bleeding and operation time. For patients, this allows earlier rehabilitation and improvement of neurological function.

In our study, only wound dehiscence was significantly associated with post-CP infection, consistent with studies reported by Riordan and colleagues⁵⁹. CP patients undergo at least two or more surgical procedures at the same site, resulting in friable soft tissue, skin retraction, thinning, and reduction in scalp tensile force⁵⁸. Therefore, wound healing may be delayed, leading to skin colonization, which increases the risk of post-CP infection^{60,61}. However, due to the small number of patients ($n=23$), a cross-sectional study may not be precise in documenting the degree of wound dehiscence. Therefore, it is difficult to conclude whether the degree of wound dehiscence affects post-CP infection. Conversely, implant infection during the operation may be a cause of wound dehiscence. Sundseth et al.⁶² recommend tissue augmentation or tissue expansion of the scalp before CP in pediatric patients to minimize the chance of wound breakdown. Although this study is small, tissue augmentation before CP is a good preoperative procedure to reduce the incidence of wound dehiscence in specific patients.

CONCLUSION

A relatively high complication rate was observed after CP for surgical bone defects after DC for vascular accident. In comparison with AB, the TM group showed benefits in terms of post-CP complication rate, intraoperative blood loss, operation time, and in-hospital stay. Different

complications occurred depending on the material used. Another artificial material may be a better option in patients with a larger surgical bone defect. Furthermore, in order to reduce the rate of complications after CP with a titanium mesh plate, other artificial materials — especially without a mesh print — should be recommended. Among the parameters, wound dehiscence and multiple bone fragments were associated with post-CP infection and BFR, respectively. In order to substantiate these findings, a prospective randomized controlled trial will be required.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As always, we thank our professors for their consistent support and express our deep respect for their passion for treating trauma and CVA patients.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. First, it includes data from a single tertiary care institution. Second, it has a cross-sectional format and nonrandomized patient groups. Another limitation relates to known or unknown bias, such as different surgical indications and surgical techniques and/or lateralization of trauma patients in this area.

ABBREVIATIONS

DC: Decompressive Craniectomy, CP: Cranioplasty, TBI: Traumatic Brain Injury, AB: Autologous Bone, TM: Titanium Mesh.

REFERENCES

- Kim JH, Kim JH, Kwon TH, Chong K, Hwang SY, Yoon WK. Aseptic bone flap resorption after cranioplasty with autologous bone: incidence, risk factors, and clinical implications. *World Neurosurg* 2018;115:e111-8.
- Schuss P, Vatter H, Oszvald A, Marquardt G, Imöhl L, Seifert V, et al. Bone flap resorption: risk factors for the development of a long-term complication following cranioplasty after decompressive craniectomy. *J Neurotrauma* 2013;30:91-5.
- Agrawal D, Hussain N. Decompressive craniectomy in cerebral toxoplasmosis. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2005;24:772-773.
- Sveikata L, Vasung L, El RA, et al. Syndrome of the trephined: clinical spectrum, risk factors, and impact of cranioplasty on neurologic recovery in a prospective cohort. *Neurosurg Rev* 2022;45:1431-1443.
- Corallo F, Lo BV, Calabro RS, et al. Can cranioplasty be considered a tool to improve cognitive recovery following traumatic brain injury? A 5-years retrospective study. *J Clin Med* 2021;10:5437.
- Oliveira A, Amorim R, Brasil S, et al. Improvement in neurological outcome and brain hemodynamics after late cranioplasty. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2021;163:2931-2939.
- Mitchell KS, Anderson W, Shay T, et al. First-in-human experience with integration of wireless intracranial pressure monitoring device within a customized cranial implant. *Oper Neurosurg (Hagerstown)* 2020;19:341-350.
- Honeybul S, Morrison DA, Ho KM, Lind CR, Geelhoed E. A randomized controlled trial comparing autologous cranioplasty with custom-made titanium cranioplasty. *J Neurosurg* 2017;126:81-90.
- Mukherjee S, Thakur B, Haq I, Hettige S, Martin AJ. Complications of titanium cranioplasty – a retrospective analysis of 174 patients. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2014;156:989-98; discussion 998.
- Lai JB, Sittavornwong S, Waite PD. Computer-assisted designed and computer-assisted manufactured polyetheretherketone prosthesis for complex fronto-orbito-temporal defect. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2011;69:1175-80.
- Roh H, Kim J, Kim JH, Chong K, Yoon WK, Kwon TH, et al. Analysis of complications after cranioplasty with a customized three-dimensional titanium mesh plate. *World Neurosurg* 2019;123:e39-44.
- Thien A, King NK, Ang BT, Wang E, Ng I. Comparison of polyetheretherketone and titanium cranioplasty after decompressive craniectomy. *World Neurosurg* 2015;83:176-80.
- Dujovny M, Fernandez P, Alperin N, Betz W, Misra M, Mafee M. Post-cranioplasty cerebrospinal fluid hydrodynamic changes: magnetic resonance imaging quantitative analysis. *Neurol Res* 1997;19:311-6.
- Chang V, Hartzfeld P, Langlois M, Mahmood A, Seyfried D. Outcomes of cranial repair after craniectomy. *J Neurosurg* 2010;112:1120-4.
- Kim JH, Hwang SY, Kwon TH, Chong K, Yoon WK, Kim JH. Defining “early” cranioplasty to achieve lower complication rates of bone flap failure: resorption and infection. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2019;161:25-31.
- Dujovny M, Aviles A, Agner C, Fernandez P, Charbel FT. Cranioplasty: cosmetic or therapeutic? *Surg Neurol* 1997;47:238-241.
- Ferro JM, Crassard I, Coutinho JM, Canhão P, Barinagarrementeria F, Cucchiara B, et al. Decompressive surgery in cerebrovenous thrombosis: a multicenter registry and a systematic review of individual patient data. *Stroke* 2011;42:2825-2831.
- Fisher CM, Ojemann RG. Bilateral decompressive craniectomy for worsening coma in acute subarachnoid hemorrhage. Observations in support of the procedure. *Surg Neurol* 1994;41:65-74.
- Honeybul S, Ho KM. How “successful” is calvarial reconstruction using frozen autologous bone? *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2012;130:1110-1117.
- Kim BJ, Hong KS, Park KJ, Park DH, Chung YG, Kang SH. Customized cranioplasty implants using three-

- dimensional printers and polymethylmethacrylate casting. *J Korean Neurosurg Soc* 2012;52:541-546.
21. Polin RS, Shaffrey ME, Bogaev CA, Tisdale N, Germanson T, Bocchicchio B, et al. Decompressive bifrontal craniectomy in the treatment of severe refractory posttraumatic cerebral edema. *Neurosurgery* 1997;41:84-92; discussion 92-94.
22. Schwab S, Steiner T, Aschoff A, Schwarz S, Steiner HH, Jansen O, et al. Early hemicraniectomy in patients with complete middle cerebral artery infarction. *Stroke* 1998;29:1888-1893.
23. Segal DH, Oppenheim JS, Murovic JA. Neurological recovery after cranioplasty. *Neurosurgery* 1994;34:729-731; discussion 731.
24. Piazza M, Grady MS. Cranioplasty. *Neurosurg Clin N Am* 2017;28:257-265.
25. Dünisch P, Walter J, Sakr Y, Kalff R, Waschke A, Ewald C. Risk factors of aseptic bone resorption: a study after autologous bone flap reinsertion due to decompressive craniotomy. *J Neurosurg* 2013;118:1141-1147.
26. Grant GA, Jolley M, Ellenbogen RG, Roberts TS, Gruss JR, Loeser JD. Failure of autologous bone-assisted cranioplasty following decompressive craniectomy in children and adolescents. *J Neurosurg* 2004;100(2 Suppl Pediatrics):163-168.
27. Honeybul S, Ho KM. Long-term complications of decompressive craniectomy for head injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2011;28:929-935.
28. Matsuno A, Tanaka H, Iwamuro H, Takanashi S, Miyawaki S, Nakashima M, et al. Analyses of the factors influencing bone graft infection after delayed cranioplasty. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2006;148:535-540; discussion 540.
29. Lee L, Ker J, Quah BL, Chou N, Choy D, Yeo TT. A retrospective analysis and review of an institution's experience with the complications of cranioplasty. *Br J Neurosurg* 2013;27:629-35.
30. Hill CS, Luoma AM, Wilson SR, Kitchen N. Titanium cranioplasty and the prediction of complications. *Br J Neurosurg* 2012;26:832-7.
31. Cabraja M, Klein M, Lehmann TN. Long-term results following titanium cranioplasty of large skull defects. *Neurosurg Focus* 2009;26:E10.
32. Lee SC, Wu CT, Lee ST, Chen PJ. Cranioplasty using polymethyl methacrylate prostheses. *J Clin Neurosci* 2009;16:56-63.
33. Wiggins A, Austerberry R, Morrison D, Ho KM, Honeybul S. Cranioplasty with custom-made titanium plates – 14 years experience. *Neurosurgery* 2013;72:248-256; discussion 256.
34. Wind JJ, Ohaegbulam C, Iwamoto FM, Black PM, Park JK. Immediate titanium mesh cranioplasty for treatment of postcraniotomy infections. *World Neurosurg* 2013;79:207.e11-e13.
35. Stieglitz LH, Fung C, Murek M, et al. What happens to the bone flap? Long-term outcome after reimplantation of cryoconserved bone flaps in a consecutive series of 92 patients. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2015;157:275-280.
36. Lindner D, Schlothofer-Schumann K, Kern BC, et al. Cranioplasty using custom-made hydroxyapatite versus titanium: a randomized clinical trial. *J Neurosurg* 2017;126:175-183.
37. Honeybul S, Morrison DA, Ho KM, et al. A randomised controlled trial comparing autologous cranioplasty with custom-made titanium cranioplasty: long-term follow-up. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2018;160:885-891.
38. Honeybul S, Morrison DA, Ho KM, et al. A randomized controlled trial comparing autologous cranioplasty with custom-made titanium cranioplasty. *J Neurosurg* 2017;126:81-90.
39. Wiggins A, Austerberry R, Morrison D, Ho KM, Honeybul S. Cranioplasty with custom-made titanium plates – 14 years experience. *Neurosurgery* 2013;72:248-56; discussion 256.
40. Cabraja M, Klein M, Lehmann TN. Long-term results following titanium cranioplasty of large skull defects. *Neurosurg Focus* 2009;26:E10.
41. Kalfas IH. Principles of bone healing. *Neurosurg Focus* 2001;10:E1.
42. Ewald C, Duenisch P, Walter J, Götz T, Witte OW, Kalff R, et al. Bone flap necrosis after decompressive hemicraniectomy for malignant middle cerebral artery infarction. *Neurocrit Care* 2014;20:91-7.
43. Brommeland T, Rydning PN, Pripp AH, Helseth E. Cranioplasty complications and risk factors associated with bone flap resorption. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med* 2015;23:75.
44. Kriegel RJ, Schaller C, Clusmann H. Cranioplasty for large skull defects with PMMA (polymethylmethacrylate) or tutoplast processed autogenic bone grafts. *Zentralbl Neurochir* 2007;68:182-9.
45. Grant GA, Jolley M, Ellenbogen RG, Roberts TS, Gruss JR, Loeser JD. Failure of autologous bone-assisted cranioplasty following decompressive craniectomy in children and adolescents. *J Neurosurg* 2004;100(2 Suppl Pediatrics):163-8.
46. Liao CC, Kao MC. Cranioplasty for patients with severe depressed skull bone defect after cerebrospinal fluid shunting. *J Clin Neurosci* 2002;9:553-5.
47. Malis LI. Titanium mesh and acrylic cranioplasty. *Neurosurgery* 1989;25:351-355.
48. Marbacher S, Andres RH, Fathi AR, Fandino J. Primary reconstruction of open depressed skull fractures with titanium mesh. *J Craniofac Surg* 2008;19:490-495.
49. Honeybul S. Complications of decompressive craniectomy for head injury. *J Clin Neurosci* 2010;17:430-435.
50. Honeybul S, Ho KM. The current role of decompressive craniectomy in the management of neurological emergencies. *Brain Inj* 2013;27:979-991.
51. Yadla S, Campbell PG, Chitale R, Maltenfort MG, Jabbour P, Sharan AD. Effect of early surgery, material, and method of flap preservation on cranioplasty infections: a systematic review. *Neurosurgery* 2011;68:1124-1129; discussion 1130.

52. Archavlis E, Carvi Y, Nievas M. The impact of timing of cranioplasty in patients with large cranial defects after decompressive hemicraniectomy. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2012;154:1055-1062.
53. Beauchamp KM, Kashuk J, Moore EE, Bolles G, Rabb C, Seinfeld J, et al. Cranioplasty after postinjury decompressive craniectomy: is timing of the essence? *J Trauma* 2010;69:270-274.
54. Chang V, Hartzfeld P, Langlois M, Mahmood A, Seyfried D. Outcomes of cranial repair after craniectomy. *J Neurosurg* 2010;112:1120-1124.
55. Gooch MR, Gin GE, Kenning TJ, German JW. Complications of cranioplasty following decompressive craniectomy: analysis of 62 cases. *Neurosurg Focus* 2009;26:E9.
56. Piedra MP, Nemecek AN, Ragel BT. Timing of cranioplasty after decompressive craniectomy for trauma. *Surg Neurol Int* 2014;5:25.
57. Thavarajah D, De Lacy P, Hussien A, Sugar A. The minimum time for cranioplasty insertion from craniectomy is six months to reduce risk of infection – a case series of 82 patients. *Br J Neurosurg* 2012;26:78-80.
58. Reddy S, Khalifian S, Flores JM, Bellamy J, Manson PN, Rodriguez ED, et al. Clinical outcomes in cranioplasty: risk factors and choice of reconstructive material. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2014;133:864-873.
59. Riordan MA, Simpson VM, Hall WA. Analysis of factors contributing to infections after cranioplasty: a single-institution retrospective chart review. *World Neurosurg* 2016;87:207-213.
60. Bruce JN, Bruce SS. Preservation of bone flaps in patients with postcraniotomy infections. *J Neurosurg* 2003;98:1203-1207.
61. Cronquist AB, Jakob K, Lai L, Della Latta P, Larson EL. Relationship between skin microbial counts and surgical site infection after neurosurgery. *Clin Infect Dis* 2001;33:1302-1308.
62. Sundseth J, Sundseth A, Berg-Johnsen J, Sorteberg W, Lindegaard KF. Cranioplasty with autologous cryopreserved bone after decompressive craniectomy: complications and risk factors for developing surgical site infection. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2014;156:805-811; discussion 811.
63. Schuss P, Vatter H, Oszvald A, Marquardt G, Imöhl L, Seifert V, et al. Bone flap resorption: risk factors for the development of a long-term complication following cranioplasty after decompressive craniectomy. *J Neurotrauma* 2013;30:91-95.
64. Borha A, Chagnot A, Goulay R, et al. Cranioplasty reverses dysfunction of the solutes distribution in the brain parenchyma after decompressive craniectomy. *Neurosurgery* 2020;87:1064-1069.
65. Annan M, De Toffol B, Hommet C, et al. Sinking skin flap syndrome (or syndrome of the trephined): a review. *Br J Neurosurg* 2015;29:314-318.
66. Thien A, King NK, Ang BT, et al. Comparison of polyetheretherketone and titanium cranioplasty after decompressive craniectomy. *World Neurosurg* 2015;83:176-180.
67. Punchak M, Chung LK, Lagman C, et al. Outcomes following polyetheretherketone (PEEK) cranioplasty: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Neurosci* 2017;41:30-35.
68. Ogino A, Nakamichi M, Takeda K, et al. Cranial reconstruction using antibiotic-impregnated calcium phosphate bone cement with a titanium mesh sheet. *J Craniofac Surg* 2020;31:1452-1454.
69. Yang J, Sun T, Yuan Y, et al. Evaluation of titanium cranioplasty and polyetheretherketone cranioplasty after decompressive craniectomy for traumatic brain injury: a prospective, multicenter, non-randomized controlled trial. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2020;99:e21251.
70. Rosenthal G, Ng I, Moscovici S, et al. Polyetheretherketone implants for the repair of large cranial defects: a 3-center experience. *Neurosurgery* 2014;75:523-529; discussion 528-9.
71. Henry J, Amoo M, Taylor J, et al. Complications of cranioplasty in relation to material: systematic review, network meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Neurosurgery* 2021;89:383-394.
72. Camarini ET, Tomeh JK, Dias RR, et al. Reconstruction of frontal bone using specific implant polyether-etherketone. *J Craniofac Surg* 2011;22:2205-2207.
73. Alkhaibary A, Alharbi A, Alnefaie N, et al. Cranioplasty: a comprehensive review of the history, materials, surgical aspects, and complications. *World Neurosurg* 2020;139:445-452.
74. Andrabi SM, Sarmast AH, Kirmani AR, et al. Cranioplasty: indications, procedures, and outcome — an institutional experience. *Surg Neurol Int* 2017;8:91.
75. Cho YJ, Kang SH. Review of cranioplasty after decompressive craniectomy. *Korean J Neurotrauma* 2017;13:9-14.
76. Safi S, Ali A, Abdelhazef I, et al. Predictors of clinical outcomes in autologous cranioplasty. *World Neurosurg* 2022;167:e561-e566.
77. Stiver SI, Wintermark M, Manley GT. Reversible monoparesis following decompressive hemicraniectomy for traumatic brain injury. *J Neurosurg* 2008;109:245-254.
78. Wen L, Lou HY, Xu J, et al. The impact of cranioplasty on cerebral blood perfusion in patients treated with decompressive craniectomy for severe traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj* 2015;29:1654-1660.
79. Akins PT, Guppy KH. Are hygromas and hydrocephalus after decompressive craniectomy caused by impaired brain pulsatility, cerebrospinal fluid hydrodynamics, and glymphatic drainage? Literature overview and illustrative cases. *World Neurosurg* 2019;130:e941-e952.
80. Akins PT, Guppy KH. Does impaired glymphatic drainage cause glymphedema? A review tailored to neurocritical care and neurosurgery. *Neurocrit Care* 2021;35:545-558.
81. Asaad M, Taslakian EN, Banuelos J, et al. Surgical and patient-reported outcomes in patients with PEEK versus

titanium cranioplasty reconstruction. J Craniofac Surg 2021;32:193-197.

82. Itokawa H, Hiraide T, Moriya M, et al. A 12 month in vivo study on the response of bone to a hydroxyapatite-poly

methyl methacrylate cranioplasty composite. Biomaterials 2007;28:4922-4927.