

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم





شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكرو فيلم



جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها
علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار



**Assessment of Muscular Characteristics After Mandibular
Setback: Intraoral Vertical Versus Sagittal Split Ramus
Osteotomy**

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Doctoral Degree in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery,

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain-Shams University

By

Ahmed Mohamed Sadek Amin El Sokkary

B.D.S 2010

M.Sc. 2017

Assistant Lecturer of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain-Shams University

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Mohammed Diaa Zein El Abdien

Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial surgery

Dean of Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dr. Amr Amin Ghanem

Assoc. Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain shams University

Faculty of Dentistry – Ain Shams University

2021

Contents

List of tables:	iv
List of Figures:	v
List of Abbreviations:	vii
Introduction	2
Review of Literature.....	4
Classification of dentofacial deformities:	4
Skeletal Class III (Prevalence / Diagnosis / Clinical Features)	4
Non Surgical Management of Skeletal Class III.....	5
Surgical Management of Skeletal Class III	6
The Evolution of the BSSO	8
IntraOral Vertical Ramus Osteotomy (IVRO)	13
A comparison between the BSSO and the IVRO:	18
Imaging and Virtual Planning in Orthognathic Surgery	19
Orthognathic Surgery and Masticatory Muscles:	21
Orthognathic Surgery and Biting Force.....	24
Aim of the study:.....	27
Patients and Methods:.....	28
Inclusion criteria.....	28
Exclusion criteria:	28
PreSurgical Preparation:	29
Surgical Procedure:	40
The LeFort I Osteotomy	40
Group I, The BSSO surgery,	45
In Group II, IVRO surgery	49
Postoperative instruction and follow up:	52
Biting force measuring and recording:	57
Statistical analysis:	59
Results:.....	60

Descriptive statistics	65
1- Effect of the surgery type on the biting force at different stages:	66
2- Effect of the surgery type on the total biting force throughout the whole treatment time:	68
3- Effect of stage of follow-up on biting force regardless the type of surgery:70	
4- Correlation between amount of setback, biting force in N and surgery type: 72	
5- Correlation between surgery type and operational time:.....	72
Discussion:	73
Discussion of methodology	73
The timing of surgery:	73
The biting force measurement tool:	74
The surgical technique:	75
The MMF duration for the IVRO Group:	76
Discussion of results:	77
The Biting force:	77
Three months followup:.....	78
Six months followup:	79
The amount of setback on the biting force:	79
The type of surgery and the operational time:.....	80
Conclusions:	81
Recommendations:	82
Summary:	83
References:	84

List of tables:

Table 1: Table representing Patients` gender, age, type of surgery, biting force preoperative and at 6 months followup, amount of setback and operation time..	61
Table 2: Descriptive statistics for biting force in Newtons of the BSSO and the IVRO at different stages.	65
Table 3: Table showing means (SD) of biting force in Newtons for both groups (BSSO & IVRO) at different followup stages	66
Table 4: One way ANOVA table showing mean standard error, lower bound and upper bound of surgery type.	68
Table 5: One way ANOVA table showing mean standard error, lower bound and upper bound of followup stage.	71
Table 6: Tukey post hoc test showing a classification of the magnitude of the biting force. (1. RED): The Lowest, (2. Yellow): The Intermediate, (3. Green): The Highest.	71
Table 7: Table showing correlation between amount of setback, surgery type, and biting force.....	72
Table 8: Table showing correlation between surgery type, and operational time .	72

List of Figures:

Figure 1: Correction of mandibular prognathism as described by A: Blair in 1914 and B: Kostecka in 1931. ²⁸	9
Figure 2: (A) The Schlossmann's extraoral approach in 1924. (B) The Kazanjian's extraoral approach in 1951. ²⁸	10
Figure 3: Illustrations showing the Saggital Split osteotomy by Trauner and Obwegeser in 1955. ²⁸	10
Figure 4: Modifications in the lateral osteotomy position of the original Obwegeser BSSO. ²⁸	11
Figure 5: The osteotomy lines for the IVRO. ³⁷	14
Figure 6: IVRO Osteotomy designs. ³⁹	15
Figure 7: The photographic documentation.	30
Figure 8: Frontal View of Maxillary Cast.	32
Figure 9: Occlusal View of Maxillary Cast.	32
Figure 10: Frontal View of Mandibular Cast.	33
Figure 11: Occlusal View of Mandibular Cast.	33
Figure 12: The scan of the maxillary arch.	34
Figure 13: The scan of the mandibular arch.	34
Figure 14: The scan of the planned postoperative occlusion.	35
Figure 15: Segmentation step on the Mimics software (Materialise, Leuven, Belgium)	36
Figure 16: Le Fort I osteotomy for maxillary advancement by 5 mm.	36
Figure 17: BSSO design for mandibular setback by 5mm.	37
Figure 18: Segmentation step on the Mimics software (Materialise, Leuven, Belgium)	38
Figure 19: Le Fort I osteotomy for maxillary advancement.	38
Figure 20: IVRO design for mandibular setback.	39
Figure 21: View after mucoperiosteum and nasal mucosa elevation. Blue arrow points to the thin lateral maxillary sinus wall which was broken during mucoperiosteum elevation.	42
Figure 22: Osteotomy lines.	42
Figure 23: View after maxillary downfracture.	43
Figure 24: Two Mini plates were used to fix the right side.	43
Figure 25: Two Mini plates were used to fix the left side.	44
Figure 26: Exposure of left ramus with a Kocher clamp placed on the ascending ramus.	46

Figure 27: Medial Osteotomy above the lingula.....	47
Figure 28: Anterior vertical osteotomy.....	47
Figure 29: Both segments adapted after removal of all bony interferences.....	48
Figure 30: Exposure of the right ramus.	50
Figure 31: The right angled oscillating saw (SGO2 – E, NSK, Japan).....	50
Figure 32: The proximal segment overlapping the distal segment laterally.	51
Figure 33: Patients are palaced in MMF using the final stent stabilized with MMF screws and wires.....	51
Figure 34: Immediate postoperative full skull CBCT showing the fixation hardware in BSSO Group with the soft tissue profile of the patient. (Patient #4).....	53
Figure 35: Immediate Postoperative Full Skull CBCT showing the upper maxillary hardware and the MMF wires in the IVRO Group (Patient # 9).	54
Figure 36: Postoperative 3D Reconstructed image showing the osteotomy.	54
Figure 37: Panoramic Radiograph for IVRO case (Patient #9), 6 months followup. 56	
Figure 38: Lateral cephalometric radiograph for IVRO case (Patient #9), 6 months followup.	56
Figure 39: The I Bite sensor (Loadstar, USA).....	57
Figure 40: The data flow through the I Bite system (Loadstar)	58
Figure 41: The LoadVUE Pro LV-1000 software showing the maximum force recorded and a graph for the course of the biting capacity during a 10 seconds duration.	58
Figure 42: Patient #4. BSSO case. Left column: Preoperative, Right column: 2 years followup, A: Frontal Smiling View, B: Lateral Profile View, C: IntraOral Side View . 62	
Figure 43: Patient #1. BSSO case, left column: Preoperative, right column: 3 years followup. A: Lateral profile View, B: Frontal Smiling View, C: IntraOral Side View . 63	
Figure 44: Patient #9. VRO case. Left column: Preoperative, Right column: 3 months followup, A: Frontal Smiling View, B: Lateral Profile View, C: IntraOral Frontal View.....	64
Figure 45: Bar chart showing mean biting force in Newtons for different surgeries at different stages of follow-up.	67
Figure 46: Bar chart showing no significant differences in the overall mean biting force in Newtons for both surgeries	69

List of Abbreviations:

3D: Three Dimensional

ABM: Anterior Border of masseter

ANOVA: Analysis Of Variance

Ar – Go – Me: Articulare - Gonion – Menton

BSSO: Bilateral Sagittal Split Osteotomy

CBC: Complete Blood Count

CBCT: Cone Beam Computed Tomography

CT: Computed Tomography

DFD: DentoFacial Deformity

EMG: ElectroMyoGram

EVRO: Extraoral Vertical Ramus Osteotomy

FHP: Frankfurt Horizontal Plane

IAN: Inferior Alveolar Nerve

ILO: Inverted L Osteotomy

INR: International Normalized Ratio

IV: IntraVenous

IVRO: IntraOral Vertical Ramus Osteotomy

MMF: Maxillo – Mandibular Fixation

MP: Mandibular Plane

MRI: Magnetic Reasonance Imaging

N: Newton

NSD: NeuroSensory Disturbance

Pog: Pogonion

PSI: Patient Specific Implant

PT: Prothrombin Time

PTT: Partial Thromboplastin Time

SARPE: Surgically Assisted Rapid Palatal Expansion

SN: Sella Nasion

SSRO: Sagittal Split Ramus Osteotomy

STL: Stereolithographic

TMJ: Temporo – Mandibular Joint

USB: Universal Serial Bus

VAS: Visual Analog Scale

VRO: Vertical Ramus Osteotomy

VSO: Vertical Subcondylar Osteotomy

VSSO: Vertical SubSigmoid Osteotomy

Introduction

Dentofacial deformity (DFD) is a multifactorial condition which affects the position and the size of the upper and lower jaws. DFD Patients exhibit different symptoms including impaired chewing, deglutition, phonation, breathing and aesthetics in addition to a decreased well-being and an affected quality of life. ¹

Orthognathic surgery has been used worldwide to correct severe dentofacial anomalies and it is associated with benefits and risks. Benefits include an improvement in esthetics, mastication and airway patency. Risks include general anasesthesia (Mortality and Morbidity), nerve damage, undesirable soft and hard tissue changes, wound infection and relapse.

A major concern of any orthognathic surgery or orthodontic treatment is the amount of relapse occurring. Several studies compared between the relapse occurring after Bilateral Sagittal Split Osteotomy (BSSO) and IntraOral Vertical Ramus Osteotomy (IVRO), they concluded that there was an insignificant difference in relapse tendency between BSSO (with miniplates fixation) and IVRO (without fixation – only Maxillo – Mandibular Fixation (MMF)). ²

In 2015, a systematic review with meta analysis was done to evaluate the difference in Stability or Neurosensory Function between BSSO and IVRO for Mandibular Setback. It concluded that both BSSO and IVRO have the same good stability. In addition, the results showed that IVRO significantly decreased the incidence of neuro sensory disturbance of the inferior alveolar nerve after mandibular setback surgery compared with the BSSO. ³

AlAbdullah et al used Electromyogram (EMG) to assess the relation between the masticatory muscles activity and the facial growth pattern. They found out that the EMG of temporalis and masseter at maximum intercuspation gave higher values in the horizontal growth pattern group but in vertical growth patterns gave lower values. They suggested that the masticatory and perioral muscles activity play an important role in the development of the facial growth pattern. ⁴

Orthognathic patients are always concerned about the timing of returning to normal masticatory function. In our study , we are comparing between the Bilateral Sagittal Split Osteotomy (BSSO) and the Intraoral Vertical Ramus Osteotomy (IVRO) regarding the biting force progress during the different phases of healing.

Review of Literature

Classification of dentofacial deformities:

Angle classified dental malocclusion into 3 categories: Class I, Class II, and Class III. These dental occlusion patterns are reflected onto the facial profile, as a result it became a way of classifying skeletal relationships of the maxilla and mandible into Class I, Class II, and Class III, where skeletal Class I: The maxillary base is in a normal anteroposterior relationship to the mandibular base, Skeletal Class II: The mandibular base is posterior to the maxillary base because of maxillary prognathism, mandibular retrognathism, or both, and Skeletal Class III: The mandibular base is anterior to the maxillary base because of maxillary retrognathism, mandibular prognathism, or both. ⁵

McNamara in 1981 ⁶ analyzed skeletal class II malocclusion and he found that the most common feature for class II malocclusion is a retrusive mandible. The position of the maxilla varied where it was found in a neutral/normal position.

Skeletal Class III (Prevalence / Diagnosis / Clinical Features)

Skeletal class III described by Angle is considered as a rare dentofacial deformity. It is believed that it has a genetic and familial etiological factor. Reported prevalence rates were as follows: 2.5% in Australia, 4.3% in southern Italy, 5.8% in Colombia, 10.3% in central Turkey and 31.4% in South Korea. ^{7,8}

The patient's chief complaint is often a poor facial appearance but it may be accompanied by functional problems, temporomandibular disorders, or psychosocial handicaps. ⁹

The etiological factors are still not well understood and this creates difficulties for prognosis and treatments. There are several hypotheses for the etiology, including: a small angle at the cranial base, which might displace the mandibular fossa forward and cause the anterior displacement of the mandible, a mismatching between the sizes of both arches such as having the mandibular angle more obtuse than normal, abnormal development of the mandibular body, and genetic or exogenous factors, such as thumb-sucking or early loss of the first molars or permanent teeth.¹⁰

Various distinct cephalometric features have been observed in class III patients, such as an acute cranial base angle, a short and retrusive maxilla, proclined upper incisors, retroclined lower incisors, an excessive lower anterior face height, short anterior cranial base length and obtuse gonial angle.^{11,12}

Non Surgical Management of Skeletal Class III

Non – surgical management of class III Patients might start during their growth phase using functional appliances, interceptive and/or corrective orthodontics, although it is controversial. For adults, dental compensation using fixed orthodontics can be done in mild or moderate cases.¹³

Mandibular growth occurring after puberty is considered as the main cause of failure with orthopedic or orthodontic treatment and as a result class III patients must wait until cessation of growth to receive definitive surgical management. However, delaying the treatment until adulthood might cause more problems with pain, speech, airways, anatomy, occlusion, temporomandibular joint, chewing function, esthetics and psychological factors.¹⁴