Osteosarcoma (OS) is the most common malignant tumor of bones in children. The incidence of osteosarcoma in the United States is 900 per year, with 400 instances occurring in persons under 20 years of age. Most of them occur in the long bones. Surgery along with chemotherapy is the recommended treatment of choice and has demonstrated improvement in survival. Primary OS of the head and neck is rare in pediatric patients, with only a few clinical reports and small clinical series reported in the English language literature. Most instances occur in the second to third decades of life. They are more common in the mandible and have a predilection to women.

Osteosarcomas are categorized in different grades (I-III) based on the severity, with grade III being the most severe type. Metastasis is uncommon for OS of the jaws; however, the most common complication of OS of the jaws is local recurrence. The few long-term prospective studies on this subject show a predictable survival after a 5-year period.

The primary treatment for OS of the jaws is surgical excision and adjuvant chemotherapy. The recommended surgical treatment results in large defects in the jaw which require a multidisciplinary approach for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

An understanding of growth of the maxilla and mandible is important for treatment planning in children. The literature is clear that the growth of the mandible is completed earlier in girls than in boys. Growth in a sagittal plane involves lengthening of the mandible by posterosuperior growth of the condyle and posterior growth of the ramus. The anterior part of the ramus shows resorption and the posterior part shows apposition. This may also be accompanied by rotation of the mandible. Growth in a transverse plane involves enlargement of the mandible by the V principle where there is more enlargement posteriorly than anteriorly, as the mandibular symphyseal region shows little expansion after the suture is closed following the first year of birth.

Growth in a vertical plane involves growth due to forces of tooth eruption and alveolar bone deposition to establish the occlusal plane. The mandibular growth in all 3 planes has important clinical bearing. Saggital growth analysis is important to understand occlusal relationships and facial esthetics. Transverse growth analysis is important in understanding occlusal relationships, compatibility with maxillary transverse growth, and facial esthetics. Vertical growth analysis is clinically important in occlusal vertical dimension issues and prosthetic space issues.

The fibula free flap technique for reconstruction of the mandible was first described by Hidalgo. This technique has been reported to have advantages such as providing adequate length, reliable shape, low donor morbidity, and a distant location from the mandible to facilitate a multiteam approach. It has been successfully documented in the literature for mandibular reconstruction, with a survival rate ranging from 95% to 100%. However, the disadvantage of the fibula bone is the restricted height it can provide for mandibular reconstruction procedures.

A cadaver study reported that the
average height of an adult fibula was anywhere from 10.6 to 11.1 mm. No such data exist for children. The dimensions of the fibula are especially important for the placement of dental implants in these grafts. Fibula is a bicortical bone and is oval in cross-section; thus, in most instances, some flattening of the bone is required prior to implant placement, which may affect the length of the dental implant to be used. The success rate of dental implants in fibula has been well documented and ranges from 91.5% to 98.6%  Considerations for implant placement in children and related prosthodontic concerns have been well reported in the literature. The purpose of this clinical report is to describe the multidisciplinary approach in the treatment of a 7-year-old boy with osteosarcoma of the mandible who underwent surgical resection followed by maxillofacial rehabilitation using dental implants.

**CLINICAL REPORT**

A 7-year-old Arabic boy presented to his dentist with a rapidly progressing mass in his left mandible. Upon consultation with different medical specialists, he was diagnosed with grade III osteoblastic osteosarcoma. A metastatic examination including chest and bone scans was negative. At the time of presentation to M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, the patient was undergoing induction chemotherapy and was asymptomatic except for a partially numb lower lip and alopecia related to chemotherapy (Fig. 1). The patient did not receive radiation therapy. Clinically, there were no signs of tumor, but a computerized tomography (CT) scan showed obvious involvement of the left mandible. A comprehensive examination was done by a multidisciplinary team comprising a pediatric oncologist, radiologist, head and neck surgeon, plastic surgeon, and maxillofacial prosthodontist.

Upon agreement between the patient’s parents and the treatment team with respect to the treatment plan, the surgery was performed under general anesthesia. Following tracheotomy, selective left neck dissection was performed. Prior to en bloc resection of the tumor, a titanium mandibular reconstruction plate (Angled Locking Reconstruction Plate; Synthes, West Chester, Pa) was contoured and adapted to the inferior border of the mandible by the maxillofacial prosthodontist. Thereafter, left mandibular resection was performed by the head and neck surgeon from the angle to the parasymphyseal region of the mandible (Fig. 2). The bone defect was approximately 7 cm in length with an overlying soft tissue defect of 1-2 cm in length and 5-6 cm in width. Negative tumor margins were confirmed by frozen sections. In a simultaneous procedure, a second team comprising plastic surgeons harvested an osseocutaneous flap from the right fibula with a skin paddle attached to it (Fig. 3). The bone flap was then contoured to the previously fashioned titanium plate and was fixed to the native mandible using titanium screws. Microvascular arterial anastomosis was then achieved between the peroneal artery of the flap and the
Fibula bone flap from patient’s right leg was harvested along with skin paddle attached to it.

Seven months following successful reconstruction of mandible. Note acceptable facial contour on reconstructed (left) side. Compare with Figure 1.

Panoramic radiograph showing 3 implants placed in fibula bone upon removal of titanium plate. Note amount of prosthetic material that will be required to contact occlusal plane.

Facial artery, and venous anastomosis between the larger of the 2 flap vena comitans and the common facial vein stump.

During a subsequent follow-up examination, a removable maxillary orthodontic retainer was inserted to prevent supraeruption of the patient’s maxillary left posterior teeth. Seven months after the successful reconstruction of the mandible, surgery was performed under general anesthesia for the removal of a portion of the titanium plate and placement of dental implants by the maxillofacial prosthodontist (Fig. 4). Based on the dimensions of the available bone from the fibula graft, 3 implants (OsseoSpeed; Astra Tech, Inc, Waltham, Mass) with dimensions of 3.5 mm x 9 mm were placed. All of the implants engaged both cortices of the fibula and had primary stability at the time of placement. Cover screws (Astra Tech, Inc) were placed on the implants, and the skin flap was closed over the implants (Fig. 5). Four months after implant placement, the implants were uncovered and demonstrated no mobility, bone loss, or clinical signs of any infection. Abutments (Locator; Zest Anchors, Escondido, Calif), 5 mm in cuff height, were torqued to 25 Ncm on all 3 implants. At this time, the 1-cm-thick skin flap over the implants was debulked to facilitate easier access to the abutments and maintenance of the soft tissues. A removable stent made of autopolymerizing resin (Dentsply Repair Material; Dentsply Intl, York, Pa) was immediately fabricated and attached to the Locator abutments to prevent the debulked tissues from growing over the abutments during the healing period. This implant-supported stent extended across the contralateral side and had a wrought wire clasp on the right first primary molar for easier insertion and removal by the patient. The removable stent allowed the patient greater access for brushing around his teeth and abutments. A fluocinonide cream, 0.5 mg/g (Lidex; Medicis Pharmaceuticals Corp, Scottsdale, Ariz), was also prescribed.
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to the patient for topical application to facilitate healing (Fig. 6).

Following 2 weeks of healing of the debulked tissues, a final impression was made using vinyl polysiloxane material (Take 1; Kerr Corp, Orange, Calif), and the definitive cast was poured twice in type IV stone (Denstone; Heraeus Kulzer, South Bend, Ind). A heat-polymerized record base (Lucitone 199 Denture Resin; Dentsply Trubyte, York, Pa), with a wrought wire clasp on the primary right first molar, was fabricated on the first cast incorporating the Locator attachments. The second cast was used to make a maxillomandibular relationship record and mount the casts in a semi-adjustable articulator. Monoplane acrylic resin denture teeth (BlueLine; Ivoclar Vivadent, Amherst, NY) of the appropriate shade were chosen for simplicity, as the opposing teeth were in the mixed dentition stage. The trial denture prosthesis confirmed the linguallized positions of the prosthetic teeth in relation to the implants; this was because the implants had been placed in a fibula flap that had been contoured to the inferior border of the native mandible to preserve facial esthetics. This is a common complication in fibula flap reconstructed patients, as the fibula is generally buccal to the occlusal table of the opposing teeth.

After evaluation of the trial denture, the prosthesis was fabricated in heat-polymerized acrylic resin (Lucitone 199 Denture Resin; Dentsply Trubyte). The attachment patrices (Locator; Zest Anchors) were placed in the completed prosthesis and the prosthesis was inserted (Fig. 7). The patient and his parents were instructed in insertion and removal procedures, maintenance, and future remakes of the prosthesis (Fig. 8). The oral hygiene regimen prescribed to the patient included daily flossing and brushing the teeth with a fluoride-containing toothpaste, brushing the prosthesis with soap and water, and cleaning the abutments with a soft cloth soaked in a 0.12% chlorhexidine rinse (Periogard; Colgate-Palmolive, Morristown, NJ). The patient was instructed to constantly wear the prosthesis except when performing oral hygiene procedures. This was recommended to prevent surrounding tissues from becoming hyperplastic over the abutments, as well as to prevent supraeruption of the opposing teeth.

The patient and his parents were informed of potential facial asymme-
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**Figures**

6. Soft tissues comprising skin and native mucosa around abutments reveal acceptable tissue health.

7. Completed mandibular resection prosthesis.

8. Frontal view of mandibular resection prosthesis in maximum intercuspation. Note buccal extension of prosthesis, which terminates on Locator abutments.
try and related occlusal discrepancies in the future due to lack of growth in the reconstructed segment of the mandible. At the 1-year follow-up examination after implant surgery, all 3 implants were stable and the prosthesis was adjusted to accommodate changes in the dentition. The patient and his parents reported satisfaction with the prosthesis. The patient was placed on regular recalls with the oncology team as well as with his pediatric dentist. Additionally, the patient and his parents were instructed to seek consultation from an orthodontist.

**DISCUSSION**

The prosthodontic treatment plan chosen for this patient was based on several factors. The mandibular resection prosthesis not only served to maintain esthetics and occlusal relationships but also contributed to the patient’s psychological well being. Given the age of the patient, an argument can be made for delay in implant placement in the fibula bone due to the additional surgeries, additional appointments, and increased expenses that were involved. However, the authors believe that a stable mandibular resection prosthesis supported by dental implants can significantly aid in preventing supraeruption of the opposing maxillary dentition and collapse of the growing maxillary arch. This was especially important in this growing patient, as the neuromuscular control was under development and the thickness and flaccidity of the soft tissue flap precluded a good supporting base for a conventional mandibular resection prosthesis. There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that growth will occur in a reconstructed mandible using fibula bone. Thus, placement of dental implants in the fibula bone would not appear to result in problems such as change in implant positions, as reported in the literature related to native mandibles of growing children.11,12,22,23

At the time of implant placement, 3 was the maximum number of implants that could be placed, given the height and contour of the fibula and the limited mouth opening of the young patient. A fourth implant could be placed in the future, if required. This implant would have to be placed in the anterior region, as any additional posterior implants would perhaps encroach on the cheek (Fig. 6). This is a common problem in patients reconstructed with fibula flaps, as the fibula bone is generally contoured using the inferior border of the native mandible as a guide to preserve facial esthetics. Thus, as one proceeds posteriorly, the surgical platform will be placed buccally, due to the natural divergence of the body of the mandible.

As the patient was only 7 years old, it was determined that a removable prosthesis would be the treatment of choice for 2 main reasons. First, it would help facilitate easier modifications and future remakes of the prosthesis to accommodate the continued growth of the right half of the native mandible, growth of the maxilla, development of occlusal vertical dimension, and the patient’s transition to permanent dentition. It was for this reason that a removable prosthesis with a cast metal framework was avoided. Secondly, a removable prosthesis could aid in easier monitoring of any local recurrence, which has been reported to be the most common complication of osteosarcoma of the jaw.5,7

A potential disadvantage to the chosen removable treatment option is that the patient will have to undergo additional surgical procedures if he desires a fixed prosthesis in the future. An opportunity for a fixed prosthesis might exist, but only if additional implants are placed. However, the authors believe that the existing fibula graft and implants are restricted in height, and any vertical cantilever forces generated on a unilateral, completely implant-supported, fixed prosthesis on this foundation might be detrimental. An alternative option for the patient is to have an additional fibula graft with the double-barrel technique followed by additional implant surgeries for placement of a fixed dental prosthesis.24 The patient will need to be educated about these additional procedures and their related challenges in the future.

**SUMMARY**

This clinical report described the maxillofacial rehabilitation of a 7-year-old boy who underwent a composite resection of a large segment of his left mandible for treatment of osteosarcoma. Simultaneously, a free osseocutaneous fibula flap was used to reconstruct his mandible. This was followed by placement of dental implants and fabrication of an implant-tissue-supported removable mandibular resection prosthesis. The prosthesis aided in providing esthetic, functional, and psychological satisfaction to the patient. The importance of a multidisciplinary approach and treatment planning concerns in a growing child with a reconstructed mandible were discussed. Given the potential for local recurrence of this type of disease and the fact that the patient has a substantial amount of maxillofacial growth remaining, close monitoring from a multidisciplinary team is essential and is in progress.
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