

(1997)^[8] reported 7% incidence, our limited experience may cause this relatively high complication rates.

However, all the complications in this study (except the case of malocclusion 4.16%) were minor. There was no case of nonunion, no case of severe infection, and no case of motor nerve injury. In addition, there were two cases of unacceptable facial scarring. In addition, the small sample of the study makes the interpretation of the results unreliable. Another cause is that most of the studies are retrospective and many of the complications are not mentioned especially injury to the sensory nerve and roots of teeth.

There was no case of wound dehiscence in the study, this agree with the results of Smith in 1991^[13] but in contrast to Cawood in (1985)^[9] who reported 12% wound dehiscence. This mostly occur when intra oral approach is used for the posterior parts of the mandibular body angular regions, as the plates, in this situation, is positioned high on the alveolar process near the vestibule. This explains the absence of wound dehiscence in this study.

No patients complained of unusual sensory abnormality, spontaneous pain, hypoesthesia or hyperesthesia in the region of the retained miniplate.

Conclusion

We conclude that

1. The short-term retention of titanium seems to be harmless and without complications.
2. With exception of condylar #s, miniplate osteosynthesis gave acceptable results, and it can be recommended as a routine method for the treatment of mandibular #s.
3. Miniplates produce no scattering during CT. scanning and this is advantageous when subsequent imaging will be needed.
4. Miniplates are rigid enough for stabilization of comminuted fractures especially when supplemented with IMF.
5. Its preferable to place the miniplate along the Champyl' ideal lines of osteosynthesis

than along the lower border to avoid postoperative IMF.

6. Intra oral approach is advantageous to, and gives comparable results with extra oral approach.

7. The application of miniplates is associated with many technically related failures, which can be reduced largely by increasing the experience in its application.

References

1. Roberts WR: The case of mandibular plating. Br J Oral Surg, 1964; 1: 200.
2. Battersby TG: Plating of mandibular #s. Br J Oral Surg, 1967; 4: 194.
3. Becker R: Stable compression plate fixation of mandibular #s. Br J Oral Surg, 1974; 12: 13.
4. Luhr HG, Drommer R, Hotcher U et al: Comparative study between the extraoral and intraoral approach to compression osteosynthesis of mandibular #s. Hjorting-Hansen textbook of Oral & maxillo-facial surgery. 1st edition, Quintessence, Chicago, 1985; (133): p.p. 137.
5. Michelet FX, Deymes J, and Dessns B: Osteosynthesis with miniaturized plates in maxillo-facial surgery. J Oral Maxillofac Surg, 1973; 1: 79-84.
6. Champy M, Lodde J.P, Schumitt R, et al: Mandibular osteosynthesis by miniature screwed plates via a buccal approach. J Maxillofac Surg, 1978; 14: 18.
7. Shafer D: Treatment of mandibular angle #s using two miniplates J Oral Maxillofacial Surg, 1994; 52: 1036-7.
8. Jaque B, Richter M, and Arza A: Treatment of mandibular #s with RIF using AO system. J Oral Maxillofac Surg, 1997; 55: 1402-6.
9. Cawood JJ: Small plates osteosynthesis of mandibular #s. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg, 1985; 23: 77-82.
10. Baker S: Concepts and techniques of rigid fixation. Fonseca & Wlker textbook of Oral & maxillofacial Trauma. Second edition, volume II, W.B. Saunders company, 1997; p.p. 1274-1328.
11. Prein J: The use of RIF in mandibular #s complicated by osteomyelitis. J Oral Macillofac Surg, 1994; 52: 1119-21.
12. Nakamura S, Takenoshita Y, and Masnichiro L: Complications of miniplates osteosynthesis for mandibular #s. J Oral Maxillofac Surg, 1994; 52: 233-8.
13. Smith WP: Delayed miniplate osteosynthesis for mandibular #s. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg, 1991; 29: 73-6.