Journal of Positive School Psychology
2022, Vol. 6, No. 3, 3864 –3867 http://journalppw.com

Naso-Orbito-Ethmoidal Fracture Approach- A Review

Dr.Saravana Kumar [1]
Professor, Dept Of Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery, Sree Balaji Dental College And Hospital, Bharath University,Chennai-600100, Tamil Nadu ,India

Dr.S.Ishwarya [2]
Post Graduate , Dept Of Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery , Sree Balaji Dental College And Hospital, Bharath University ,Chennai -600100,Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT:-

The motivation behind this review is to examine a few ways to deal with naso-orbito-ethmoidal (NOE) fracture. Orbital fracture, particularly infraorbital fracture, can be treated through the transconjunctival approach without any problem. In more serious cases, for instance, fracture extending out to the middle orbital wall or zygomatico-frontal suture line, just transconjunctival incision is deficient to get great surgical field. and, it likewise has risk of tearing the conjunctiva, which could injure the lacrimal duct. Likewise, in most complex kinds of facial fracture, such as, NOE fracture or panfacial fracture, destruction of the structure frequently happens, for example, trapdoor deformity; a fracture of orbital floor where the inferiorly displaced blowout fracture forces to its unique position, or then again vertical folding deformity.

Keywords: Surgical procedures, NOE fractures, naso orbital and ethomiodal fractures

INTRODUCTION: -

Naso-orbito-ethmoidal (NOE) fractures are convoluted cracks of mid-face structure which incorporate nasal, lacrimal, maxillary, frontal, and ethmoid bones. The focal component of NOE fracture is dislodging of the middle orbital rim with the middle canthal tendon attached. The middle canthal ligament (MCT) parts before insertion into the frontal process of maxilla. A fracture that isolates the maxilla from the MCT connection site results in fatal displacements.

This part has an interesting component that requires cautious attention for return the fracture to its pre-injury state. One of the significant objectives of facial fracture treatment is to recreate the state of the pre-injury face [1,2]. Another purpose is normal function and form of facial structure [3].

Recent advances in reconstruction of the craniofacial skeleton have presented new surgical techniques for NOE fracture. New ways to deal with these NOE cracks have been presented that limit scarring and facilitate fracture fragment reduction. The methodologies incorporate endoscopic, bone tissue engineering, and strategies for changing existing methodologies. Be that as it may, every one of these methodologies enjoys benefits and burdens. Hence, the choice of approach might vary depending upon the fracture and choice of the doctor.

ETIOLOGY:-

NOE fractures are common with blunt injury and are most commonly by road traffic accidents and assaults [4-7]. Since NOE fracture happen because of high energy, they frequently happen with other facial fracture [8]. Around 60% of NOE breaks are associated with orbital fracture, and roughly 20% are diagnosed to have panfacial fracture [9]. Isolated NOE

fracture records for roughly 5% of all facial fractures in adults and 16% in pediatric facial fractures [10,11].

The MCT is separated before insertion into the frontal process of the maxilla. Anterior limbs are embedded in the lacrimal gland in the frontal process of the maxilla while posterior limbs inserted in the posterior crest on the lacrimal bone. These two limbs of the ligament encompass the lacrimal fossa and build up a soft tissue boundaries around the lacrimal sac fossa.

Because of this design, telecanthus frequently occurs in NOE fractures. Traumatic telecanthus is seen at all stages with the except of the primary stage of NOE fracture, and distance between MCTs is expanded. The patient has a distinctive appearance of telecanthus. Eyes might show up far separated, as in orbital hypertelorism [12,13]. Traumatic orbital hypertelorism (when compared with telecanthus) is a deformity portrayed by increase in distance between orbits and ocular globes [7].

Because NOE fracture usually happens with extreme injury, evaluation of other critical regions before fracture assessment ought to be finished. Patients with ocular damage or suspected visual anomalies ought to go through full ophthalmologic assessment to dismiss damage related with the visual system, for example, traumatic optic neuropathy [14].

DIAGNOSIS:-

NOE fractures can cause indications like facial edema, flattening of the malar region, haemorrhage, diplopia, enophthalmos, telecanthus, and loss of nasal support [14,15]. Epiphora is regularly associated with 50% of NOE fracture brought about by nasolacrimal duct block, direct damage to the lacrimal organ, or soft tissue edema [16].

A few classifications system have been introduced to evaluate severity of injury and for arranging the type of reconstruction. The primary classification system, first described by Gruss [2] in 1985, classified NOE fractures into five types with description of explicit treatment strategies for every impairment pattern.

Presently, the most often used classification was definite by Markowitz et al. [3] in 1991 for grading injuries. Degree of injury in this system depends on the MCT position and condition of the central bone portion.

MANAGEMENT:-

A significant objective of facial fracture treatment is to reconstruct facial appearance to its past state. It is important to choose a suitable methodology that exposes the fracture site.

Despite of much advancement, surgical way to deal with NOE or Le Fort II fracture requires broad access, has remained generally unaltered. Coronal approach stays the highest quality level for complicated NOE fractures, yet it very well might be too invasive to even consider treating basic NOE fracture, because of the requirement of large cuts. Moreover, it has of complications like scalp paralysis, balding, and hematoma of flap, and the operation is extended [17,18]. Additionally, if the fracture includes the lower level, coronal incision may not be adequate to accomplish the ideal outcome [19].

To avoid these disadvantages, a few authors have presented a mid-facial degloving (MFD) approach that can give an exposure of the whole mid-facial skeleton through the sublabial entry point of the maxilla and expand to upper and lateral sides according to the extent of fracture. In any case, the MFD approach will also create some nasal related complications, like nasal obstruction, nasal cosmetic deformity, and temporary infraorbital parasthesia [19,20].

As of late, an endoscopic methodology has been introduced. This methodology has the benefit of creating comparative results with small incisions, reducing patient morbidity, shortening operation duration and patient recovery period. However, there stays a downside in that extra instruments are required and there is a learning curve [21].

At times, it might require additional skin incision, for example, infraorbital, sub ciliary, transconjunctival, and/or lateral incision, which might leads to facial scarring [19]. A transconjunctival approach is frequently used, to get access the nasofrontal suture. Nonetheless, there were limitation in the chance of injury to normal orbital structures, such as, disregarding the posterior limb of the MCT, and limitation of surgical view. Sometimes a local

cutaneous approach is used, but not often, unless if it is a special case due to scarring [22-25]. The percutaneous MCT approach exposes the entire medial orbital wall, nose, and orbital apex by percutaneously with an incision of just 1.5 cm to 2.0 cm, which is more cosmetically acceptable than a lynch incision [26].

In instances of accompanying with zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture, lateral canthotomy is frequently performed with transconjunctival incision, if exposure of zygomaticofrontal suture is required [27,28]. There is a benefit of provide a more extensive surgical field of view and less chance of lacrimal duct injury, than conventional transconjunctival incision alone. however, scar formation is possible, and asymmetric palpebral fissure length can be accomplished, if precise repair of the lateral canthus not performed [29]. To overcomes these deficiencies, approaching the blow out fracture through transconjunctival approach with paracanthal incision has been introduced [30,31].

CONCLUSION:-

Different methodologies have been introduced with treat NOE fracture. These techniques are common in that they were developed to achieve maximum surgical effectiveness with minimal scar. Since NOE crack isn't steady and various types of fractures happen, we should to precisely find the fractured site by using progressed imaging technology and pick a appropriate approach.

REFERENCES

1. He D, Zhang Y, Ellis E 3rd. Panfacial fractures: analysis of 33 cases treated late. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2007;65:2459-65.

2. Gruss JS. Naso-ethmoid-orbital fractures: classification and role of primary bone grafting. Plast Reconstr Surg 1985;75:303- 17.

3. Markowitz BL, Manson PN, Sargent L, Vander Kolk CA, Yaremchuk M, Glassman D, et al. Management of the medial canthal tendon in nasoethmoid orbital fractures: the importance of the central fragment in classification and treatment. Plast Reconstr Surg 1991;87:843-53.

4. Baril SE, Yoon MK. Naso-orbito-ethmoidal (NOE) fractures: a review. Int Ophthalmol Clin 2013;53:149-55.

5. Rosenberger E, Kriet JD, Humphrey C. Management of nasoethmoid fractures. Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2013;21:410-6.

6. Cruse CW, Blevins PK, Luce EA. Naso-ethmoid-orbital fractures. J Trauma 1980;20:551-6.

7. Converse JM, Smith B. Naso-orbital fractures and traumatic deformities of the medial canthus. Plast Reconstr Surg 1966; 38:147-62.

8. Roden KS, Tong W, Surrusco M, Shockley WW, Van Aalst JA, Hultman CS. Changing characteristics of facial fractures treated at a regional, level 1 trauma center, from 2005 to 2010: an assessment of patient demographics, referral patterns, etiology of injury, anatomic location, and clinical outcomes. Ann Plast Surg 2012;68:461-6.

9. Becelli R, Renzi G, Mannino G, Cerulli G, Iannetti G. Posttraumatic obstruction of lacrimal pathways: a retrospective analysis of 58 consecutive naso-orbitoethmoid fractures. J Craniofac Surg 2004;15:29-33.

10. Kelley P, Crawford M, Higuera S, Hollier LH. Two hundred ninety-four consecutive facial fractures in an urban trauma center: lessons learned. Plast Reconstr Surg 2005;116:42e-49e.

11. Chapman VM, Fenton LZ, Gao D, Strain JD. Facial fractures in children: unique patterns of injury observed by computed tomography. J Comput Assist Tomogr 2009;33:70-2.

12. Mulliken JB, Kaban LB, Evans CA, Strand RD, Murray JE. Facial skeletal changes following hypertelorbitism correction. Plast Reconstr Surg 1986;77:7-16.

13. Tessier P, Guiot G, Rougerie J, Delbet JP, Pastoriza J. Cranionaso-orbito-facial osteotomies. Hypertelorism. Ann Chir Plast 1967;12:103-18.

14. Nguyen M, Koshy JC, Hollier LH Jr. Pearls of nasoorbitoethmoid trauma management. Semin Plast Surg 2010;24:383-8.

15. Buchanan EP, Hopper RA, Suver DW, Hayes AG, Gruss JS, Birgfeld CB. Zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures and their association with naso-orbito-ethmoid fractures: a 5-year review. Plast Reconstr Surg 2012;130:1296-304.

16. Gruss JS, Hurwitz JJ, Nik NA, Kassel EE. The pattern and incidence of nasolacrimal injury in naso-orbital-ethmoid fractures: the role of delayed assessment and dacryocystorhinostomy. Br J Plast Surg 1985;38:116-21.

17. Ellis E 3rd. Sequencing treatment for naso-orbito-ethmoid fractures. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 1993;51:543-58.

18. Manson PN. Facial fractures. In: Mathes SJ, editor. Plastic surgery. 2nd ed. New York: Elsevier; 2006. p. 77-381.

19. Cultrara A, Turk JB, Har-El G. Midfacial degloving approach for repair of naso-orbital-ethmoid and midfacial fractures. Arch Facial Plast Surg 2004;6:133-5.

20. Villwock JA, Suryadevara AC. Update on approaches to the craniomaxillofacial skeleton. Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2014;22:326-31.

21. Pham AM, Strong EB. Endoscopic management of facial fractures. Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2006;14:234-41.

22. Garcia GH, Goldberg RA, Shorr N. The transcaruncular approach in repair of orbital fractures: a retrospective study. J Craniomaxillofac Trauma 1998;4:7-12.

23. Shorr N, Baylis HI, Goldberg RA, Perry JD. Transcaruncular approach to the medial orbit and orbital apex. Ophthalmology 2000;107:1459-63.

24. Rodriguez J, Galan R, Forteza G, Mateos M, Mommsen J, Bou- Ha YI et al. Approaches to severe NOE fracture 222 so OV, et al. Extended transcaruncular approach using detachment and repositioning of the inferior oblique muscle for the traumatic repair of the medial orbital wall. Craniomaxillofac Trauma Reconstr 2009;2:35-40.

25. Choi M, Flores RL. Medial orbital wall fractures and the transcaruncular approach. J Craniofac Surg 2012;23:696-701.

26. Timoney PJ, Sokol JA, Hauck MJ, Lee HB, Nunery WR. Transcutaneous medial canthal tendon incision to the medial orbit. Ophthalmic Plast Reconstr Surg 2012;28:140-4.

27. Kushner GM. Surgical approaches to the infraorbital rim and orbital floor: the case for the transconjunctival approach. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2006;64:108-10.

28. Rohrich RJ, Janis JE, Adams WP Jr. Subciliary versus subtarsal approaches to orbitozygomatic fractures. Plast Reconstr Surg 2003;111:1708-14.

29. De Riu G, Meloni SM, Gobbi R, Soma D, Baj A, Tullio A. Subciliary versus swinging eyelid approach to the orbital floor. J Craniomaxillofac Surg 2008;36:439-42.

30. Emam HA, Stevens MR, Larsen PE, Jatana CA. Lateral tarsotomy: a practical alternative to lateral canthotomy to increase orbital access. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol 2016; 122:e1-4.

31. Suh YC, Choi JW, Oh TS, Koh KS. Analysis of extended transconjunctival approach with lateral paracanthal incision: a study among classical methods of orbital approach and new method. J Craniofac Surg 2016;27:2050-4.