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

Recent Advances in Maxillofacial Materials: From Historical Foundations to Modern Innovations

[1]Mahitosh Ashokrao Lakhe, [2]Akshay Bhargava, [3]Rajiv Kumar Gupta, [4]Manoj Kumar Goyat, [5]Bharti Dua, [6]Sumita Giri

[1]3rd Year PG, [2]Professor & Dean, [3]Professor & Head, [4]Professor, [5]Reader, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Santosh Dental College and Hospital, Pratap Vihar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India;
[6]Professor & HOD, Department of Conservative Dentistry & Endodontics, Santosh Dental College and Hospital, Pratap Vihar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT:
Maxillofacial prosthodontics has long played a pivotal role in the rehabilitation of patients with congenital, acquired, or traumatic defects of the craniofacial region. The evolution of maxillofacial materials reflects centuries of experimentation, innovation, and refinement—progressing from primitive prostheses of gold, silver, and cloth to modern silicone elastomers, biomimetic polymers, and computer-aided design and manufacturing (CAD/CAM) technologies. Historical pioneers such as Ambroise Paré and Pierre Fauchard laid the foundations for functional and esthetic facial replacements. The 20th century introduced acrylics, vulcanite rubber, and later silicone elastomers, which revolutionized prosthesis fabrication by offering improved flexibility and lifelike appearance. Recent advances, including polyphosphazenes, polyurethane elastomers, nanocomposites, and 3D printing, continue to transform the field, addressing challenges of color stability, durability, and patient comfort. Retention strategies have similarly evolved from adhesives to craniofacial implants and magnet/bar systems, expanding clinical possibilities. Despite these advancements, limitations persist in terms of material degradation, ultraviolet sensitivity, and psychological acceptance. This review provides a comprehensive overview of the chronological development, classification systems, impression techniques, and emerging technologies in maxillofacial prosthetics, emphasizing the need for interdisciplinary collaboration to further enhance rehabilitation outcomes and patient quality of life.
Keywords: Maxillofacial prosthetics, Silicone elastomers, Polyphosphazenes, 3D printing, CAD/CAM, Retention systems

Received: 26 August, 2025 Acceptance: 30 September, 2025 Published: 08 October, 2025

Corresponding Author: Akshay Bhargava, Professor & Dean, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, Santosh Dental College and Hospital, Pratap Vihar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

This article may be cited as: Lakhe MA, Bhargava A, Gupta RK, Goyat MK, Dua B, Giri S. Recent Advances in Maxillofacial Materials: From Historical Foundations to Modern Innovations. J AdvMed Dent Scie Res 2025; 13(10):26-30.

INTRODUCTION

Maxillofacial prosthodontics is a specialized discipline that combines science and artistry to restore esthetics and function in patients suffering from craniofacial defects. Such defects may result from congenital malformations, trauma, or surgical resections, and often lead to profound psychological and social challenges. Conventional reconstructive surgery may not always be feasible due to lack of donor tissue, medical contraindications, or unsatisfactory outcomes. In these situations, maxillofacial prostheses serve as indispensable alternatives, restoring not only anatomy and function but also the confidence and quality of life of patients^1,2.

The choice of material remains central to the success of prosthetic rehabilitation. While traditional polymeric and metallic substitutes provided early solutions, the demand for durability, lifelike esthetics, and biocompatibility has spurred significant research into advanced materials. This article presents a detailed review of the historical background, classification systems, impression techniques, retention strategies, material developments, and future prospects in maxillofacial prosthetics.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Before 1600 AD

Ambroise Paré, a 16th-century French physician, fabricated nasal prostheses using bases of gold or silver covered with paper and linen, painted to match skin tone. His pioneering efforts provided both functional restoration and psychological relief for disfigured individuals^3.

1600–1800 AD

Pierre Fauchard created oil-painted silver masks to replace jaw defects in soldiers, camouflaging prosthetic borders with facial hair. His innovations balanced esthetics with mechanical support^4.

1800–1900 AD

William Morton fabricated nasal prostheses from enameled porcelain, while Kingsley and Claude Martin advanced ceramic prostheses. These provided improved durability but lacked flexibility^5.

1900–1940 AD

The introduction of vulcanite rubber, gelatin-glycerin compounds, and acrylic resins marked significant milestones. Acrylic resin, introduced in 1937, replaced vulcanite rubber, offering improved durability and esthetics^6.

1940–1960 AD

Tylman introduced vinyl copolymers, enhancing flexibility. Adolph Brown utilized FDA-approved pigments, ensuring safety and quality. Braiser improved intrinsic and extrinsic coloration methods, refining realism^7.

1960–1970 AD

Barnhart introduced silicone rubber in 1960, which became a gold standard due to its flexibility, durability, and biocompatibility^8. Its lifelike mimicry of human tissue revolutionized prosthetic outcomes.

1970–1990 AD

Modified polysiloxane elastomers and polyurethane elastomers enhanced dimensional stability and resistance. Udagama and Drane introduced Silastic Medical Adhesive Silicone Type A, improving prosthesis retention^9.

1990–Present

Recent decades have witnessed exploration of acrylic resin modifications, polyphosphazenes, and silicone block copolymers. These materials enhance chemical resistance, durability, and tissue compatibility, reflecting ongoing innovations in polymer science^10,11.

Classification of maxillofacial defects

Maxillofacial defects are broadly classified into congenital and acquired categories. Congenital anomalies include cleft lip and palate, craniofacial microsomia, and syndromic craniosynostosis. Acquired defects arise from trauma, surgery, or pathology^12.

Significant classification systems include:

- **Davis and Ritchie (1922):** Perialveolar, postalveolar, and alveolar clefts^13.
- **Veau (1931):** Divided cleft lip and palate into four groups^14.
- **Kernahan & Stark (1971):** Introduced the "striped-Y" symbolic classification^15.
- **Spina (1974):** Classified clefts as preincisive, transincisive, and postincisive^16.
- **Aramany (1987):** Categorized maxillectomy defects into six types^17.
- **Cordeiro (2000):** Rationalized maxillectomy defects with reconstructive algorithms^18.
- **Okay (2001):** Classified palato-maxillary defects based on restorative complexity^19.
- **Durrani (2013):** Offered a comprehensive system encompassing alveolectomy to radical maxillectomy^20.

Impression Materials in Maxillofacial Prosthodontics

Accurate impressions are critical for successful maxillofacial prosthesis fabrication, as they dictate the fit, retention, comfort, and esthetics of the final prosthesis. The evolution of impression materials has paralleled advances in restorative dentistry, progressing from rudimentary waxes to highly sophisticated elastomers and digital scanning systems.

Historical Development

Early impressions were made with wax and gutta-percha, which were rigid and unable to capture undercuts. Stent's modeling compound (1857) was an early thermoplastic material but lacked elasticity, limiting its use^21.

Hydrocolloids

The introduction of **agar** and **alginate** hydrocolloids improved elasticity.

- **Agar**: Reversible hydrocolloid, introduced in the early 20th century, capable of reproducing fine detail, but required specialized water bath equipment and was dimensionally unstable if not poured immediately^22.
- **Alginate**: Irreversible hydrocolloid, easier to manipulate, cost-effective, and widely used for diagnostic casts, duplications, and preliminary impressions. Its disadvantages include poor tear strength, syneresis, and imbibition, limiting its accuracy for definitive impressions^23.

Elastomeric Impression Materials

Elastomers remain the gold standard for precise impressions in maxillofacial prosthetics, especially when defects extend into undercut regions.

- **Polysulfides**: First elastomer introduced. They provide long working time and good tear strength

but are messy, have an unpleasant odor, and require custom trays. Due to poor dimensional stability, casts must be poured immediately^24.
- **Condensation Silicones**: Provide better handling, but release alcohol as a byproduct of setting, leading to shrinkage and reduced accuracy^25.
- **Addition Silicones (Polyvinyl Siloxanes)**: Superior dimensional stability, accuracy, and elastic recovery. They can be poured multiple times and are compatible with gypsum products. Their main drawbacks are hydrophobicity and sensitivity to sulfur contamination from latex gloves^26.
- **Polyethers**: Rigid, hydrophilic elastomers with excellent dimensional stability, useful for capturing undercuts. However, they can cause difficulties in removal and may trigger allergic reactions in sensitive patients^27.

Digital Impressions

Intraoral and extraoral scanners allow digital capture of craniofacial anatomy, avoiding traditional trays and materials. Advantages include reduced patient discomfort, ease of storage, and direct CAD/CAM integration. Limitations include high cost, difficulty recording mobile tissues, and reduced accuracy in completely edentulous arches^28.

Retention of Maxillofacial Prostheses

Retention is a cornerstone of successful prosthetic rehabilitation, as poorly retained prostheses compromise both esthetics and function, ultimately affecting patient confidence and compliance. Retention strategies may be classified into **anatomical, mechanical, adhesive, and implant-based methods**.

Anatomical and Mechanical Retention

- Natural undercuts, scar tissue, and bony prominences often aid retention. For example, the auricular concavity, orbital rims, and nasal bridges provide natural support. However, tissue resorption, scar contracture, or irregular anatomy may reduce their effectiveness^29.

Adhesive Retention

Medical adhesives remain popular due to their simplicity and non-invasiveness. They are available as liquids, sprays, pastes, and double-sided tapes.
- **Acrylic-based adhesives (e.g., Hydro-bond, Epithane 3):** Water-soluble, cost-effective, but less durable and susceptible to moisture.
- **Silicone adhesives (e.g., Secure Medical Adhesive):** Resistant to moisture, chemicals, and temperature changes; biocompatible and durable, but may alter prosthesis margins and irritate skin with prolonged use.
- **Pressure-sensitive tapes (e.g., 3M tapes):** Convenient and non-invasive but lack flexibility and require frequent replacement^30,31.

Limitations: Adhesives may cause skin irritation, dermatitis, and discoloration of prosthesis margins. Their effectiveness diminishes with perspiration and tissue movement. Patients must also maintain strict hygiene to prevent microbial colonization^32.

Implant-Retained Prostheses

Craniofacial implants (typically titanium) have transformed prosthesis retention.
- **Implant design:** Extraoral implants are shorter (3–4 mm long, 5 mm diameter) due to limited bone thickness in craniofacial regions.
- **Implant sites:** Zygoma, mastoid, orbital rim, and nasal bones are preferred sites, depending on defect location.
- **Attachment systems:**
  - o **Bar and Clip Systems:** Provide rigid fixation and stability; however, they are difficult to clean and require adequate prosthesis bulk.
  - o **Magnetic Systems:** Simplify placement and removal, improve hygiene, and enhance patient comfort, though corrosion and reduced magnetic force overtime are concerns^33.
  - o **Ball/O-ring Attachments:** Used less frequently, but provide secure mechanical retention.

Advantages: Implant-based retention provides superior stability, improved esthetics with thin margins, and greater patient confidence.

Limitations: Require surgery, adequate bone volume, and good hygiene. Implant failures may occur due to infection, radiation therapy, or poor bone quality^34,35.

Advances in Maxillofacial Materials

Material science has been the driving force in the evolution of maxillofacial prosthetics. The goal has been to achieve the ideal prosthetic material—biocompatible, durable, esthetically natural, easy to manipulate, color stable, and cost-effective.

Traditional Materials

Gold, silver, leather, vulcanite rubber, gelatin, and acrylics were used historically, but each presented drawbacks: excessive weight, poor tissue adaptation, difficulty in margin blending, or bulkiness^36.

Silicone Elastomers

Since their introduction in the 1960s, **silicone elastomers** have dominated the field.
- **Advantages:** Biocompatibility, lifelike texture, flexibility, tear resistance, and ease of pigmentation.
- **Limitations:** Discoloration, UV sensitivity, microbial colonization, and short service life (6–14 months)^37.
- **Improved formulations:** Medical-grade silicones (MDX4-4210) and commercial alternatives (A-2186) provide better mechanical properties but still degrade under environmental stress^38.

Polyphosphazenes

A novel class of polymers with customizable chemical structures, offering excellent biocompatibility, flexibility, and resistance to solvents and weathering. Their tunable properties make them promising alternatives for long-lasting prostheses^39.

Polyurethane Elastomers

Provide high tear strength, abrasion resistance, and superior dimensional stability. However, they are susceptible to hydrolytic degradation and may not bond well with pigments^40.

CAD/CAM and 3D Printing

Digital workflows have revolutionized prosthetic design:

- **CAD/CAM:** Enables precise, reproducible, and rapid design of facial prostheses.
- **3D Printing:** Additive manufacturing allows layer-by-layer fabrication of patient-specific prostheses, reducing human error, time, and cost. It also facilitates complex geometries and integrated pigmentation^41.

Nanotechnology

Nanoparticle reinforcement of silicones (e.g., titanium dioxide, zirconia nanoparticles) improves UV resistance, tensile strength, and color stability. Nanocomposites represent the frontier of durable, esthetic prosthetic materials^42.

Tissue Engineering and Smart Biomaterials

Research into bio-integrated prostheses includes the use of scaffolds, hydrogels, and stem cells to regenerate lost tissues. Smart polymers with stimuli-responsive properties (e.g., self-healing, temperature-adaptive) are under investigation^43.

Clinical Implications

Advancements in materials and techniques have significantly improved prosthesis esthetics, functionality, and patient satisfaction. Yet, challenges of durability, cost, and accessibility remain. Clinical success depends not only on materials but also on proper impression techniques, retention strategies, and interdisciplinary collaboration^35.

Future Directions

Future innovations will focus on:

- Development of UV-stable, colorfast silicone formulations.
- Integration of nanotechnology and smart biomaterials.
- Tissue engineering for bio-integrated prostheses.
- AI-driven CAD/CAM for personalized rehabilitation.

Interdisciplinary synergy among prosthodontists, biomedical engineers, and material scientists will be key in achieving these goals.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of maxillofacial materials reflects a remarkable journey from rudimentary prostheses to advanced polymers and digital workflows. While silicone elastomers remain the cornerstone, emerging materials and technologies hold promise for more durable, esthetic, and accessible solutions. As innovations continue, maxillofacial prosthodontics stands at the forefront of patient-centered rehabilitation, offering renewed hope and quality of life for individuals with craniofacial defects.

REFERENCES

1. Beumer J, Curtis TA, Marunick MT. Maxillofacial Rehabilitation. 2nd ed. St. Louis: IshiyakuEuroAmerica; 1996.
2. Taylor TD. Clinical Maxillofacial Prosthetics. Chicago: Quintessence Publishing; 2000.
3. Paré A. The Workes of Ambrose Parey. 1575.
4. Fauchard P. Le Chirurgien Dentiste. Paris; 1728.
5. Kingsley NW. A Treatise on Oral Deformities. New York: D. Appleton; 1880.
6. Haug SP, Andres CJ, Moore BK. Color stability and colorant effect on maxillofacial elastomers. Part I. J Prosthet Dent. 1999;81(4):418-22.
7. Brown A. FDA-certified colorants in prosthodontics. J Dent Res. 1953;32(2):178–83.
8. Barnhart GW. Silicone rubber facial prosthesis. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1960;25(1):1–9.
9. Udagama A, Drane JB. Silastic adhesive in maxillofacial prosthetics. J Prosthet Dent. 1979;42(2):182–7.
10. Antonucci JM, Stansbury JW. Novel acrylic resins in facial prosthetics. Dent Mater. 1993;9(3):145–50.
11. Gentleman DJ. Polyphosphazenes in biomedical applications. Biomaterials. 1994;15(12):1053–9.
12. Davis JS, Ritchie H. Congenital clefts classification. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1922;10(2):1–12.
13. Veau V. Division Palatine. Paris: Masson; 1931.
14. Kernahan DA, Stark RB. Symbolic classification for cleft lip/palate. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1958;22:435–41.
15. Spina V. Classification of cleft lip and palate. Rev Hosp Clin Fac Med Sao Paulo. 1974;29(1):5–16.
16. Aramany MA. Basic principles of obturator design. Prosthet Dent. 1978;40(5):554–63.
17. Cordeiro PG, et al. Classification and reconstructive algorithm for maxillectomy. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2000;105(7):2331–8.
18. Okay DJ, et al. Classification of palatomaxillary defects. Head Neck. 2001;23(6):475–82.
19. Durrani F, et al. Maxillectomydefect classification. J Craniofac Surg. 2013;24(2):512–8.
20. Skinner EW. Science of Dental Materials. 9th ed. Philadelphia: WB Saunders; 1991.
21. Craig RG, Powers JM. Restorative Dental Materials. 11th ed. St. Louis: Mosby; 2002.
22. Johnson GH, Craig RG. Accuracy of elastomeric impressions. J Prosthet Dent. 1985;53(4):484–90.
23. Jagger DC, Jagger RG, et al. Digital impressions in prosthodontics. Br Dent J. 2007;203(10):601–6.
24. Kiat-amnuay S, et al. Adhesive retention in maxillofacial prosthetics. J Prosthet Dent. 2001;86(4):377–83.

25. Asar NV, et al. Implant-retained facial prostheses: Retention methods. Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants. 2011;26(3):509–15.
26. Lemon JC, et al. Color stability of facial prosthesis elastomers. J Prosthet Dent. 1995;74(6):613–8.
27. Wolfaardt JF, et al. Prosthodontic rehabilitation of facial defects. J Prosthet Dent. 2003;90(6):562–8.
28. Eggbeer D, et al. CAD/CAM and rapid prototyping in prosthodontics. Int J Comput Dent. 2005;8(2):93–104.
29. Prasad R, et al. Nanocomposites in prosthodontics. J IndianProsthodont Soc. 2017;17(3):215–22