

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

وقل رب زدني علما

صدق الله العظيم

(سورة طه - آية 14)

Radiodensitometric Evaluation of Low Intensity Laser Therapy on Healing Of Mandibular Fracture in Tooth Bearing Area

A Thesis is Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Requirements of Master
Degree in Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery

BY
Ahmad Mohammad Salah
B.D.S.

Faculty of Oral & Dental Medicine
Cairo University
2010

Supervisors

Dr. Hany Amin

Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

Dr. Mouchira Salah El-Din

Professor of Oral Medicine and Periodontology

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

Dr. Dalia Abd-El khalek Radwan

Lecturer in Oral Surgery

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

Dedication

To my family, my father, my mother and to my Supervisors who helped me to succeed and supported me during my study.

Acknowledgement

*First of all, I thank Allah for paving the way for me to fulfill this work. Second of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to **Dr. Hany amin**, Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University. I will remain grateful to him for his wise advice, scientific supervision and kind guidance throughout the entire course of this work.*

*I am also very grateful to **Dr. Mouchira salah el-din**, Professor of Oral Medicine and Periodontology, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for her unlimited effort and time spent and continuous motivation.*

*My deepest thanks and appreciation to **Dr. Dalia Abd El-khalek Radwan**, Lecturer in Oral Surgery, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for her active supervision and support.*

Finally, many thanks to the members of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Department, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for their kind cooperation towards achieving this work.

LIST OF CONTENTS

	page
List of tables	i
List of figures	ii
List of abbreviations	iv
Introduction	1
Review of literature	4
Aim of the study	34
Patients and methods	35
Results	47
Discussion	60
Summary and conclusion	66
References	69
Arabic summary	

LIST OF TABLES

Tab. No.		Page
Tab.(1)	Illustrates the data of the non-laser control group (Group A) in terms of age, sex, site and etiology of fracture and time elapsed between injury and reduction.	38
Tab.(2)	Illustrates the data of the laser group (Group B) in terms of age, sex, site and etiology of fracture and time elapsed between injury and reduction	39
Tab.(3)	Presenting the mean and standard deviation for both control and laser group within the follow-up periods.	49
Tab.(4)	Presenting the mean, standard deviation (S.D.) values, and P-values of the mean bone density for the control group (group A) at different time intervals	50
Tab.(5)	Presenting the mean, standard deviation (S.D.) values, and P-values for mean bone density for the laser group (group B) at the different time intervals	52
Tab.(6)	Presenting the mean, standard deviation (S.D.), and P-values of the student's t-test (Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances) for the comparison between mean bone densities in both groups through the different time intervals	54

LIST OF FIGURES

No.		Page
Fig. (1)	Preoperative digital orthoppanograph for assessment of mandibular fracture	44
Fig. (2)	Galliumm aluminum arsenide laser device.	44
Fig. (3)	Maxillary and mandibular arch bars were placed for MMF	45
Fig. (4)	Laser application at the fracture site	45
Fig. (5)	polygon at which IDRISI software measure the bone density	46
Fig. (6)	A histogram representing the bone densities for the control group within the follow-up periods.	50
Fig. (7)	A linear graph representing bone densities for the control group within the follow-up periods	51
Fig. (8)	A histogram representing the bone densities for the laser group within the follow-up periods.	52
Fig. (9)	A linear graph representing bone densities for the laser group within the follow-up periods.	53
Fig. (10)	A histogram showing mean bone densities between control and laser groups through different time intervals.	54

Fig. (11)	A linear graph showing mean bone densities between control and laser groups through different time intervals.	55
Fig. (12)	Base line post-operative digital orthopanograph for control group	56
Fig. (13)	2 week post-operative digital orthopanograph for control group	56
Fig. (14)	4 weeks post-operative digital orthopanograph for control group	57
Fig. (15)	6 weeks post-operative digital orthopanograph for control group	57
Fig. (16)	Base line post-operative digital orthopanograph for laser group	58
Fig. (17)	2 weeks post-operative digital orthopanograph for laser group	58
Fig. (18)	4 weeks post-operative digital orthopanograph for laser group	59
Fig. (19)	6 weeks post-operative digital orthopanograph for laser group	59

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PEMF : Pulsed Electromagnetic Field.

LILI : Low Intensity Laser Irradiation.

MMF : Maxillo-Mandibular Fixation.

BMP : Bone Morphogenic Protein.

Ga-Al-As : Gallium Aluminum Arsenide.

LILT : Low Intensity Laser Therapy.

LLLT : Low-Level Laser Therapy.

ATP : Adenosine Triphosphate

CT : Computerized Tomography.

CADIA : Computer Assisted Densitometric Image Analysis.

IM : Intramuscular.

Introduction

Introduction

The mandible is the second most commonly fractured part of the maxillofacial skeleton because of its position and prominence.^[1,2]

The direction of vector of the force and the mechanism of injury both affect the location and pattern of the fractures. Also the patient's age, the presence of teeth and the physical properties of the causative agent have a direct effect on the characteristics of the resultant injury.^[3]

The goals of mandibular fracture treatment is to restore function by ensuring union of the fractured segments and reestablishing preinjury strength; to restore any contour defect that might arise as a result of the injury; and to prevent infection at the fracture site. Restoration of the mandibular function, in particular, as part of stomatognathic system must include the ability to masticate properly, to speak normally and to allow for articular movements as ample as before the trauma. In order to achieve these goals, restoration of normal occlusion of the patient becomes paramount for the treating surgeon.^[4]

Principles of orthopedic surgery applied to mandibular fractures include reduction, fixation, immobilization and supportive therapies. It is well known that union of fractured segments will only occur in absence of excessive mobility. Stability of the fracture segments is the key for proper hard and soft tissue healing in the injured area. Therefore, the fracture site must be stabilized by mechanical means in order to help guiding of the physiologic process towards normal bony healing. Reduction of the fracture can be achieved either with an open or closed technique. A closed reduction

takes place when the fracture site is not going to be surgically exposed but reduction is deemed accurate by palpation of the bony fragments and by restoration of the functioning segments, for example, restoration of the dental occlusion by wiring the teeth together, using splints, or employing external pins.^[4,5]

It is generally accepted that the vast majority of fractures of the mandible may be treated satisfactorily by closed reduction. Nevertheless, with the advent of the plate and screw fixation devices, open treatment become more common. According to Bernstein, "it is safe to say that the vast majority of fractures of the mandible may be treated satisfactory by the closed reduction technique".^[6] May and colleagues go further: many fractures are properly over treated by open reduction.^[7]

It is important to realize that the majority of fractures can be successfully managed by conservative means (closed reduction). " This concept becomes critical when one considers the economic significance of inflated hospital, operating room material, the need of general anesthesia, and personnel costs. A patient with a mandibular fracture managed by closed technique can be successfully treated as an outpatient with either local anesthesia or conscious sedation.^[8,9,10]

According to Peterson, most uncomplicated fractures in children are united in 2 to 3 weeks, in adults 3to 4 weeks and in older patients in 6 to 8 weeks.^[11]

The main disadvantage of closed technique is the need for long period of immobilization under intermaxillary fixation with subsequent delay of rehabilitation. This draws the attention of many researchers toward

accelerating the healing of fractures by stimulation of osteogenesis. With the subsequent reduction of the immobilization period, prevention of joint stiffness and permission of early rehabilitation. Doubtless, great benefits would accrue to orthopedic patients if the processes of bone healing could be brought under the command of the surgeon, permitting the formation of bone on demand in order to aid in the repair of fractures, nonunion and other skeletal defects.^[12]

Various devices and methods have been used to enhance bone healing including; Low intensity pulsed ultrasound^[13,14], pulsed electromagnetic therapy (PEMF),^[15,16] and low intensity laser irradiation (LILI).^[17]

A lot of studies and researches have been done for over 20 years to know the effect and mechanism of low intensity laser therapy on bone healing. Therefore the aim of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of using low intensity laser therapy in enhancing bone healing in mandibular fractures treated by closed reduction to decrease the immobilization period of maxillomandibular fixation (MMF).

Review of literature