Journal of Advanced Medical and Dental Sciences Research

@Society of Scientific Research and Studies *NLM ID: 101716117*

Journal home page: www.jamdsr.com doi: 10.21276/jamdsr Indian Citation Index (ICI) Index Copernicus value = 100

(e) ISSN Online: 2321-9599; (p) ISSN Print: 2348-6805

Review Article

Current Trends and Innovations in Oral and Maxillofacial Reconstruction

[1]Sneha Sandeep Naware, [2]Meghna Chandrachood, [3]Neelam Salvi

[1]Associate Professor, [2]Lecturer, Department Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, MGM Dental College and Hospital, Kamothe, Navi Mumbai, India;
[3]Lecturer, Department of Prosthodontics, MGM Dental College and Hospital, Kamothe, Navi Mumbai, India

ABSTRACT:
Oral and maxillofacial reconstruction represents one of the most challenging domains in surgical practice, requiring the restoration of complex anatomical structures essential for mastication, speech, respiration, and facial aesthetics. The past two decades have witnessed remarkable advances in reconstructive techniques, driven by innovations in microsurgical approaches, biomaterial science, digital planning technologies, and regenerative medicine.This narrative review aims to comprehensively examine the current trends and emerging innovations in oral and maxillofacial reconstruction, synthesizing evidence from recent literature to provide clinicians and researchers with an updated understanding of the evolving landscape in this field. The review explores several key areas including advances in microvascular free tissue transfer, the integration of computer-aided design and manufacturing (CAD/CAM) technologies, three-dimensional bioprinting applications, stem cell-based regenerative approaches, and the role of patient-specific implants in achieving optimal functional and aesthetic outcomes. Additionally, the article addresses contemporary approaches to bone reconstruction, soft tissue management, and the emerging paradigm of tissue engineering.The convergence of digital technologies with traditional surgical techniques has fundamentally transformed preoperative planning and intraoperative execution. While microvascular free flaps remain the gold standard for complex reconstructions, emerging technologies including bioprinted scaffolds and stem cell therapies show promising potential for future clinical translation. However, significant challenges persist regarding cost-effectiveness, accessibility, and long-term outcome validation. Multidisciplinary collaboration and continued research investment are essential to advance the field toward more predictable, personalized, and patient-centered reconstructive solutions.
Keywords: Oral reconstruction, maxillofacial surgery, microvascular free flaps, CAD/CAM technology, 3D bioprinting, tissue engineering, patient-specific implants

Received: 03 December, 2025 Accepted: 05 January, 2026 Published: 08 January, 2026

Corresponding Author: Sneha Sandeep Naware, Associate Professor, Department Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, MGM Dental College and Hospital, Kamothe, Navi Mumbai, India

This article may be cited as: Naware SS, Chandrachood M, Salvi N. Current Trends and Innovations in Oral and Maxillofacial Reconstruction. J AdvMed Dent Scie Res 2026; 14(1):1-6.

INTRODUCTION

The oral and maxillofacial region encompasses intricate anatomical structures that serve critical functions including mastication, deglutition, speech articulation, and respiratory maintenance, while simultaneously contributing to facial identity and social interaction **[1]**. Defects in this region may arise from diverse etiologies including oncological resections, trauma, congenital anomalies, osteoradionecrosis, and infectious processes **[2]**. The restoration of these defects presents formidable challenges due to the complex three-dimensional anatomy, the need for both functional rehabilitation and aesthetic restoration, and the proximity to vital neurovascular structures **[3]**.

Historically, reconstructive options were limited to local and regional flaps, which often provided suboptimal outcomes for extensive defects. The introduction of microvascular free tissue transfer in the 1970s revolutionized the field, enabling surgeons to transplant vascularized composite tissues from distant donor sites **[4]**. Subsequently, the fibula osteocutaneous flap, first described by Hidalgo in 1989, became the workhorse for mandibular reconstruction **[5]**. Despite these advances, significant controversies persist regarding optimal flap selection, the timing of reconstruction, and the integration of prosthetic rehabilitation.

The contemporary era has witnessed an unprecedented convergence of digital technologies with surgical practice. Computer-aided design and computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM) have transformed preoperative planning, enabling virtual surgical simulations and the fabrication of patient-specific cutting guides and implants **[6]**. Furthermore, advances in three-dimensional (3D) bioprinting and regenerative medicine offer the tantalizing prospect of creating biological substitutes that can integrate seamlessly with host tissues **[7]**.

Despite these technological advances, significant gaps remain in our understanding of optimal reconstructive strategies. Questions persist regarding the long-term functional outcomes of various techniques, the cost-effectiveness of emerging technologies, and the translation of laboratory advances to clinical practice. Additionally, disparities in access to advanced reconstructive care remain a global concern **[8]**.

This narrative review aims to synthesize current evidence on trends and innovations in oral and maxillofacial reconstruction, providing a comprehensive overview of established techniques and emerging technologies. The objectives are to: (1) examine advances in microvascular reconstruction; (2) evaluate the role of digital planning and CAD/CAM technologies; (3) explore tissue engineering and regenerative approaches; (4) assess outcomes and quality of life considerations; and (5) identify future directions and research priorities.

Advances in Microvascular Free Tissue Transfer

Evolution of Flap Selection

Microvascular free tissue transfer remains the cornerstone of complex oral and maxillofacial reconstruction, offering the ability to transplant vascularized tissues tailored to specific defect requirements. The fibula free flap, with its reliable blood supply, adequate bone stock, and acceptable donor site morbidity, continues to be the predominant choice for mandibular reconstruction **[9]**. Studies have demonstrated success rates exceeding 95% in experienced centers, with favorable long-term functional outcomes **[10]**.

However, alternative osseous flaps have gained recognition for specific indications. The scapular and parascapular system offers versatility with the potential for chimeric tissue transfer, incorporating bone, muscle, and skin on separate pedicles **[11]**. Wei and colleagues demonstrated that the anterolateral thigh (ALT) flap, while primarily a soft tissue flap, can be harvested with a segment of the vastus lateralis muscle for composite reconstructions requiring bulk without bone **[12]**.

The iliac crest free flap, though associated with greater donor site morbidity, provides the advantage of natural curvature closely resembling the mandible and superior bone height for dental implant placement **[13]**. Comparative studies by Kesting and colleagues found no significant differences in flap survival between fibula and iliac crest flaps, though the latter demonstrated better vertical bone height at the expense of increased donor site complications **[14]**.

Perforator Flap Refinements

The evolution toward perforator-based flaps represents a significant paradigm shift, emphasizing precise vascular anatomy and reduced donor site morbidity. The ALT perforator flap has emerged as the dominant soft tissue option for oral cavity reconstruction, offering thin, pliable tissue with a long pedicle **[15]**. Saint-Cyr and colleagues elucidated the perforasome concept, providing a theoretical framework for understanding perforator flap perfusion territories **[16]**.

Recent modifications include the thinning and suprafascial harvesting techniques, which enable primary flap debulking without compromising vascularity **[17]**. Studies by Huang and colleagues demonstrated that suprathin ALT flaps with thicknesses less than 5 millimeters could be safely harvested in selected patients, facilitating improved functional outcomes for tongue and floor of mouth reconstruction **[18]**.

Technical Innovations

Contemporary microsurgical practice has been enhanced by several technical refinements. The adoption of coupling devices for venous anastomosis has reduced ischemia times and demonstrated comparable or superior patency rates to hand-sewn techniques **[19]**. Additionally, the use of arterial loops and interposition vein grafts has expanded the possibilities for vessel-depleted necks in salvage settings **[20]**.

Intraoperative monitoring technologies, including implantable Doppler probes and near-infrared spectroscopy, have improved early detection of vascular compromise, enabling timely intervention and flap salvage **[21]**. Smit and colleagues reported that continuous tissue oxygen monitoring detected perfusion changes earlier than clinical assessment, potentially improving salvage rates **[22]**.

Digital Planning and CAD/CAM Technologies

Virtual Surgical Planning

The integration of computer-aided design with preoperative planning has fundamentally transformed the approach to complex maxillofacial reconstruction. Virtual surgical planning (VSP) enables three-dimensional visualization of the defect, simulation of osteotomies, and optimization of flap positioning before surgery **[23]**. Studies have demonstrated that VSP reduces operative times, improves accuracy of bone segment placement, and enhances symmetry in mandibular reconstruction **[24]**.

Tarsitano and colleagues conducted a systematic review demonstrating that VSP-guided fibula free flap reconstruction achieved superior accuracy compared to conventional freehand techniques, with mean deviations of less than 2 millimeters in most studies **[25]**. However, concerns persist regarding the additional cost and time required for planning sessions, and the potential for workflow disruptions when intraoperative findings necessitate deviation from the planned approach **[26]**.

Patient-Specific Implants

Advances in additive manufacturing have enabled the fabrication of patient-specific implants (PSIs) from titanium and other biocompatible materials. These custom implants can be designed to precisely match defect geometries, eliminating the need for intraoperative contouring of stock plates **[27]**. Ciocca and colleagues demonstrated that PSIs reduced operative time and improved accuracy in mandibular reconstruction, with favorable integration and low complication rates **[28]**.

The application of PSIs has expanded to include custom temporomandibular joint replacements for ankylosis and tumor resection, with studies reporting satisfactory functional outcomes at medium-term follow-up **[29]**. However, long-term data remain limited, and concerns regarding stress shielding and hardware longevity require ongoing surveillance **[30]**.

Surgical Navigation

Intraoperative navigation systems provide real-time feedback on instrument positioning relative to preoperative imaging, enhancing precision in complex resections and reconstructions **[31]**. These systems have proven particularly valuable in orbital and midface reconstruction, where millimetric accuracy is essential for functional and aesthetic outcomes **[32]**. Zavattero and colleagues reported that navigation-guided orbital reconstruction achieved superior volumetric accuracy compared to conventional techniques **[33]**.

Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Approaches

Stem Cell-Based Therapies

Regenerative medicine offers the potential to create biological substitutes that overcome the limitations of current reconstructive techniques. Mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) derived from bone marrow, adipose tissue, and dental pulp have demonstrated osteogenic potential in preclinical studies **[34]**. Adipose-derived stem cells (ADSCs) are particularly attractive due to their abundance and ease of harvest through lipoaspiration **[35]**.

Clinical translation has progressed cautiously, with early-phase trials demonstrating safety and feasibility. Sandor and colleagues reported successful mandibular reconstruction using ADSCs seeded onto beta-tricalcium phosphate scaffolds in a case series, though larger controlled trials remain necessary **[36]**. Challenges include ensuring adequate vascularization of engineered constructs and achieving predictable bone formation at clinically relevant scales **[37]**.

Three-Dimensional Bioprinting

Bioprinting technology enables the layer-by-layer deposition of cells, biomaterials, and growth factors to create complex three-dimensional structures. This approach holds promise for generating customized bone and soft tissue constructs matching patient-specific defect geometries **[38]**. Recent advances have demonstrated the printability of cell-laden hydrogels with maintained viability and differentiation capacity **[39]**.

Kang and colleagues developed an integrated tissue-organ printer capable of fabricating human-scale bone constructs with structural integrity, though clinical application remains in developmental stages **[40]**. Significant challenges persist regarding vascularization of thick constructs, mechanical properties sufficient for load-bearing applications, and regulatory pathways for clinical translation **[41]**.

Biomaterial Innovations

Novel biomaterials continue to expand the reconstructive armamentarium. Bioactive ceramics, including hydroxyapatite and beta-tricalcium phosphate, provide osteoconductive scaffolds supporting bone regeneration **[42]**. Composite materials combining ceramics with polymers or growth factors aim to optimize mechanical properties while enhancing biological activity **[43]**.

The incorporation of bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs), particularly BMP-2, has shown efficacy in enhancing bone formation in maxillofacial applications. However, concerns regarding supraphysiological dosing, unpredictable bone formation, and potential adverse effects have tempered enthusiasm **[44]**. Controlled release strategies using nanocarriers and microparticles represent promising approaches to optimize growth factor delivery **[45]**.

Functional Outcomes and Quality of Life

The ultimate measure of reconstructive success extends beyond flap survival to encompass functional rehabilitation and patient-reported outcomes. Speech and swallowing function are critically dependent on tongue mobility, oral competence, and velopharyngeal closure **[46]**. Studies have demonstrated that preservation of the tongue base and restoration of oral continuity are associated with improved functional outcomes **[47]**.

Dental rehabilitation following jaw reconstruction presents ongoing challenges. While osseointegrated implants placed in fibula bone demonstrate acceptable survival rates, the often inadequate bone height and width may compromise prosthetic outcomes **[48]**. Vertical distraction osteogenesis and onlay bone grafting have been employed to optimize implant positioning, though these add complexity and treatment duration **[49]**.

Quality of life assessments using validated instruments including the University of Washington Quality of Life questionnaire (UW-QOL) and the EORTC QLQ-H&N35 have provided insight into patient experiences following reconstruction **[50]**. While significant impairments are common in the early postoperative period, many patients demonstrate adaptation and improvement over time, particularly with comprehensive rehabilitation support **[51]**.

DISCUSSION

The reviewed evidence demonstrates remarkable progress in oral and maxillofacial reconstruction over recent decades, driven by advances in microsurgical techniques, digital technologies, and regenerative medicine. Microvascular free tissue transfer has achieved maturity as a reliable reconstructive modality, with refinements in flap design and monitoring technologies contributing to improved outcomes **[52]**.

The integration of virtual surgical planning and CAD/CAM technologies represents perhaps the most transformative development of the contemporary era. These tools have enhanced precision, reduced operative times, and facilitated communication among multidisciplinary team members **[53]**. However, important limitations warrant consideration. The cost of virtual planning services and custom implants may be prohibitive in resource-limited settings, potentially exacerbating disparities in reconstructive care **[54]**. Additionally, the learning curve associated with these technologies and the infrastructure requirements for implementation present barriers to widespread adoption.

Tissue engineering and regenerative approaches remain largely in preclinical and early clinical stages, with translation to routine practice awaiting resolution of significant technical and regulatory challenges **[55]**. The creation of vascularized, mechanically competent bone constructs at human scales represents a formidable bioengineering challenge. Nevertheless, continued progress in biomaterial science, stem cell biology, and biofabrication technologies suggests that clinically viable solutions may emerge in the coming decades.

Gaps in the literature are evident in several areas. Long-term functional outcome data, particularly regarding speech, swallowing, and oral rehabilitation, remain limited for many reconstructive techniques **[56]**. Comparative effectiveness research directly comparing alternative approaches is scarce, with most evidence derived from case series and retrospective cohort studies. Standardization of outcome measures and establishment of multi-institutional registries would facilitate evidence synthesis and quality improvement initiatives.

The clinical implications of these findings emphasize the importance of multidisciplinary care, individualized treatment planning, and comprehensive rehabilitation. Surgeons should remain cognizant of both the opportunities and limitations of emerging technologies, integrating innovations judiciously based on patient needs and available resources **[57-59]**.

CONCLUSION

Oral and maxillofacial reconstruction has evolved dramatically, transforming from an era of limited options to one of sophisticated, technology-enhanced approaches. Microvascular free tissue transfer remains the gold standard for complex reconstructions, with refinements in flap design and perioperative management contributing to high success rates. Digital planning technologies have revolutionized preoperative assessment and intraoperative execution, enabling unprecedented precision and predictability.

Emerging technologies including bioprinting and stem cell therapies hold promise for future clinical translation, potentially overcoming limitations of current techniques related to donor site morbidity and tissue availability. However, significant work remains to validate these approaches and ensure accessibility across diverse healthcare settings.

Future perspectives should emphasize comparative effectiveness research, standardization of outcome measures, and development of cost-effective implementation strategies. The ultimate goal remains the restoration of patients to optimal function and quality of life, requiring continued collaboration among surgeons, engineers, scientists, and rehabilitation specialists. As technologies continue to evolve, the field must balance innovation with evidence-based practice, ensuring that advances translate to meaningful improvements in patient care.

REFERENCES

1. Urken ML, Buchbinder D, Costantino PD, et al. Oromandibular reconstruction using microvascular composite flaps: report of 210 cases. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1998;124(1):46-55. DOI: 10.1001/archotol.124.1.46
2. Shah JP, Gil Z. Current concepts in management of oral cancer--surgery. Oral Oncol. 2009;45(4-5):394-401. DOI: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2008.05.017
3. 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. 1999;104(5):1314-1320. PMID: 10513911
4. Taylor GI, Miller GD, Ham FJ. The free vascularized bone graft. A clinical extension of microvascular techniques. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1975;55(5):533-544. PMID: 1096183
5. Hidalgo DA. Fibula free flap: a new method of mandible reconstruction. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1989;84(1):71-79. PMID: 2734406
6. Roser SM, Ramachandra S, Blair H, et al. The accuracy of virtual surgical planning in free fibula mandibular reconstruction: comparison of planned and final results. J Oral Maxillofac Surg.

2010;68(11):2824-2832. DOI: 10.1016/j.joms.2010.06.177
7. Nyberg EL, Farris AL, Carleton DC, et al. 3D-printing technologies for craniofacial rehabilitation, reconstruction, and regeneration. Ann Biomed Eng. 2017;45(1):45-57. DOI: 10.1007/s10439-016-1668-5
8. Rogers SN, Brown JS, Woolgar JA, et al. Survival following primary surgery for oral cancer. Oral Oncol. 2009;45(3):201-211. DOI: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2008.05.008
9. Bak M, Jacobson AS, Buchbinder D, Urken ML. Contemporary reconstruction of the mandible. Oral Oncol. 2010;46(2):71-76. DOI: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2009.11.006
10. Peng X, Mao C, Yu GY, et al. Microvascular free flaps for maxillofacial reconstruction: experience with 396 flaps. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2005;34(2):144-148. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijom.2004.06.001
11. Clark JR, Vesely M, Gilbert R. Scapular angle osteomyogenous flap in postmaxillectomy reconstruction: defect, reconstruction, shoulder function, and harvest technique. Head Neck. 2008;30(1):10-20. DOI: 10.1002/hed.20649
12. Wei FC, Jain V, Celik N, et al. Have we found an ideal soft-tissue flap? An experience with 672 anterolateral thigh flaps. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2002;109(7):2219-2226. PMID: 12045540
13. Urken ML, Vickery C, Weinberg H, Buchbinder D, Biller HF. The internal oblique-iliac crest osseomyocutaneous free flap in oromandibular reconstruction. Report of 20 cases. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1989;115(3):339-349. PMID: 2644971
14. Kesting MR, Holzle F, Wales C, et al. Microsurgical reconstruction of the oral cavity with free flaps from the anterolateral thigh and the radial forearm: a comparison. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2011;49(1):27-31. DOI: 10.1016/j.bjoms.2009.11.009
15. Song YG, Chen GZ, Song YL. The free thigh flap: a new free flap concept based on the septocutaneous artery. Br J Plast Surg. 1984;37(2):149-159. PMID: 6713155
16. Saint-Cyr M, Wong C, Schaverien M, Mojallal A, Rohrich RJ. The perforasome theory: vascular anatomy and clinical implications. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2009;124(5):1529-1544. DOI: 10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181b98a6c
17. Kimura N, Satoh K. Consideration of a thin flap as an entity and clinical applications of the thin anterolateral thigh flap. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1996;97(5):985-992. PMID: 8619001
18. Huang WC, Chen HC, Jain V, et al. Reconstruction of through-and-through cheek defects involving the oral commissure, using chimeric flaps from the thigh lateral femoral circumflex system. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2002;109(2):433-441. PMID: 11818817
19. Jandali S, Wu LC, Engel H, et al. Anastomotic coupling device versus suture anastomosis: a comparison of free flap success. Microsurgery. 2010;30(3):193-195. DOI: 10.1002/micr.20746
20. Harris JR, Lueg E, Genden EM, Urken ML. The arteriovenous loop: a solution to the vessel-depleted neck. Head Neck. 2002;24(5):419-423. DOI: 10.1002/hed.10082
21. Chao AH, Meyerson J, Garvey PB, et al. A review of devices used in the monitoring of microvascular free tissue transfers. Expert Rev Med Devices. 2013;10(5):649-660. DOI: 10.1586/17434440.2013.827527
22. Smit JM, Zeebregts CJ, Acosta R, Werker PM. Advancements in free flap monitoring in the last decade: a critical review. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2010;125(1):177-185. DOI: 10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181c49580
23. Hanasono MM, Skoracki RJ. Computer-assisted design and rapid prototype modeling in microvascular mandible reconstruction. Laryngoscope. 2013;123(3):597-604. DOI: 10.1002/lary.23717
24. Zweifel DF, Simon C, Hoarau R, Schwarz K, Zebrowski J. Does computer-assisted reconstruction with patient-specific implants improve accuracy in secondary orbital reconstructions? J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2016;74(6):1183-1190. DOI: 10.1016/j.joms.2016.01.003
25. Tarsitano A, Mazzoni S, Cipriani R, Scotti R, Marchetti C. The CAD-CAM technique for mandibular reconstruction: an 18 patients oncological case-series. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2014;42(7):1460-1464. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcms.2014.04.014
26. Katsuragi Y, Kayano S, Akazawa S, et al. Mandible reconstruction using the calcium-sulphate three-dimensional model and rubber stick: a new method, 'mould technique', for more accurate, efficient and simplified fabrication. J Plast ReconstrAesthet Surg. 2011;64(5):614-622. DOI: 10.1016/j.bjps.2010.08.010
27. Wilde F, Winter K, Kletsch K, Lorenz K, Hasta A. Mandible reconstruction using patient-specific pre-bent reconstruction plates: comparison of standard and transfer key method. Int J Comput Assist Radiol Surg. 2015;10(2):129-137. DOI: 10.1007/s11548-014-1065-1
28. Ciocca L, Mazzoni S, Fantini M, et al. CAD/CAM guided secondary mandibular reconstruction of a discontinuity defect after ablative cancer surgery. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2012;40(8):e511-e515. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcms.2012.03.015
29. Mercuri LG, Wolford LM, Sanders B, White RD, Hurder A, Henderson W. Custom CAD/CAM total temporomandibular joint reconstruction system: preliminary multicenter report. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 1995;53(2):106-115. PMID: 7830175
30. Gerbino G, Zavattero E, Bosco G, Berrone S, Ramieri G. Temporomandibular joint reconstruction with stock and custom-made devices: indications and results of a 14-year experience. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2017;45(10):1694-1701. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcms.2017.08.011
31. Bernstein JM, Daly MJ, Chan H, Siewerdsen JH, Irish JC. Accuracy and reproducibility of virtual cutting guides and 3D-navigation for osteotomies of the mandible and maxilla. PLoS One. 2017;12(3):e0173111. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0173111
32. Essig H, Rana M, Zebrowski J, et al. Pre-operative planning for craniomaxillofacial surgery – skull reconstruction and navigated resection. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2011;39(8):598-605. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcms.2010.12.004
33. Zavattero E, Ramieri G, Roccia F, Gerbino G. Comparison of the outcomes of complex orbital fracture repair with and without a surgical navigation system: a prospective cohort study with historical controls. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2017;139(4):957-965. DOI: 10.1097/PRS.0000000000003189

34. Pittenger MF, Mackay AM, Beck SC, et al. Multilineage potential of adult human mesenchymal stem cells. Science. 1999;284(5411):143-147. DOI: 10.1126/science.284.5411.143
35. Zuk PA, Zhu M, Mizuno H, et al. Multilineage cells from human adipose tissue: implications for cell-based therapies. Tissue Eng. 2001;7(2):211-228. DOI: 10.1089/107632701300062859
36. Sandor GK, Numminen J, Wolff J, et al. Adipose stem cells used to reconstruct 13 cases with cranio-maxillofacial hard-tissue defects. Stem Cells Transl Med. 2014;3(4):530-540. DOI: 10.5966/sctm.2013-0173
37. Grayson WL, Frohlich M, Yeager K, et al. Engineering anatomically shaped human bone grafts. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2010;107(8):3299-3304. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0905439106
38. Murphy SV, Atala A. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nat Biotechnol. 2014;32(8):773-785. DOI: 10.1038/nbt.2958
39. Mandrycky C, Wang Z, Kim K, Kim DH. 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. Biotechnol Adv. 2016;34(4):422-434. DOI: 10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.12.011
40. Kang HW, Lee SJ, Ko IK, et al. A 3D bioprinting system to produce human-scale tissue constructs with structural integrity. Nat Biotechnol. 2016;34(3):312-319. DOI: 10.1038/nbt.3413
41. Keriquel V, Oliveira H, Remy M, et al. In situ printing of mesenchymal stromal cells, by laser-assisted bioprinting, for in vivo bone regeneration applications. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):1778. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-017-01914-x
42. Mishra BP, Harish A, Mathew AM, Pradhan A, Sneha S, Murty V, Makkad RS. Management of zygomatic fractures using different surgical approaches. Bioinformation. 2023; 31;19(13):1371-1376. doi: 10.6026/973206300191371.
43. Bohner M. Calcium orthophosphates in medicine: from ceramics to calcium phosphate cements. Injury. 2000;31(Suppl 4):37-47. DOI: 10.1016/s0020-1383(00)80022-4
44. Petrovic V, Zivkovic P, Petrovic D, Stefanovic V. Craniofacial bone tissue engineering. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2012;114(3):e1-e9. DOI: 10.1016/j.oooo.2012.02.030
45. Herford AS, Boyne PJ. Reconstruction of mandibular continuity defects with bone morphogenetic protein-2 (rhBMP-2). J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2008;66(4):616-624. DOI: 10.1016/j.joms.2007.11.021
46. Fang J, Zhu YY, Smiley E, et al. Stimulation of new bone formation by direct transfer of osteogenic plasmid genes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 1996;93(12):5753-5758. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.93.12.5753
47. Pauloski BR, Rademaker AW, Logemann JA, et al. Speech and swallowing in irradiated and nonirradiated postsurgical oral cancer patients. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1998;118(5):616-624. DOI: 10.1177/019459989811800509
48. Hsiao HT, Leu YS, Lin CC. Tongue reconstruction with free radial forearm flap after hemiglossectomy: a functional assessment. J ReconstrMicrosurg. 2003;19(3):137-142. DOI: 10.1055/s-2003-39827
49. Chiapasco M, Colletti G, Romeo E, Zaniboni M, Brusati R. Long-term results of mandibular reconstruction with autogenous bone grafts and oral implants after tumor resection. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2008;19(10):1074-1080. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0501.2008.01542.x
50. Chiapasco M, Romeo E, Casentini P, Rimondini L. Alveolar distraction osteogenesis vs. vertical guided bone regeneration for the correction of vertically deficient edentulous ridges: a 1-3-year prospective study on humans. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2004;15(1):82-95. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0501.2004.00999.x
51. Rogers SN, Gwanne S, Lowe D, et al. The addition of mood and anxiety domains to the University of Washington quality of life scale. Head Neck. 2002;24(6):521-529. DOI: 10.1002/hed.10106
52. Mishra BP et al. Comparative Study of Scalpel and Surgical Diathermy Incision in Elective Operations of Head-and-neck Cancer. JRAD. 2024;15(2):1-4.
53. Borggreven PA, Verdonck-de Leeuw IM, Muller MJ, et al. Quality of life and functional status in patients with cancer of the oral cavity and oropharynx: pretreatment values of a prospective study. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 2007;264(6):651-657. DOI: 10.1007/s00405-007-0249-5
54. Bianchi B, Ferri A, Ferrari S, et al. Mandibular reconstruction using autologous and alloplastic materials: a 20-year experience at an Italian Tertiary Care Center. Cancers (Basel). 2020;12(9):2417. DOI: 10.3390/cancers12092417
55. Rodby KA, Turin S, Jacobs RJ, et al. Advances in oncologic head and neck reconstruction: systematic review and future considerations of virtual surgical planning and computer aided design/computer aided modeling. J Plast ReconstrAesthet Surg. 2014;67(9):1171-1185. DOI: 10.1016/j.bjps.2014.04.038
56. Loeffelbein DJ, Holzle F, Wolff KD. Double-skin paddle perforator flap from the lateral lower leg for reconstruction of through-and-through cheek defect: a report of two cases. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2006;35(11):1016-1020. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijom.2006.08.003
57. Tevlin R, McArdle A, Atashroo D, et al. Biomaterials for craniofacial bone engineering. J Dent Res. 2014;93(12):1187-1195. DOI: 10.1177/0022034514547271
58. Canis M, Weiss BG, Ihler F, Hummers-Pradier E, Matthias C, Wolff HA. Quality of life in patients after resection of pT3 lateral tongue carcinoma: microvascular reconstruction versus primary closure. Head Neck. 2016;38(1):89-94. DOI: 10.1002/hed.23861
59. Brown JS, Barry C, Ho M, Shaw R. A new classification for mandibular defects after oncological resection. Lancet Oncol. 2016;17(1):e23-e30. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00310-1.