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There are many different types of hernias including inguinal, umbilical, epigastric, spigelian, femoral, and diaphragmatic. The four most common types of hernia are inguinal, umbilical, incisional and epigastric. Spigelian, femoral, and diaphragmatic hernias are much less common in the U.S., and, for this reason, will not be included in the analysis. This report will focus on inguinal hernias and ventral hernias. Ventral hernia is an umbrella term for multiple types of hernia that occur on the ventral abdominal wall, including umbilical, incisional and epigastric hernias. In the United States, inguinal hernias were the most common, followed by ventral hernias. While the total number of both classes of hernia has been increasing in the United States, the frequency of inguinal hernias is decreasing and the frequency of ventral hernias is increasing. The market has been increasing as the general incidence of hernias is increasing in the United States. The total market includes allograft, xenograft and alloplast reinforcement devices used to repair inguinal and ventral hernias. This dominance is misleading as there were not actually more ventral hernia procedures performed; on the contrary, inguinal hernia procedures more than doubled ventral hernia procedures in 2016. The significantly larger market share of ventral hernia repair devices was due to their generally higher ASP, compared to inguinal hernia repair devices.

A hernia is a condition in which part of the intestine bulges through a weak area in the abdominal muscles. Hernias can cause pain and discomfort to the patient, and in more severe cases, can even cause the twisting of the intestine, which would subsequently require removal. Hernia repair involves repositioning the intestine into the body cavity. With over 1 million hernia repair procedures conducted in the U.S. alone in 2016, hernia repair is one of the most common surgical procedures performed in the country. The rising demand for hernia repair is intimately linked to the growing elderly and obese populations, as individuals from these groups are at a high risk of developing a hernia during surgical procedures. The correction of a hernia can be performed using an open or laparoscopic technique.
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