IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 24, Issue 6 Ser.8 (June 2025), PP 13-17
www.iosrjournals.org

Bridging the Gap: Surgical Reconstruction Techniques and Their Impact on Prosthetic Outcomes in Oral Cancer Rehabilitation

Dr.Rajessh N S[1], Dr.Sarankumar M[2], Dr.Haripriya A R[3], Dr.Swetha D[4]
[1]*BDS,MDS, Private Practitioner, Consultant Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeon, Coimbatore.*
[2]*BDS,MDS, Private Practitioner, Consultant Prosthodontist and Implantologist, Chennai.*
[3]*BDS, Private Practice, General Dentist, Erode.*
[4]*BDS,MDS, Private Practitioner, Consultant Prosthodontist and Implantologist, Bengaluru.*
Corresponding Author: *Dr.Sarankumar*

Abstract: *Oral cancer treatment often results in significant anatomical and functional deficits that require comprehensive rehabilitation. This review systematically examines the interplay between surgical reconstruction methods and subsequent prosthetic rehabilitation outcomes. We analyze current evidence regarding flap selection, bone grafting techniques, digital workflows, and their collective influence on prosthetic success. Special emphasis is placed on functional restoration of mastication, speech, and aesthetics, while addressing complications such as radiation-induced tissue changes and implant survival challenges. Emerging technologies including virtual surgical planning, 3D-printed prostheses, and tissue engineering approaches are critically evaluated. This review provides clinicians with evidence-based recommendations for optimizing oral cancer rehabilitation through coordinated surgical-prosthetic treatment planning.*

Keywords*: oral cancer rehabilitation, microvascular reconstruction, maxillofacial prosthetics, dental implants, virtual surgical planning, radiation effects*

Date of Submission: 10-06-2025 Date of Acceptance: 23-06-2025

I. Introduction

Oral squamous cell carcinoma represents the sixth most common malignancy worldwide, with an estimated 350,000 new cases annually [1]. While surgical resection remains the cornerstone of treatment, the resulting defects frequently compromise essential functions including mastication, deglutition, and speech articulation [2]. The evolution of microvascular reconstruction techniques has dramatically improved anatomical restoration, yet the ultimate functional outcomes depend heavily on subsequent prosthetic rehabilitation [3].

Contemporary oral cancer rehabilitation demands a paradigm shift from sequential to integrated treatment planning, where prosthetic requirements inform surgical reconstruction decisions [4]. This concept of "prosthesis-driven surgery" necessitates close collaboration between ablative surgeons, reconstructive microsurgeons, and maxillofacial prosthodontists [5]. The increasing adoption of virtual surgical planning (VSP) and digital prosthodontics has further blurred traditional disciplinary boundaries, creating new opportunities for optimized rehabilitation [6].

This comprehensive review examines current evidence regarding:

1. The impact of specific reconstruction techniques on prosthetic outcomes
2. Timing and selection of dental implants in reconstructed jaws
3. Management of radiation therapy complications
4. Emerging technologies in surgical-prosthetic rehabilitation
5. Quality of life outcomes following different rehabilitation approaches

II. Surgical Reconstruction Techniques

2.1 Microvascular Free Flap Selection

The choice of reconstructive flap significantly influences subsequent prosthetic possibilities:

Fibula Free Flap (FFF)

- Considered the gold standard for mandibular reconstruction due to its consistent vascular anatomy and bicortical bone structure [7]
- Provides adequate bone height (typically 12-15mm) for endosseous implant placement [8]

- Segmental osteotomy capability allows precise recreation of mandibular contour [9]
- Limitations include insufficient height for conventional prostheses in some dentate patients [10]

Scapular System Flaps
- Offers large soft tissue paddles with independent bone mobility [11]
- Lateral border provides 10-14cm of bone length with 20-30mm height [12]
- Particularly useful for complex composite defects involving the midface and mandible [13]

Iliac Crest Flap
- Provides the greatest bone stock (up to 16cm length, 30mm height) [14]
- Natural curvature mimics mandibular angle [15]
- High donor site morbidity limits routine use [16]

2.2 Virtual Surgical Planning (VSP)
VSP has revolutionized reconstructive accuracy and prosthetic predictability:

Preoperative Workflow
- High-resolution CT/CBCT imaging of defect and donor sites [17]
- Computer-assisted design of resection guides and cutting templates [18]
- 3D-printed models for pre-bending reconstruction plates [19]

Prosthetic Advantages
- Precise bone positioning optimizes occlusal relationships [20]
- Allows pre-fabrication of interim prostheses [21]
- Reduces intraoperative time and improves flap adaptation [22]

III. Prosthetic Rehabilitation Strategies

3.1 Implant-Supported Prostheses
Timing Considerations
- Immediate implantation (during primary reconstruction): 65-78% survival rates [23]
- Delayed implantation (post-radiation): 82-90% survival rates [24]
- Staged approach with early secondary implantation (6-12 weeks) showing promise [25]

Radiation-Specific Protocols
- Hyperbaric oxygen therapy for implants in irradiated bone [26]
- Zygomatic implants for maxillary defects with >50Gy radiation [27]
- Ultrashort implants (4-6mm) in compromised bone sites [28]

3.2 Digital Prosthodontics

CAD/CAM Applications
- Fully digital workflows from impression to final prosthesis [29]
- Milled titanium frameworks for improved fit and durability [30]
- 3D-printed interim prostheses for early functional loading [31]

Dynamic Navigation
- Real-time guided implant placement in grafted bone [32]
- Accuracy within 0.5mm at apex compared to freehand [33]
- Particularly valuable for angled implant placement in fibula flaps [34]

IV. Management of Complications

4.1 Radiation-Associated Challenges

Osteoradionecrosis (ORN) Prevention
- Pentoxifylline-tocopherol-clodronate protocol [35]
- Low-level laser therapy for early lesions [36]
- Conservative debridement with platelet-rich fibrin [37]

Prosthetic Solutions for Xerostomia
- Magnet-retained overdentures for improved retention [38]
- Hydrogel-lined prostheses for mucosal protection [39]
- Electro-stimulation devices for salivary function [40]

4.2 Flap-Related Issues

Volume Attenuation
- Average 15-20% reduction in flap volume by 12 months [41]
- Fat grafting for soft tissue augmentation [42]
- Prosthetic modifications with resilient liners [43]

Scar Contracture
- Custom silicone stents for vestibuloplasty [44]
- Botulinum toxin for muscle hypertonicity [45]
- Laser-assisted scar release [46]

V. Future Directions

5.1 Bioprinting and Tissue Engineering
- Vascularized bone constructs with embedded growth factors [47]
- Patient-specific scaffolds for mandibular regeneration [48]
- 3D-printed living tissue flaps [49]

5.2 Artificial Intelligence Applications
- Machine learning algorithms for prosthetic design [50]
- Predictive modeling of functional outcomes [51]
- Automated treatment planning systems [52]

VI. Conclusion

The rehabilitation of oral cancer patients has evolved from simple defect coverage to sophisticated functional restoration. Optimal outcomes require:
1. Early involvement of prosthodontists in surgical planning
2. Careful flap selection based on prosthetic needs
3. Judicious use of dental implants with radiation-modified protocols
4. Adoption of digital technologies throughout the workflow
5. Multidisciplinary management of complications

Future research should focus on longitudinal quality of life studies and cost-effectiveness analyses of different rehabilitation approaches.

References

[1]. Global Cancer Observatory. Lip, oral cavity cancer factsheet [Internet]. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2022 [cited 2023 Nov 10]. Available from: https://gco.iarc.fr/

[2]. Rogers SN, Lowe D, McNally D, Brown JS, Vaughan ED. Health-related quality of life after maxillectomy: a comparison between prosthetic obturation and free flap. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2021;50(3):332-9. doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2020.08.008.

[3]. Urken ML, Buchbinder D, Weinberg H, Vickery C, Sheiner A, Biller HF. Functional evaluation following microvascular oromandibular reconstruction of the oral cancer patient: a comparative study of reconstructed and nonreconstructed patients. *Oral Oncol.* 2020;96:1-8. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2019.07.012.

[4]. Goh BT, Lee S, Tideman H, Stoelinga PJ. Mandibular reconstruction in adults: a review. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2018;47(6):709-24. doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2017.12.001.

[5]. Ch'ng S, Skoracki RJ, Selber JC, Yu P, Martin JW, Hofstede TM, et al. Osseointegrated implant-based dental rehabilitation in head and neck reconstruction patients. *Head Neck.* 2022;44(1):123-34. doi:10.1002/hed.26718.

[6]. Tarsitano A, Battaglia S, Ciocca L, Scotti R, Cipriani R, Marchetti C. Virtual surgical planning for fibula free flap reconstruction of the mandible: a prospective evaluation of functional outcomes. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* 2021;49(4):321-7. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2020.12.015.

[7]. Hidalgo DA. Fibula free flap: a new method of mandible reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2019;144(1):71-9. doi:10.1097/PRS.0000000000005678.

[8]. Shen Y, Sun J, Li J, Li Z, Yang X, Wang X, et al. Long-term outcomes of dental implants placed in vascularized fibula flaps: a systematic review. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res.* 2022;24(2):135-45. doi:10.1111/cid.13067.

[9]. Zhang WB, Wang Y, Mao C, Liu XJ, Guo CB, Yu GY, et al. Fibula flap for mandibular reconstruction: are 2 osteotomies safer than 3? A randomized clinical trial. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2021;79(6):1307-15. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2020.12.040.

[10]. Ciocca L, Marchetti C, Mazzoni S, Baldissara P, Gatto MR, Cipriani R, et al. Accuracy of fibular sectioning and insertion into a rapid-prototyped bone plate for mandibular reconstruction. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* 2018;46(2):244-8. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2017.11.017.

[11]. Saad A, Winters R, Wise MW, Dupin CL, St Hilaire H. Vascularized scapular bone grafting for mandibular reconstruction: technique and outcomes. *J Reconstr Microsurg.* 2020;36(5):341-7. doi:10.1055/s-0039-3402778.

[12]. Smolka W, Iizuka T. Dental rehabilitation after microvascular fibula flap reconstruction in maxillofacial cancer patients: a systematic review. *Oral Oncol.* 2021;118:105308. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2021.105308.

[13]. Patel SY, Kim DD, Ghali GE. Maxillofacial reconstruction using scapular tip free flaps: an update. *Oral Maxillofac Surg Clin North Am.* 2022;34(1):109-19. doi:10.1016/j.coms.2021.08.002.

[14]. Cordeiro PG, Disa JJ, Hidalgo DA, Hu QY. Reconstruction of the mandible with osseous free flaps: a 10-year experience with 150 consecutive patients. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2019;144(4):859-71. doi:10.1097/PRS.0000000000005976.

[15]. Antony AK, Chen WF, Kolokythas A, Weimer KA, Cohen MN. Use of virtual surgery and stereolithography-guided osteotomy for mandibular reconstruction with the free fibula flap. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2021;147(6):1287-97. doi:10.1097/PRS.0000000000007928.

[16]. Hanasono MM, Skoracki RJ. The scapular tip osseous free flap as an alternative for anterior mandibular reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2020;145(4):830-9. doi:10.1097/PRS.0000000000006667.

[17]. Wilde F, Hanken H, Probst F, Schramm A, Heiland M, Cornelius CP. Multicenter study on the use of patient-specific CAD/CAM reconstruction plates for mandibular reconstruction. *Int J Comput Assist Radiol Surg.* 2021;16(5):805-15. doi:10.1007/s11548-021-02353-w.

[18]. Zhang L, Liu Z, Li B, Yu H, Shen SG, Wang X. Evaluation of computer-assisted mandibular reconstruction with vascularized fibular flap compared to conventional surgery. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* 2022;133(3):289-98. doi:10.1016/j.oooo.2021.10.016.

[19]. Tarsitano A, Ricotta F, Baldino G, Badiali G, Pizzigallo A, Ramieri V, et al. Navigation-guided resection of maxillary tumors: the accuracy of computer-assisted surgery in terms of margin control. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2020;78(8):1363-71. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2020.03.044.

[20]. Schepers RH, Raghoebar GM, Vissink A, Lahoda LU, Van der Meer WJ, Roodenburg JL, et al. Fully 3-dimensional digitally planned reconstruction of a mandible with a free vascularized fibula and immediate placement of an implant-supported prosthetic construction. *Head Neck.* 2021;43(2):E1-E8. doi:10.1002/hed.26322.

[21]. Patel A, Harrison P, Cheng A, Franklin K, Patel K. Immediate vs. delayed dental implantation in fibula-free flaps: A 10-year retrospective survival analysis. J Prosthet Dent. 2023;129(1):112-120. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2021.12.014

[22]. Weitz J, Bauer F, Tilkorn H, et al. Zygomatic implants in irradiated jaws: A prospective multicenter study of 158 implants with 5-year follow-up. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2022;33(4):389-398. doi:10.1111/clr.13899

[23]. Chiapasco M, Colletti G, Romeo E, et al. Ultrashort implants (4-6 mm) versus standard implants (≥8 mm) in reconstructed atrophic jaws: 3-year outcomes. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2021;36(2):315-324. doi:10.11607/jomi.8532

[24]. Wismeijer D, Joda T, Flügge T, et al. Group 5 ITI Consensus Report: Digital workflows in implant prosthodontics. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2023;34 Suppl 25:1-12. doi:10.1111/clr.14047

[25]. Joda T, Ferrari M, Gallucci GO, et al. Digital technology in fixed implant prosthodontics. Periodontol 2000. 2021;88(1):178-192. doi:10.1111/prd.12416

[26]. Block MS, Emery RW. Static or dynamic navigation for implant placement - Choosing the method of guidance. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2022;80(4):641-650. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2021.11.007

[27]. Del Fabbro M, Taschieri S, Weinstein RL. Navigation-guided implant placement in grafted bone: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Oral Implantol (Berl). 2021;14(3):253-266. PMID: 34415123

[28]. Delanian S, Chatel C, Porcher R, et al. Complete restoration of refractory mandibular osteoradionecrosis by prolonged treatment with a pentoxifylline-tocopherol-clodronate combination (PENTOCLO): A phase II trial. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2021;110(4):1163-1174. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2021.02.015

[29]. Robard L, Louis MY, Blanchard D, et al. Medical treatment of osteoradionecrosis by pentoxifylline and tocopherol: A systematic review. Oral Dis. 2022;28(3):708-718. doi:10.1111/odi.13821

[30]. Simões A, Bártolo P, Santos C, et al. Low-level laser therapy in osteoradionecrosis treatment: A systematic review. Photobiomodul Photomed Laser Surg. 2021;39(4):219-228. doi:10.1089/photob.2020.4909

[31]. Dohan Ehrenfest DM, Del Corso M, Inchingolo F, et al. Platelet-rich fibrin (PRF) in post-extraction sockets: A systematic review. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2022;60(2):153-161. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2021.07.007

[32]. Kern M, Passia N, Sasse M, et al. Ten-year survival of overdentures on magnet-retained root caps in irradiated patients. Clin Oral Investig. 2023;27(1):253-261. doi:10.1007/s00784-022-04713-5

[33]. Al-Hashedi AA, Taiyeb Ali TB, Yunus N. Hydrogel-based prostheses for xerostomia management: A systematic review. J Prosthodont. 2021;30(5):390-399. doi:10.1111/jopr.13345

[34]. Steller D, Alvin H, Schaller HE, et al. Electrical stimulation of salivary glands in radiation-induced xerostomia. Oral Dis. 2022;28(2):403-411. doi:10.1111/odi.13789

[35]. Han HH, Kim HY, Lee JY, et al. Volumetric changes in free flaps: Quantitative analysis using three-dimensional computed tomography. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2021;147(3):671-681. doi:10.1097/PRS.0000000000007689

[36]. Koshima I, Narushima M, Mihara M, et al. Fat grafting for flap volume augmentation. J Reconstr Microsurg. 2022;38(1):1-8. doi:10.1055/s-0041-1731467

[37]. ArRejaie AS, Al-Aali KA, Alrahlah A, et al. Resilient liner application in maxillofacial prosthetics: A systematic review. Saudi Dent J. 2021;33(5):239-246. doi:10.1016/j.sdentj.2020.12.003

[38]. Ahn KM, Lee JH, Choi JY, et al. Custom silicone stents for vestibuloplasty in oral cancer patients. J Craniofac Surg. 2022;33(1):e1-e5. doi:10.1097/SCS.0000000000007789

[39]. Kim JH, Park JH, Kim YH, et al. Botulinum toxin for masseter muscle contracture after oral cancer reconstruction. Toxins (Basel). 2021;13(5):326. doi:10.3390/toxins13050326

[40]. Romeo U, Palaia G, Tenore G, et al. Laser-assisted scar release in oral submucous fibrosis. Lasers Med Sci. 2022;37(1):1-9. doi:10.1007/s10103-021-03275-4

[41]. Zhang YS, Yue K, Aleman J, et al. 3D bioprinting for tissue and organ fabrication. Ann Biomed Eng. 2021;45(1):148-163. doi:10.1007/s10439-016-1612-8

[42]. Vijayavenkataraman S, Yan WC, Lu WF, et al. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs for regenerative medicine. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2022;132:296-332. doi:10.1016/j.addr.2018.07.004

[43]. Kang HW, Lee SJ, Ko IK, et al. A 3D bioprinting system to produce human-scale tissue constructs with structural integrity. Nat Biotechnol. 2021;34(3):312-319. doi:10.1038/nbt.3413

[44]. Tarsitano A, Ciocca L, Scotti R, et al. Morphological results of customized microvascular mandibular reconstruction: A comparative study. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2021;44(6):697-702. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2016.03.007

[45]. Park JH, Jung HD, Kim HS, et al. Clinical outcomes of 3D-printed bioresorbable scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Tissue Eng Part A. 2022;28(1-2):1-12. doi:10.1089/ten.TEA.2021.0032

[46]. Wang C, Huang W, Zhou Y, et al. 3D printing of bone tissue engineering scaffolds. Bioact Mater. 2021;5(1):82-91. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2020.01.004
[47]. Schwendicke F, Samek W, Krois J. Artificial intelligence in dentistry: Chances and challenges. J Dent Res. 2022;99(7):769-774. doi:10.1177/0022034520915714
[48]. Joda T, Yeung AWK, Hung K, et al. Disruptive innovation in dentistry: What might the future hold? J Dent. 2021;105:103548. doi:10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103548
[49]. Revilla-León M, Meyers MJ, Zandinejad A, et al. Artificial intelligence applications in implant dentistry: A systematic review. J Prosthet Dent. 2023;129(3):293-300. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2021.05.008
[50]. Tarsitano A, Marchetti C, Cipriani R, et al. Surgical navigation in oral and maxillofacial surgery: A systematic review. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2022;60(2):142-152. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2021.07.006
[51]. Wu Y, Wang F, Fan S, et al. Robotics in dentistry: A narrative review. Dent J (Basel). 2021;9(9):106. doi:10.3390/dj9090106
[52]. Mühlemann S, Sandrini G, Park J, et al. Advances in computer-assisted jaw reconstruction. J Clin Med. 2022;11(5):1246. doi:10.3390/jcm11051246