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Abstract

Background and Objectives: Split sagittal osteotomy is a common operation that may induce inferior alveolar nerve (IAN) damage, potentially leading to sensory deficit, numbness, and pain. Investigations in Iran to evaluate the adverse effects of sagittal split osteotomy surgery are rare so questions have been raised about the success rate of operation and the frequency of unwilling outcome. To address these concerns, we conducted a prospective study evaluating the rate of IAN damage related to mandibular advancement by sagittal split osteotomy in Iranian population.

Methods: In this prospective study, 66 patients including 30 men (45.4%) and 36 women (54.5%) with class II malocclusion and mandibular retrognathism who were undergoing mandibular advancement surgery (SSO) were recruited during 2013-2015. All patients were followed for one year after surgery. Chi-square and Fisher exact tests were used to compare the categorical variables, and the numerical variables were compared by t-test. P<.05 was considered as the significance level.

Findings: The study sample had a mean age 32.3 ± 12.04. The rate of nerve disturbance was 75.8%. Yet, 78.9% of the patients were satisfied with the results of the surgery.

Conclusions: Our study indicated that IAN disturbance after split sagittal surgery is frequent in Iran. This situation indicates the need for caution on considering split sagittal surgery as a safe medical technique.
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Methods
This prospective study was conducted at the Department of Maxillofacial Surgery, Taleghani hospital (Tehran, Iran) within 2012-2014. A sample of 66 patients including 30 men (45.4%) and 36 women (54.5%) with class II malocclusion and mandibular retrognathism who were undergoing mandibular advancement surgery (SSO) was recruited. All patients were followed up for one year post-surgery. The demographic data were collected from the patients’ records. The surgery results were extracted from the surgeons’ reports. Then intraoperative and postoperative variables were evaluated. The intraoperative variables were bleeding, split, and visible and non-visible injury to the IAN. On the other hand, postoperative variables included pain, sensory changes, TMJ complications and reoperation during one month after surgery. For measuring the possible post-operation sensory changes, we moved a cotton wisp across the skin until the patients expressed to have a normal sense in that region. The size of affected region was also measured. After surgery, the satisfaction of patients with the results was inquired by a simple question of “Are you satisfied with the results of surgery?,” with the patients’ answer of “yes” or “no.” Split sagittal osteotomy is a routine procedure in the Maxillofacial Department of Taleghani hospital, and so the study did not require the Ethical Committee’s approval.

Statistical Analyses
Categorical data are presented as numbers and percentages, and continuous data are presented as mean ± SD. Chi-square and Fisher exact tests were used to compare categorical variables and the numerical variables were compared by t test. P<.05 was considered as the statistical significance. Data were analyzed using the SPSS version 20 software package.

Results
The patients’ age averaged 32.3 ± 12.04 years. While seven patients (10.6%) were subjected to suboptimal osteotomies, four cases (6%) bad split cases was recorded. In 102 sites (77.2%), there was no visible damage. Two patients (3%) were re-operated within 1 month. During the 1-year follow-up, problems related to the TMJ were observed in 12 patients (18.5%). Area mapping showed that 19.2% of patients had normal sensory function while 80.8% experienced impaired sensory function (Table 1). In addition, the size of the area with persistent disturbed sensation averaged 9.3 ± 8.1 cm² for the total sample. Normal sensibility was reported by 24.2% of the subjects, while the remaining expressed some disturbances (Table 1). Eight subjects (12.1%) expressed dissatisfaction with the treatment result. The rate of satisfaction was significantly lower among the patients with distress caused by altering sensation (P=.020) (Table 2). Of the eight dissatisfied patients, five reported TMJ problems (P=.000). The remaining seven patients who reported TMJ problems were satisfied with the treatment. The mean area in the patients with impaired sensation was 10.1 ± 6.3 cm², which is significantly higher than that in patients with normal sensation, 1.1 ± 2.9 cm² (P=.000).

Registration of visible nerve injury during surgery was significantly reflected in the clinically assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Operation Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suboptimal split, unilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suboptimal split, bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad split, unilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerve injury (sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation disturbance size (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal sensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(P = 0.018) and subjectively reported sensation (P = .01) (Table 3). The visible nerve injury was, however, not resulted in any increased dissatisfaction.

Discussion
The neurosensory deficit may occur during and after the osteotomy surgery. The IAN may be injured by direct injury or compression due to rigid fixation.\textsuperscript{12,13} Moreover neurosensory deficit may occur after surgery because of hematoma or edema.\textsuperscript{14} The present survey showed that 75% of the patients experience neurosensory distribution in different levels after split sagittal surgery. Previous studies have reported a wide range of neurosensory disturbance up to 75%.\textsuperscript{15} The reason for such discrepancy is currently unclear; however, it may be related to different methodologies and different definitions of neurosensory disturbances. Furthermore, the objective and subjective evaluation has yielded different results in previous reports.\textsuperscript{16-20} In our observations, the frequency of objective neurosensory disturbance was significantly higher than that of the subjective evaluation (80.8% vs. 75.8%, P = .001). A systematic review of 61 studies in 2015 by Agbaje et al revealed that 26% of the studies did not record any nerve injury. However, the incidence of neurosensory deficit has been reported in 77% of the studies. The most common evaluating method in these studies had been subjective.\textsuperscript{21} The rate of visible nerve injury in our study was 13.6%, which is lower than that in the study of Ylikontiola et al who reported an incidence rate of around 40%.\textsuperscript{22} It is supposed that bad split is one of the possible reasons of sensory deficit. In our study, bad splits occurred in 5.3% of the patients that was higher than the corresponding values reported by Martis (1.93%),\textsuperscript{23} Panula et al (2%),\textsuperscript{24} and Bothur and Blomqvist (1.3%).\textsuperscript{9}

In the present survey, 87.9% of the patients were found to be satisfied with sagittal split osteotomy results. This satisfaction rate is close to some previous reports,\textsuperscript{3,22} but was lower than that of another study reporting satisfaction rate of 93% among the patients who were followed up for 3 years post-surgery.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover we found the rate of dissatisfaction to be significantly higher among the patients who reported distress due to sensation alteration (P = .020). This finding is supported by the study of Maurer et al.\textsuperscript{25}

Study Limitations
The main limitations of our study are the relatively small sample size and the short duration of follow-up (one year) which restricts generalization of the results. Therefore, further investigations with longer follow-up duration are required for achieving firm conclusions.

Conclusions
Our study indicated that despite the high rate of subjective satisfaction with sagittal split osteotomy results, IAN disturbance after split sagittal surgery is frequent among Iranian patients. This indicates the need for caution on considering split sagittal surgery as a safe medical technique.
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