

Journal homepage: http://www.journalijar.com Journal DOI: <u>10.21474/IJAR01</u> INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH

RESEARCH ARTICLE

MAXILLOFACIAL PROSTHETIC TREATMENT OF CONGENITAL CRANIOFACIAL DEFECT PATIENTS.

Ghasak H. Jani and Intisar J. Ismail.

Manuscrint Info	Abstract
	1050 000
Manuscript History:	Cleft palate is one of the most common congenital craniofacial anomaly,
Received: 25 April 2016 Final Accepted: 19 May 2016 Published Online: June 2016	eating, breathing and speaking, but their psychological well-being, somaxillofacial prosthetic treatment for these patients restricted physical and psychological defect.
Key words:	
*Corresponding Author	
Ghasak H. Jani.	Copy Right, IJAR, 2016,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

The morphology of the jaw has a functional and aesthetic role. The palate separates the oral cavity from the nasal fossa and occlusion between the dental arches provides the mandible with the stability which enables the pharyngeal muscles to initiate the critically important act of swallowing. Aesthetically, the maxillary bone is responsible for the projection of the nose, cheeks and hemi-face.⁽¹⁾

The congenital anomalies are quite frequent, although their prevalence among the general population depends on racial, ethnic and geographic factors, as well as on socioeconomic status. ⁽²⁾ Cleft lip and palate (CLP) is the most common congenital craniofacial anomaly.

A maxillary-palatal defect may have serious consequences as far as concerns the relationship between form and function: inability to chew and swallow, disorders in phonation and important psychological implications ⁽³⁾.

The causes of cleft palate are not entirely clear. The causes may be due to infectious diseases of the mother, mechanical interference with local blood supply in the fetus, malnutrition in the mother or any of the several changes in intrauterine environment. ⁽⁴⁾

The difficulties of cleft palate patients involve physical activities such as eating, breathing and speaking, but their psychological well-being is also affected. Thus, it has been suggested that a prosthesis may improve both the physical and psychological performances of patients, as well as their quality of life .⁽⁵⁾

Patients in this group usually present with a palatal defect, despite previous attempts at a surgical repair, although there are still a few older patients that have been left with an unprepared palatal defect. The oro-nasal communication may contribute to a hyper nasal speech pattern and difficulties with feeding and drinking. Where there is only a small fistula, some patients are surprisingly able to manage without any intervention.⁽⁶⁾

When rehabilitating these patients, face the difficult decision of whether to use fixed or removable partial dentures (FPDs, RPDs). In patients with severe deficiency, more extensive, advanced restorative care is required to resolve functional, esthetic, and phonetic problems. There are various methods of definitive prosthetic treatment in cleft palate patients. A combination of bone grafting and implant- supported fixed or removable prostheses is an invasive

treatment approach. A conservative alternative treatment could be conventional fixed or removable prostheses for patients who refuse surgical intervention ⁽⁷⁾. RPDs are especially indicated in patients with tissue deficiency, several fistulae, soft palate dysfunction, or uncoordinated nasopharyngeal sphincter action, which can lead to hyper nasal speech ⁽⁸⁾. Furthermore, it is suggested that a prosthesis may improve the psychological status of patients as well as their quality of life ⁽⁹⁾. Providing maxillofacial prosthetic treatment for patients with congenital and craniofacial defects should not only address physical and functional deficiencies, but, ideally, should also consider the possible psychological effects of these deformities.⁽¹⁰⁾

Case report 1:-

A 30 -year-old man came to the Patient Admission Office at the School of Dentistry of the University of Baghdad seeking prosthetic treatment for his perforated maxilla. he had several previous reconstructive surgical attempts toclose or reduce her palatal cleft lip/palate . he has only few teeth, which moved to become close to mid palatine suture after surgery, after Consulted surgeon about extracting these teeth , they preferred to leave some of them to prevent open oro- nasal fistula , so made preparation of remaining teeth to make over denture and obtain retention from undercut especially in the absence of supporting bone . (Fig. 1)



Fig. 1:- Pretreatment intraoral view.

Thus, prosthetic treatment was chosen, elaborating a removable acrylic prosthesis best suited for him, with a palatal obturator of soft resin to improve denture retention and stability. For absentfor bone reasons, the patient enable the placement of an implant-retained overdenture.

After preliminary impressions of the maxillary and mandibular arches had been made using irreversible hydrocolloid impression material (alginate), custom trays were made and final impression made with heavy and light body additional silicone impression material (EliteHD+, Zhermack, Rovigo, Italy) (Fig. 2).



Fig 2:- Final impression made with heavy and light body additional silicone impression material.

A complete denture of acrylic was made using routine procedures, but with obturator bulb the closure of the palatovelar communication. It was initially made of acrylic tissue surface lining by high impact soft lining material. After check retention, stability and denture occlusion, gave instruction to the patient how to use, clean the denture and another appointment to check the appliance. (Fig. 3) and (Fig. 4).



Fig. 3:- Frontal view of patient before and after rehabilitation.



Fig. 4:- Final prostheses.

Case report 2:-

A 28 -year-old female patient in good general health . She present with cleft palate and only right and left first premolar which due to several surgical has positionon useful to construction, removal partial denture or fix restoration, so decided to benefit from these teeth by making preparation to construction over denture support by them to replace the support that loss due to absent of supporting bone. (Fig. 5)



Fig. 5:- Pretreatment intraoral view.

Thus, prosthetic treatment was chosen, elaborating a removable acrylic prosthesis best suited for her, with a palatal obturator of soft resin to improve denture retention and stability. Maxillary complete-arch impressions were made using irreversible hydrocolloid impression material.Final impressions after prepared teeth were obtained using hydrophilic addition (heavy and light body) silicone impression material (EliteHD+, Zhermack, Rovigo, Italy) (Fig. 6).



Fig.6:- final impression made with heavy and light body additional silicone impression material.

Routine procedures of acrylic complete dentures continue to construct e acrylic denture with tissue surface lining by high impact soft lining material. After check retention, stability and denture occlusion, gave instruction to the patient how to use, clean the denture and another appointment to check the appliance. (Fig. 7).



Fig. 7:- Frontal view of patient before and after rehabilitation.

Discussion:-

Obturator prostheses**are aiming** to restore the anatomical loss of hard and soft tissues, providing enough retention to the denture to improve function and psychological well being. There are several factors determined materials used to create obturator prostheses such as type and extent of the cleft palate and the ability of the patient to overcome with conventional removable dentures. Generally, palatal obturators are used as simple solutions for the reconstruction of minor palatal defects, while larger maxillary-palatal defects represent a considerable challenge for functional and aesthetic reconstruction.⁽¹¹⁾

The area of defect in contact with obturator is inadequately keratinized gingiva, so soft materials used for lining tissue side in contact with defect.

Patients with defect usually hadbone atrophy or small amount of bone remaining after corrective surgery, so prostheses obturator could obtained retention from defect area undercut that no interference with the path of insertion and removal of appliances and not cause any pressure or pain on the soft tissue of patients.

References:-

- 1. G Tirelli, R Rizzo, M Biasotto, R Di Lenarda, B Argenti, A Gatto, and F BulloGenden EM, Okay D. Obturator prostheses following palatal resection: clinical cases. Acta Otorhinolaryngol Ital. 2010 Feb; 30(1): 33–39.
- 2. Slayton RL, Williams L, Murray J, Wheeler JJ, Lidral AC, Nishimura CJ. Genetic Association Studies of Cleft Lip and/or Palate with Hypodontia Outside the Cleft Region. Cleft Palate-Craniofac J. 2003; 40: 274-9.
- 3. Stepp MT, et al. Comparison of functional and quality-of-life outcomes in patients with and without palatomaxillary reconstruction. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2003;129:775-80.
- 4. Wendy Moh, JohnM. GrahamJr., IshaWadhawan, and Pedro A. Sanchez-Lara Extrinsic Factors Influencing Fetal Deformations and Intrauterine Growth Restriction.Journal of Pregnancy 2012, 11.
- 5. Hickey AJ, Salter, M. Prosthodontic and psychological factors in treating patients with congenital and craniofacial defects. J Prosthet Dent. 2006; 95: 392–6
- 6. Rahat Ali Peter J Nixon and Martin F W-Y Chan. Restorative Management of the Cleft Patient: CLP Series Ortho Update 2014; 7: 42–47
- 7. Watanabe I, Kurtz KS, Watanabe E, Yamada M, Yoshida N, Miller AW. Multi-unit fixed partial denture for a bilateral cleft palate patient: a clinical report. J Oral Rehabil. 2005;32:620–622.
- 8. Hochman N, Yaffe A, Brin I, Zilberman Y, Ehrlich J. Functional and esthetic rehabilitation of an adolescent cleft lip and palate patient. Quintessence Int. 1991;22:401–404.
- 9. Koyama S, Sasaki K, Inai T, Watanabe M. Effects of defect configuration, size, and remaining teeth on masticatory function in post-maxillectomy patients. J Oral Rehabil. 2005;32:635–641.
- 10. Turner SR, Rumsey N, Sandy JR. Psychological aspects of cleft lip and palate. Eur J Orthod. 1998;20:407-415
- 11. MacCarthy D, Murphy N. Replacement of an obturador section of an existing two-piece implant-retained edentulous obturator. J Prosthet Dent. 2000; 83: 652-5