

شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلو

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم





HANAA ALY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكرونيله



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكروفيلم



HANAA ALY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكترونى والميكروفيلم

جامعة عين شمس التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم قسم

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



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار



HANAA ALY

Management of Zygomatic-MaxillaryOrbital Fracture Using Transcutaneous Approaches Versus Retroseptal Transconjunctival Approach

Submitted to the Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University for partial fulfillment of the requirements for master's degree in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery

 $\underline{\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}}$

Mohannad Abdel Hamed Wahdan

BDS 2012

Faculty of Dentistry - Misr International University

Ain Shams University

2021

Supervised by

Mohamed Abdel Mageed Katamish

Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery

Faculty of Dentistry - Ain Shams University

Amr Amin Ghanem

Associate Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery

Faculty of Dentistry - Ain Shams University

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Colonel Dr. Youssef Elmansy head of maxillofacial department of Maadi military hospital for his contribution in this thesis.

A debt of gratitude is also owed to Dr. Magid Omar for always supporting and guiding me.

Many thanks to my senior staff and colleagues in and out of the department of oral and maxillofacial surgery – Ain Shams University, especially Omar Hamad and Mohammad Salah for their efforts.

Dedication

I would like to thank my family and friends, especially my parents for helping, supporting and putting up with me throughout this whole process, without you none of this would indeed be possible.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	I
List of Tables	IV
List of Appendix	V
List of Abbreviations	VI
Introduction	1
Review	3
Aim	25
Patients and Methods	26
Results	48
Discussion	57
Summary	63
Conclusion	64
Recommendation	
References	66
Appendix	73
الملخص العربي	
	List of Appendix List of Abbreviations Introduction Review Aim Patients and Methods Results Discussion Summary Conclusion Recommendation References Appendix

List of Figures

Figure 1 Schematic diagram illustrating the lower eyelid anatomical structures	
traversed by the three approaches for reaching the orbital floor (sagit	tal
view).	16
Figure 2 AO Surgical Reference diagram showing Transconjunctival Approach	
(Courtesy of AO foundation)	16
Figure 3 AO Surgical Refrence diagram showing the retroseptal route enters	
directly into the fat compartments of the lower eyelids. (Courtesy of A	Ю
foundation)	17
Figure 4 AO Surgical Reference diagram showing the incision is placed in the dep	oth
of the fornix. When using scissors, the conjunctiva is elevated laterally	/
with a fine forceps and incised over a distance of about 8 mm includin	ıg
the lower-eyelid retractors. (Courtesy of AO foundation)	17
Figure 5 AO Surgical Reference diagram showing the conjunctiva and the lower-	
eyelid	18
Figure 6 AO Surgical Reference diagram showing the incision line is extended from	m
laterally to medially to expose the fat compartment behind the orbita	l
septum. (Courtesy of AO foundation)	18
Figure 7 AO Surgical Reference Diagram showing Frontal view: A. Subciliary incis	ion
B. Subtarsal incision C. Infra orbital incision D. Subciliary Lateral	
Extention. (Courtesy of AO foundation)	24
Figure 8 AO Surgical Reference Diagram showing the Transcutaneous approachs	;.
Saggital view. (Courtesy of AO foundation)	24
Figure 9 Clinical picture on presentation. (group 2 Case 1)	28
Figure 10 Coronal CT scan showing right orbital floor fracture. (Group 2 Case 1)	28
Figure 11 Clinical picture on presentation. (group 1 Case 1)	28
Figure 12 3D Generated CT scan showing a fracture of the left lower orbital rim	
and floor of the orbit. (Group 1 Case 1)	28
Figure 13 A series of Saggital CT scans showing oblitertion of the maxilliary sinus	;
due to right orbital floor fracture. (Group 3 Case 1)	29
Figure 14 Exposure of the infra orbital fracture (Transconjunctival approach)(Gro	oup
1 Case 3)	33
Figure 15 Exposure of the infra orbital fracture (Transconjunctival approach)(Gro	oup
1 Case 7)	33

Figure 16 Placement of titanium mesh for orb	oital floor fracture and plates and
screws for orbital rim fracture (Trar	nsconjunctival approach)(Group 1
case 7)	34
Figure 17 Closure of the incision using a frost	suture (Transconjunctival
approach)(Group 1 case 7)	34
Figure 19 Placement of titanium mesh fixed v	vith micro screws (Subtarsal
approach)(Group 2 Case 6)	36
Figure 18 Exposure of the inferior orbital rim	(Subtarsal approach)(Group 2 Case 5)
	36
Figure 20 Closure of the orbicularis oculi mus	cle (Subtarsal approach)(Group 2
Case 5)	37
Figure 21 Closure of the skin incision (Subtars	al approach) (Group 2 Case 5) 37
Figure 22 Temporary Tarsorrhaphy (Subciliary	approach) (Group 3 Case 7) 40
Figure 23 Skin incision (Subciliary approach) (
Figure 24 Dissection and exposure (Subciliary	approach) (Group 3 Case 6) 41
Figure 25 Placement of Titanium mesh fixed v	with micro screws (Subciliary
approach)(Group 3 Case 7)	41
Figure 26 Or placement of plates and screws	on infra orbital rim (Subciliary
approach)(Group 3 Case 5)	42
Figure 27 Closure of the skin incision (Subcilia	ry approach)(Group 3 Case 5) 42
Figure 28 Virtual 3D reconstruction of the orb	
Figure 29 A photograph showing preoperative	e (left) and 6 months (right)
postoperative views of a transconju	unctival incision patient. Group 1 case
1	50
Figure 30 A photograph showing preoperative	e (left) and 6 months (right)
postoperative views of a subtarsal i	
Figure 31 A photograph showing 1 week (left)	and 6 months (right) postoperative
views of a subciliary incision patien	
Figure 32 A CT 3D image showing preoperativ	ve (left) and postoperative (right) scan
for a transconjunctival case. Group	1 case 1. 52
Figure 33 A CT 3D image showing preoperativ	ve (left) and postoperative (right) scan
for a subtarsal case. Group 2 Case 1	
Figure 34 A CT coronal cut showing preoperat	tive (top left) and postoperative (top
right) and a CT 3D image (bottom) s	scans for a subciliary case. Group 3
case 7.	,
Figure 35 Chart showing primary outcome res	sults 54
Figure 36 chart showing secondary outcome r	

Figure 37	Transconjunctival approach: 6 months follow up showing scleral show	of
	the right eye.	56
Figure 38	Subtarsal approach: 6 months follow up showing scleral show of the rig	ght
	eye.	56

List of Tables

Table 1 Modified Vancouver scale form	46
Table 2 Classification of scar formation according to modified Vancouver scar sc	ale
	47
Table 3 First follow up results (Immediate postoperative)	48
Table 4 Outcomes means ±SD and P-Values	56

Appendix

Appendix 1 Visual Analogue Scale	. 72
Appendix 2 Patient Form page 1 of 7	. 73
Appendix 3 Patient Form page 2 of 7	. 74
Appendix 4 Patient Form page 3 of 7	. 75
Appendix 5 Patient Form page 4 of 7	. 76
Appendix 6 Patient Form page 5 of 7	. 77
Appendix 7 Patient Form page 6 of 7	. 78
Appendix 8 Patient Form page 7 of 7	. 79

List of Abbreviations

AOCMF Arbeitsgemeinschaft fur Osteosynthesefragen (German) / Cranio-

Maxillofacial

ASA American Society of Anesthesiology

BOV Bony Orbital Volume

CBCT Cone Beam Computed Tomography

CT Computed Tomography

DICOM Digital Imaging and Communications on Medicine

EFI Eye Fissure Index

IM Intra-Muscular

LIC Lower Iris Coverage

MRI Magnetic Resonance Imaging

MVSS Modified Vancouver Scar Scale

NOE Naso-Orbital-Ethmoid

OF Orbital Fracture

ORIF Open Reduction Internal Fixation

OSTV Orbital Soft Tissue Volume

VA Visual Acuity

VAS Visual Analogue Scale

ZMO Zygomatic-Maxillary-Orbital

ZO Zygomatico-Orbital

3D Three Dimensional

Orbital floor and mid facial fractures are a common result of periorbital trauma⁽¹⁾. Traumatic incidents are increasing throughout the world, therefore maxillofacial surgeons must be updated with different ways and approaches to treat the facial fractures.

There are two major approaches to the orbit, which are transcutaneous and transmucosal, under each there are variations. For the former there are three variations, starting closest to the lower eyelid or the cilia line and moving further down towards the cheek. The first is the subciliary approach which has two sub variations, skin flap (non-stepped) and skin muscle flap (stepped). The second is the subtarsal approach, when John Converse published the method in 1944, it soon became widely recognized and clinically applied in orbital surgery⁽²⁾. The third and least used if used at all is the infraorbital approach.

As for the transmucosal approaches there are mainly two variations, preseptal transconjunctival approach which is more demanding and requires meticulous manipulation and surgical skills. The second variation is retroseptal transconjunctival approach, which is easier and slightly faster⁽³⁾.

This approach was first described by Bourquet⁽⁴⁾ for lower eyelid fat removal. Tessier⁽⁵⁾ later popularized this approach in 1973 for exposure of the orbital floor and maxilla for treatment of facial and orbital fractures.

Willson et al.⁽⁶⁾ compared between the two approaches, he mentioned that neither the transconjunctival nor the transcutaneous approaches are immune from complications. But he stated that, oral and maxillofacial surgeons are more likely to be able to manage complications from the subtarsal approach, which include ectropion, scleral-show, and/or hypertrophic scar formation better than they might manage complications from the transconjunctival approach, such as entropion, ectropion, sclera-show, lid