Surgical procedures performed to improve the prosthetic prognosis in case of maxillary defects: a review of the literature
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ABSTRACT

Aim The purpose of this review is to address the surgical procedures that need to be followed to obtain a maxillary defect that can be suitable to receive a prosthesis.

Methods An extensive search of the literature was performed, on the databases of PubMed/Medline and Scopus, in addition to congress proceedings and books, written in English or Italian. Literature search was performed using combinations of the following keywords: (“obturator prognosis” OR “palatal obturator” OR “obturator prosthesis” OR “prosthetic prognosis”) AND (“maxillectomy” OR “maxillary defect”).

Results 35 articles, 2 books and 3 congress proceedings were included. After the study of the records included in this review, it was found that surgeon must preserve the anterior maxilla as much as possible, because it is the most suitable site for the placement of implants. Furthermore, if the implant site is involved in post-operative radiotherapy, it is advisable to know the x-ray dose of such an exposition. The surgical cut should preserve mucosa and bone support around the tooth adjacent to the defect, and keratinized mucosa should cover the palatal margin of the defect. Equally important is to prepare an adequate access to the defect, because the turbinates and the bands of oral mucosa may prevent the prosthesis from engaging key areas of the defect, impairing function.

Conclusion A complete knowledge about the construction techniques and biological/mechanical principles of maxillofacial prosthesis is essential to perform surgical interventions that enhance the prosthetic prognosis.

KEYWORD Obturator prognosis, palatal obturator, obturator prosthesis, prosthetic prognosis, maxillary defect, osseodensification.

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, different classification systems of maxillary defects have been proposed, to describe the anatomical limits of defects following maxillectomy. In their systematic review, Bidra et al. (1) concluded that a description of the maxillectomy defect based on 6 criteria could be more objective and amenable to a universal use than a description of the defect based only on a classification system, because of the anatomic complexity of the maxilla and of the various types of maxillary defects that make it not easy to identify a single classification that meets the surgical and prosthetic requirements and that is easy to remember and use.

The six criteria identified by Bidra et al. were the following.
1) Dental status.
2) Oroantral/nasal communication status.
3) Soft palate and other contiguous structure involvement.
4) Superior-inferior extent.
5) Anterior-posterior extent.
6) Medial-lateral extent of the defect (1).

Currently, in oncological surgery, a conservative surgical approach is a must, allowing surgical aggressivity to be reduced to the minimum required to guarantee its effectiveness in terms of lesion removal and, at the same time, to allow the possibility of an efficient closure of the maxillary defect by a correct obturator prosthesis. An obturator is a prosthesis for closing an acquired or congenital opening of the palate (2). It is generally indicated for smaller defects, while microvascular grafts are highly recommended for larger defects, with particular reference to defects requiring a bone support. An obturator is the only solution to give the patient...
a better life quality when a microvascular surgery approach is not feasible due to the characteristics and dimensions of the lesion or to poor systemic-medical conditions. Multiple surgical techniques have been considered over the years to solve problems subsequent to maxillectomy, like free flaps including grafts harvested from rectus abdominus, radial forearm, lateral arm, fibula, iliac crest, and scapula (3, 4). This approach, however, is limited by difficulties in controlling facial contour, soft tissue prolapse, poor facial skin color match, and loss of direct tumor surveillance (3,5-8). Therefore, prosthetic rehabilitation should be taken into account by the clinical team, for the advantages that it is able to bring compared to surgery alone, such as: reduction in loss of substance, control of tumor recurrences, restoration of function and aesthetics. As reported by El Fattah et al., clinical success in patients undergoing maxillectomy depends on some factors: pre-prosthetic surgical preparation of the defect site, dimension and location of the defect, amount and integrity of the remaining structures (3). Therefore, the final result should be an “ideal maxillary defect” specifically created to receive a prosthesis, without compromising the tumor’s resection, improving aesthetics, function and psychological status of the patient.

This paper is aimed at reviewing the literature on the surgical principles to improve prosthetic prognosis in patients with maxillary defects after maxillectomy.

**METHODS**

**Search strategy**

The authors performed an extensive search of the literature, published until January 2019, on the databases of PubMed/Medline and Scopus, in addition to congress proceedings, books and manuals related to the prosthetic rehabilitation of the maxillary defects, written in English or Italian. To avoid missing relevant studies, the authors also reviewed the reference lists of the identified articles, congress proceedings and books. Literature search was performed using combinations of the following keywords: (“obturateur prognosis” OR “palatine obturature” OR “obturateur prosthesis” OR “prosthetic prognosis”) AND (“maxillectomy” OR “maxillary defect”).

The literature search was completed in January 2019, and the studies included in this review were published between 1968 and September 2018. The search strategy and results are reported in Table 1.

**Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

Studies were considered as appropriate for inclusion in this review if they met the following criteria.

1) Studies focusing on the prosthetic rehabilitation of the maxillary defects.

2) Studies based on the implant-prosthetic rehabilitation of the maxillary defects.

3) Studies that address the problem of implant-prosthetic rehabilitation in the patient undergoing radiation therapy.

4) Studies that provide useful explanations on the surgical procedures to be followed in order to rehabilitate the patient with a defect of the upper jaw.

5) Studies published in Italian or English.

The following were the exclusion criteria.

1) Non-human studies.

2) In vitro studies.

3) Studies published in languages other than English or Italian.

**Data extraction**

Following the inclusion criteria, three authors independently selected the articles by reading relevant abstracts. The full text of each identified article was then read to determine whether it was suitable for inclusion. The authors were in agreement regarding the inclusion of all the articles included in this review.
RESULTS

Study selection
The search strategy produced 472 records, many of which were duplicates, 317 from Scopus and 155 from PubMed. All the duplicates were removed, thus all of the selected databases produced 338 records. After the examination of titles, abstracts and keywords, the reviewers excluded 230 records, because they did not meet the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Of the remaining 108 records, 73 were excluded because they did not provide useful information to evaluate which surgical modifications should be followed to improve the prosthetic prognosis of the maxillary obturators. The remaining 35 articles were included in the present systematic review.

Furthermore, a manual search was conducted through manuals of maxillofacial prostheses and congress proceedings carried out during the events of the "International Congress on Maxillofacial Prosthetics" and of the "International Congress on Pre-Prosthetic Surgery". After this manual search, 2 books and 3 congress proceedings were included because they met the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The workflow of the paper screening process is reported in Figure 1, according to the "PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram" (9).

Evaluated surgical modifications
After an extensive review of the literature, the authors highlighted the points on which to focus on in order to improve the prosthetic prognosis of the obturators: the importance of the hard palate for the retention of implants; the usefulness of skin graft; the retention of the teeth adjacent to the defect; the preservation of palatal mucosa; the removal of the coronoid process and of the soft palate; the accessibility of the obturator through the defect; the implant therapy and the new digital technologies and finally the management of the patient undergoing radiotherapy.

**Hard palate:** retention of the anterior maxilla improves prosthetic prognosis through the enhancement of stability and support of the prosthesis (especially in highly atrophic ridges).

The anterior maxilla is the preferred site for the placement of implants in these edentulous patients, so if a large part of this region can be preserved, more implants can be positioned to achieve a better retention of the obturator prosthesis and an improved tolerance to masticatory forces (10).

**Skin grafts:** the key to the success of the prosthetic rehabilitation is the utilization of the lateral wall of the defect left by the surgical procedure. Covering the reflected cheek flap and other adjacent raw tissue surfaces with a split-thickness skin graft allows to enhance the obturator’s retention and tolerance, in patients with total maxillectomy defects. Respiratory epithelium is less resistant to the abrasion caused by the obturator than keratinized stratified squamous epithelium. Moreover, when the defect is allowed to granulate and epithelialize spontaneously, it can be covered by poorly keratinized epithelium. Placement of the skin graft limits scarring and improves the flexibility of the cheek area, so there will be more support and better restoration of the midfacial contours with the obturator prosthesis. It is worth noticing that at the junction of the oral mucosa and the skin graft, a longitudinal scar band is formed, which creates a retentive pocket above and a support area below the band. Engaging the scar band superiorly and inferiorly with the prosthesis enhances retention, stability and support (10-15).

**Transalveolar resection:** the surgical incision should provide the availability of bone and mucosa near the tooth adjacent to the defect, although this can require the sacrifice of a dental element. This tooth is often involved in prosthetic retention, by using clasp and rest, and, in cases of large defects, can be subjected to excessive loads. Scarcity or lack of bone around this tooth significantly limits its involvement as a retaining element and makes a proper prosthetic design of the prosthesis difficult to obtain. For these reasons, maxillectomy should be performed making the bone resection at the center of the alveolar socket of the adjacent, previously extracted, tooth. It is critical that the line of incision of the mucosa is made laterally to the bone cutting line, so subsequently the mucosa will be reflected to cover the medial margin of the defect.

This procedure provides a sufficient quantity of bone...
to the distal side of the tooth medially localized to the defect (10). So, a satisfactory retention of this tooth in its alveolus will be ensured and it will maintain its retentive function.

**Palatal mucosa:** when possible, the surgeon should save some portions of the palatal mucosa normally included in the resection area. In addition, he should reflect this tissue during palatal bone resection, because it could be used later to cover the medial palatal bone margin. This bone margin should be surgically rounded before covering it with palatal mucosa. Keratinized mucosa should cover the palatal margin of the defect, in such a way that the prosthesis may optimally engage this surface, so that the lateral stability of the prosthesis obturator can be improved. In fact, in these edentulous patients, the palatal margin of the defect often behaves as the fulcrum around which the prosthesis rotates during function. Surgeons may perform a split-thickness skin graft to cover the medial surface of the defect, when an appropriate amount of palatal keratinized mucosa is not available due to the size of the tumor (10).

In patients undergoing hemimaxillectomy, a reduced number of remaining teeth, the closure of the palatal flap with rotated temporalis muscle can lead to the onset of difficulties for the prosthetic rehabilitation. Some of these are the following.

- The different axes of rotation of the prosthesis.
- The possible difficulty in directing the occlusal forces along the long axes of the remaining teeth without applying excessive lateral loads.
- The possible difficulty in getting a good stability of the prosthesis during masticatory function (15).

**Coronoid process:** when mandible moves downward and forward, the coronoid process can cause the displacement of the disto-lateral portion of the obturator and/or the inflammation of the adjacent mucosa. Therefore, surgeon should remove the coronoid process, particularly when the resection extends posteriorly into the soft palate. If the coronoid process is not removed, then postoperative pain and limitation of mandibular movements will be observed (3, 17).

**Soft palate:** when less than one-third of the posterior aspect of the soft palate is left postsurgically in the resected side, the entire soft palate should be removed. This remnant band of intact soft palate, in fact, has neither innervation nor capacity for normal elevation, so that these nonfunctional bands often contract superiorly, thus preventing proper positioning of an obturator prosthesis designed to interface with the residual velopharyngeal musculature still present in the postero-lateral pharyngeal wall. However, surgeon should not remove the entire soft palate when there is an edentulous patient undergoing a total maxillectomy. In such situation the retention of the obturator is difficult and the extension of the obturator to the nasal side of the residual soft palate is an advantage that overcomes the possible speech and leakage problems (10).

**Access to the defect:** structures such as the turbinates and bands of oral mucosa may prevent the prosthesis from engaging key areas of the defect, compromising its function. Actually, the extension of the obturator up the lateral wall of the defect enhances the retention and stability of the prosthesis, and the engagement of the lateral nasal side of the orbital floor provides support for the obturator. Naturally, the situation worsens when the post-surgical defect is very large. So, it is advisable to include the turbinates in the surgical resection, but this advice may not apply to small midline defects of the hard palate-soft palate junction because the superior extension of the obturator is not as critical (14).

**Implants:** when the prognosis for the remaining teeth is not favorable or when the patient is totally edentulous, the placement of some implants might be an effective therapeutic choice. The most appropriate and frequent site where they can be placed is the remaining premaxilla (10, 18, 19). In certain edentulous patients, the alveolar process under the maxillary sinus, like maxillary tuberosities, might offer sufficient bone for a proper implant placement. These implants can be placed immediately after surgical resection of the tumor, but the use of bony sites adjacent to the defect is not advisable, except in some particular cases, because the maintenance of a proper hygiene becomes quite difficult around the implants (10).

In patients undergoing hemimaxillectomy, the defect does not allow an ideal distribution of the implants. The placement of zygomatic implants and “patient-specific sub-periosteal implant” (20) can be considered to rehabilitate a largely compromised maxillary bone anatomy (20-21), and this solution can help to achieve an additional retentive element and a more balanced distribution of forces (22).

The retentive systems described in the literature to retain an obturator are: locators (23), bars (24-25), and telescopic attachments (26).

Another key point is to restore proper adherent mucosa in the insertion area of the implants. In a case reported by Ciocca et al. (16), it has been reported that after a Le Fort I fracture (27), with retrusion of the maxilla and complete edentulism, bone veneers were positioned in the pre-maxilla in order to place implants allowing a greater prosthetic anchorage. However, this procedure led to a subsequent positioning of the fixtures in the lip mucosa with hygienic difficulties for the cleaning of the abutments (16).

**Digital technology:** it is an undisputable fact that, in the last years, Computer Aided Design/Computer Aided Manufacturing (CAD-CAM) systems and, more generally, digital technologies have become widespread in every field of dentistry. Recently, significant progress has been made with the use of implants and with digital technology to design surgical guides, patient-specific sub-periosteal implants, superstructures and
craniofacial implants (20, 28). A study of Mertens et al. demonstrated that cross-arch CAD/CAM milled superstructures supported by implants and placed in both residual alveolar ridges and contralateral zygomatic bone could enhance obturator stability and improve functional outcomes (26, 29). Furthermore, the CAD/CAM superstructures improved retention, without any mechanical or biological complications (26).

In the scientific literature there are several case reports and innovative digital workflows for the construction of an obturator prosthesis. The conventional procedures for the realization of these prostheses, however, are not totally supplanted by new digital technologies, in fact to date there is no protocol that does not require at least an “analogic” step compared to a workflow that therefore can not be defined totally digital, but “hybrid”, because of the intercalation of at least one analogic step in a digital workflow.

In some works (30-33) the authors started from the digitization of the upper jaw; the digitization could be obtained with cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) systems (31-34) sometimes associated with the datasets of a magnetic resonance imaging (33) or of an intraoral scanner (IOS) or a laboratory scanner (30, 32).

Other authors (30) first scanned the upper jaw with an IOS and then they designed and printed (with three-dimensional printer) a metal frame as a support to obtain a functional impression of the defect. George Michelinakis (31) scanned the maxilla using a CBCT system, and printed a three-dimensional model, useful to fabricate a custom acrylic tray for the final impression of the remaining maxilla and the maxillary defect.

Radiotherapy: the maxillofacial prosthodontist has a key role in limiting the negative effects of radiotherapy through the design and construction of specific devices that direct the rays towards the anatomical area that should have to be treated with radiotherapy and not in the healthy surrounding tissues not affected by the tumor.

Between the secondary effects that could cause difficulties for the prosthodontist, during the rehabilitation of maxillary defects, there are: trismus of the masticatory muscles, mucositis, quantitative and qualitative alterations of saliva and periodontal disease. If the positioning site of the implant is subjected to exposure of rays during the post-operative radiotherapy, then it will be advisable to know the dose to which this site will be subjected, because if the dose is excessive, then the positioning of the implants will be an unwise procedure at the time of tumor ablation.

If the use of radiation therapy is not programmed, then the placement of implants will be indicated at the time of surgical resection of the tumor, but if the use of radiation therapy is programmed, the placement of the implants must be made at least one and a half months prior to the first session of radiotherapy, so it is influenced by staging and histology of the tumor (10, 35–38). The risk of osteoradionecrosis increases with doses exceeding 50Gy (39), 60Gy (40), 65Gy (41), and 70Gy (42); the necrosis of the soft tissues may occur with doses lesser than 50 Gy, while damage to the salivary glands can be achieved with doses lesser than 20 Gy (42-44).

In their study, Claudy et al. (45) concluded that there is a higher risk of failure if implants are installed within a period of less than 12 months after radiotherapy, however, there is no evidence from clinical trials to verify this risk (45).

CONCLUSION

The prosthodontist has the task of restoring aesthetics and function but such a task is not easy to achieve in cases of resected patients. Not only the effectiveness of rehabilitation depends on the extension of the residual alveolar ridge, but it is also related to the number of remaining teeth and the degree of resection. Today, new plastic surgery techniques and endosseous implants have enhanced the prognosis of such prosthetic rehabilitations.

Unfortunately, not all surgical interventions are performed in a way that plead a possible prosthetic rehabilitation; the reason could be that there is not always a complete knowledge about the construction techniques and biological/mechanical principles of maxillofacial prosthesis.
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