



||

||

|| ||

***Panoramic Radiography, Conventional and
Reformatted 3D Computed Tomography in
Diagnosis of Mandibular Fractures***

Thesis

*Submitted to the Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine,
Cairo University, in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of Master Degree
in Oral Radiology*

Presented by

Omniya Mahmoud Hussien Abu El-Dahab

*B.DS, 2003, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine,
Cairo University*

2008

Supervisors

Dr. Mushira M. Dahaba

*Professor, Oral Radiology Department, Faculty of
Oral and Dental Medicine,
Cairo University*

***Dr. Mohamed Baher Tewfik,
MD***

*Head and Consultant, Radiology Department,
Students' Hospital,
Cairo University*

Dr. Hany Mahmoud Omar

*Lecturer, Oral Radiology Department, Faculty of
Oral and Dental Medicine,
Cairo University*

/ .

/ .

/

-
()

/
- -

Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the validity of panoramic radiography, conventional and multiplanar reconstructed (MPR) 3DCT in diagnosis of mandibular fractures.

Introduction

Maxillofacial fractures occur when the facial bones are subjected to forces that exceed their impact tolerance. The more the severe the forces, the greater the likelihood of the fracture. Injury to the facial bones might occur in one or more of the bones. Facial fractures most frequently occur in the zygoma or mandible and, to a lesser extent, in the maxilla. Diagnosis is obvious with a gross deformity or displacement, but in other cases a fracture may be suggested in the history and examination. In such cases, radiographs are mandatory to confirm the fracture **(Dongas 2002, Ceallaigh *et al* 2006, Mohammadi and Mohebbi 2007 and Moliere 2008)**.

Mandibular fractures are the next most common facial bone fractures after fractures of the nasal skeleton. These fractures occur most frequently as a result of the raised nature of this bone in the face **(Mohammadi and Mohebbi 2007 and Moliere 2008)**.

Successful fracture treatment depends on precise clinical and radiographic examinations to conceptualize the overall injury and to establish a correct diagnosis. Failure to recognize, and the resultant mistreatment, of facial fractures is an important cause for later cosmetic and functional complications, which are difficult or even impossible to correct at a secondary stage **(Klenk and Kovacs 2004)**.

Complications of mandibular fractures might consist of fragment malunion or non-union leading to pseudarthrosis in the location of the previous fracture. Other complications include infection resulting in mandibular osteomyelitis, ischemic necrosis of the condylar head, and

traumatic damage to the articular disc (**Schuknecht and Valavanis 2003 and Schuknecht and Graetz 2005**).

For many years, physicians relied on two dimensional (2D) radiographs of the facial skeleton including panoramic views to evaluate facial injuries. However, such radiographs were relatively difficult to interpret because of the superimposition of the bony landmarks and defects. The image might miss the displacement of bone fragments, and impair a correct diagnosis (**Marentette and Maisal 1988, Costa e Silva *et al* 2003 and Saigal *et al* 2005**).

During interpretation of conventional radiographs, the overlap of structures might impair a proper interpretation of images. The head of the mandibular condyle is often obscured by the superimposition of the skull base so intra-capsular fractures of the mandibular condyle and fractures in the high portion of its condylar process are difficult to be visualized on plain radiographs (**Schimming *et al* 1999 and Costa e Silva *et al* 2003**).

The traditional strong role of conventional imaging in assessment of patients with isolated trauma to the viscerocranium is decreasing. Computed tomography is progressively replacing the panoramic radiograph, Water's view, and axial films for maxillofacial trauma. It is increasingly being performed in addition to conventional films to detail and classify trauma to the mandible as well. Imaging thus contributes to accurately categorize mandibular fractures based on location, into alveolar, mandibular proper, and condylar fractures (**Schuknecht and Graetz 2005**).

Early CT scanners produced images of transverse sections through the body, thus avoiding the problem of superimposed tissues. The narrow beam geometry and special collimation effectively eliminated scatter,

thus greatly improving the contrast detectability over that of conventional radiographic methods (**Mahesh 2002**).

Three dimensional images were produced by using special softwares. These images provide superior definition of fracture lines (especially horizontal lines) as well as better revealing of the extent of the comminution. Additionally, the display parameters might be adjusted to improve edge sharpness, as well as image contrast and brightness. These additional informations improved the surgeons' ability to plan placement of inter-fragmentary wires and/or plates. Surgeons were also able to more accurately predict those patients requiring immediate bone grafting (**Mayer *et al* 1988, Vannier *et al* 1997, Klenk and Kovacs 2004 and Reuben *et al* 2005**).

2D and 3DCT images could be useful to the clinician in diagnosis and treatment planning. These methods enhance the accuracy of diagnostic decisions and the establishment of appropriate treatment plans. Because the radiographic data are archived as computerized data rather than on films, the images could be manipulated repeatably until desired results are obtained and with minimal loss of resolution (**Alder *et al* 1995 and Costa e silva *et al* 2003**).

That's why this study was performed to assess the validity and exact role of conventional and Multiplanar Reconstructed (MPR) 3DCT as well as panoramic radiography in diagnosis of mandibular fractures.

List of Abbreviations

2D	Two Dimentional
3D	Three Dimensional
CT	Computed Tomography
DPT	Dental panoramic tomogram
kVp	Kilovoltage
mA	Milliamper
MCCT	Multi-channel Computed Tomography
MDCT	Multidetector-row Computed Tomography
MPa	Mega Pascal
MPR	Multipplanar reconstruction
MVA	Motor Vehichle Accident
N	Number of active detector rows
NOE	Naso-orbito-ethmoid
OPG	Orthopantomography
P	Pitch
PA	Posteroanterior
RTA	Raod traffic accident

SC	Section collimation
Sv	Sivelent
SW	Section width
TF	Table feed per rotation
TMJ	Temporomandibular joint

List of Contents

<i>Item</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature.....	2
<u>1- Maxillofacial Injuries</u>-----	4
- Classification of maxillofacial injuries-----	6
- Diagnosis of maxillofacial injuries-----	8
- Radiographic assessment of maxillofacial injuries-----	10
<u>2- Mandibular Fractures</u>-----	14
- Classification of mandibular fractures-----	16
- Diagnosis of mandibular fracture-----	23
- Radiogr. assessment of mandi.fractures-----	25
- Complications of mandi. Fracture-----	27
<u>3- Panoramic Radiography</u>-----	29
<u>4- Computed Tomography</u>-----	37
<u>5- Convrt.CT and 3DCT in diagnosis of mand. fractures</u>	63
 Aim of the Study	 68
Material and Methods	69
Results.....	90
Case Presentation.....	131
Discussion	159
Summary&Conclusions	176
References.....	178

List of Tables

<i>Table</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table(1)	Types of mandibular fracture.....	22-23
Table (2)	Scanning Parameters used during Multislice Computed Tomographic Imaging.....	73
Table (3)	The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in detecting fractures.....	90-91
Table (4)	(a)The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of number of fracture lines..... (b)The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of number of fracture lines.....	92 94
Table (5)	The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of complete and incomplete fracture lines	96
Table (6)	The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of anatomic location of fracture lines.....	97-98
Table (7)	The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of displacement.....	99

Table (8)	<i>The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of comminutions.....</i>	<i>100-101</i>
Table (9)	<i>The frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of asymmetry.....</i>	<i>102</i>
Table (10)	<i>frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for the comparison between the different modalities in diagnosis of soft tissue involvement.....</i>	<i>103-104</i>
Table (11)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of axial cut in detection.....</i>	<i>105</i>
Table (12)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of coronal cut in detection.....</i>	<i>106</i>
Table (13)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of sagittal cut in detection.....</i>	<i>106</i>
Table (14)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of reconstructive panoramic modality in detection.....</i>	<i>107</i>
Table (15)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of 3D modality in detection.....</i>	<i>107</i>
Table (16)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of panoramic modality in detection.....</i>	<i>108</i>
Table (17)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of axial cut in diagnosis of number of fracture lines.....</i>	<i>109</i>
Table (18)	<i>Sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy of coronal cut in diagnosis of number of fracture lines.....</i>	<i>109</i>