

Maxillofacial Trauma: Pattern & Management: Systematic Review & Meta Analysis

DrRajshree Borah¹, Dr. ShraddhaJugade², DrPriyankaRazdan³, Dr. Neha Singh⁴, Dr. Abhishekh Kumar⁵, Dr. S. Ganesh Kumar Reddy⁶, Dr. Rahul VC Tiwari⁷.

¹Assistant professor, Department of Dentistry, Assam Medical College and Hospital, Dibrugarh, Assam. rajshreeborah@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Oral Medicine and Radiology, Dr. D.Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pune. shraddha.jugade@dpu.edu.in

³Reader, Department of Paediatric and Preventive dentistry, Yogita dental college and hospital, Khed, Maharashtra. docpedopriya@gmail.com

⁴Resident, Department of oral and maxillofacial surgery, Surendra Dental College & RI, Sriganganagar, Rajasthan, India. doctor.neha.singh9@gmail.com

⁵Resident, Department of oral and maxillofacial surgery, Surendra Dental College & RI, Sriganganagar, Rajasthan, India. abhishekhkumar93@gmail.com

⁶Professor, Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery, C.K.S Teja institute of dental sciences, Tirupathi. haripriyadentalhospital@gmail.com

⁷OMFS, FOGS, PhD Scholar, Dept of OMFS, Narsinbhai Patel Dental College and Hospital, Sankalchand Patel University, Visnagar, Gujarat, 384315. drahulvctiwari@gmail.com

Corresponding Author:

DrRajshree Borah, Assistant professor, Department of Dentistry, Assam Medical College and Hospital, Dibrugarh, Assam. rajshreeborah@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Maxillofacial trauma has experienced an increase in number in the last decade. Though a number of studies have been done on pattern, incidence and cause of maxillofacial trauma in various local populations in India, no systematic review of the pattern and cause of maxillofacial trauma in India has been done. Hence, the purpose of this systematic review is to present the epidemiologic data on pattern of maxillofacial trauma in India.

Material and methods: Electronic searching of Pubmed, ScienceDirect and institute library databases to identify studies reporting the epidemiology of injuries in maxillofacial trauma in India.

Results: A total of 23 studies were eligible for inclusion in this review. The most common anatomic part involved was found to be mandible; the most common age group involved was 21-30 years while males were more commonly involved than females. The main cause of maxillofacial trauma all over India was found to be road traffic accidents.

Conclusion: The findings from studies all over India show that road traffic accidents (RTAs) cause most of the maxillofacial injuries, mandible being the more commonly involved bone. The accidents involve young males in productive age group causing concerns as in time, money and aesthetics.

Keywords: Maxillofacial Trauma, Systematic Review, Meta analysis, India.

INTRODUCTION

The face often constitutes the first point of contact in various human interactions and is frequently the likely target for blows in assault cases as well as accidents. Maxillofacial trauma is thus a common presentation in Casualty department of hospitals either as an isolated injury or

as a part of multiple injuries to the head, neck, chest, and abdomen. These injuries may cause serious functional, psychological, physical, and cosmetic disabilities [1].

About 1.25 million people die each year as a result of RTAs. Road traffic injuries are the most common reason of death among young people. Without action, road traffic crashes are predicted to rise to become the 7th leading cause of death by 2030 [2].

Facial fractures constitute a significant percent of trauma patients. Being the most exposed part of the body, the face is particularly prone to trauma. The incidence and pattern of maxillofacial fractures vary from country to country depending upon the prevailing geographical, social, cultural and environmental factors [4]. These injuries are often associated with severe morbidity due to their close proximity to vital organs such as brain and cervical vertebrae causing loss of function and even death [5]. The numbers of maxillofacial injuries in India are rising. There are various reports on the incidence of maxillofacial fractures in different countries. There appears a different cause of maxillofacial injuries in developed as against developing countries [6]. A number of studies have been published till date to state the pattern, analyse the causes and find gender and age predilection. The increase in number of maxillofacial injuries seems to be directly proportionate to the increase in number of vehicles on Indian roads. Road traffic accidents have assumed a major role in health status of young Indians. Here, we analysed systematically the cause and pattern of maxillofacial injuries in India based on articles published on the same subject.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The aim of this study was to evaluate the cause and pattern of maxillofacial injuries in India.

A comprehensive search of the literature was undertaken. This included electronic searching of the Pubmed, ScienceDirect and institution library. Keywords used in the electronic searches were maxillofacial trauma, India, epidemiology, road traffic accidents, facial trauma, incidence and pattern.

The inclusion criteria was

1. Studies about maxillofacial trauma
2. Studies in Indian scenario
3. Studies about adult population
4. Studies that give information of main cause of trauma, main bone involved, age and sex predilection.

Full-text versions of all the remaining after duplicate removal, potentially eligible studies were retrieved, and three independent reviewers evaluated the articles for compliance with the selection criteria.

Data from included studies were extracted and tabulated in an electronic spread sheet. The data of interest were as follows: (1) general study descriptors (e.g. authors, year of publication, and study design), (2) description of the study population (e.g. location, sex distribution and age), and (3) main epidemiologic findings (e.g. injury and exposure data, distribution of injuries by anatomic location, and type of injury, and causative factors for injury).

This review adhered to guidelines in the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta Analyses) Statement. (Figure 1)

RESULTS

23 studies which fit the inclusion criteria were selected. There were 11 studies from North India, 5 from South India, 2 from East India, 3 from West India and 2 from Central India. 18 studies found mandible to be the main bone involved in trauma, the involved age group was the found to be 21-30 years in majority of the studies. Males were uniformly more commonly affected

than females. RTAs were main cause for maxillofacial trauma than assault, falls or other causes.

Table 1. Provides a descriptive summary of the characteristics of the included studies.

	Author names	Place	Total sample size	Bone involved	Age in years	Main causative factor	Gender
1	Parveen Lone ²³	Jammu	787	Mandible 44.34%	21-30 (76.49%)	RTA 73.95%	Male 76%
2	Rishi Bali ⁹	Yamunanagar	740	Mandible 70.2%	21-30 (38.3%)	RTA 71.89%	Male 81.08%
3	Ashok K Gupta ²¹	Punjab	189	Zygoma 57.4%	21-30 (34.9%)	RTA 79.9%	Male 72.5%
4	Pranav Kapoor ¹	East Delhi	1000	Mandible 63.0%	21-30 (60.0%)	Interperson - al assault 54%	Male 85.0%
5	Subodh S. Natu ¹³	Lucknow	66	Mandible 100%	21-30 (28.8%)	RTA 68.2%	Male 81%
6	Ruchi Pathak ⁴	New Delhi	542	Mandibular 77.3%	31-40 (36.3%)	RTA 56.8%	Male 78.9%
7	Prasad B Rajendra ¹⁴	Mangalore	100	Zygoma 48%	21-40 (79%)	RTA 54%	Male 80%
8	Sukhminder Jit Singh Bajwa ¹⁹	Patiala, Punjab	129	Maxilla and nasal bones 51.9%	15-40 (62.8%)	RTA 90%	Male 83.72%
9	Rajasekhar Gali ⁵	Nellore, Andhra Pradesh	638	Mandible 41.4%	18-40 (53.9%)	RTA 71.9%	Male 79.4%
10	Kiran Gadre ⁸	Pune	6,872	Mandible 51.63%	21-30 35.2%	RTA 86.4%	Male
11	Kolli Yada Giri ²⁵	Rohilkhand region, Uttar Pradesh	144	Parasymphysis 32.63%	21-30 (35.4%)	RTA 79.2%	Male 84.7%
12	Rajay A. D. Kamath ³	Davangere, Karnataka	111	Mandible 74.77%	21-30 (41.8%)	RTA 74.7%	Male 74.7%
13	Dhananjay B arde ²²	Nagpur, Maharashtra	1842	Mandible 25%	21-30 (37.5%)	RTA 68%	Male 79.1%
14	Indu Bhusan Kar ²⁷	Cuttack, Odisha	539	Mandible 100%	21-30 (37.4%)	RTA 80.31%	Male 87.87%
15	Sandeep Pandey ²⁸	New Delhi	1,108	Mid-face fractures 81%	21-30 (39.98 %)	RTA 49.01 %	Male 89.62 %
16	Vibha Singh ²⁹	Lucknow	1,038	Mandible 47.87%	21-30 (37.66%)	RTA 97.10%	Males 89.1%
17	Chandra Shekar BR ³⁰	Mysore	546	Mandible 60.4%	11-40 years (78.3%)	RTA 61.3%	Male 83%

18	Yadavalli Guruprasad 31	Bangalore	689	Mandible 50.3%	21-30 (42.5%)	RTA 74.3%	Male 75.9%
19	Dilip Septa32	Indore	200	zygomatic complex fractures 62.5 %	21-30 (47%)	RTA 64 %	Male 76%
20	G Mittal33	Garhwal Region	121	Mandible 100%	21-30 (43.8%)	RTA 37.1%	Female 60.3%
21	Sawhney CP34	Chandigarh	262	Mandible 100%	16-45 (75%)	RTA 100%	Similar in Both
22	Bither S35	Loni	324	Mandible 100%	21-30 (19.1%)	RTA 42.9%	Male 80.9%
23	Rajput D36	Aligarh	1202	Mandible 64.6%	21-30 (32.36%)	RTA 56.73%	Male 88%

Figure 1 - PRISMA flow diagram depicting the study selection process




Table 2. The Haddon matrix applied to a road traffic crash Factors

Phases	Human	Vehicle	Environment Physical	Social
Pre -event	Attitudes Knowledge Use of alcohol Driver experience	Vehicle condition Speed	Roadway design Traffic calming Pedestrian facilities	Traffic laws Cultural norms
Event	Use of seat belts Wearing fastened helmet	Seat belts Helmets	Shoulders, medians Guardrails	Helmet and seat belt laws
Post- event	First aid Medical treatment	Fire risk	Availability of trauma equipment care in hospitals Traffic congestion	Standards of trauma care

DISCUSSION

The studies included covered considerable cities in India. The consensus was that RTAs caused maxillofacial trauma more than any other cause. The reason for this is multifactorial. Bad road conditions, poor road lighting along with lack of adequate public transport systems all contribute to increased trauma. A primary reason for the increase in fatalities and injuries from traffic crashes in developing countries is simply the rising number of motor vehicles. In developing countries various reasons contribute to increased road traffic accidents. These include need to travel for employment, lack of traffic police manpower to implement existing laws, sudden urbanization as well as availability of easy loans for middle and low socio-economic population and lack of awareness of use of helmets [7, 8]. Additionally, ever increasing volume of traffic as a result of rapid economic expansion, urbanization, active night life in metros, may also be contributory factors [9,10].

Telfer MR et al (1991) conducted a study in United Kingdom, and reported that total number of patients with facial bone fractures had risen from 79 per annum in 1977 to 94 per annum in 1987, an increase of 20% which was statistically highly significant [11].

The mandible was commonly involved bone in maxillofacial trauma in 19 out of 23 studies. The prominent position on face is primary reason for its involvement. Here, again, use of helmet with mandibular component and which is properly secured can help save the mandible from injury [12]. The instances of facial fractures between helmeted and non-helmeted individuals were 14 % and 53 % respectively [13].

It was common consensus of all the selected studies that young (21-30 years age group) males were more involved in maxillofacial trauma. This age predilection can be due to the freedom males enjoy in our society to move freely and more use of two wheelers by them [15]. This can also be explained by the fact that males of this age group are more mobile, go out for work and take more risks [16]. The crash rate of a two- wheeler is four times and the likelihood of being injured in a road traffic accident is 10-20 times higher compared to four-wheelers [12].

Younger motorcyclists believe that risky riding is a way to have fun and to gain the attention and acclamation of their friends [17]. Drivers using mobile phones may have: slower reaction times (notably braking reaction time, but also reaction to traffic signals), impaired ability to keep in the correct lane, and shorter following distances [17].

William Haddon, Jr was the first to do road safety research when he combined the host-agent-environment triad with the concepts of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention to create the

Haddon Matrix (Table 2). This matrix provides a framework for understanding the cause of injuries and identifies potential interventions at each step in the injury process [8].

The report states that the Indian road safety laws do not meet the best practice requirements for four out of five risk factors: enforcing speed limits, prevention of drunk driving, and safety of children and use of helmets. Even for seat-belts, where the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, is in consonance with the WHO standards, the enforcement is poor and India has a low score of four out ten. With respect to vehicle safety, India meets only two out of the seven vehicle safety standards.

Human factor also contributes to increasing number of road accidents in India. Most drivers continue to be acting like maniacs in a great hurry and error in judgment often leads to a lot of accidents. Reckless driving, over speeding, not following traffic rules, and drunken driving are main reasons for road accidents [13,16].

One "Disability-Adjusted Life Year (DALY)" can be thought of as one lost year of "healthy" life. The sum of these DALYs across the population is the burden of disease on the population. Lower middle income group countries like India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are accumulating 55 percent of injury costs. These countries have has a loss of DALY almost one third injury mortalities (31%). These also have loss the highest proportions of DALYs due to injuries (29%) and 27 percent of the proportions of economic value of DALYs. High income countries have reported for 16 percent injury deaths [19]. In lower middle income countries, like India injury treatments consume a very high proportion of personal resources mainly due to out-of pocket payment and also affects societal resources [19].

According to a study carried out by Hans-Joerg Oestern, Bhavuk Garg and Prakash Kotwal comparing trauma care in Germany and India, the prehospital care and in-hospital care in India is in infancy stage and mostly unorganised [20]. Equally important is the availability of back-up services like intensive care unit (ICU) and trauma team so that the necessary interventions are carried out at the earliest [21].

Only a few injuries are as challenging as those in the maxillofacial region. Oral and maxillofacial surgeons who undertake treatment of facial injuries have a dual responsibility: repair of the aesthetic defect (restoration of the pre-injury appearance) and restoration of function. A third goal is to reduce the period of disability. Therefore, the complete assessment and diagnosis, during the primary survey, of these injuries is mandatory [22]. Facial fractures can have long-term residual effects both functionally and aesthetically, irrespective of nature and accuracy of treatment. It has also been seen that techniques for the treatment of facial fractures have evolved over the years to reduce if not preclude associated morbidity [23].

CONCLUSION

The main causative factor in all selected studies in India is RTAs. Young Indian males in their productive years seem to suffer maxillofacial injuries, specially involving mandible. This causes functional and aesthetic disabilities to varying extent. The use of helmets is not clarified in most of the studies. This needs to be addressed to derive conclusions for increased number of RTAs in recent years. Better road conditions, improved road lighting, stricter laws for use of helmets as well as increase in awareness of use of helmets may help reduce the road traffic accidents and subsequently maxillofacial trauma in India.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kapoor P and Kalra N. A retrospective analysis of maxillofacial injuries in patients reporting to a tertiary care hospital in East Delhi. *Int J Crit Illn Inj Sci.* 2012; 2(1): 6–10.
- [2] WHO's "Global status report on road safety 2015. World Health Organization. World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention. Geneva: World Health Organization

- [3] Kamath RAD. Maxillofacial Trauma in Central Karnataka, India: An Outcome of 95 Cases in a Regional Trauma Care Centre. *Craniomaxillofac Trauma Reconstruction*. 2012;5:197–204.
- [4] Kaul RP et al. Burden of Maxillofacial Trauma at Level 1 Trauma Center. *Craniomaxillofac Trauma Reconstruction*. 2014;7:126–30.
- [5] Gali R, Devireddy SK, Akheel M. Faciomaxillary fractures in a Semi-urban South Indian Teaching Hospital: A retrospective analysis of 638 cases. *Contemp Clin Dent*. 2015; 6(4): 539–543.
- [6] Peden M, Scurfield R, Sleet D, Mohan D, Hyder AA, Jarawan E, Mathers C. *Helmets: a road safety manual for decision-makers and practitioners*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2006.
- [7] Hazen A and Ehiri JE. Road Traffic Injuries: Hidden Epidemic in Less Developed Countries. *Journal of the national medical association*. 2006 ; 98(1):72-83.
- [8] Gadre KS et al. Incidence and Pattern of Cranio-Maxillofacial Injuries: A 22 year Retrospective Analysis of Cases Operated at Major Trauma Hospitals/Centres in Pune, India. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*. 2013; 12(4):372–378.
- [9] Bali R et al. A comprehensive study on maxillofacial trauma conducted in Yamunanagar, India. *J Inj Violence Res*. 2013; 5(2): 108-16.
- [10] Telfer MR, Jones GM, Shepherd JP. Trends in the aetiology of maxillofacial fractures in the United Kingdom (1977-1987). *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 1991; 29(4): 250-5.
- [11] Møller M, Hausteijn S. Factors contributing to young moped rider accidents in Denmark. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2016;87:1-7.
- [12] *Helmets: a road safety manual for decision-makers and practitioners*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2006.
- [13] Natsu SS et al. An Epidemiological Study on Pattern and Incidence of Mandibular Fractures Hindawi Publishing Corporation. *Plastic Surgery International Volume 2012*, Article ID 834364, 7 pages.
- [14] Rajendra PB et al. Characteristics of associated craniofacial trauma in patients with head injuries: An experience with 100 cases. *J Emerg Trauma Shock*. 2009; 2(2): 89–94.
- [15] Usha M, Ravindran V, Soumithran CS, Nair KSR. The Impact of Mandatory Helmet Law on the Outcome of Maxillofacial Trauma: A Comparative Study in Kerala. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*. 2014 ; 13(2):176–183.
- [16] Zamani-Alavijeh F et al. Self-reported risk behaviors among offender motorcyclists in Ahvaz City. *Electronic physician*. 2015;7(7):1464-69.
- [17] Agnihotri A, Galfat D, Agnihotri D. Incidence and Pattern of Maxillofacial Trauma Due to Road Traffic Accidents: A Prospective Study. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*. 2014 ; 13(2):184–88.
- [18] Dalal K and Svanström L. Economic Burden of Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) of Injuries. *Health*. 2015 ;7:487-94.
- [19] Bajwa SJS, Kaur J, Singh A, Kapoor V, Bindra GS, Ghai GS. Clinical and critical care concerns of cranio-facial trauma: A retrospective study in a tertiary care institute. *Natl J Maxillofac Surg*. 2012; 3(2):133–38.
- [20] Oestern HJ, Garg B, Kotwal P. Trauma Care in India and Germany. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2013 ; 471:2869–877.
- [21] Gupta AK et al. A retrospective analysis of 189 patients of maxillofacial injuries presenting to a tertiary care hospital in Punjab, India. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*. 2009 ;8:241–45.
- [22] Barde D, Mudhol A, Madan R. Prevalence and pattern of mandibular fracture in Central India. *Natl J Maxillofac Surg*. 2014;5(2):153–56.
- [23] Lone P, Singh AP, Kour I, Kumar M. A 2-year retrospective analysis of facial injuries in patients treated at department of oral and maxillofacial surgery, IGGDC, Jammu, India. *Natl J Maxillofac Surg*. 2014; 5(2):149–52.