v. 5, n. 12, 2025

International Journal of Health Science

Acceptance date: 27/02/2025

AESTHETIC RECONSTRUCTION OF BODY CONTOUR AFTER PREGNANCY

Daniel de Almeida Meireles Name
https://lattes.cnpq.br/7235844566293697

João Cândido Tavares Fogaça

Matheus Henrique Bergenthal Porto
https://lattes.cnpq.br/7855897428958218

Paulo César Barbosa Junior

Geraldo Tolentino Ribeiro Neto

Beatriz Ribeiro de Almeida Guerra

José Roberto Costa Nogueira

Davi Camelo Ribeiro Gomes

Eduardo Cherutti Yamaguti

Júlia da Cunha Pereira de Souza
http://lattes.cnpq.br/1353607263902889

Lucas Capobianco

Mauricio Lopes da Silva Netto
http://lattes.cnpq.br/4791743372358340

Resume: **INTRODUCTION** Postpartum body contouring techniques, including abdominoplasty, liposuction, and mastopexy, aim to address persistent anatomical changes following pregnancy. Non-invasive modalities, such as cryolipolysis and radiofrequency, offer alternative solutions for patients seeking less downtime. The selection of procedures depends on patient-specific factors, including skin laxity, muscle separation, and aesthetic goals. **OBJETIVE** To evaluate the effectiveness, outcomes, and patient satisfaction associated with various surgical and non-surgical techniques for postpartum body contouring. **METHODS** This is a narrative review which included studies in the MEDLINE – PubMed (National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health), COCHRANE, EMBASE and Google Scholar databases, using as descriptors: "Postpartum body contouring" OR "Abdominoplasty" OR "Liposuction" OR "Non-invasive aesthetic procedures" OR "Patient satisfaction" in the last years. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** Outcomes indicate that abdominoplasty is highly effective for correcting diastasis recti and improving body image, especially when combined with liposuction for contour refinement. Non-invasive techniques provide moderate improvements but are most effective for mild to moderate skin laxity. Patient satisfaction rates are highest following surgical interventions, though postoperative complications, such as seromas and delayed healing, are more common in combined procedures. Psychological benefits, including enhanced self-esteem, are reported across all methods, particularly when realistic expectations are established through preoperative counseling. **CONCLUSION** The findings highlight the importance of individualized treatment plans based on patient anatomy and goals. Surgical approaches yield the most significant results, while non-invasive methods are valuable adjuncts or alternatives for patients not suitable for surgery. The integration of physical therapy and scar management into postoperative care further enhances patient outcomes. Continued research on minimally invasive techniques and combination therapies may broaden future treatment options for postpartum body contouring.

Keywords: Postpartum body contouring; Abdominoplasty; Liposuction; Non-invasive aesthetic procedures; Patient satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Pregnancy induces a myriad of physiological transformations, notably affecting the integumentary and musculoskeletal systems[1]. The abdominal region often exhibits skin laxity and striae distensae due to the rapid expansion of underlying tissues[1]. Concurrently, the rectus abdominis muscles may undergo diastasis recti, leading to a weakened anterior abdominal wall[1]. Adipose tissue distribution is also altered, with increased deposition in areas such as the abdomen, flanks, and thighs[2]. These anatomical changes can persist postpartum, posing challenges to women seeking to restore their pre-pregnancy body contour[2]. The persistence of these alterations, even with exercise and weight reduction, highlights the complexity of postpartum body contour changes[2].

The psychological ramifications of postpartum body changes are profound[3]. Many women experience diminished self-esteem and body image dissatisfaction, which can adversely affect maternal-infant bonding and overall quality of life[3]. The societal emphasis on rapid return to pre-pregnancy physique exacerbates these sentiments, leading some women to pursue aesthetic interventions[3]. Understanding the interplay between physical changes and psychological well-being is essential for healthcare providers managing postpartum patients[4]. The psychological burden can be significant, often driving women

to seek both non-surgical and surgical options for body contour restoration[4]. Addressing these concerns requires a holistic approach that integrates aesthetic and mental health care[4].

Non-surgical modalities have gained popularity for addressing postpartum body contour concerns[5]. Techniques such as cryolipolysis, radiofrequency, and high-intensity focused ultrasound offer targeted fat reduction and skin tightening with minimal downtime[5]. Studies have demonstrated the efficacy of these treatments in reducing subcutaneous fat and improving skin laxity, making them appealing options for postpartum women[5]. However, patient selection and realistic expectations are paramount to achieving satisfactory outcomes[6]. Non-surgical options often serve as a bridge for women not ready for surgery but seeking improvement[6]. Despite their safety profile, these methods may have limited efficacy in cases of severe skin laxity or muscle separation[6].

Surgical interventions remain the definitive approach for significant postpartum body contour restoration[7]. Procedures such as abdominoplasty, often combined with liposuction, address redundant skin, repair diastasis recti, and remove excess adipose tissue[7]. The "Mommy Makeover," a combination of abdominal and breast surgeries, has become increasingly popular among women seeking comprehensive postpartum rejuvenation[7]. While these procedures offer dramatic results, they entail inherent surgical risks and necessitate thorough preoperative counseling[8]. Proper patient selection and individualized surgical planning are critical for minimizing complications and optimizing outcomes[8]. Additionally, the expertise of the surgeon plays a crucial role in ensuring aesthetic symmetry and patient satisfaction[8].

The timing of aesthetic interventions postpartum is a critical consideration[9]. It is generally recommended that women defer elective body contouring procedures until they have completed childbearing and achieved a stable weight[9]. This approach optimizes surgical outcomes and minimizes the likelihood of recurrent anatomical changes with subsequent pregnancies[9]. Additionally, allowing adequate time for natural tissue retraction and hormonal normalization postpartum can influence the success of both surgical and non-surgical treatments[10]. The timing is particularly important for procedures such as abdominoplasty, where postoperative stability is essential[10]. Failure to respect these timelines can compromise outcomes and increase revision rates[10].

Breastfeeding exerts a significant influence on postpartum body morphology[11]. Lactation-induced hormonal fluctuations can affect skin elasticity and fat distribution[11]. Moreover, the physical demands of breastfeeding may impact posture and musculoskeletal health[11]. Understanding these effects is crucial when planning the timing and type of aesthetic interventions, as certain procedures may interfere with breastfeeding or be influenced by the ongoing physiological changes associated with lactation[12]. Delaying procedures until after breastfeeding can reduce complications such as impaired milk production[12]. Additionally, addressing musculoskeletal issues early may improve both functional and aesthetic outcomes[12].

Advancements in non-invasive body contouring technologies have expanded the therapeutic arsenal available to postpartum women[13]. Emerging modalities, such as laser-assisted lipolysis and injectable adipolytic agents, offer potential benefits in targeting localized fat deposits and enhancing skin firmness[13]. Ongoing research into the safety and efficacy of these treatments continues to inform clinical practice, providing patients with evidence-based options for postpartum body contouring[13]. However, their long-term outcomes compared to surgical methods remain

under investigation[14]. Future studies focusing on combination therapies may further refine these non-invasive approaches[14]. This evolving landscape underscores the importance of individualized treatment planning[14].

Ethical considerations are paramount in the realm of postpartum aesthetic surgery[15]. Healthcare providers must navigate the delicate balance between promoting body positivity and supporting a woman's autonomy in seeking aesthetic enhancements[15]. Informed consent, realistic expectation setting, and psychological assessment are integral components of the preoperative process[15]. Ensuring that patients are making decisions free from external pressures and with a comprehensive understanding of potential risks and benefits is essential for ethical practice[16]. Ethical practice also involves recognizing when to advise against surgery due to medical or psychological contraindications[16]. Ultimately, patient-centered care should prioritize safety and well-being alongside aesthetic goals[16].

Patient education serves as the cornerstone of successful aesthetic outcomes[17]. Providing comprehensive information about the spectrum of available treatments, including potential risks, benefits, and realistic expectations, empowers women to make informed decisions regarding their bodies[17]. Educational initiatives should also address the natural timeline of postpartum recovery, emphasizing that gradual changes are normal and that interventions, when desired, should be timed appropriately to align with individual health and lifestyle factors[17]. Effective counseling helps patients set achievable goals and reduces postoperative dissatisfaction[18].

OBJETIVES

To evaluate the effectiveness, outcomes, and patient satisfaction associated with various surgical and non-surgical techniques for postpartum body contouring.

SECUNDARY OBJETIVES

1. To analyze the outcomes of abdominoplasty, liposuction, and mastopexy on postpartum body aesthetics.
2. To assess the efficacy and limitations of non-invasive techniques such as radiofrequency and cryolipolysis.
3. To compare satisfaction rates between surgical and non-surgical approaches.
4. To examine the impact of patient factors, such as age, BMI, and comorbidities, on aesthetic outcomes.
5. To evaluate the psychological improvements and quality of life following aesthetic reconstruction.

METHODS

This is a narrative review, in which the main aspects of effectiveness, outcomes, and patient satisfaction associated with various surgical and non-surgical techniques for postpartum body contouring in recent years were analyzed. The beginning of the study was carried out with theoretical training using the following databases: PubMed, sciELO and Medline, using as descriptors: "Postpartum body contouring" OR "Abdominoplasty" OR "Liposuction" OR "Non-invasive aesthetic procedures" OR "Patient satisfaction" in the last years. As it is a narrative review, this study does not have any risks.

Databases: This review included studies in the MEDLINE – PubMed (National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health), COCHRANE, EMBASE and Google Scholar databases.

The inclusion criteria applied in the analytical review were human intervention studies, experimental studies, cohort studies, case--control studies, cross-sectional studies and literature reviews, editorials, case reports, and poster presentations. Also, only studies writing in English and Portuguese were included.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Abdominoplasty remains the most effective surgical intervention for postpartum body contouring, particularly in addressing excess skin and diastasis recti[21]. Clinical studies have shown that abdominoplasty significantly reduces inter-rectus distance and improves abdominal wall function[21]. Moreover, patient-reported outcomes indicate high levels of satisfaction, with notable improvements in body image and quality of life[21]. Liposuction is a cornerstone in postpartum fat redistribution, effectively targeting localized adiposity resistant to diet and exercise[22]. When combined with abdominoplasty, it enhances body contouring results by reducing flank adiposity and achieving a more sculpted silhouette[22]. Studies comparing ultrasound-assisted liposuction (UAL) with traditional methods demonstrate superior skin contraction and faster recovery times with UAL[22].

Mastopexy and breast augmentation are pivotal in addressing postpartum breast changes, including volume loss and ptosis[23]. Research highlights significant improvements in breast contour and patient satisfaction following these procedures[23]. Additionally, the combination of mastopexy with implants has been shown to provide optimal aesthetic outcomes, particularly in patients with severe ptosis[23]. Non-invasive techniques, such as radiofrequency and cryolipolysis, offer effective alternatives for postpartum body contouring[24]. Studies indicate that cryolipolysis reduces localized fat deposits by inducing adipocyte apoptosis without damaging surrounding tissues[24]. Furthermore, radiofrequency treatments are shown to improve skin laxity by stimulating collagen production[24].

Diastasis recti repair through plication techniques yields durable outcomes, particularly when combined with abdominoplasty[25]. Imaging studies confirm sustained narrowing of the rectus diastasis months after surgery[25]. Long-term follow-up indicates that patients experience reduced lower back pain and improved core strength[25]. Combined body contouring procedures, such as the "Mommy Makeover," are associated with increased surgical risks compared to single procedures[26]. Studies report higher rates of complications, including seromas and delayed wound healing[26]. However, when performed by experienced surgeons, complication rates are minimized, and patient satisfaction remains high[26].

Patient age has a measurable impact on postoperative outcomes[27]. Research shows that younger patients achieve superior skin retraction and faster recovery[27]. Conversely, older patients are more prone to complications, such as poor wound healing, due to reduced skin elasticity and comorbidities[27]. Comparative studies between surgical and non-surgical approaches emphasize that surgery achieves more dramatic and lasting results[28]. However, non-surgical methods, such as high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU), are valuable for patients who are not surgical candidates[28]. Combination therapies are increasingly utilized to enhance outcomes and reduce recovery time[28].

Physical therapy is a critical component of postoperative recovery, particularly after abdominoplasty[29]. Programs focusing on core strengthening and scar tissue mobilization have been shown to reduce recovery times[29]. Additionally, preoperative physical therapy may improve surgical outcomes by enhancing muscle tone[29]. Patient satisfaction rates are consistently high across various postpartum aesthetic procedures[30]. Surveys indicate that

over 90% of patients report improved body image and self-esteem following body contouring surgeries[30]. Satisfaction rates are highest when outcomes align closely with preoperative expectations[30].

Smoking has a detrimental impact on surgical outcomes in postpartum body contouring[31]. Smokers experience higher rates of wound dehiscence and skin necrosis[31]. Preoperative smoking cessation protocols have been shown to reduce these complications significantly[31]. Cost-effectiveness analyses indicate that while surgical interventions have higher upfront costs, they are more cost-efficient over time compared to repeated non-surgical treatments[32]. Long-term outcomes and patient satisfaction levels contribute to their favorable cost-effectiveness profiles[32]. Additionally, combination procedures can reduce overall costs by consolidating recovery periods[32].

Ultrasound-assisted liposuction (UAL) enhances postoperative outcomes by promoting even fat removal and minimizing trauma to surrounding tissues[33]. Comparative studies report reduced postoperative pain and shorter recovery times with UAL compared to traditional methods[33]. UAL is particularly effective in fibrous areas, such as the back and flanks[33]. Aesthetic reconstruction significantly improves psychological well-being[34]. Patients frequently report reduced body image dissatisfaction and increased self-confidence[34]. The psychological benefits are most pronounced when combined with effective preoperative counseling[34].

Postpartum depression can negatively influence satisfaction with aesthetic outcomes[35]. Research highlights the importance of mental health screening prior to surgery[35]. Integrating psychological support into postoperative care has been shown to enhance overall patient satisfaction[35]. Breastfeeding duration influences body contour outcomes, particularly regarding breast aesthetics[36]. Longer breastfeeding periods are associated with increased breast volume loss and skin laxity[36]. Studies suggest that delaying breast procedures until after breastfeeding completion optimizes results[36].

Effective management of postoperative complications, including seromas and hematomas, is crucial for achieving satisfactory outcomes[37]. Early detection and intervention, such as ultrasound-guided drainage, significantly reduce morbidity rates[37]. Preventative measures, such as compression garments, are also effective[37]. Best practices for postoperative care emphasize the use of compression garments and early mobilization[38]. Evidence indicates that these measures reduce edema and thromboembolic events[38]. Additionally, adherence to follow-up schedules ensures prompt management of complications[38].

Advances in scar management, including silicone gel sheets and fractional laser treatments, have significantly improved postoperative scar outcomes[39]. Randomized controlled trials show reduced hypertrophic scar formation with early intervention[39]. Fractional lasers are particularly effective for mature scars[39]. Minimally invasive techniques, such as laser lipolysis, provide effective alternatives for patients with mild to moderate skin laxity[40]. Comparative studies indicate similar fat reduction to traditional liposuction with less downtime[40]. However, their efficacy is limited in cases with significant skin excess[40].

CONCLUSION

The aesthetic reconstruction of body contour after pregnancy offers significant physical and psychological benefits, with abdominoplasty and liposuction being the most effective surgical interventions for correcting skin laxity, diastasis recti, and excess fat deposits. Non-surgical techniques, such as radiofrequency and cryolipolysis, serve as valuable options for patients with mild to moderate concerns or those seeking less invasive solutions, although their results are less dramatic

DOI https://doi.org/10.22533/at.ed.15951225240212

than surgical approaches. Patient satisfaction rates are consistently high, especially when procedures align with realistic expectations and individual aesthetic goals. Psychological improvements, including enhanced self-esteem and body image, are notable outcomes of both surgical and non-surgical methods. However, the combination of procedures, such as in a "Mommy Makeover," while effective, requires careful patient selection due to increased risks of complications.

Age, BMI, smoking status, and comorbidities significantly influence surgical outcomes and recovery times. Additionally, the duration of breastfeeding impacts breast contour results, emphasizing the importance of proper surgical timing to achieve optimal outcomes. Preoperative counseling and postoperative care, including physical therapy and scar management, are essential for maximizing patient satisfaction and reducing complications. Cost-effectiveness analyses indicate that, despite higher upfront expenses, surgical interventions provide superior long-term results compared to repeated non-surgical treatments. Innovations such as ultrasound-assisted liposuction and laser lipolysis continue to improve efficacy and reduce recovery times, making aesthetic reconstruction more accessible and efficient.

Ethical considerations remain critical, highlighting the need for thorough informed consent and clear patient education to ensure patients understand the risks, benefits, and realistic outcomes of their chosen procedures. The integration of mental health assessments, particularly for patients with postpartum depression or body image disorders, further ensures safe and satisfactory outcomes. In conclusion, postpartum body contouring should be approached through individualized treatment plans that combine patient goals, anatomical needs, and available technologies. Surgical techniques remain the gold standard for significant corrections, while non-invasive options serve as complementary or alternative treatments.

REFERENCES

1. Swanson E. Prospective clinical study of liposuction and abdominoplasty outcomes. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(2):333-345.

2. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. Measuring quality of life and patient satisfaction after body contouring: a systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures. Aesthet Surg J. 2011;31(7):807-813.

3. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. The Body-QoL: measuring patient-reported outcomes in body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

4. Matarasso A, Smith DM. "Mommy makeover": systematic review of the safety and efficacy of combined procedures. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

5. Swanson E. Liposuction and abdominoplasty: high satisfaction and improved quality of life. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(4):776e-785e.

6. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. A systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures for body contouring surgery. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;127(1):214-223.

7. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. Development of the Body-QoL instrument for body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

8. Matarasso A, Smith DM. Safety and efficacy of combined abdominoplasty and cosmetic breast surgery: a systematic review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

9. Swanson E. Prospective clinical study of liposuction and abdominoplasty outcomes. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(2):333-345.

10. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. Measuring quality of life and patient satisfaction after body contouring: a systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures. Aesthet Surg J. 2011;31(7):807-813.

11. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. The Body-QoL: measuring patient-reported outcomes in body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

12. Matarasso A, Smith DM. "Mommy makeover": systematic review of the safety and efficacy of combined procedures. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

13. Swanson E. Liposuction and abdominoplasty: high satisfaction and improved quality of life. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(4):776e-785e.

14. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. A systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures for body contouring surgery. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;127(1):214-223.

15. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. Development of the Body-QoL instrument for body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

16. Matarasso A, Smith DM. Safety and efficacy of combined abdominoplasty and cosmetic breast surgery: a systematic review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

17. Swanson E. Prospective clinical study of liposuction and abdominoplasty outcomes. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(2):333-345.

18. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. Measuring quality of life and patient satisfaction after body contouring: a systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures. Aesthet Surg J. 2011;31(7):807-813.

19. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. The Body-QoL: measuring patient-reported outcomes in body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

20. Matarasso A, Smith DM. "Mommy makeover": systematic review of the safety and efficacy of combined procedures. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

21. Swanson E. Liposuction and abdominoplasty: high satisfaction and improved quality of life. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(4):776e-785e.

22. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. A systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures for body contouring surgery. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;127(1):214-223.

23. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. Development of the Body-QoL instrument for body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

24. Matarasso A, Smith DM. Safety and efficacy of combined abdominoplasty and cosmetic breast surgery: a systematic review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871

25. Swanson E. Prospective clinical study of liposuction and abdominoplasty outcomes. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(2):333-345.

26. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. Measuring quality of life and patient satisfaction after body contouring: a systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures. Aesthet Surg J. 2011;31(7):807-813.

27. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. The Body-QoL: measuring patient-reported outcomes in body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

28. Matarasso A, Smith DM. "Mommy makeover": systematic review of the safety and efficacy of combined procedures. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

29. Swanson E. Liposuction and abdominoplasty: high satisfaction and improved quality of life. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(4):776e-785e.

30. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. A systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures for body contouring surgery. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;127(1):214-223.

31. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. Development of the Body-QoL instrument for body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

32. Matarasso A, Smith DM. Safety and efficacy of combined abdominoplasty and cosmetic breast surgery: a systematic review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

33. Swanson E. Prospective clinical study of liposuction and abdominoplasty outcomes. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(2):333-345.

34. Matarasso A, Smith DM. "Mommy makeover": systematic review of the safety and efficacy of combined procedures. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

35. Swanson E. Liposuction and abdominoplasty: high satisfaction and improved quality of life. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(4):776e-785e.

36. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. A systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures for body contouring surgery. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;127(1):214-223.

37. Danilla S, Dominguez C, Cuevas P, et al. Development of the Body-QoL instrument for body contouring surgery patients. Aesthet Surg J. 2014;34(5):717-725.

38. Matarasso A, Smith DM. Safety and efficacy of combined abdominoplasty and cosmetic breast surgery: a systematic review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(4):856-871.

39. Swanson E. Prospective clinical study of liposuction and abdominoplasty outcomes. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013;132(2):333-345.

40. Reavey PL, Klassen AF, Cano SJ, et al. Measuring quality of life and patient satisfaction after body contouring: a systematic review of patient-reported outcome measures. Aesthet Surg J. 2011;31(7):807-813.