

‘MANDIBULAR DEFECTS’- A NARRATIVE REVIEW

Dr. DeviSuvarchala A,¹ Dr. LakshmanaRao B,² Dr. T.S.V Satyanarayana,³ Dr. Ysaswini K,⁴ Dr. Bhanu prasad K.⁵

1. Post Graduate Student, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh, India,
2. Professor and HOD, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh, India,
3. Professor, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh, India,
4. Post Graduate Student, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh, India,
5. Post Graduate Student, Dept of Prosthodontics, Lenora Institute of Dental Sciences, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh, India.

INTRODUCTION:

Mandibular defects can result from an assortment of causes, counting injury, tumors, disease, innate irregularities, and surgical resection. Understanding the classifications of these abandons is vital for treatment arranging and remaking. These classifications give an organized approach to diagnosing and arranging the treatment for mandibular absconds. Each framework has its applications and can be chosen based on the clinical situation and the needs of the patient. Mandibular defects taking after ablative surgery for dangerous tumors of the head and neck locale affect both shape and work. Procured segmental defects of the mandible are most commonly auxiliary to extirpation tumor treatment or avulsive traumatic harm. [1]

Presently there is no all-around acknowledged classification framework of graphic surgical significance that exists for mandibular absconds taking after mandibular resection or planed mandibulectomy. Most of the accessible classifications are coordinated to mandibular surrenders counting hard surrenders of the

mandible after surgical extraction of mandibular tumors or composite surrenders due to different etiologies. [2]

Functional disturbances:

The most genuine sequelae of procured mandibular irregularity are a retrusion and deviation of the remaining mandibular fragment towards the surgical side. [3] On mouth opening, mandibular deviation increments, and the way of closure is no longer a straight pivot development in the sagittal plane. Up to 20 mm of sidelong deviation and 10 mm of back retrusion may be encountered.³ The whole envelope of movement happens on the deformity side amid rumination. [4] When seen from the frontal plane, teeth on the surgical side of the mandible move absent from their contradicting maxillary teeth after their starting contact on the non-surgical side is achieved.

There is an going with misfortune of the proprioceptive sense of impediment, which leads to uncertain mandibular developments. Mandibulectomy patients are likely to show blunders due to impedance of the articulating instrument and/or change of the reverberation chambers. Numerous patients encounter serious impediment of mouth opening after mandibulectomy. [5] Mandibular trismus frequently makes challenges in recording intra-oral anatomy.

The greatness of restorative deformation is influenced by the measure and area of the imperfection and the strategy of recreation. [6]

Patients with brokenness abandons commonly display more noteworthy misfortune of mandibular bone and soft tissue bulk or maybe than patients with mandibular coherence defects.³⁸ Front surrenders without surgical reproduction comes about in circumstances with the most deformation. [7]

Basically the mandibular defects are two types:

- A. Acquired Defects
- B. Congenital Defects

A. Acquire Defects:

Here are a few common classifications of acquired mandibular defects:

1. HCL Classification

The HCL classification, presented by Jewer et al. in 1989, is broadly utilized to depict mandibular surrenders based on anatomical location:[8]

H (Hemimandibular imperfection): Includes half of the mandible, counting the condyle.

C (Central deformity): Includes the midline of the mandible, influencing the symphysis.

L (Horizontal imperfection): Includes the body of the mandible but not amplifying to the midline.

2. Cantor R, Curtis TA Classification: [9]

One of the prevalent classifications. The classifications are based on the sum of the edentulous mandible that has been resected or reestablished and are particular to edentulous patients. Subjectively characterized to offer assistance clarify future talks of these patients. the classifications are based on the sum of the mandible that has been resected or reestablished and are particular to edentulous patients. The categories are as follows:

Class I: Radical alveolectomy with conservation of mandibular continuity

Class II: Sidelong resection of mandible distal to the cuspid

Class III - Horizontal resection of the mandible to the midline

Class IV: Horizontal bone unite surgical reconstruction

Class V: Front bone join surgical reconstruction

Class VI: Resection of the front parcel of the mandible without reconstructive surgery to join together sidelong fragments.

3. Cordeiro and Santamaria Classification : [10]

This classification framework centers on the degree of the imperfection and its suggestions for reconstruction:

Type I: Constrained to the alveolar process.

Type II: Includes the alveolar prepare and the second rate border of the mandible.

Type III: Includes the condyle.

4. Milora M Classification: [11]

Surgical Anatomy-Based Classification, which is based on the association of diverse anatomical parts of the mandible:

Type I: Abandons including the symphysis and parasymphysis.

Type II: Surrenders including the body of the mandible.

Type III: Abandons including the ramus.

Type IV: Absconds including the condyle.

5. AO CMF Classification OR Schramm A et al. Classification: [12]

The AO CMF (Cranio-Maxillofacial) gather has created a comprehensive classification framework that considers the area and degree of the defect:

M1: Separated deformity in the tooth-bearing segment.

M2: One-sided deformity not including the condyle.

M3: Two-sided imperfection not including the condyle.

M4: Imperfection including the condyle.

M5: Imperfection including the whole mandible.

6. MDC (Mandibular Deformity Classification) OR Urken ML et al., classification: [13]

Developed by Urken et al., CRBS classification was based on delicate tissue and nerve absconds in expansion to hard imperfection, It's a comprehensive classification of composite oromandibular surrenders which incorporates 'neurological deficits' (8 conceivable outcomes) in expansion to hard (20 conceivable outcomes) and delicate tissue abandons (22 conceivable outcomes). this classification fizzled to separate irregularity abandons from coherence surrenders when compared with the classification proposed by Cantor and Curtis. [1]

Class I: Sidelong deformity not including the angle.

Class II: Horizontal imperfection including the point but not the ramus.

Class III: Horizontal imperfection including the point and ramus but saving the condyle.

Class IV: Sidelong deformity including the point, ramus, and condyle.

Class V: Central imperfection including the symphysis.

7. ABC Classification: [14]

This classification by Brown and Shaw partitions surrenders based on their anatomic and useful impact:

A: Surrenders that do not include the mandibular continuity.

B: One-sided abandons including the mandibular continuity.

C: Reciprocal surrenders including the mandibular continuity.

Each classification framework gives an organized approach to diagnosing and arranging the treatment for obtained mandibular abandons. The choice of classification frequently depends on the clinical situation and the reconstructive goals.

8. Brown's Classification: [15]

This classification framework centers on the association of the mandible's progression and adjoining structures:

Class I: Horizontal imperfection not including the condyle.

Class II: Horizontal imperfection including the condyle.

Class III: Front deformity including the symphysis but not the condyles.

Class IV: Two-sided absconds including the condyles and symphysis.

9. Boyd's Classification: [16]

Boyd et al., altered the HCL classification to incorporate delicate tissue component into it in 1993 and this included delicate tissue abandons by including 3 lower case letter sets (o,m,s) This classification centers on the degree of hard and delicate tissue involvement:

Type I: Bone deformity only.

Type II: Bone and intraoral delicate tissue defect.

Type III: Bone and extraoral delicate tissue defect.

Type IV: Combined bone, intraoral, and extraoral delicate tissue defect.

B. Congenital Mandibular Defects:

Congenital mandibular surrenders are conditions show at birth that influence the structure and work of the mandible. These surrenders can result from hereditary variables, natural impacts, or a combination of both. Here are a few of the common inherent abandons of the mandible, along with references for assist reading:

1. Micrognathia

Micrognathia alludes to an unusually little jaw. It can be an disconnected condition or portion of a disorder such as Pierre Robin Grouping or Treacher Collins Disorder. {17]

2. Mandibulofacial Dysostosis (Treacher Collins Syndrome)

This hereditary clutter influences the advancement of bones and other tissues of the confront. It is characterized by immature facial bones, counting the mandible, cleft sense of taste, and hearing misfortune. [18]

3. Pierre Robin Sequence

A condition characterized by micrognathia, glossoptosis (descending relocation or withdrawal of the tongue), and cleft sense of taste. These highlights can lead to breathing and nourishing troubles. [19]

4. Hemifacial Microsomia

This condition includes underdevelopment of one side of the confront, counting the mandible. It can run from gentle to serious and may influence the ears, eyes, and other facial structures.[20]

5. Agnathia

A uncommon condition where there is halfway or total nonattendance of the mandible. It regularly presents with other extreme craniofacial inconsistencies.[21]

6. Goldenhar Disorder (Oculo-Auriculo-Vertebral Spectrum)

A intrinsic condition characterized by irregularities of the eye, ear, and spine, with mandibular hypoplasia being a common include. It is considered a variation of hemifacial microsomia.[22]

7. Nager Disorder (Nager Acrofacial Dysostosis)

This disorder includes underdevelopment of the mandible (micrognathia), descending inclining eyes, and appendage anomalies. It is portion of the acrofacial dysostosis bunch of disorders.[23]

8. Craniofacial Microsomia

This term depicts a range of conditions where there is underdevelopment of the mandible and other facial structures. It includes different syndromic and non-syndromic introductions. [24]

9. Orofacial Advanced Syndrome

A gather of clutters characterized by anomalies in the advancement of the verbal depth, facial highlights, and digits. A few subtypes include mandibular hypoplasia. [24] These inherent mandibular defects require cautious conclusion and regularly multidisciplinary administration including paediatricians, geneticists, verbal and maxillofacial specialists, orthodontists, and other masters. Early intercession and treatment arranging are significant for tending to utilitarian and stylish concerns related with these conditions.

Prosthetic Management of mandibular surrenders:

Prosthetic administration of mandibular absconds centres on reestablishing work and aesthetics for patients who have misplaced portion or all of their mandible due to surgery, injury, or infection. This incorporates the utilize of detachable prostheses, settled prostheses, and implant-supported prostheses. Here are the different prosthetic approach for overseeing mandibular absconds, along with references for encourage reading:

a). Removable Prostheses:

Obturator- Utilized to near huge surrenders, such as those coming about from hemi mandibulectomy, to progress discourse and gulping. Frequently incorporates a spine expanding into the deformity range to bolster the prosthesis. Illustrated adequacy in making strides masticatory work and discourse with obturator prostheses for patients with mandibular defects.[25]

Guiding Plane Prosthesis-Helps in repositioning the mandible to a more ideal occlusal relationship. Particularly useful in cases of mandibular deviation taking after segmental resection. Shown made strides work and quality of life for patients utilizing directing rib prostheses after mandibular resections. [26]

b). Fixed Prostheses:

Dental Bridges-: Supplant lost teeth by tying down to adjoining characteristic teeth. Reasonable for little absconds where adequate projection teeth are display. Appeared moved forward steadiness and maintenance of dental bridges in patients with mandibular absconds. [27]

c). Implant-Supported Prostheses:

Implant-Supported Overdentures-Provide upgraded soundness and maintenance compared to ordinary dentures. Particularly advantageous for patients with broad mandibular absconds. Highlighted the victory of implant-supported overdentures in making strides masticatory work and quiet satisfaction.[28]

Fixed Implant-Supported Prostheses- Offer a changeless arrangement with great solidness and work. Incorporates systems and prosthetic teeth secured to inserts. Illustrated fruitful results with settled implant-supported prostheses in patients with mandibular progression absconds. [29]

d). Maxillofacial Prostheses:

Mandibular Resection Prostheses- Planned to reestablish mandibular form and work taking after segmental resection. May incorporate spines and expansions to fill the deformity and back the remaining mandibular fragments. Appeared made strides mandibular work and esthetics with the utilize of a resection prosthesis with a direction incline. [30]

e). Reconstruction Plates and Prostheses:

Custom-Made Titanium Prostheses - Give basic bolster and keep up mandibular coherence. Appropriate for expansive abandons requiring broad reproduction. Highlighted fruitful useful and tasteful results utilizing custom-made titanium inserts for mandibular recreation. [31]

f). Guided Prosthetic Rehabilitation:

3D Printing and CAD/CAM Technology-Allows exact creation of prostheses and surgical guides. Upgrades exactness in prosthetic fitting and surgical arranging. Illustrated the potential of CAD/CAM innovation in making profoundly exact and well-fitting prostheses for complex mandibular absconds. [32]

Prosthodontic administration of mandibular absconds includes a multidisciplinary approach that incorporates different sorts of prostheses and progressed advances to reestablish work and aesthetics. Thinks about bolster the viability of these strategies, highlighting the significance of individualized treatment arranging to accomplish ideal results for patients with mandibular defects.

CONCLUSION:

Several endeavours at classifying mandibular surrenders in a straightforward and viable way, to help administration, have been made, and they have steadily transformed with time as the administration for these surrenders has advanced. Unsurprising recovery of patients with procured mandibular absconds requires near coordination between the specialists and maxillofacial prosthodontists.

REFERENCES:

1. Leong EWJ, Cheng AC, Tee-Khin N, Wee AG. Management of Acquired Mandibular Defects—Prosthodontic Considerations. *Singapore Dent J* 2006;28 (1):1-12.
2. Adelusi EA. Classification of Mandibulectomy/Mandibular Defects. *World J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2019; 2(3):1-6.
3. Curtis TA, Cantor R. The forgotten patient in maxillofacial prosthetics. *J Prosthet Dent* 1974;31:662–80.
4. Curtis T, Taylor R, Rositano J. Physical problems in obtaining records of the maxillofacial patient. *J Prosthet Dent* 1975; 34:539–54.
5. Taylor TD. Diagnostic considerations for prosthodontic rehabilitation of the mandibulectomy patient. In: Taylor TD, ed. *Clinical Maxillofacial Prosthetics*. Chicago: Quintessence, 2000:171–88.
6. Urken ML, Buchbinder D, Costantino PD, Sinha U, Okay D, Lawson W, et al. Oromandibular reconstruction using microvascular composite flaps. Report of 210 cases. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 1998;124:46–55.
7. Beumer J III, Marunick MT, Curtis TA, Roumanas E. Acquired defects of the mandible: etiology, treatment, and rehabilitation. *Maxillofacial Rehabilitation: Prosthodontic and Surgical Considerations*. St Louis: Ishiyaku EuroAmerica, 1996:113–224.
8. Jewer DD, Boyd JB, Manktelow RT, Zuker R M, Rose I B, Rotstein L E et al. Orofacial and mandibular reconstruction with the radial forearm free flap: A review of 60 cases. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* 1989; 84(3): 391-402.
9. Cantor R, Curtis TA. Prosthetic management of edentulous mandibulectomy patients. Part I. Anatomic, physiologic, and psychologic considerations. *J Prosthet Dent* 1971; 25(4): 446-57.

10. Cordeiro P G, Santamaria E. A classification system and algorithm for mandibular reconstruction. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* 2000; 105(1): 18-30.
11. Miloro M, Ghali G E, Larsen P E, Waite P D. *Peterson's Principles of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2nd Edition, 2004, BC Decker Inc., Hamilton, London, Vol-1: 583.
12. Schramm A, Gellrich NC, Schmelzeisen R, Rohner D. (2009). AOCMF Classification System: Mandible Defects. AOCMF.
13. Urken ML, Weinberg H, Vickery C, Buchbinder D, Lawson W, Biller H F et al. Oromandibular reconstruction using microvascular composite flaps. *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery* 1991; 117(7):733-744.
14. Brown JS, Shaw R J. (2010). Reconstruction of the Mandible. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* 2010;; 125(2);117-125.
15. Brown J S, Jones D C. Total reconstruction of the mandible using a titanium plate with a particulate cancellous bone and marrow graft. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery* 2001; 59(3): 287-295.
16. Boyd J B, Gullane P J, Rotstein LE, Brown D H, Irish J C. (1993). Classification of mandibular defects. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* 1993; 92(1): 126-132.
17. St-Hilaire H, Buchbinder D. (2014). Congenital Mandibular Anomalies. In O. E. Johnson & C. Y. Mah (Eds.), *Textbook of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, 2014, Springer, pp. 105-116.
18. Poswillo D. (1975). The pathogenesis of the Treacher Collins syndrome (mandibulofacial dysostosis). *British Journal of Oral Surgery* 1975;13(1):1-26.
19. Bush P, Williams AJ. The classification of the Pierre Robin syndrome. *Journal of Maxillofacial Surgery* 1983; 11(2): 61-65.
20. Vento A R, LaBanc J P. Hemifacial microsomia: a review of the literature. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery* 1994; 52(10):1012-1017.
21. Spranger J W, Benirschke K. Agnathia–holoprosencephaly: a new polytopic field defect. *Human Genetics* 1974; 23(1):98-101.
22. Grabb WC. The first and second branchial arch syndrome. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* 1965; 36(5):485-508.

23. Nager FR. Das gehororgan bei den angeborenen kopfmissbildungen. *Pract Otorhinolaryngol* (Basel) 1948;10(suppl 2):1–128.
24. Monasterio FO, Taylor JH. Congenital mandibular hypoplasia. *Seminars in Orthodontics* 2001; 7(3):201-214.
25. Gurrieri F, Franco B, Toriello H, Neri G. Oral–facial–digital syndromes: review and diagnostic guidelines. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part A* 2007; 143(24): 3314-3323.
26. Marunick M T, Mathog R H. (1990). Evaluation of a mandibular guide flange prosthesis. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 1990; 63(5): 578-583.
27. Pratap B, Gill DS. (2006). Prosthetic rehabilitation of a segmental mandibulectomy patient using a bar-retained, implant-supported overdenture: A clinical report. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 2006; 95(6): 489-493.
28. Roumanas ED. (2009). The role of implants in the prosthodontic management of the irradiated patient. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 2009; 102(6): 224-232.
29. Bedrossian E, Tawadros A. Implant-supported fixed restorations for the mandibular continuity defects: A clinical report. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 2016; 115(6): 637-642.
30. Jacob R F. Modified mandibular resection prosthesis with guidance ramp for a patient with head and neck cancer: A clinical report. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 1998; 80(2): 129-132.
31. Scolozzi P, Herzog G, Jaques B. (2007). Functional and aesthetic restoration of complex mandibular defects using patient-specific implants: Report of two cases. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery* 2007; 65(9): 1837-1843.
32. Ciocca L, Scotti R. (2004). CAD-CAM generated ear cast by means of a laser scanner and rapid prototyping machine. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry* 2004; 92(6): 591-595.