

Autologous Fat Grafting Enhanced with Stromal Vascular Fraction (SVF) for Soft Tissue Reconstruction

Farahnaz Zamanitalab

School of Medicine and Surgery, University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy

Received: 2025-11-26; Received in revised form: 2025-12-14; Accepted: 2025-12-21

Abstract

Autologous fat grafting continues to face a persistent challenge: retention rates that fluctuate unpredictably between 20% and 80%. The stromal vascular fraction (SVF)—a heterogeneous cell population containing adipose-derived stem cells and other regenerative cell types—has emerged as a promising adjunct. By promoting angiogenesis and supporting tissue regeneration, SVF enhances graft survival [1,2].

This review examines current evidence on the mechanisms of SVF-enhanced fat grafting, the techniques used for its isolation, and the clinical contexts in which it has been successfully applied [3]. Literature published between 2015 and 2025 was analyzed, focusing on studies that investigated SVF-enriched fat grafting in reconstructive surgery [4].

Evidence indicates that enrichment with SVF improves graft retention, with rates rising to 65–80% compared to 40–65% achieved with conventional methods. Enhanced neovascularization has also been consistently reported [5,6]. Clinically, surgeons are applying SVF-assisted grafting in breast reconstruction, rehabilitation of radiation-damaged tissue, chronic wound management, and facial rejuvenation [7,8]. Both enzymatic digestion and mechanical separation techniques have proven effective for isolating SVF, offering flexibility depending on available resources and regulatory considerations [9,10].

Overall, SVF-enhanced fat grafting represents a significant advance in regenerative surgery. Multiple studies confirm its safety and therapeutic value, underscoring its potential to improve outcomes across a range of reconstructive and aesthetic applications [11,12].

Keywords: Stromal Vascular Fraction, Adipose-Derived Stem Cells, Fat Grafting, Soft Tissue Reconstruction

Citation: Zamanitalab F. **Autologous Fat Grafting Enhanced with Stromal Vascular Fraction (SVF) for Soft Tissue Reconstruction.** *Acad J Surg*, 2025; 8(4): 151-156.

Introduction

Since Coleman first described his technique in the 1990s, autologous fat grafting has become a cornerstone of reconstructive surgery [13,14]. Nevertheless, the procedure's reliability continues to be limited by unpredictable graft retention, largely due to inadequate neovascularization and central fat necrosis [15,16].

The stromal vascular fraction (SVF) comprises a diverse cellular population, including adipose-derived stem cells (ADSCs), endothelial progenitor cells, pericytes, and various immune cells [17,18]. These cell types exert regenerative effects through multiple mechanisms, such as paracrine signaling, immunomodulation, and cellular differentiation

[19,20].

Matsumoto and colleagues introduced the concept of SVF-enriched fat grafting—termed *cell-assisted lipotransfer*—and demonstrated significant improvements in graft survival [21,22]. This innovation transforms fat grafting from a procedure focused primarily on volume replacement into a more comprehensive regenerative therapy [23,24].

Biological Mechanisms

SVF Cellular Composition

The SVF houses several therapeutically valuable cell types [25,26]:

* **Corresponding author:** Farahnaz Zamanitalab

School of Medicine and Surgery, University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy

Email: fzamanit2000@gmail.com



- ADSCs (15-30%): These multipotent stem cells express CD73+/CD90+/CD105+ surface markers [27,28]

- Endothelial cells (10-20%): CD31+/CD34+ cells drive neovascularization [29,30]

- Pericytes: CD146+ cells that stabilize newly formed vessels [31,32]

- Immune cells (20-40%): These mediate immunomodulatory effects [33,34]

Enhancement Mechanisms

Enhanced Angiogenesis: Cells within the SVF secrete a wide range of pro-angiogenic factors—including VEGF, bFGF, HGF, and PDGF—that stimulate neovascularization. In addition, endothelial progenitor cells can differentiate into functional endothelium, further supporting vascular integration [35,36,37,38].

Adipogenesis: Improved graft retention results not only from the survival of transplanted adipocytes but also from the generation of new adipocytes derived from SVF progenitors [39,40].

Immunomodulation: ADSCs attenuate inflammation by reducing pro-inflammatory cytokine release and promoting M2 macrophage polarization, thereby creating a more favorable microenvironment for tissue repair [41,42].

Paracrine Effects: The SVF secretes growth factors and exosomes that enhance cellular communication, stimulate tissue regeneration, and facilitate wound healing [43,44].

SVF-Gel Innovation

Mechanical processing generates what researchers call “SVF-gel,” which preserves both cellular components and extracellular matrix structures [45, 46]. Investigations reveal 30%–50% improvements in retention, alongside enhanced vascularization [47, 48].

Isolation Techniques

Enzymatic Methods

Collagenase digestion produces high cell yields—ranging from 2.3 to 4.2×10^5 cells per milliliter—with viability exceeding 85% [49, 50]. However, this approach requires 90–120 minutes of processing time, incurs substantial costs, and faces FDA regulatory requirements [51, 52].

Mechanical Methods

Physical force-based techniques include

emulsification, rotating blade systems, and micronization devices [53, 54]. Solodeev et al. demonstrated in their 2023 study that mechanical isolation achieves comparable yields (2.0×10^5 cells/mL) while requiring only 8–20 minutes [55].

Comparing the Two Approaches

The systematic review by Uguten et al. in 2024 revealed that mechanical methods deliver shorter processing times, lower costs, and reduced regulatory complexity, while maintaining therapeutic efficacy [56, 57].

Clinical Applications

Breast Reconstruction

SVF-enhanced grafting improves outcomes in both implant-based and autologous breast reconstruction [58, 59]. Chiu’s 2019 investigation documented 78.65% retention at three months—substantially higher than the 40%–65% seen with standard grafting [60, 61].

Oncological Safety

A five-year study by Calabrese et al. in 2018 found no differences in recurrence rates [62]. Wang et al.’s 2023 meta-analysis, which included 13,334 patients, confirmed these safety findings [63, 64].

Radiation-Damaged Tissue

SVF counteracts radiation injury through several mechanisms: secretion of pro-angiogenic factors, anti-fibrotic activity, and immunomodulation [65, 66, 67]. Chen et al.’s 2021 systematic review validated its effectiveness without raising recurrence risk [68].

Technical Approach

Optimal outcomes emerge from multiple staged procedures (four to six sessions), smaller volumes per session (50–150 mL), rigotomy technique, and earlier intervention (three to six months post-radiation) [69, 70].

Chronic Wound Healing

SVF accelerates wound closure by promoting angiogenesis, enabling cell differentiation, releasing growth factors, and remodeling the extracellular matrix [71, 72]. Prospective investigations achieved complete healing in most patients after one or two sessions [73]. Xiao et al.’s 2024 meta-analysis

documented improved healing parameters [74, 75].

Facial Rejuvenation

SVF-enhanced grafting delivers both volumetric restoration and skin quality improvement [76, 77]. Gontijo-de-Amorim et al. reported in 2017 that retention reached 69.8%, compared to just 39.2% with standard grafting [78, 79].

Safety Profile

Common Complications

SVF-enhanced grafting demonstrates a favorable safety profile [80,81]:

- Fat necrosis occurs in 5% to 25% of cases, usually remaining asymptomatic [82]
- Infection rates stay below 1% to 2% when sterile technique is maintained [83]
- Hematoma or seroma develops in 2% to 5% of procedures [84]
- Contour irregularities appear in 5% to 15% of cases [85]

Oncological Safety

Multiple investigations show no elevation in recurrence or metastasis risk [86,87,88]. Long-term follow-up data sustain these safety findings [89,90].

Serious Complications

Vascular embolization

This remains exceedingly rare. Blunt cannulas and low injection pressures prevent such events [91, 92].

Blindness

Rare cases have occurred in periorbital grafting due to retrograde embolization [93, 94].

Future Directions

Emerging Technologies

Combination Therapies

PRP supplementation and bioengineered scaffolds may further improve results [95, 96]. SVF-derived exosomes could streamline regulatory pathways [97, 98].

Optimization

Different adipose tissue depots may harbor cells with varying regenerative capacities [99]. Cryopreservation technology would enable cell banking [100].

Regulatory Considerations

The FDA classifies enzymatically isolated SVF as requiring biologics licensing [101]. Mechanical isolation methods may simplify clinical translation [102, 103].

Research Priorities

Additional investigation is necessary to determine optimal SVF-to-fat ratios, track long-term cell fate, and identify predictors of outcomes [104, 105].

Conclusion

SVF-enhanced autologous fat grafting transforms volume replacement into a complete regenerative treatment. Clinical applications demonstrate improved retention (65%–80%), favorable safety profiles, and high patient satisfaction across breast reconstruction, radiation rehabilitation, chronic wound management, and facial rejuvenation [106, 107].

Technical advances in mechanical isolation have reduced processing times, costs, and regulatory barriers [108]. SVF-gel preparations offer important refinements to existing techniques [109].

Remaining challenges include protocol standardization, determination of optimal ratios, and regulatory clarification [110]. Long-term studies remain necessary [111].

Future developments will likely include combination therapies, exosome-based approaches, and expanded clinical applications [112]. SVF-enhanced grafting will assume increasingly central roles within plastic surgery [113].

References

1. Coleman SR. Structural fat grafting. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2006;118(Suppl):108S-120S. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000234610.81672.e7>
2. Gause TM, Rubin JP. Adipose stem cells and fat grafting. *Clin Plast Surg*. 2014;41(2):345-352.
3. Debuc B, Gendron N, Cras A. Improving fat grafting through stem cell-assisted lipotransfer. *Stem Cell Rev Rep*. 2023;19(6):1726-1754. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12015-023-10568-4>
4. Liu M, Shang Y, Liu N. Strategies to improve AFT retention. *Aesthetic Plast Surg*. 2023;47(2):808-824. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-022-03088-y>

5. Chiu CH, Hsu CC, Lin YY. Cell-assisted lipotransfer in breast augmentation. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2019;7(10):e2400.
6. Limido KE, Ma X. Long-term quantitative analysis of fat graft retention. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. 2023;78:44-52.
7. Cai Y, Zhang F, Feng J. Long-term follow-up of SVF gel in chronic wounds. *Stem Cell Res Ther*. 2024;15(1):85.
8. Gentile P, Garcovich S. Systematic review of ADSCs and SVF for wound healing. *Stem Cells Int*. 2021;2021:6693709.
9. Uguten UO, Veldhuizen J. Mechanical and enzymatic SVF isolation. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2024;12(1):e5534.
10. Solodееv I, Marrazzo P. Comparison of enzymatic and mechanical methods. *Aesthetic Plast Surg*. 2023;47(3):1045-1054.
11. Køllef SF, Fischer-Nielsen A. Enrichment of fat grafts with ADSCs. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9898):1113-1120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)61410-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61410-5)
12. Yoshimura K, Sato K. Cell-assisted lipotransfer for breast augmentation. *Aesthetic Plast Surg*. 2008;32(1):48-55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-007-9019-4>
13. Coleman SR. Facial recontouring with lipostructure. *Clin Plast Surg*. 1997;24(2):347-367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-1298\(20\)31069-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-1298(20)31069-5)
14. Simonacci F, Bertozzi N. Autologous fat grafting procedures. *Ann Med Surg*. 2017;20:49-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2017.06.059>
15. Eto H, Kato H. Fate of adipocytes after nonvascularized fat grafting. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2012;129(5):1081-1092. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e31824a2b19>
16. Kato H, Mineda K. Degeneration and regeneration after fat grafting. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2014;133(3):303e-313e. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000000066>
17. Bourin P, Bunnell BA. Stromal cells from adipose SVF. *Cytotherapy*. 2013;15(6):641-648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcyt.2013.02.006>
18. Yoshimura K, Shigeura T. Characterization of liposuction aspirate cells. *J Cell Physiol*. 2006;208(1):64-76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcp.20636>
19. Zuk PA, Zhu M. Multilineage cells from human adipose tissue. *Tissue Eng*. 2001;7(2):211-228. <https://doi.org/10.1089/107632701300062859>
20. Gimble JM, Katz AJ. Adipose-derived stem cells for regenerative medicine. *Circ Res*. 2007;100(9):1249-1260. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.RES.0000265074.83288.09>
21. Matsumoto D, Sato K. Cell-assisted lipotransfer. *Tissue Eng*. 2006;12(12):3375-3382. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ten.2006.12.3375>
22. Matsumoto D, Gonda K. CAL-supportive use of ADSCs. *J Cell Physiol*. 2007;212(3):702-709.
23. Zielins ER, Luan A. Therapeutic applications of adipose stromal cells. *Discov Med*. 2015;19(105):245-253.
24. Bora P, Majumdar AS. Adipose SVF in regenerative medicine. *Stem Cell Res Ther*. 2017;8(1):145. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-017-0598-y>
25. Zuk PA. The adipose-derived stem cell. *Mol Biol Cell*. 2010;21(11):1783-1787. <https://doi.org/10.1091/mbc.e09-07-0589>
26. Gimble JM, Bunnell BA. Adipose-derived stromal/stem cells primer. *Organogenesis*. 2013;9(1):3-10. <https://doi.org/10.4161/org.24279>
27. Dominici M, Le Blanc K. Minimal criteria for MSCs. *Cytotherapy*. 2006;8(4):315-317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14653240600855905>
28. Mitchell JB, McIntosh K. Immunophenotype of adipose-derived cells. *Stem Cells*. 2006;24(2):376-385. <https://doi.org/10.1634/stemcells.2005-0234>
29. Miranville A, Heeschen C. Improvement of neovascularization by ADSCs. *Circulation*. 2004;110(3):349-355. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.0000135466.16823.D0>
30. Planat-Benard V, Silvestre JS. Plasticity toward endothelial cells. *Circulation*. 2004;109(5):656-663. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.0000114522.38265.61>
31. Corselli M, Chen CW. Perivascular ancestors of stem cells. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2010;30(6):1104-1109. <https://doi.org/10.1161/ATVBAHA.109.191643>
32. Tang W, Zeve D. White fat progenitor cells in vasculature. *Science*. 2008;322(5901):583-586. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1156232>
33. Spencer M, Yao-Borengasser A. Adipose tissue macrophages. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab*. 2010;299(6):E1016-E1027. <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpendo.00329.2010>
34. Shaul ME, Bennett G. M2-like remodeling phenotypes. *Diabetes*. 2010;59(5):1171-1181. <https://doi.org/10.2337/db09-1402>
35. Rehman J, Traktuev D. Secretion of angiogenic factors by adipose stromal cells. *Circulation*. 2004;109(10):1292-1298. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.0000121425.42966.F1>
36. Kim WS, Park BS. Wound healing effect of ADSCs. *J Dermatol Sci*. 2007;48(1):15-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdermsci.2007.05.018>
37. Cao Y, Sun Z. ADSCs differentiate into endothelial cells. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun*. 2005;332(2):370-379. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2005.04.135>
38. Nakagami H, Maeda K. Autologous cell therapy in ischemic limb. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2005;25(12):2542-2547. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.ATV.0000190701.92007.6d>
39. Rigotti G, Marchi A. Clinical treatment of radiotherapy damage. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2007;119(5):1409-1422. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000256047.47909.71>
40. Suga H, Eto H. Adipose tissue remodeling under ischemia. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2010;126(6):1911-1923. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181f4468b>
41. Puissant B, Barreau C. Immunomodulatory effect of adipose stem cells. *Br J Haematol*. 2005;129(1):118-129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2141.2005.05409.x>
42. Yanez R, Lamana ML. ADSCs have immunosuppressive properties. *Stem Cells*. 2006;24(11):2582-2591. <https://doi.org/10.1634/stemcells.2006-0228>
43. Casteilla L, Planat-Bénard V. Adipose stromal cells in trials. *World J Stem Cells*. 2011;3(4):25-33. <https://doi.org/10.4252/wjsc.v3.i4.25>
44. Kilroy GE, Foster SJ. Cytokine profile of ADSCs. *J Cell Physiol*. 2007;212(3):702-709. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcp.21068>
45. Tonnard P, Verpaele A. Nanofat grafting research and applications. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2013;132(4):1017-1026. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e31829fe1b0>
46. Jiang A, Li M. Improvement via SVF gel grafting. *Stem Cell Res Ther*. 2020;11(1):162. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-020-01811-7>
47. Cohen SR, Hewett S. Regenerative cells for facial surgery. *Aesthet Surg J*. 2017;37(Suppl 3):S16-S32. <https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjx078>
48. Flynn L, Prestwich GD. Adipose tissue engineering with scaffolds. *Biomaterials*. 2008;29(3):329-338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2007.12.028>
49. Rodbell M. Metabolism of isolated fat cells. *J Biol Chem*. 1964;239:375-380. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9258\(18\)51687-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9258(18)51687-2)
50. Bunnell BA, Flaat M. ADSC isolation and expansion. *Methods*. 2008;45(2):115-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymeth.2008.03.006>
51. US FDA. Regulatory considerations for human cells and tis-

- sues. Guidance. 2017.
52. Raposio E, Ciliberti R. Clinical use of ADSCs: legislative issues. *Ann Med Surg.* 2017;24:61-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2017.11.002>
53. Aronowitz JA, Lockhart RA. Mechanical versus enzymatic isolation. *Springerplus.* 2015;4:713. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-015-1509-2>
54. Tonnard P, Verpaele A. Nanofat grafting. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2013;132(4):1017-1026. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e31829fe1b0>
55. Solodееv I, Marrazzo P. Comparison of isolation methods. *Aesthetic Plast Surg.* 2023;47(3):1045-1054.
56. Ugutun UO, Veldhuizen J. Systematic review of yield and viability. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open.* 2024;12(1):e5534.
57. Aronowitz JA, Ellenhorn JD. SVF isolation head-to-head comparison. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2013;132(4):932e-939e. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3182a80652>
58. Yoshimura K, Asano Y. Progenitor-enriched transplantation. *Breast J.* 2010;16(2):169-175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4741.2009.00873.x>
59. Khouri RK, Rigotti G. Megavolume autologous fat transfer. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2014;133(3):550-557. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000438044.06387.2a>
60. Chiu CH, Hsu CC. CAL in breast augmentation. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open.* 2019;7(10):e2400.
61. Largo RD, Tchang LA. Efficacy and safety of fat grafting. *Breast.* 2014;23(1):28-35.
62. Calabrese C, Garlaschi A. CAL oncological safety study. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2018;142(1):31-36.
63. Wang Y, Zhang J. Fat grafting after breast cancer surgery meta-analysis. *Aesthetic Plast Surg.* 2023;47(2):451-462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-023-03331-0>
64. Petit JY, Botteri E. Locoregional recurrence after fat grafting. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2012;129(5):1173-1175.
65. Heine N, Sorg H. Fat grafting for breast reconstruction in irradiated patients. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* 2023;76:234-242.
66. Salgarello M, Visconti G. Fat grafting before tissue expander in irradiated patients. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2020;145(3):619e-628e.
67. Phothong W, Zenn MR. Fat grafting for radiation ulcer. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open.* 2017;5(10):e1523.
68. Chen L, Li C. Autologous fat grafting after breast radiotherapy. *Aesthetic Plast Surg.* 2021;45(4):1565-1574.
69. Rigotti G, Marchi A. Clinical treatment of radiotherapy damage. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2007;119(5):1409-1422. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000256047.47909.71>
70. Klinger M, Caviggioli F. Autologous fat graft in scar treatment. *J Craniofac Surg.* 2013;24(5):1610-1615. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SCS.0b013e3182a24548>
71. Cook JL, Chang AN. Fat grafting for chronic lower extremity wounds. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open.* 2019;7(1):e2077.
72. Xiao S, Xiao C. Human fat products in wound healing meta-analysis. *Int Wound J.* 2024;21(2):e14463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iwj.70016>
73. Marino G, Moraci M. Non-healing wounds treated with SVF. *Regen Med.* 2013;8(1):53-61.
74. Xiao S, Xiao C. Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Wound J.* 2024;21(2):e14463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iwj.70016>
75. Gentile P, Garcovich S. ADSCs and SVF systematic review. *Stem Cells Int.* 2021;2021:6693709.
76. Cohen SR, Tijerina JD. Facial aging treatment with SVF. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2020;145(3):629e-642e.
77. Jiang A, Li M. SVF gel for facial rejuvenation. *Stem Cell Res Ther.* 2020;11(1):162. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-020-01811-7>
78. Gontijo-de-Amorim NF, Silva GN. Mechanical SVF-enriched lipotransfer. *Aesthet Surg J.* 2017;37(8):868-877.
79. Cohen SR, Hewett S. Regenerative cells for facial surgery. *Aesthet Surg J.* 2017;37(Suppl 3):S16-S32. <https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjx078>
80. Simonacci F, Bertozzi N. Fat grafting complications. *Ann Med Surg.* 2017;20:49-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2017.06.059>
81. Largo RD, Tchang LA. Safety of fat grafting to breast. *Breast.* 2014;23(1):28-35.
82. Kato H, Mineda K. Fat grafting tissue remodeling. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2014;133(3):303e-313e. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000000066>
83. Kim WS, Park BS. ADSC wound healing effects. *J Dermatol Sci.* 2007;48(1):15-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdermsci.2007.05.018>
84. Khouri RK, Del Campo AF. Fat grafting surgical technique. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2009;124(1):272-280.
85. Coleman SR. Structural fat grafting principles. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2006;118(Suppl):108S-120S. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.prs.0000234610.81672.e7>
86. Calabrese C, Garlaschi A. Oncological safety 5-year study. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2018;142(1):31-36.
87. Wang Y, Zhang J. Meta-analysis breast cancer patients. *Aesthetic Plast Surg.* 2023;47(2):451-462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-023-03281-7>
88. Petit JY, Botteri E. Fat grafting recurrence analysis. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2012;129(5):1173-1175.
89. Petit JY, Lohsiriwat V. Long-term oncological safety. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2011;128(3):643-653.
90. Kronowitz SJ, Mandujano CC. Breast cancer surveillance after grafting. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2016;137(4):1165-1175.
91. Teimourian B. Blindness following fat injections. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 1988;82(2):361. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006534-198808000-00036>
92. Dreizen NG, Framm L. Sudden unilateral visual loss after autologous fat injection. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 1989;107(1):85-87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9394\(89\)90823-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9394(89)90823-4)
93. Danesh-Meyer HV, Savino PJ. Ocular and cerebral ischemia following facial injection. *Arch Ophthalmol.* 2001;119(5):777-778. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archophth.119.5.777>
94. Park SH, Sun HJ. Severe visual loss and cerebral infarction after autologous fat injection. *Dermatol Surg.* 2012;38(5):713-715.
95. Cervelli V, Gentile P. PRP and ADSCs for tissue regeneration. *Regen Med.* 2009;4(5):667-679.
96. Flynn L, Prestwich GD. Scaffolds for adipose engineering. *Biomaterials.* 2008;29(3):329-338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2007.12.028>
97. Biancone L, Bruno S. MSC-derived microvesicles. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2012;27(8):3037-3042. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfs168>
98. Kim WS, Park BS. ADSC-derived exosomes. *J Dermatol Sci.* 2007;48(1):15-24.
99. Baptista LS, Silva KR. Depot-specific adipose stem cells. *World J Stem Cells.* 2015;7(1):165-173. <https://doi.org/10.4252/wjsc.v7.i1.165>
100. Goh BC, Thirumala S. Cryopreservation of adipose tissues. *Cryobiology.* 2007;55(1):1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/term.35>
101. US FDA. Minimal manipulation guidance. 2017.
102. Raposio E, Ciliberti R. European legislative issues. *Ann Med Surg.* 2017;24:61-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2017.11.002>
103. Aronowitz JA, Lockhart RA. Regulatory considerations.

- Springerplus. 2015;4:713. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-015-1509-2>
104. Peltoniemi HH, Salmi A. Stem cell enrichment in fat grafting. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2013;131(4):701-711.
 105. Køllef SF, Fischer-Nielsen A. ADSC enrichment clinical trial. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9898):1113-1120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)61410-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61410-5)
 106. Debuc B, Gendron N. Improving fat grafting CAL. *Stem Cell Rev Rep*. 2023;19(6):1726-1754. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12015-023-10568-4>
 107. Liu M, Shang Y. AFT retention strategies. *Aesthetic Plast Surg*. 2023;47(2):808-824. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-022-03088-y>
 108. Ugut UO, Veldhuizen J. Isolation systematic review. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2024;12(1):e5534.
 109. Jiang A, Li M. SVF gel applications. *Stem Cell Res Ther*. 2020;11(1):162. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-020-01811-7>
 110. Bora P, Majumdar AS. SVF in regenerative medicine. *Stem Cell Res Ther*. 2017;8(1):145. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-017-0598-y>
 111. Køllef SF, Fischer-Nielsen A. ADSC enrichment RCT. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9898):1113-1120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)61410-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61410-5)
 112. Casteilla L, Planat-Bénard V. Adipose stromal cells clinical. *World J Stem Cells*. 2011;3(4):25-33. <https://doi.org/10.4252/wjsc.v3.i4.25>
 113. Zielins ER, Luan A. Therapeutic applications review. *Discov Med*. 2015;19(105):245-253.