



The Management of Zygomatic Complex Fractures: A Review

Abbas Karimi¹ and Ehsan Shoohanizad^{2*}

¹Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Craniomaxillofacial Research Center, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

²Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, School of Dentistry, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JPRI/2019/v27i430176

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Syed A. A. Rizvi, Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Nova Southeastern University, USA.

Reviewers:

- (1) Dr. K. Srinivasan, NTR University of Health Sciences, India.
- (2) Karpal Singh Sohal, Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania.
- (3) Ngeow Wei Cheong, University of Malaya, Malaysia.
- (4) Yeşim Deniz, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/48906>

Review Article

Received 18 February 2019

Accepted 06 May 2019

Published 14 May 2019

ABSTRACT

The face symmetry has prominent role in the human body after injuries and accident. The zygomatic region is important factor in the injuries face. Due to its location, its fracture is the 2nd frequent fractured bone of mid-facial. Zygomatic bone fractures are more abundant in young males and its incidence and etiology is different based on location. Post-traumatic facial deformity is the most incorrect reconstruction of the facial skeleton. Inadequate healing of the supported soft tissues lead to malposition of landmarks, shrinkage and thickening. The zygomatic bone fracture and coronoid process impingement lead to restricted mouth opening. Interruption in zygomatic position has psychological, aesthetic and functional effects which impairs the function of mandible and ocular tissue. Therefore, diagnose and properly management of the zygomatic bone injury is important. Healing displaced fragments of zygomatic bone after inadequate fixation and reduction of fracture consequences facial asymmetry. There is a lack of information about evaluation of benefits and costs of different zmc fracture methods. So, this literature review was done to

*Corresponding author: E-mail: Ehsan.shohany@gmail.com;

characterize the etiology, incidence, clinical findings and results of different treatment trends of zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures. Surgeons have been utilized numerous approaches, but there are different ideas for the best one.

Keywords: Zygomatic complex fractures; management; Zygomatic fractures.

1. INTRODUCTION

Due to Zygomatic bone prominancy, Zmc fractures are the second most common fractures after nasal bone fractures [1] but there has not been a single best trend in treating of these fractures [2] So we decided to do a literature review on zmc fractures and its different treatment trends in articles. The face is most vulnerable position in the human body in the injury and accidents. The importance of anatomic region of the zygomatic bone apt it to the facial injuries [3]. The lateral mid structure of the facial skeleton supports by zygoma [4]. Zygomatic bone is the most prominent part of lateral face and has articulations with Maxilla, Temporal, Frontal and Sphenoid bones [1]. Despite the high rate of the head, face and neck injuries there is little attention on the etiology of maxillofacial injuries [5]. Zygomaticomaxillary has key role in protecting maxillary sinus, temporal fossa and zygomatic arch as well as eye and orbital cavity. The most frequent type of the facial fractures is zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures [6]. So, this literature review as a part of Ph.D thesis aimed to determine the etiology, incidence, clinical findings and treatment of the zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

For this review, literature search performed using keywords of peer-reviewed articles as follows: Zygomaticomaxillary × complex × fractures × etiology × incidence × clinical findings × treatment. Related articles were also deeply investigated. Beside electronic-searching, hand-searching was also done. Biological Abstracts, Chemical Abstracts, PubMed and Medline databases updated to 2018 were used for conducting the search. All the references of the search result were then studied in details.

3. ZYGOMATICOMAXILLARY COMPLEX FRACTURES

Fracture in Zygomatic bone and its articulations is called Zygomaticomaxillary complex or Zmc or orbitozygomatic fracture [1]. Most people involved in this type of fractures are male individuals in

there second or third decade of their lives [7]. The fracture of the zygomatic arch bone, impairs coronoid process and leads to restriction of mouth opening. Disruption of the zygomatic position has psychological and aesthetic effect which impairs ocular and mandibular function [8]. Three superimposed layers composed the masseter muscle which connects mandible and cheekbone. The superficial layer arises from of zygomatic bone maxillary process and two-third the zygomatic arch frontal lower margin give rise to superficial layer [9]. The middle layer originates from the zygomatic arch. The deep layer arises from the deep surface of the arch. The main cause of zygoma post reduction displacement is contraction of this muscle. In moderate displaced fractures, placement of temporalis fascia to the arch superior makes the internal fixation unnecessary, due to the ability of fascia to stabilize the fragments effectively [10]. The zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures have different severity [11]. Minimal to severe displacement reported for the zygomaticomaxillary complex. Also, based on the severity, they affect internal orbital disruption and entrapped the extraocular muscles. Thus, each individualized zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture should receive a specific treatment plan [11]. Innovative diagnosis and treatment strategies for the improvement of malar bone fracture have been carried out, but the adequate reduction and patient satisfaction is still unsolved problem. Facial symmetry affected by the malar bone due to its location [9]. Every facial post-traumatic deformity is faced with inaccurate facial skeleton primary reconstruction. Landmarks misplacement, thickening and shrinkage are the results of inadequately supported soft tissues subsequent healing. This deformity of soft tissue can be utilized for every secondary correction outcome [10].

4. FRACTURE MANAGEMENT

Reconstruction and positioning of the zygomaticomaxillary complex in facial esthetics is known as critical challenge for maxillofacial surgeons [12]. Surgeons have been used numerous surgical procedures, but there are different ideas for the best one [5]. Various

approaches including Gillies', Dingman's, Keen's and bicoronal scalp flap are the most common methods for treatment of the zygomatic complex fracture [1]. The most important spot of the zygoma have been implicated to establish mid facial symmetry for evaluation of treatment outcome [5]. In healthy individuals, differences among the both halves of the face and two-sided composition are frequent and scarcely lead to aesthetic complaints [13]. Several studies investigated the diagnosis and analysis of different methods and revealed that the trans oral (Keen's) approach provides a direct access to the zygomatic arch. Intraoral incision would be allowed and there is no risk of scar alopecia compared to the temporal (Gillie's) approach [8]. Surgical management of the zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures [4]. However, infection rates would be increased by oral flora introduction into the infratemporal fossa. Temporal fossa approach described by Gilles et al. in 1927 and became popular method for treatment of the isolated arch fractures [14]. The main advantages of this technique are its simple procedure and leaving no trace of scars. Midface fractures are required to be supported by three basic buttresses. The frontal maxillary alveolus connects to the anterior cranial attachment through the nasomaxillary buttress [15]. The maxilla posteriorly connects to the sphenoid bone via the pterygomaxillary buttress. The lateral maxillary alveolus connected to the zygomatic process of the temporal bone by zygomaticomaxillary buttress. Fracture lines extend through the infraorbital rim to the inferior orbital fissure and find its way to the zygomatic sphenoid suture and frontozygomatic suture line [15]. The Gillie's approach is an open approach and considered for the decrease in the zygomatic arch [10]. Gillie's temporal technique for reducing fracture of zygomatic arch is simple, effectiveness and acceptable method [8]. Reduction at zygomatic arch region in zygomatico-maxillary complex fracture is due to its direct elevation of the arch using elevator and tactile sensation for reduction confirmation [16].

The extent and the region of fixation depends on the articulations comminution and displacement expansion. Based on the reports, there is no designed comparison research to provide meaningful for zygomatic bone fracture [1]. The aim of zygomatic fractures treatment is to provide and maintain the arrangement of pre-injury facial skeleton [16]. The reposition of the zygoma at three locations is essential to achieve three

dimensions [17]. Also, decrease at the inferior orbital rim and frontozygomatic suture leads to continuous lateral rotation in the region of anterior maxillary buttress and ceases to the expansion of intra-orbital volume behind the globe axis. The upper buccal sulcus approach was recommended as primary technique for various types of zygomatic fractures except the fractures of rim and arch [18]. It is a fast, simple technique and needs much less force for elevation than external approach. During the surgery operation, buccal fat pad was not enough for dehiscence to occur. For reaching post reduction stability, the simplest method was tried to be defined by open reduction and internal fixation of dislocated zygoma fractures [1]. In almost cases to access the zygomatic complex fractures, using open reduction was recommended by lateral eyebrow approach. Advantages of this method are providing invisible scar and direct access to the zygomatico-frontal region [7]. Gillies temporal approach are used to arch fractures and sometimes to help the reduction of zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures [7]. The vestibular and lower eyelid approaches are frequently used. Maxillary vestibular approach is associated with approximately 20% complications [8]. The zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures was found to be laterally rotated, and temporal approach is extended preauricular. Recontouring of arch and zygomaticomaxillary buttress expanding exposure to the zygomaticomaxillary complex. The temporal approach provided depression reconstruction with temporalis flap over the area of zygoma and diminishes a second procedure necessity [7].

5. REPORTS FOR THE ZYGOMATIC COMPLEX FRACTURES

Ellis et al. [11] reported that incidence of male predominance was 80.2% at 30 years of age. Zygomatic complex fractures happened approximately at age of 21 and 40 years and the most frequent cause of individual injuries was road traffic crashes. [7]. The high rates of the zygoma fractures incidence attributed to the motor vehicle accidents and lack of safety measures. Mouth opening limitation or lateral deflection of zygomatic bone or mandible arch impinging on coronoid process [19] reported by 70 percent of patients [7]. The fixation required to prevent displacement should not higher than isolated zygomatic arch fracture [7]. In implication of the zygomatic bone fracture surgical treatment via two-point fixation against

three-point fixation, Rana et al. [1] reported that individuals treated with two-point fixation experienced complications following surgical operation like reduced malar height and vertical dystopia than three-point fixation patients. Based on their report, the best strategy treating fractures of zygomatic bone is internal three-point fixation using mini plates. The significant stability achieved by three-point fixation including FZ suture, zygomaticomaxillary buttress and inferior orbital rim through either interosseous wiring or just mini plates [20]. On analysis of outcome of zygomatic fracture management, Senthilkumar et al. [21]. reported the most common procedure was 2-point fixation. Post-operatively, trismus infraorbital anesthesia, malar asymmetry and orbital dystopia was improved in patients. The most common complication was plate extrusion. The type of management depends on clinical and radiological features. Computed tomography scan axial and coronal section of facial bones shows the severity of fractures not all patients need operative intervention [21]. Protocol management and long-term follow up enable us to measure outcomes objectively and compare different surgical methods and following complications. In a 12-year assessing treatment methods used for zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures, Zachariades and Mezitis [22] reported that Semirigid fixation with miniplates provides the highest reliability for zygomatico-orbital complex fractures treatment. Infrequent urgency to remove hardware and the high cost are the essential disadvantages of the method. Over the years, zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture fixation procedures have been developed, initiating with osteosynthesis wiring. However, wire osteosynthesis is not effective compared to plating systems in zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures reduction maintenance [23]. Conventional teaching suggests three-point fixation for zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures. Nevertheless, Ellis and Kittidumkerng suggests a step-wise process algorithm in the zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures treatment [24]. Soft-tissue preservation is another procedure to zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures [23]. Minimizing soft-tissue morbidity is the goal of skeletal fixation. Fracture type and the surgeon opinion define the soft-tissue approaches and required the fixation of buttresses [25]. A brow incision leaves a considerable scarring. Exposures of lower eyelid results in entropion or ectropion [26]. The coronal method provides subjection of the zygomatic arch and lateral orbital rim to treat severe

zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures [27]. The main complications of this approach are facial nerve injury, temporal fat pad injury, necrosis of alopecia and scalp [27]. It has been reported that insertion of one plate through a lateral brow incision on the superolateral orbital rim had good outcomes in patients [28]. Ocular symptoms are not associated with single-plate fixation which is typically limited to non-comminuted zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures. Treatment of zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture should be personalized based on each patient. Different variations of fracture warrant numerous combinations of fixation approaches. Surveyed population revealed that they would frequently employ procedures through the mouth and eyelid for zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture treatment [28]. In conclusion, the main solution for the acute repair of mid facial fractures is precise evaluation of the zygomatic bone location regarding the cranial base posteriorly and the midface anteriorly. One of the great challenges of posttraumatic deformities of the orbitozygomatico- maxillary complex is the secondary reconstruction which remains unsolved.

It needs to notice, patients' awareness of the fact that individuals with zygomatic arch fracture have higher prevalence of facial asymmetry, it can increase their satisfaction [29]. It is noteworthy that the zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture type significantly impacts its treatment outcome. Kim et al. [30]. also showed that comminuted zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures have a higher level of asymmetry.

6. CONCLUSION

At last, our conclusion based on this literature review is that Zmc fractures are more happening in less secure roads and in societies with lower cultural levels. There is not a single method with similar result to treat the ZMC fractures. The treatment plan should be based on individual desire and severity of trauma and displacement, considering optimal fixation via minimally invasive approaches.

CONSENT

It is not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

It is not applicable.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Rana M, Warraich R, Tahir S, Iqbal A, See CV, Eckardt AE, Gellrich NC. Surgical treatment of zygomatic bone fracture using two points fixation versus three point fixation-a randomised prospective clinical trial. *Trials*. 2012;13:36. Available:<http://www.trialsjournal.com/content/13/1/36>
2. Farber SJ, Nguyen DC, Skolnick GB, Woo AS, Patel KB. Current management of zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures: A multidisciplinary survey and literature review. *Cranio-maxillofac Trauma Reconstr*. 2016;9(4):313-322. Epub 2016 Sep 16.
3. Salentijn EG, van den Bergh B, Forouzanfar T. A ten-year analysis of midfacial fractures. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2013;41:630.
4. Gong X, He Y, An J, et al: Application of a computer-assisted navigation system (CANS) in the delayed treatment of zygomatic fractures: A randomized controlled trial. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2017;75:1450.
5. Birgfeld CB, Mundinger GS, Gruss JS. Evidence-based medicine: Evaluation and treatment of zygoma fractures. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2017;139:168e.
6. Hwang H-S, Yuan D, Jeong K-H, et al. Three-dimensional soft tissue analysis for the evaluation of facial asymmetry in normal occlusion individuals. *Korean J Orthod*. 2012;42:56.
7. Bhasker Yamsani B, Gaddipati R, Vura N, Ramiseti S, Yamsani R. Zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures: A review of 101 cases. *J. Maxillofac. Oral Surg*. 2016;15(4):417-424.
8. Sonone RM, Kumar S, Kukreja P, Agarwal A, Bhatnagar A, Chhabra V. Computed tomography scan evaluation of adequacy for reduction of zygomatic arch fracture using Gillie's temporal approach. *J Dent Specialities*. 2015;3(2):156-158.
9. Carter TG, Bagheri S, Dierks EJ. Towel clip reduction of the depressed zygomatic arch fracture. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2005;63:1244-6.
10. Czerwinski M, Ma S, Williams HB. Zygomatic arch deformation: An anatomic and clinical study. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2008;66:2322-9.
11. Ellis E, Perez D. An algorithm for the treatment of isolated zygomatico-orbital fractures. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2014;72:1975-1983.
12. Salentijn EG, Boverhoff J, Heymans MW, et al. The clinical and radiographical characteristics of zygomatic complex fractures: A comparison between the surgically and non-surgically treated patients. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2014;42:492.
13. Nur RB, Cakan DG, Arun T. Evaluation of facial hard and soft tissue asymmetry using cone-beam computed tomography. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2016;149:225.
14. Daabiss M. American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status classification. *Indian J Anaesth*. 2011;55:111-15.
15. Friedrich RE, Henning M. Causes and treatment of patients with fractures of zygoma: Analysis of 911 consecutive patients. *J Cranio-Maxillofac Surg*. 2004;32:282.
16. Priya S, Ebenezer V, Balakrishnan R. Versatility of Gillie's temporal approach in the management of ZMC fractures. *Biomed Pharma J*. 2014;7:253-6.
17. Pearl RM. Treatment of enophthalmos. *Clin Plast Surg*. 1992;19:99-111.
18. Yanagisawa E. Pitfalls in the management of zygomatic fractures. *Laryngoscope*. 1973;83(4):527-546.
19. Rowe NL, Killey HC. Fractures of the facial skeleton, 2nd Edn, Edinberg E & Livingstone S, London. 1970;328-359.
20. Davidson J, Nickerson D, Nickerson B. Zygomatic fractures: Comparison of method of internal fixation. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 1990;86:25-32.
21. Senthilkumar R, Prakash S, Anandan H. Analysis of outcome of zygomatic fracture management. *International Journal of Scientific Study*. 2017;5(5):216-219.
22. Zachariades N, Mezitis M. Changing trends in the treatment of zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures: A 12-year evaluation of methods used. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 1998;56:1152-1156.
23. Ellstrom CL, Evans GR. Evidence-based medicine: Zygoma fractures. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2013;132(6):1649-1657.
24. Rodriguez ED, Losee JE, Neligan PC. Plastic surgery: Craniofacial, head and

- neck surgery, pediatric plastic surgery, 3rd Ed. New York: Elsevier Health Sciences. 2012;3:49–88.
25. Czerwinski M, Martin M, Lee C. Quantitative comparison of open reduction and internal fixation versus the Gillies method in the treatment of orbitozygomatic complex fractures. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2005;115(7):1848–1854.
 26. Raschke GF, Rieger UM, Bader RD, et al. The zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture - an anthropometric appraisal of surgical outcomes. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* 2013;41(4):331–337.
 27. Lee EI, Mohan K, Koshy JC, Hollier LH Jr. Optimizing the surgical management of zygomaticomaxillary complex fractures. *Semin Plast Surg.* 2010;24(4):389–397.
 28. Hwang K. One-point fixation of tripod fractures of zygoma through a lateral brow incision. *J Craniofac Surg.* 2010;21(4):1042–1044.
 29. Khaqani MS, Tavosi F, Gholami M, Eftekharian HR, Khojastepour L. Analysis of facial symmetry after zygomatic bone fracture management. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2018;76:595-604.
 30. Kim DH, Kim RH, Lee J, et al: Evaluation of soft tissue asymmetry using cone-beam computed tomography after open reduction and internal fixation of zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture. *J Korean Assoc Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2014;40:103.

© 2019 Karimi and Shoohanizad; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/48906>