

Int Poster J Dent Oral Med 2002, Vol 4 No 1, Poster 116

The effect of Le Fort I osteotomy on nasal form and function

Language: English

Authors: Dr.Dr. Sirichai Kiattavorncharoen¹, Dr.Dr. Christian Kleier², PD Dr.Dr. Richard Werkmeister², Prof.Dr.Dr.Dr.h.c. Ulrich Joos² ¹Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Faculty of Dentistry, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand ²Department of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery, Westphalian Wilhelms University of Muenster, Germany

IP

Date/Event/Venue:

5-9 September 2000 $\mathsf{XV}^{\mathsf{th}}$ Congress of the European Association for Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery Edinburgh International Conference Centre, Edinburgh UK

International Poster Journal

Introduction

The Le Fort I osteotomy is a versatile procedure used to correct a variety of dentofacial deformities of the maxilla. It was first described by von Langenbeck in 1859 (3). The most frequent complications include intraoperative hemorrhage, infection, nerve injury, oronasal fistula formation, relapse, dental injury, and rarely, avascular nacrosis (4). The surgical goal in repositioning the maxilla is to establish a harmonious maxillomandibular dentoskeletal relationship and to achieve esthetic soft-tissue changes. It results also in alterations in the form and function of the nose (1,2).

Aim of the study

Aim of the present study was the prospective evaluation of the effect of Le Fort I osteotomy on nasal form and function.

Materials and methods

Twenty-five patients who underwent Le Fort I osteotomy were included into the study over a 3-years period of time. Patients with cleft lip and/or cleft palate, rhinoplastic were excluded. Within the study group there were 13 females and 12 males with an age distribution between 16 and 38 years and a mean value of 26.7 years. Of these patients, 9 were treated for anterior, 8 for anterior/superior and 8 for anterior/inferior maxillary repositioning. 17 patients underwent bimaxillary osteotomy. The patients were examined pre-operatively (T0) and 6 month post-operatively (T1).

All of the patients underwent a clinical examination at T0 and T1 including the assessment of the nasal form and function. The nasal form was determined by measurement of the standardized raster photographs of the nose and lateral teleradiography. The distances and angles of the nasal base were determined (Fig. 1). The nasal profile was assessed by measurement of the nasofacial angle (NF), the nasolabial angle (NL), the angle between upper lip and Frankfort horizontal plane (L/FH), the angle between collumella and Frankfort horizontal plane (N/FH) and the nasocollumellar angle (NC) (Fig. 2). Nasal function was evaluated by anterior rhinomanometry with a rhinomanometer (Atmos Medizintechnik), whereby the overall flow and nasal resistance were determined (Fig. 3).





Fig.1 (a) The measurement of the standardized raster photograph of the nose.

P: Bipupilar plane

- B: The middleline of the distance between internal canthus and perpendicular to P
- C: The line tangent to the right alar of the nose and perpendicular to P
- D: The line tangent to the left alar of the nose and perpendicular to P
- A: Nasal base plane
- P': The line parallel to P
- alpha: The angle between A and P'
- E: The line tangent to the right alar of nose and cross C
- F: The line tangent to the left alar of nose and cross D β: The angle between B and F

delta: The angle between B and E

- CB + BD: The length of the nasal base
- β + delta: The angle of the nasal base
- (b) Preoperative raster photograph of the nose (T0)
- (c) Postoperative raster photograph of the nose (T1)



(a)

Fig. 2 (a) The nasal profil was assessed by measurement of the lateral teleradiography

The soft tissue angular measurements used in this study: the nasofacial angle (NF), the nasolabial angle (NL), the angle between upper lip and Frankfort horizontal plane (L/FH), the angle between collumella and Frankfort horizontal plane (N/FH) and the nasocollumellar angle (NC).

- (b) Preoperative teleradiographic profile view (T0)
- (c) Postoperative profile view of the same patient (T1)



Fig. 3 (a) The preoperative anterior rhinomanometry shows pressure and overflow in the xy diagram.

(b) The postoperative rhinomanometry of the same patient

Results

		Т0	Τ1	р
Anterior maxillary repositioning	D (mm)	32.78	35.72	0.012
	A (Degree)	63.33	68.61	0.038
Anterior/superior maxillary repositioning	repositioning D (mm)	35.50	37.44	0.011
	A (Degree)	63.56	71.69	0.012
Anterior/inferior maxillary repositioning	D (mm)	33.56	35.38	0.021
interior/interior maxiliary repositioning	A (Degree)	53.56	62.00	0.012

Table 1. Finding of standardized raster photographs of the nose

D= The distance of the nasal base

A= The angle of the nasal base

		Т0	T1	р
	NL (Degree)	100.67	105.56	0.341
	NF (Degree)	30.28	35.22	0.011
Anterior maxillary repositioning	N/FH (Degree)	15.56	17.67	0.122
	L/FH (Degree)	84.00	86.56	0.722
	NC (Degree)	67.17	67.33	0.944
	NL (Degree)	105.56	108.38	0.611
	NF (Degree)	36.19	38.81	0.049
Anterior/superior maxillary repositioning	N/FH (Degree)	19.38	19.69	
Anterior/superior maxillary repositioning	L/FH (Degree)	88.06	90.50	0.528
	NC (Degree)	69.50	68.75	0.671
	NL (Degree)	103.13	105.63	0.292
	NF (Degree)	31.31	32.50	0.326
Anterior/inferior maxillary repositioning	N/FH (Degree)	16.38	17.94	0.362
	L/FH (Degree)	87.00	88.56	0.673
	NC (Degree)	70.00	70.88	0.441
Table 2. Finding of the paged quality from	lateral televadios	wo n h v		

Table 2. Finding of the nasal profile from lateral teleradiography

		Т0	Τ1	р
Anterior maxillary repositioning	nasal airflow (ccm/s)	411.56	637.33	0.038
	airway resistance	0.42	0.26	0.049
Anterior/superior maxillary repositioning	nasal airflow (ccm/s)	433.00	554.50	
, 1 , 1 5	airway resistance	0.40	0.37	0.233
Anterior/inferior maxillary repositioning	nasal airflow (ccm/s)	662.00	711.50	0.484
	airway resistance	0.31	0.25	0.440
Table 2. Dhinanaanaanatula findina in natio	when within the Fleith Theater.			

Table 3. Rhinomanometric finding in patients with Le Fort I osteotomy

Conclusion

Le Fort I osteotomy does not adversely affect nasal function (nasal breathing) but has an impact on nasal form (widening of the nasal base and increased angle of the nasal base), which however is not seen in the nasal profile.

References

- 1. Götzfried HF, Masing H. On the improvement of the nasal breathing following mid-face osteotomies, and possible reasons for the phenomenon. J max-fac Surg 1984; 12: 29-32.
- Götzfried HF, Paulus GW. Die Verbreiterung der Nasenbasis nach maxillären Dysgnathiekorrekturen. Dtsch Z Mund Kiefer GesichtsChir 1986; 10: 429-32.
- Langenbeck BV. Beiträge zur Osteoplastik- Die osteoplastische Resektion des Oberkiefers. In: Göschen A. Deutsch Klinik. Reimer, Berlin 1859.
- 4. Sailer HF, Haers PE. Komplikationen bei bimaxillären chirurgischen Eingriffen. Fortschr Kiefer Gesichtschir 1995; 40: 41-9.

Correspondence address:

Dr.Dr. Sirichai Kiattavorncharoen Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Faculty of Dentistry Mahidol University Yothi Street Bangkok 10400 Thailand

Poster Faksimile:





Münster

The effect of Le Fort I osteotomy on nasal form and function

Kiattavorneharoen S, Kleier Č, Werkmeister R, Joos U Department of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery, Westphalian Wilhelms University of Münster, Germany (Head: Prof. Dr. med. Dr. med. dent. Dr. h.c. U. Joos)

Introduction

The Le Fort I osteotomy is a versatile procedure used to correct a variety of dentofacial deformities of the maxilla. It was first described by von Langenbeck in 1859 (3). The most frequent complications include intraopentive hemorthage, infection, nerve injury, coronasal fistula formation, relapse, dental injury, and rarely, avacular necrosis (4). The surgical goal in repositioning the maxilla is to establish a harmonious maxillomandibular demoskeletal relationship and to achieve exhether is oft-tissue changes. It results also in alterations in the form and function of the nose (1,2).

Aim of the study

Aim of the present study was the prospective evaluation of the effect of Le Fort I osteotomy on nasal form and function.

Materials and methods

Twenty-five patients who underwent Le Fort I osteotomy were included into the study over a 3-years period of time. Patients with cleft lip and/or cleft palate, thinoplastic were excluded. Within the study group there were 13 females and 12 males with an age distribution between 16 and 38 years and a mean value of 2.6.7 years. Of these patients, 9 were treated for anterior, 8 for anterior/waperior and 8 for anterior/inferior maxillary repositioning. 17 patients underwent bimaxillary osteotomy. The patients were examined pre-operatively $(T_{\rm p})$ and 6 month post-operatively $(T_{\rm p})$.

All of the patients underwent a clinical examination at T_0 and T_1 including the assessment of the nasal form and function. The nasal form was determined by measurement of the standardized naster photographs of the nose and lateral teleratiography. The distances and angles of the nasal base were determined (Fig. 1). The nasal profile was assessed by measurement of the nasofacial angle (NF), the nasolabial angle (NL), the angle between upper lip and Frankfort horizontal plane (L/FH), the angle between collumella and Frankfort horizontal plane (N/FH) and the nasocollumellar angle (NC) (Fig. 2). Nasal function was evaluated by anterior rhinomanometry with a rhinomanometer (Atmos Medizintechnik), whereby the overall flow and nasal resistance were determined (Fig. 2). etermined (Fig. 3)



 T0
 T1
 p

 100.67
 105.56
 0.341

 30.28
 35.22
 0.011

 15.56
 17.67
 0.122

 84.00
 86.56
 0.722

 67.17
 67.33
 0.944
NL (Degree) NF (Degree) terior maxillary repositioning N/FH (Degree) L/FH (Degree) NC (Degree) 07.17 67.33 105.56 108.38 36.19 38.81 19.38 19.69 88.06 90.50 69.50 68.75 102.13 105.55 0.611 0.049 0.865 0.528 NL (Degree) NF (Degree) N/FH (Degree) L/FH (Degree) NC (Degree) NL (Degree) NF (Degree) N/FH (Degree) L/FH (Degree) NC (Degree)
 69.50
 68.75
 0.671

 103.13
 105.63
 0.292

 31.31
 32.50
 0.326

 31.31
 32.35
 0.340

 16.38
 17,94
 0.362

 87.00
 88.56
 0.673

 70.00
 70.88
 0.441
o'inferior mullary repositioning

Table 2. Finding of the natal profile from lat-

	A	é
(a)	(b)	(c)

The roll times angular momentum and in this study, the nanolacial angle (NF), the nanolabial angle (NL), the angle hors-are upper lip and Frankfert horizontal plane (L/FR), the angle between collarable and Frankfort Acciounts plane (NFR) and the momentum-file angle (NC).

			0.0	
	and the second second second	T0	TI	p
Anterior musillary repositioning	nasal airflow (ccm/s)	411.56	637.33	0,038
	airway resistance	0,42	0.26	0.049
Anterior/superior maxillary repositioning	nasal airflow (ccm/s)	433.00	554.50	0.123
	airway resistance	0.40	0.37	0.233
Anterior/inferior modilary repositioning	nasal airflow (ccm's)	662.00	711.50	0.484
	airway resistance	0.31	0.25	0.440

Table 3. Rhine write finding in pair as with Le Fort I onto

Conclusion

omy does not adversely affect nasal function (nasal breatl Le Fort I oster hing) but has an impact on nasal form (widening of the nasal base and increased angle of the nasal base), which however is not seen in the nasal profile.

(b) Presperative televaliographic profile view (T_0)

Fig. 2 (a) The naval profil was assessed by measurement of the lateral telenadiography

time of the dis

e plane parallel to P c between A and P

Set Pe

or or me distance between internal cash-pus to the right alar of the nose and perpen-pus to the left alar of the nose and perpen-

tive same photograph of the nove (T_i) operative mater photograph of the sour (T,)

(c) Po toperative profile view of the same patient (T_j)

References 1. Götzfried HF, Masing H. On the improvement of the nasal breathing following mid-face osteotomics, and possible reasons for the phenomenon. J max-fac Surg 1984; 12: 29-32. 2. Götzfried HF, Paulus GW. Die Verbreiterung der Nasenbasis nach maxillären Dysgnathiekorrekturen. Dtsch Z Mund Kiefer GesichtsChir 1986; 10: 429-32. 3. Langenbeck BV. Beiträge zur Osteoplastisk- Die osteoplastische Resektion des Oberkiefers. In: Göschen A. Deutsch Klinik. Reimer, Berlin 1859. 4. Sailer HF, Haers PE. Komplikationen bei bimaxillären chirurgischen Eingriffen. Fortschr Kiefer Gesichtschir 1995; 40: 41-9.

se and cross 0 and cross D

is to the second P second B and F.



Fig. 3 (a) The prooperative assertior ch (b) The ponoperative chinema natry of the same parient

Results

		TO	TI	p
Anterior maxillary repositioning Anterior/superior maxillary repositioning	D (mm)	32,78	35.72	0.012
	A (Degree)	63.33	68.61	0.038
Anterior/superior maxillary repositioning	D (mm)	35.50	37.44	0.011
	A (Degree)	63.56	71.69	0.012
Anterior/inferior musillary repositioning	D (mm)	33.56	35.38	0.021
	A (Degree)	53.56	62.00	0.012

He 1. Finding of standardized coster photographs of the none D+ The distance of the sanal base A+ The angle of the nanal base