Prosthodontic management of a patient with mandibular asymmetry: a case report
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A small degree of facial and dental asymmetry is a common finding and is normal in the facial dynamics of the population. However, in some cases, facial asymmetries can be more obvious and can lead to functional and esthetic concerns. Management of these patients can be very challenging.

Case History/Examination

A 62-year-old gentleman presented to the Prosthodontic department, in the Centre for Dentistry, Queens University Belfast, following referral by his General Dental Practitioner. His presenting complaint was that he was unable to wear his existing complete removable dentures and found it almost impossible to eat with them in situ.

The patient had previously worn an upper complete denture and lower removable partial denture. The lower denture had been retained with numerous postretained telescopic crowns; however, these abutment teeth were extracted a number of years previously due to periodontal involvement. The patient had then been provided with complete upper and lower removable prostheses but these had been replaced previously on two occasions due to difficulties with retention and occlusion. He reported no history of maxillofacial trauma or radiation therapy.

Medically, the patient suffered from high cholesterol, Crohn’s disease, arthritis, and benign prostate hypertrophy. His regular medications included simvastatin, mesalamine, omeprazole, pregabalin, tramadol, adalimumab, alverine citrate, alfuzosin hydrochloride, and fentanyl. He also reported a history of depressive illness, controlled with sertraline. He was allergic to penicillin.

On extraoral examination, the patient had a class III skeletal relationship and left-sided transverse asymmetry of the mandible. Asymmetry can affect any of the three planes of space; however, it is most easily assessed in the frontal view [1]. This patient’s asymmetry was classified as T1 M3 L3 on the TML classification. There was menton deviation without maxillary or lip cant and deviation of the menton was in the same transverse direction as the soft tissue asymmetry (Table 1) [2].
There were no adverse findings associated with the patient’s lymph nodes or muscles of mastication on palpation.

Intraorally, the soft tissues appeared healthy with no evidence of pathology. The class III upper alveolar ridge was well rounded, firm and showed minimal signs of alveolar bone resorption with adequate height and width.

Investigations

The orthopantomogram (Fig. 1) illustrated that the left mandibular condyle and ramus were shortened and slightly widened. The increased diameter of the neural canal reflected generalized remodeling. There was no radiographic evidence of previous trauma and no obvious mandibular fractures present.

In this case, the investigation into the cause for mandibular asymmetry was inconclusive and no underlying cause was determined. It is likely that the deviation was the result of developmental abnormalities (Table 2) [8, 9].

Differential Diagnosis

- Edentate upper class III alveolar ridge, lower class II alveolar ridge.
- Class III skeletal discrepancy and unilateral left-sided transverse mandibular asymmetry.

Treatment

Treatment options were discussed with the patient which included conventional prosthodontic rehabilitation and possible orthognathic surgery. Orthognathic surgery is often used to create a symmetrical facial midline, ideal facial profile, and optimal dental occlusion. Both options were described to the patient and the benefits and risks discussed. The patient decided the conservative prosthodontic option would be most appropriate for him in this case based on the information provided on the clinic.

Treatment plan:
- Upper and lower complete denture construction.
- Review and maintenance.
The patient was seen again in the clinic to start treatment and upper and lower impressions were taken in nonelastic compound material in edentulous perforated stock trays for provision of special trays. Special trays were constructed using polymethyl methacrylate. The trays were spaced and perforated to allow for impressions in addition reaction silicone (polyvinyl siloxane impression material type 2, medium...
viscosity). These special trays were then border molded with green stick used to take master impressions. Care was taken to ensure that the full width and depth of the buccal and lingual sulcus was recorded in the master impressions, along with extension to the hamular notch in the upper arch and retromolar pad in the lower arch. These were poured in the laboratory to be used as master models for construction of registration rims. The master models are shown in Figures 2 and 3.

Jaw registration proved to be very challenging in this case and close liaison and communication took place with the on-site dental laboratory. The upper rim was altered to achieve optimal anterior occlusal plane parallel to the interpupillary line. The posterior occlusal plane was measured according to the ala-tragal line [4]. The lower rim was trimmed to ensure correct interocclusal freeway space of 2–4 mm based on the occlusal vertical and relaxed vertical dimensions. The midline was marked to be coincident with the natural facial midline, using the philtrum of the lip, nose, and labial frenum as a guide. The rims were registered with polyvinyl siloxane registration paste in retruded contact position. These were disinfected and instructions were sent to the laboratory for them to be articulated on an average value articulator (Average Value Articulator, 30° condylar angle and flat incisal table) (Figs. 4 and 5).

The upper teeth were set up as per the registration rim and based around the midline. This was important esthetically to the patient as the asymmetry was confined to a left-sided mandibular chin point shift only. Conventional posterior occlusion was set up on the right side. In order to maintain occlusal contact, the posterior teeth on the lower left side were placed lingual to the alveolar ridge in a balanced occlusal scheme (cross-bite). This was checked with the patient at trial to ensure the teeth were not encroaching in the tongue space. Anatomical teeth were used rather than a flat occlusal table [5]. The upper and lower wax try in complete dentures were well fitting and the dentition arrangement was verified. At this stage, the occlusion was reregistered, again in polyvinyl siloxane registration paste.

The denture was gum fitted in the lower anterior 3-3 region labially (open-faced denture). Due to the gum fit anteriorly and the risk of midline fracture of the denture, processing involved the use of high impact acrylic. This was spot ground on the articulator prior to fit.

The patient returned for fit of the removable complete dentures (Figs. 6 and 7). The occlusion and esthetics were good and at this stage, some adjustment was required on the lower denture fit surface for the patient’s comfort. The patient was very pleased with the result. At this stage, oral and written denture instructions were given and the patient was encouraged to make efforts to adapt to the new dentures [6].
Outcome

At review, the patient reported that he was very pleased with the outcome both esthetically and functionally and that he felt his concerns had been appropriately addressed. He was particularly pleased that such success had been achieved by adapting the most conservative treatment option. The final prosthodontic outcome is shown in Figures 7 and 8.

Discussion

Mandibular transverse asymmetries have many causes and can often be challenging to treat [7]. However, as seen in this case, with a detailed clinical history, examination and further investigations into the cause of the problem successful prosthodontic management can be achieved with close input from skilled dental technicians. It is also important to have discussion with the patient in order to appropriately address their concerns.

Treatment options can range from simple nonsurgical measures to complex multidisciplinary approaches with the requirement for restorative specialists, orthodontic opinions, and surgical input. Surgical options may have included distraction osteogenesis which has been used to treat mandibular asymmetries where the mandibular ramus and body are to be lengthened. Lower border osteotomy of the mandible can reposition the chin point transversely or vertically in order to address the asymmetry. It is one of the most stable movements compared to managing mandibular asymmetries by other orthognathic movements [8].

Understanding the etiology of mandibular asymmetry is important in the management of patients [1]. Common Causes of Mandibular Jaw Deviation are summarized in Table 1 [8, 9].
Conclusion

This case demonstrated the successful prosthodontic rehabilitation of a patient with a significant mandibular asymmetry. In some cases, treatment can be provided within primary care; however, in this case, specialist input was required [1]. There is minimal guidance surrounding the referral criteria for facial asymmetries; however, due to the potential for joint maxillofacial, orthodontic and restorative treatment planning and close liaison with dental laboratories, it may be necessary in most cases to refer to specialist services.

Furthermore, if the cause of the facial asymmetry is unknown further investigations may also be required to rule out pathology, which may not be possible in a primary care setting. The extent to which the functional and esthetic concern affects the patient is also likely to influence the referral decision and treatment choice.

It is hoped that this report will provide further information to practitioners in varying care settings and aid in management of these challenging patients.
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