Pre and postoperative changes in the morphology of pharyngeal airway in patients with skeletal mandibular prognathism — A comparison between Class 1 malocclusion and simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery —
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Abstract

Objective: Many reports mentioned the reduction of pharyngeal airway space after orthognathic surgery in patients with skeletal mandibular prognathism. We examined the pharyngeal airway space in patients treated with simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery and presented our findings.

Materials and Methods: Records of 31 patients treated with simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery (case group) and 28 patients with Class 1 malocclusion treated with orthodontic treatment alone (control group) were examined from the pre treatment. The size of the pharyngeal airway (at 5 locations) in the control and case groups at pre– and post–treatments were analyzed through ANCOVA. Also the change in the size of the pharyngeal airway (at 5 locations) between pre– and post–treatments in each group were analyzed through ANCOVA.

Results: (1) At the pre treatment, we found out that SPPS (soft palate to the posterior pharyngeal wall) in the case group was significantly wider than the control group (p<0.05) however, multiple comparisons showed no significant difference. (2) After treatment, the SPPS and MPS (PSP to the posterior pharyngeal wall) in the case group were significantly wider than in the control group (p<0.05) nevertheless, multiple comparisons showed no significant difference. (3) The width of the pharyngeal airway before and after treatment was compared between the control and the case group. In the control group, PPS (PNS to the posterior pharyngeal wall) after treatment was signif-
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significantly larger than before treatment but multiple comparisons showed no significant difference. In
the case group, PPS was larger after treatment than before treatment and multiple comparisons
showed significant difference (p<0.01).

Discussion: Before treatment, we found out that the upper pharyngeal airway space was nar-
rower and the lower part is wider than after treatment whereby we predicted that after treatment,
the upper part would be wider and the lower part would be narrower. However, no significant dif-
ference was obtained in the group treated with simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery due to the
complex three–dimensional movement of the maxilla. The trend shown in the hypothesis was not
recognized.

Conclusion: When simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery was carried out to treat cases of
skeletal mandibular prognathism, the pharyngeal airway (PPS) significantly increased after sur-
gery. Meanwhile, the lower part of the airway decreased.

Introduction

A number of pre and post–operative changes in the morphology of pharyngeal airway in pa-
tients with skeletal mandibular prognathism, in particular, patients with maxillary and mandibu-
lar skeletal deformities, have been extensively reviewed and reports have shown changes in the
width of pharyngeal airway and its recovery after surgery\(^1\)\(^{-1}_1\). Emata et al.\(^1\) reviewed the effect of
orthognathic surgery on skeletal mandibular prognathism showing a slight decrease in the antero-
posterior diameter of the airway with the setback of the mandible. However, a slight recovery oc-
curred with a tendency of becoming stable thereafter. Furthermore, Yoshida et al.\(^8\) showed a slight
decrease of the upper part of the pharyngeal airway in patients with skeletal mandibular progna-
thism treated with SSRO and significant changes occurred in the middle and lower parts of the air-
way. They mentioned that narrowing of the entire pharyngeal airway was recognized after orthog-
nathic surgery. Furthermore, the significant decrease in pharyngeal airway after mandibular
setback may cause respiratory disorder\(^1_2\). Mandibular setback surgery narrows the pharyngeal air-
way, and recent studies showed the adverse effects of the procedure on breathing during sleep\(^1_3\),\(^1_4\).

On the other hand, other reports have shown that patients with skeletal mandibular progna-
thism have pharyngeal airways that are originally wider than normal\(^1_5\)\(^{-1}_8\). Based on our many
years of clinical experience, we consider that the pharyngeal airway of patients with skeletal man-
dibular prognathism is wider than patients with normal jaw relationship. No studies have com-
pared the changes in pharyngeal airway between orthognathic surgery cases with skeletal mandib-
ular prognathism and cases with normal occlusion or treated with orthodontics alone. Therefore, in
our first report\(^19\), we used a case of mandibular setback surgery and predicted that although the
pharyngeal airway decreased after mandibular setback surgery, the airway is still nearly normal in
width. The purpose of the study was to examine: (1) the width of the pharyngeal airway before
mandibular setback surgery and (2) to determine the change in the width of the airway before and
after surgery. The study group was compared to the control group who only had orthodontic treat-
ment. Results showed that the pharyngeal airway in a patient with mandibular prognathism was
wider than the patient with normal jaw relationship. After surgery, the pharyngeal airway de-
creased as we predicted. Although the pharyngeal airway decreased, the space was still nearly nor-
mal\(^19\).

On this report, as the second it, we analyzed a case group treated with simultaneous maxillo-
mandibular surgery for the correction of skeletal mandibular prognathism. This procedure is differ-
ent from the mandibular setback alone. Before treatment, the upper pharyngeal airway space in
the case group was wider than the control group and the lower pharyngeal airway space was nar-
rower. Our goal was to test the new hypothesis that after treatment with simultaneous maxillo-
mandibular surgery, the upper pharyngeal space would be wider and the lower part would be nar-
rower. In order to verify the hypothesis: (1) pre and post-operative changes in the width of the
pharyngeal airway were measured in patients who underwent orthodontic treatment alone as the
control group (2) and in patients who underwent simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery as the

Materials and methods

Records of 439 patients with jaw deformities who completed dynamic treatment at the ortho-
dontic clinic between June 30, 1998 and June 30, 2012 were reviewed for case group selection. After
a thorough review, 182 who underwent simultaneous maxillomandibular movement were selected
regardless of gender. Although equal number of male and female patients was desirable, the cases
were dominated by female patients therefore, only female cases were used as subjects. Cases with
asymmetrical face, those with congenital anomalies and cases with significant overbite were ex-
cluded. Finally, only 31 patients (28Y11M ± 1Y8M) were selected.

For the control group, 196 patients who completed general orthodontic alone at the orthodontic
clinic between June 30, 1998 to June 30, 2012 were reviewed. Following the selection criteria, 28
adult female patients(28Y5M ± 2Y3M) without skeletal deformity and those who completed
orthodontic treatment alone were selected (Table 1). Table 1 shows the average age, treatment
period, post-operative correction period (case group) and retention period of the cases used at the
first visit for both groups, before surgery (case group) and at the end of treatment. Table 2, 3 shows
the measurement from the cephalogram (Table 2, 3).

Lateral cephalograms were taken following the conventional method; in a standing position,
with the head positioned so that the Frankfurt plane is parallel to the floor. The patients were in-
structed to bite in central occlusion and to keep the tongue in a resting position while breathing
through the nose. Evaluation of the pharyngeal airway space using lateral cephalogram was per-
formed according to the method of Mochida et al. An example of simultaneous maxillomandib-
ular surgery case was shown in Fig. 1.

Measurement on lateral cephalogram

Each parameter below was measured from the tracing done on lateral cephalogram at each
point for both groups. Measurement was performed by a single operator to eliminate errors between
operators (Fig. 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 : Mean age and treatment period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age at pre treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case group n=31 mean ± SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group n=28 mean ± SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Superior posterior pharyngeal space (SPPS): the distance between the soft palate and the posterior pharyngeal wall, with a line parallel to the FH plane passing through the PNS

Table 2: Comparison of cephalometric analysis between the case and the control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Case group Pre operation</th>
<th>Case group Post treatment</th>
<th>Control group Pre treatment</th>
<th>Control group Post treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td>79.3±3.1</td>
<td>79.4±3.0</td>
<td>80.9±3.2</td>
<td>81.1±3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNB</td>
<td>80.8±4.1</td>
<td>80.7±3.8</td>
<td>80.1±3.2</td>
<td>77.7±3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANB</td>
<td>-1.5±3.3</td>
<td>-1.5±3.1</td>
<td>0.8±2.4</td>
<td>3.4±1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial angle</td>
<td>89.1±4.5</td>
<td>114.7±4.63</td>
<td>88.5±3.9</td>
<td>85.5±2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-axis</td>
<td>62.7±4.6</td>
<td>62.6±4.64</td>
<td>62.7±4.2</td>
<td>65.2±3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD angle</td>
<td>30.9±6.0</td>
<td>30.9±5.9</td>
<td>31.3±6.0</td>
<td>29.9±5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonial angle</td>
<td>128.6±5.9</td>
<td>128.6±5.9</td>
<td>129.4±5.8</td>
<td>124.8±4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH to SN</td>
<td>8.2±2.9</td>
<td>8.2±2.9</td>
<td>8.2±2.9</td>
<td>7.7±2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 to FH</td>
<td>113.6±8.9</td>
<td>116.4±6.4</td>
<td>117.8±6.4</td>
<td>115.1±8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1to Mandibular</td>
<td>84.0±9.9</td>
<td>90.0±7.1</td>
<td>87.4±6.7</td>
<td>95.4±5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter incisal</td>
<td>131.6±13.9</td>
<td>122.7±7.8</td>
<td>123.5±9.5</td>
<td>119.5±9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Mean value of measurements and their standard deviations (sd) at each time of measurements and mean value of differences between pre- and post-treatments, at time of diagnosis and before operation, before and after operations, at time of diagnosis and after operation and their sd. (a) Control group, (b) Case group.

(a) Control group (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pre treatment</th>
<th>Post treatment</th>
<th>*Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>28.0 (2.44)</td>
<td>28.6 (2.63)</td>
<td>0.6 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPS</td>
<td>12.8 (3.22)</td>
<td>12.8 (2.80)</td>
<td>0.0 (2.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>11.2 (2.60)</td>
<td>11.2 (2.38)</td>
<td>0.0 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>12.2 (3.65)</td>
<td>11.9 (3.63)</td>
<td>-0.3 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>11.9 (3.39)</td>
<td>11.7 (3.75)</td>
<td>-0.2 (2.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Case group (N=31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pre treatment</th>
<th>Pre Operation</th>
<th>Post treatment</th>
<th>**Difference</th>
<th>***Difference</th>
<th>****Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
<td>mean (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>28.0 (3.50)</td>
<td>28.0 (2.95)</td>
<td>29.2 (3.42)</td>
<td>0.1 (1.51)</td>
<td>1.2 (2.25)</td>
<td>1.3 (2.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPS</td>
<td>14.5 (2.70)</td>
<td>14.4 (2.30)</td>
<td>14.5 (3.42)</td>
<td>-0.1 (2.64)</td>
<td>0.1 (2.75)</td>
<td>0.0 (2.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>12.2 (2.68)</td>
<td>12.7 (2.47)</td>
<td>12.6 (2.66)</td>
<td>0.6 (1.74)</td>
<td>-0.1 (2.31)</td>
<td>0.5 (1.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>14.2 (4.68)</td>
<td>14.5 (4.30)</td>
<td>13.0 (4.04)</td>
<td>0.3 (3.88)</td>
<td>-1.5 (4.00)</td>
<td>-1.2 (4.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>13.6 (3.51)</td>
<td>14.1 (4.15)</td>
<td>13.7 (3.87)</td>
<td>0.5 (3.65)</td>
<td>-0.4 (3.79)</td>
<td>0.1 (2.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference = (Post-treatment)-(Pre-treatment)
**Difference=(before Operation)-(at Diagnosis)
***Difference=(after Operation)-(before Operation)
****Difference=(after Operation)-(at Diagnosis)

Measuring the width of the pharyngeal airway (mm)

1. Palatal pharyngeal space (PPS): the distance between PNS and posterior pharyngeal wall, with a line parallel to the FH plane passing through the PNS.
2. Superior posterior pharyngeal space (SPPS): the distance between the soft palate and the posterior pharyngeal wall, with a line parallel to the FH plane passing through the midpoint of PNS and PSP.
3. Middle pharyngeal space (MPS): the distance between PSP and posterior pharyngeal wall, with a line parallel to FH plane through PSP.
4. Inferior pharyngeal space (IPS): the distance between the tongue and the posterior pharyngeal wall, with a line parallel to the FH plane passing through the lowest point of the 2nd cervical.
spine

(5) Epiglottic pharyngeal space (EPS): the distance from tongue and posterior pharyngeal wall, with a line parallel to the FH plane passing through the pharyngeal tip

Measurement of skeletal indicators (mm)

(6) S–N: distance from Sella–Nasion
(7) N–FH: distance from Nasion perpendicular to FH plane
(8) FH–A: distance from FH plane perpendicular to point A
(9) FH–PNS: distance from the FH plane perpendicular to PNS
(10) M–A: distance from point A perpendicular to McNamara line

A: FH plane
B: McNamara line: line passing through Nasion perpendicular to the FH plane

Statistical analysis

First, ANCOVA was used to examine a difference of pharyngeal airway size (at 5 locations) between the control and case groups, where each size of the pharyngeal airway was used as a response variable and indicator variable discriminating between control and treatment groups (control: 0; case: 1), age at diagnosis, size of SN and size of N–FH were used as explanatory variables. Secondly, a change of each size of the pharyngeal airway between pre– and post–treatments in the control and case groups was analyzed with ANCOVA, where age at diagnosis, SN and N–FH were used as explanatory variables.

Since the pharyngeal airway used for the objective variable was measured at five locations (PPS, SPPS, MPS, IPS and EPS), the p–values, indicating the level of statistical significance of changes in pharyngeal airway size, were adjusted with Bonferroni correction taking into account the effect of five multiple comparisons.

R software version 3.5.1 and SPSS version 8 were used to implement the analysis.

This research was reviewed and approved by the Matsumoto Dental University Ethics Committee on October 31, 2010 (Permit number 0119).

Results

1) Difference in the size of the pharyngeal airway between the control and the case group at the pre-treatment. During the pre-treatment, the SPPS in the case group was significantly larger than the control group (p<0.05). Nevertheless, multiple comparisons showed no significant difference. The results obtained were contrary to the original hypothesis (Fig. 3).

2) Difference in the size of the pharyngeal airway between the control group and the case group at the end of treatment. After surgical correction, the size of the PPS in the upper oropharynx was significantly wider (p<0.05), and the lower SPPS and MPS were significantly wider than the control group in the case group, although no significant difference was obtained in multiple comparisons.

As expected, this point was significantly different in PPS. Although that trend was observed with other parameters, no significant difference was obtained.

After correction, SPPS and MPS (PSP–posterior pharyngeal wall) in the case group was significantly larger than the control group (p<0.05) but multiple comparisons showed no significant difference (Fig. 4).

3) Comparison of pharyngeal airway size before and after treatment in the control group PPS (PNS–pharyngeal wall) was significantly wider after treatment than before treatment but no significant difference was obtained in multiple comparisons (Fig. 5).
4) In the case group, PPS was significantly wider after treatment than before treatment in multiple comparisons (p<0.01) (Fig. 6).

**Discussion**

*Verifying the hypothesis*

Isono et al. mentioned that upper airway muscle activity and airway pressure fluctuate dynamically regardless of waking up and sleeping and that diagnosis of airway obstruction by measuring the area cross-sectionally is difficult [21]. However, Chen et al proposed an equation that could predict the morphology of pharyngeal airway that is likely to develop Obstructive Sleep Apnea Syndrome (OSAS) after surgical correction; taking into account various risk factors during surgery [22].

Tonogi et al. [17] reported that changes in the maxilla are more important than the changes in
the mandible. Hence, we tried to verify the hypothesis taking OSAS into consideration. It was predicted that the upper pharyngeal airway in the case group would be smaller and the lower part would larger than the control group. Although that trend was observed, there was no significant difference between the control and the case group.

Almuzian et al. reported in 40 patients who had undergone a single Le Fort I to correct Class III malocclusion with maxillary hypoplasia. As a result, the single Le Fort I osteotomy was found to increase the retroglossal airway volume.

It was hypothesized that during the pre treatment, the upper pharyngeal airway would originally be narrow and the lower part would be wide. However, no significant difference was obtained between the control and the case group. After surgery, it was predicted that the upper pharyngeal airway would be larger and the lower part would be smaller. However, the results showed no change between the control and the case groups. The three–dimensional movement of the bone dur-
ing simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery seemed to complicate the data obtained. Orthognathic surgery of the maxilla and the mandible can improve occlusion, masticatory functions, and esthetics but multiple movements in the jawbone may cause significant changes in the morphology of the pharyngeal airway as well as changes in the position of the tongue and soft palate\textsuperscript{24}.

Subject selection and research limitations
In this study, we were able to utilize a large number of cases selected from a huge pool of data. However, due to the peculiarities in the treatment, only female patients were selected because data collection from many male patients was not possible. Results could have been different if male cases were analyzed.

Method of evaluating pharyngeal airway
In this study, an analysis was carried out on two-dimensional lateral cephalogram. Lateral cephalograms have the advantage of evaluating the lower face and pharyngeal airway under the same condition. Since lateral cephalogram is standard radiography, images can be easily compared. Many studies in the past used two-dimensional lateral cephalogram to measure the size of pharyngeal airway\textsuperscript{1,8,11} however recently, the use of three-dimensional CT images in researches is
rapidly becoming a practice. Kiryu et al. suggested that although three-dimensional CT image is qualitatively excellent, it is not clinically applicable quantitatively. Furthermore, the diagnosis of jaw deformity has not been established using CT image compared to using lateral cephalogram. Notwithstanding, recently a study showed that data obtained from three-dimensional images is four to five times more precise (error within 0.1 mm) than the data obtained from two-dimensional images. If the present study was evaluated using three-dimensional radiographs, more interesting findings could have been obtained and not just limited to anteroposterior data.

Currently, orthodontic clinics equipped with CT scan are limited and many medical institutions routinely perform treatments based on two-dimensional images. Besides, CT imaging exposes the patients at an extremely high dose of radiation than lateral cephalogram. From the viewpoint of whether it is justifiable to use CT imaging in daily clinical practice for orthodontic correction is questionable because of the disadvantage of radiation exposure leading carcinogenicity thus, outweighs the merit. For that reason, we should be more cautious in considering the use of CT. Needless to say, CT imaging is essential when performing surgery.

In the present study, the control group did not consist of a population without orthodontic treatment, rather it was selected from patients who underwent and have completed orthodontic
treatment alone (without skeletal deformities). Thus, the results of this study were based on patients treated orthodontically and not compared to untreated normal individuals. So far, numerous studies regarding changes in pharyngeal airway before and after orthognathic surgery have been presented. Pushkar et al.\textsuperscript{21} mentioned that maxillary and mandibular surgery caused an increase in the pharyngeal airway when the maxilla was moved forward and a decrease during a mandibular setback. Moreover, during orthognathic surgery involving the maxilla and the mandible, the pharyngeal airway was reduced to 47%, and that the position of the base of the tongue was altered by 65% due to the mandibular setback. Aoki et al.\textsuperscript{27} analyzed the effect of orthognathic surgery on the morphology of pharyngeal airway after doing Le Fort I on the maxilla and SSRO on the mandible. They found out that surgically moving the jaw increased the upper pharyngeal airway and decreased the lower pharyngeal airway.

The anterior movement of the maxilla caused the posterior part of the nasal lobule to move forward thereby increasing the anteroposterior diameter of the pharyngeal airway. Also, the posterior movement of the mandible reduced the oral cavity region. The posterior movement of the tongue and the base of the tongue likewise reduced the oral cavity region. The posterior movement of the tongue together with the base of the tongue caused stenosis and movement of the soft palate since the posterior part of the tongue is connected to the soft palate. Kouno et al.\textsuperscript{11} compared the changes in pharyngeal airway before and after surgery in patients with mandibular prognathism treated with simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery. They found that although surgery involving the maxilla and the mandible relatively changed the anteroposterior pharyngeal airway in comparison with mandibular setback alone, stenosis of the posterior part of the soft palate especially the laryngeal airway is low.

Until now, there have been plenty of studies on the changes in pharyngeal airway before and after orthognathic surgery. We reviewed those studies and as far as we know, the difference between surgical and non–surgical cases has not been reported. Therefore, after examining the case treated with mandibular setback and comparing it with orthodontic correction alone, we observed that after treatment, pharyngeal airway became smaller than before treatment. Although the pharyngeal airway became smaller, the size was not different from those that were not treated surgically. Our results showed no significant difference in the pharyngeal airway between those treated with maxillomandibular surgery and those treated with orthodontics alone. Brunetto et al.\textsuperscript{28} tried three–dimensional prediction in orthognathic surgery patients. As a result, it was reported that there was no strong correlation between the amount of movement and volume change of the pharyngeal airway in cases of mandibular prognathism that performed simultaneous maxillomandibular surgery.

In the case of simultaneous maxillomandibular movement for the correction of mandibular prognathism, the upper pharyngeal airway before treatment is narrower than the control group and the lower part of the airway is wider. Our hypothesis was that the upper airway would become wider and the lower airway would be narrower after treatment. Nevertheless, after maxillomandibular surgery, only slightly significant difference was obtained. The slight difference was considered due to the complex three–dimensional movement of the bone – upward–forward–rotation of the maxilla and downward–backward movement of the mandible. All points of measurement did not show a significant difference which proved our null hypothesis. Neither sufficient data was obtained to support the originally intended hypothesis. However, it was established that cases with jaw deformity (mandibular prognathism) requiring simultaneous
maxillomandibular movement create a larger upper pharyngeal airway and a smaller lower pharyngeal airway than the pre treatment.

As stated in the introduction, this is the first report stating that pharyngeal airway in mandibular prognathism is wider than normal. After surgical correction, the pharyngeal airway becomes narrower nevertheless we predicted and demonstrated that the size was not abnormal and in fact, it was nearly normal. However, during simultaneous maxillomandibular movement, the slight significant difference was considered due to the complex three–dimensional movement of the jaw – upward–forward–rotation of the maxilla and downward–backward movement of the mandible. It was demonstrated and proven that this is not abnormal and was close to normal. However, the case of simultaneous movement of the upper and lower jaw was considered to have little significant different due to complicated three–dimensional movement such as backward, upward and rotation of the maxilla.

**Conclusion**

A comparison of the morphology of pharyngeal airway, before and after surgery was carried out in patients with skeletal mandibular prognathism treated with simultaneous maxillomandibular movement and in patients treated with orthodontics alone. Our data on multiple comparisons showed no significant difference at all points; neither did we obtain sufficient results to support our originally intended hypothesis. However, patients with mandibular prognathism requiring simultaneous maxillomandibular movement tended to have a smaller upper pharyngeal airway and larger lower pharyngeal airway at the pre treatment. After mandibular prognathism was improved by simultaneous maxillomandibular movement, the upper pharyngeal airway became larger and the lower pharyngeal airway became smaller. The results showed slightly significant difference in the dimension of the pharyngeal airway between the case and the control group. The slight change was considered due to the complex three–dimensional movement of the maxilla – in an upward, forward and rotation. The morphology of the pharyngeal airway and the presence of respiratory disorder should be taken into consideration when considering performing orthognathic surgery.
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抄録：顎変形症（骨格性下顎前突症）における咽頭気道形態の術前術後の変化—上下顎同時移動術と1級不正咬合の比較—

吉川仁育1, 魚住智子1, 橫井由紀子2, 古谷昌裕3, 岡藤範正4

1(よしかわ矯正歯科クリニック)
2(松本歯大・歯科理工)
3(一般財団法人甲南会六甲アイランド甲南病院・歯科口腔外)
4(松本歯大・歯科矯正)

【目的】骨格性下顎前突症の外科的矯正治療において術後に咽頭気道形態が狭小化したとの報告が多い。今回上下顎同時移動術を用いた骨格性下顎前突症例の咽頭気道形態について検討し、知見を得たので報告する。

【資料および方法】上下顎同時移動術31例（ケース群）、1級矯正単独28例（コントロール群）の初診時、術前矯正終了時（ケース群のみ）、終了時の3ステージ（コントロール群は2ステージ）の側面セファロX線写真の中咽頭部における5点（PPS, SPPS, MPS, IPS, EPS）の距離計測を行った。（1）初診時、および矯正治療後における対照群とケース群の各点での咽頭気道の広さの比較、（2）コントロール群とケース群について、初診時と治療後の各点での咽頭気道の広さの変化について共分散分析（ANCOVA）を用いて検討を行った。

【結果】1）初診時では、ケース群のSPPS（軟口蓋ー咽頭後壁）はコントロール群と比較して有意に広かったが（p<0.05）、多重比較では有意差は認められなかった。2）矯正後では、ケース群のSPPSとMPS（PSPー咽頭後壁）はコントロール群に比べ有意に広かったが（p<0.05）、多重比較では有意差は認められなかった。3）コントロール群とケース群について治療前後の咽頭気道の広さを比較した結果、コントロール群では治療後のPPS（PNSー咽頭後壁）が治療前に比較して有意に広くなっていたが、多重比較では有意差が認められなかった。ケース群では治療後のPPSが治療前に比較して多重比較の意味において有意に広くなっていた（p<0.01）。

【考察】治療前は中咽頭上部のスペースはコントロール群と比較して狭く、下部は広く、治療後では上部は広くなり下部は狭くなるという仮説を立てた。しかしながら、上下顎同時移動術症例は上顎骨の複雑な三次元的移動を伴うため、有意差が少ないと考えられた。

【結論】骨格性下顎前突症例が上下顎同時移動術により改善すると同時に中咽頭気道上部（PPS）は術前と比較し有意に広くなっていった。また、中咽頭下部は狭くなる傾向がみられた。