



## New methods for craniofacial bone reconstruction: review

Nawres Bahaa Mohammed<sup>1</sup>, Murtadha Mohammed Baqer Easa<sup>2</sup>, Maytham Yahya Al-Tufaili<sup>3\*</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Assistant professor, Maxillofacial surgery Department, college of dentistry , University of Al-Ameed, Karbala, Iraq.

<sup>2</sup>Teacher, Maxillofacial surgery Department, college of dentistry , National University for science and technology, Thi-Qar, Iraq.

<sup>3</sup>Teacher, Restorative Department, college of dentistry , National University for science and technology, Thi-Qar, Iraq.

\***Corresponding author:** Maytham Yahya Al-Tufaili, Teacher, Restorative Department, college of dentistry , National University for science and technology, Thi-Qar, Iraq, Email: Maithamy788@gmail.com

**Submitted: 05 January 2023; Accepted: 15 February 2023; Published: 03 March 2023**

---

### ABSTRACT

**Foundation and Objective:** The craniofacial structures are mind-boggling and stylishly the main part of appearance. The objective of the review is to highlight the advances in bone remaking and its likely use in craniofacial skeletal imperfections. Progresses in uniting and tissue move strategies have worked on the careful results however our capacity to completely recover the lost or flawed tissue is restricted.

**Methods:** A point-by-point information-based search utilizing google researcher was performed searching for articles in English with the hunt including the accompanying terms: bone recovery, tissue designing, craniofacial recreation, platforms, and osteoinductive development factors. The inquiry was enhanced by checking references of applicable audit articles.

**Key Content and Findings:** Currently, research and clinical ways to accomplish craniofacial bone recovery are endeavoring to move to new methods to avoid serious medical procedures. Presently, no strategy has been demonstrated to satisfy all qualities expected to supplant autologous uniting as the new best quality level.

**Conclusions:** Currently the highest quality level for craniofacial bone recovery is as yet autologous uniting, yet the obtrusiveness and careful morbidities included have incited exploration to investigate further choices. The fuse of personal computer (PC) helped plans have progressed the capacity to imitate the setups, morphologic attributes, and mechanical capacity of the local site.

**Keywords:** *Bone regeneration; tissue engineering; craniofacial reconstruction*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Reconstructive medical procedures can demonstrate trouble in enormous craniofacial skeletal deformities from innate circumstances, injury, or disease resections, which can cause critical useful, stylish, and mental hindrances to patients. The skeleton-facial breakdown is frequently connected with the gamble of useful aggravations (twofold ptosis and vision); as well as tasteful unsettling influences (facial imbalance) (1). Until this point, the supreme material is accessible to fix these post-terrible imperfections and reestablish work.

## 2. DISCUSSION

Facial skeleton reconstruction is quite difficult for specialists because of hardships with the upkeep of long-haul stylish and practical impacts. The utilization of various procedures and materials has fundamentally impacted how specialists continue with patients who have post-awful grumblings (2). Hoffmann et al. (In 1998,) found the use of dental prosthodontic methodology to foster a singular skeletal facial fabricated of metal oxide fired (3). Around then, the high-level designing techniques applied today were not accessible (4). From that point forward, PC projects and PC innovation have grown new apparatuses that are considerably more impressive.

### 2.1 Alloplastic Materials

Alloplastic materials are accessible for the reconstruction of facial-cranial fractures by incorporating titanium, plastics (like acrylates, and permeable polyethylene), and ceramics (like bioactive creative glass, hydroxyapatite, tricalcium phosphate, calcium sulfate or aluminum oxide) (5). Inserts fabricated alloplastic materials (like titanium network, hydroxyapatite, and permeable polyethylene) promise great elasticity however have the chance of contamination, death, or relocation of the facial reconstruction (6).

#### 2.1.1. Metallic materials

Titanium (Ti) metal is one of the biocompatible materials and is considered a safe metal material. It is synthetically fabricated and its physiological properties are inactive (7). The Ti versatility

related to the bone is better than that of some other metals (8). Ti metal is tracked down in the geosphere, however acquiring unadulterated titanium metal (with under one percent added substances) is troublesome and costly, involving the extraction of Ti from iron metal by multipart cycles. Ti is considered one of the osteosynthesis materials because it contains a low proportion of aluminum, vanadium, or niobium. Despite the low harmfulness effects of titanium; it will be prolonged by a mixture of added substances (like aluminum that can assemble in occasions of kidney dissatisfaction, and its neuro-toxic effect) (9). As of now, titanium is open in a couple of designs: like plates, screws, or nets. Now, specific plates are connected to the disservice of rectangular plates (5).

Ti screws and plates have a decent hardness and adaptability for unyielding fixation of the broken bone through the repairing time and are normally torpid (10). Likewise, titanium appends to neighbouring bones and habitually stays asymptomatic (11). Ti involving pullouts can cause contamination, torment, unfamiliar body response, or even kidney disappointment by collecting consumption items (12). Also, the possible expulsion of facial reconstruction in the wake of recuperating is disputable (5). Medical procedures are required to eliminate this contamination from Ti facial reconstruction in such a situation.

Ti facial reconstruction that is utilized in craniofacial proliferation is the most part created in standard shapes during operation; they are acclimated to the actual condition of the patient's bone flaw. This manual variety to the actual condition of the patient's bone during an operation is monotonous and a wellspring of error in the extreme change to the patient's bone disfigurement, specifically for experts who have a relatively little contribution (13).

Furthermore, the manual transformation includes different controls of the facial reconstruction, which prompts expanded interior mechanical pressure on the Ti facial reconstruction. This outcome in numerous clinical difficulties, involving insert burst, erosion, debilitating of the screws, and bone resorption (14, 15). Forming and twisting titanium network plates can be testing and can prompt blunders (16).

### **2.1.2 Zirconium dioxide (zirconia) materials**

A terminated material with genuine details has long been esteemed in the space business to protect transports and create clinical devices. In 1969, zirconium dioxide (ZrO<sub>2</sub>) material was first perused up by solid well-being for the replacement of the hip head (17). Starting around 1985, ZrO<sub>2</sub> has been applied to make the phoney top of the hip (18). Its peculiar break resistance (2000 N), pressure block (2000 MPa), and biocompatibility have found their application in facial reconstruction to reproduce missing teeth as well as hips, knees, shoulders, and wrists (17). Its mechanical properties are fundamentally equivalent to those of metals. MgO, CaO, or Y<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> interstitials are being added for more obvious sub-nuclear strength. The most focused blend is yttrium-offset zirconia, generally called tetragonal zirconia polycrystals. ZrO<sub>2</sub> offset with Y<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> has favoured mechanical properties over various blends (17).

Disregarding an essentially more problematic course of sintering; this kind of zirconia is used for clinical tenders. The usage of different materials rises out of the preferred issue. Autologous associations are the most standard way to deal with redoing hurt skeletal plans; in any case, a cozy relationship has been certified among reabsorption and will grow to the level of clinical enophthalmos (19). The usage of alloplastic materials appreciates many advantages, similar to the strength of volume and nonappearance of perioperative awfulness, like the strength of volume and absence of perioperative horribleness, as well as downsides, like significant expenses and absence of adequate perseverance to inert and active anxieties (20). Finally, the condition of the entertainment material is critical. The talk had no CAD/CAM support; so, it will exhibit the material truly. This type of approach started with change quite a while ago.

### **2.1.3 Resorbable type Osteosynthesis Materials**

Damages of titanium facial reconstructions for osteosynthesis recall the necessity for cautious intervention for example challenges, cranium advancement in young people that can provoke the development of the reconstruction, antipathy for low temperatures, and imaging impedance, which have incited the prerequisite to improve elective plans: bioresorbable polymers (11, 21). Polymers are tremendous particles fabricated

with an emphasis on subunits. It can be assembled into porous and non-penetrable, and resorbable and non-resorbable, independently (7, 22).

Medpor (really high-thickness porous polyethylene) is a non-resorbable, and uneasy moulded polymer that has been in many cases utilized in the minimal floor of orbit deserts (23). This type of material has a smooth external surface and is incredibly biocompatible because the holes grant the improvement of veins and connective tissue (24). Medpor showed that titanium facial reconstructions got autologous bone tissue, yet illness rates were lower (7). Porous type of polyethylene has additionally exhibited its efficacy in redoing deserts with extraordinary boundaries to help the titanium facial reconstruction (25). It has extraordinary strength and can be changed well to the blemish. One advantage of utilizing of porous type of polyethylene material is the cost and the habit of preventing the takeoff of fluids from the environment (26).

Lately, a couple of assessments intended to deal with these issues. Such appropriations demonstrated that mixing aluminum with magnesium intensifies chips away at their fortitude. In any case, further investigation is supposed to decrease magnesium weights (hydrogen creation, low biocompatibility, and high disintegration) (11).

### **2.1.4 Mixtures of Material**

Various potential mixes are using the materials referred to already. Titanium-upheld porous polyethylene-type sheets can be utilized for the reconstruction of complex orbital defects (27). The occupation of titanium is to slide addiction into the bone, which makes the facial reconstruction's control more specific. What's more, titanium elements make facial reconstruction in a radiopaque state (26).

### **2.1.5 Patient-Specific facial Reconstructions**

Patient-explicit inserts are carefully planned inserts in light of the contralateral circle, which can be utilized to remake perplexing and broad orbital breaks (28). They partake in the compensations of biocompatibility, and radiopacity, and are raised more consistently than genuinely turned titanium (29). So, it can be

placed in a specific region with an intraoperative CT course (30). Then again, making the facial reconstruction is tedious and costly, and it requires a flawless contralateral circle (26).

Lately, an always expanding number of revisions have itemized the utilization of 3D-printed patient explicit supplements (31). Li et al. nitty gritty eighteen occasions of maxilla-mandibular amusement using 3D printed additions and 8 cases of maxillofacial generation utilizing 3D printed patient-express titanium facial reconstruction in ortho-gnathic operation. The survey found that the patient-express facial reconstructions had a colossal upgrade in morphology, and gigantic and complex desert shapes (14). In 2014, Stoor et al. found an examination of twelve generations of orbit utilizing a 3D printed patient unequivocal supplement of modified thickness and changed size; where it counts flaw (32). Furthermost installs were set via a subsidiary cut and fixed with two millimeters of screw length (33). The previous surveys demonstrated a shortening in the time of operation (1.17 hours utilizing patient-express facial reconstruction, correspondingly 1.57 hours utilizing a procedure of intraoperative bending) yet what's more than two patient-unequivocal supplements (sixteen percent) had a deceptive form, because of the mixed-up CAD since data of small bone didn't move precisely to CAD and achieved a screw-up. Stoor et al. suggested that these "thin bone eccentricities" could maybe be tended to in the future by using the morphometry of the airspace in the opposite maxillary sinus as opposed to the hard plan. Rotaru et al. presented a movement of 10 propagations of the calvaria using 3D-printed titanium facial reconstructions analyzing both the degree of uniformity and the complexities (14, 34). The examination found that the qualification between the volume of the recreated right calvaria and the left calvaria was not basic, while the upscale appearance was altogether better (34).

Numerous assessments have been appropriated actually for seeing titanium additions with 3D printing; that were created as ordinary and genuinely changed through an action (35). Wilde et al. examined two sorts of additions to the extent that biomechanical belongings and assumed that 3D-printed ones suggest predominant constancy and firmness (14). Regardless, the chief benefit of changed 3D-

printed facial reconstruction is the quickness of the operation time and evidently in a short time of the sedation and diminishing its dangers, in addition to the precision of changing the facial reconstruction; where it counts flaw by the remaking volume of orbit, that controls a well utilitarian outcome concurring than the assessment of visual motility, besides the binocular vision (36). This closure is similarly maintained by Zimmerer et al. besides, Fan et al. (37-39). Though, the use of 3D-printed facial reconstruction is the greatest decision for orbit, specifically in those that include gigantic bone disfigurements.

### **2.1.6 Resorbable Sheetting type**

Regarding facial reconstruction materials, the resorbable sheetting type has been effectively utilized to replicate breaks through little openings and stable equal and normal limits. The resorbable sheetting type is a composite of polyglactin, poly-L/D-lactide, and polydioxanone. They have also exhibited significant pediatric orbital breaks. A few creators suggest its utilization for surrenders <2.5 cm because of the deficiency of long-haul underlying scaffolding (40). Resorbable sheetting is malleable and can be changed by the deformity. The benefits of resorbable sheetting type are widespread openness, extraordinary portability in the injury, an opportunity for intra-operative forming, and flat surfaces and edges. The weights consolidate their cost, radiolucent (postoperative facial reconstruction shouldn't be visible), damage of the material can change the shape, sterilized worsening, serous circle leakage is less powerful than in titanium organizations, and extended stretch consistent quality and care (26, 41).

Polycaprolactone (PCL) is considered a biodegradable polyester material that partakes in a couple of benefits like its hydrophobicity and unhurried-corrupting (up to 2 y) and it can be mixed with HAP with the external layer of the material (42). Polycaprolactone facial reconstruction has been utilized for enormous deformations (more than 20 mm level measurement flaw) with extraordinary outcomes like little distortions, and the original bone advancement envisioned on CT takes a look at 1.5 years after facial reconstruction (43). Intricacies connected with fibrovascular reconciliation into the permeable facial

reconstruction may build the gamble of limitation and diplopia because of cauterization between the permeable facial reconstruction and the delicate tissue of orbit (44).

## 2.2 *Newest Discoveries*

Ongoing disclosures in regards to the remaking of the craniofacial skeleton incorporate the utilization of morphogenetic protein of bone in blend through different biomaterials, for example, bioresorbable manufactured polymer to help their mix, demineralized bone, surface changes damage the osseointegration, bifocal interruption osteogenic process, and tissue designing (5).

Since exorbitant wear and untimely corruption can unfavourably influence the biocompatible property of materials that are utilized to reproduce different sorts of breaks, forestalling recuperating and making extended haul adverse consequences, the accentuation has as of late been on working on their properties (45). In this manner, these materials can be stacked with normal components, for instance, morphogenetic protein-2 of bone, changing improvement factors, fibroblasts, platelet, and vascular endothelial advancement factors; to quicken cell association and biocompatibility, or to convey fundamental particles and particles during the biodegradation of supporting materials (Table 2). The magnesium model demonstrates particles that stimulatingly influence the time of new bone tissue (46).

Added substance delivery has been utilized for various surfaces in dissimilar biomaterials: polymers, metals, and stoneware. Two kinds of changes in material surface, that can be utilized on entertainment materials to work on their biocompatibility and their sizes like real modifications and engineered changes. Genuine modifications consolidate coarseness affecting, machining effect, and drawing; which lead to variations in the shape of the material surface. Manufactured strategies integrate plasma and substance rage and electro-engineered or atomic layer declaration and can achieve single or different layer coatings using different combinations, or atomic layer proclamation and can achieve single or various layer coatings using different blends, oxidizing nitrating or carbide a surface, molecule facial reconstruction and functionalization of surface (47).

## 2.3 *Modifications of Metallic Biomaterial, Polymer, and Ceramic Surfaces by Using Additive Manufacturing*

Metal facial reconstructions are considered a bad environment for cell connection; because of their smoothness and decrease in their wettability (48). To repair tissue, blend for metallic biomaterials, added substance creating was utilized to make repulsiveness and get a permeable development in the farthest layer; while endeavouring to save a thick plan inside. Appearing differently about even out titanium, facial reconstruction got after added substance creation has provoked better mineralization in vitro (47).

In any case, these movements in surface geography could similarly impact the correspondences between pathogenic microorganisms and surfaces. To the extent that; metallic biomaterials (like 3D-printing ones) are a hopeful methodology for changing their plans to increase biocompatibility (49). Regardless, this procedure will improve the surface connection between the facial reconstructions and tissues with extended molecule release from the facial reconstruction. In this way, the addition of a dirt or polymer coating to the external layer of the 3D-printed facial reconstructions confines the appearance of particles (46).

The essential change required for stoneware creation is a polymeric covering. It works on the facial reconstruction's uprightness in laboratory studies and stays aware of stable conveyance profiles; while, the surface modifications of ceramic facial reconstruction s happen commonly in the ground of resorbable medicine movement strategies (47).

In all polymer improvements, regularly huge changes to the arrangement record of the device are by starting material piece adaptation to provoke nano-topography and micro-topography, assortment in substance blend, and even crystallin surfaces (47). In Hydroxyapatite crystallin, calcium and phosphate were utilized in specific assessments with polymer-based materials (41, 50). This is provoked by the treatment of polymer-type materials with nano-sized and hardened clay grains at that surface (51, 52). This system finished the insert cruelly and outfitted with a substance plan and crystallin shaped-like bone (47).

## 2.4 Prospects and Future Prospects

In specific areas of the human body; some kinds of biomaterial can be utilized in the proliferation process like covered versus non-covered, autogenous/autologous/xenogeneic versus alloplastic, titan network standard versus a changed one, non-penetrable versus porous materials and resorbable versus non-resorbable. Due to the changing hardships in orbital rebuilding, at this point, there is no supreme biomaterial sensible for all circumstances. Trendy biomaterial types should truck a basic added regard not simply in regards to biocompatibility, bioactivity, and bone capacity to recuperate yet furthermore to the extent that the capability to go about lattices for postural drug transportation (53).

Despite mechanical advances in bone turn of events, new materials and techniques for bone mending keep on being examined (54). The restricting variables of bone join substitutes presently being used show that further enhancements are required (49).

## CONCLUSION

After complex cracks, the diversion of a circle can be truly challenging by the impact of the absence of vision. The reconstruction materials utilized in orbital revamping are bone and ligament autografts, alloplastic, titanium organization, penetrable-type polyethylene, resorbable sheeting, and patient-explicit reconstructions. All these reconstruction types of materials have unequivocal signs, compensations, and deterrents. Extraordinary results showed that the reconstructive operations of the orbital dividers are needed for both material and mechanical turns of events.

Finding: self-finding.

## REFERENCES

1. Metzger MC, Schön R, Weyer N, Rafii A, Gellrich N-C, Schmelzeisen R, et al. Anatomical 3-dimensional pre-bent titanium implant for orbital floor fractures. *Ophthalmology*. 2006;113(10):1863-8.
2. Klein M, Glatzer C. Individual CAD/CAM fabricated glass-bioceramic implants in reconstructive surgery of the bony orbital floor. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery*. 2006;117(2):565-70.
3. Hoffmann J, Cornelius CP, Groten M, Pröbster L, Pfannenbergl C, Schwenzler N. Orbital reconstruction with individually copy-milled ceramic implants. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery*. 1998;101(3):604-12.
4. Elgalal MT, Kozakiewicz M, Loba P, Walkowiak B, Olszycki M, Stefańczyk L. Patient specific implants, designed using Rapid Prototyping and diagnostic imaging, for the repair of orbital fractures. *Medical Science Monitor*. 2010;16(1):75-9.
5. Neumann A, Kevenhoerster K. Biomaterials for craniofacial reconstruction. *GMS current topics in otorhinolaryngology, head and neck surgery*. 2009;8.
6. Pan H, Zhang Z, Tang W, Li Z, Deng Y. Bioresorbable material in secondary orbital reconstruction surgery. *Journal of Ophthalmology*. 2019;2019.
7. Ye L-X, Sun X-M, Zhang Y-G, Zhang Y. Materials to facilitate orbital reconstruction and soft tissue filling in posttraumatic orbital deformities. *Plastic and Aesthetic Research*. 2016;3:86-91.
8. Ellis E, Messo E. Use of nonresorbable alloplastic implants for internal orbital reconstruction. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery*. 2004;62(7):873-81.
9. Kim KT, Eo MY, Nguyen TTH, Kim SM. General review of titanium toxicity. *International journal of implant dentistry*. 2019;5(1):1-12.
10. Dorri M, Nasser M, Oliver R. Resorbable versus titanium plates for facial fractures. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2009(1).
11. On S-W, Cho S-W, Byun S-H, Yang B-E. Bioabsorbable osteofixation materials for maxillofacial bone surgery: a review on polymers and magnesium-based materials. *Biomedicines*. 2020;8(9):300.
12. Matusiewicz H. Potential release of in vivo trace metals from metallic medical implants in the human body: from ions to nanoparticles—a systematic analytical review. *Acta biomaterialia*. 2014;10(6):2379-403.
13. Marchetti C, Bianchi A, Mazzoni S, Cipriani R, Campobassi A. Oromandibular reconstruction using a fibula osteocutaneous free flap: four different “preplating” techniques. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery*. 2006;118(3):643-51.
14. Du R, Su Y-X, Yan Y, Choi WS, Yang W-F, Zhang C, et al. A systematic approach for making 3D-printed patient-specific implants for craniomaxillofacial reconstruction. *Engineering*. 2020;6(11):1291-301.
15. Martola M, Lindqvist C, Hänninen H, Al-Sukhun J. Fracture of titanium plates used for mandibular reconstruction following ablative tumor surgery. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials: An Official Journal of The Society for Biomaterials, The Japanese Society for Biomaterials, and The Australian Society for Biomaterials and the Korean Society for*

- Biomaterials. 2007;80(2):345-52.
16. Wang Y-T, Huang S-F, Fang Y-T, Huang S-C, Cheng H-F, Chen C-H, et al. Anatomical thin titanium mesh plate structural optimization for zygomatic-maxillary complex fracture under fatigue testing. *BioMed Research International*. 2018;2018.
  17. Manicone PF, Iommetti PR, Raffaelli L. An overview of zirconia ceramics: basic properties and clinical applications. *Journal of dentistry*. 2007;35(11):819-26.
  18. Piconi C, Maccauro G. Zirconia as a ceramic biomaterial. *Biomaterials*. 1999;20(1):1-25.
  19. Ellis III E, Tan Y. Assessment of internal orbital reconstructions for pure blowout fractures: cranial bone grafts versus titanium mesh. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery*. 2003;61(4):442-53.
  20. Dougherty WR, Wellisz T. The natural history of alloplastic implants in orbital floor reconstruction: an animal model. *The Journal of Craniofacial Surgery*. 1994;5(1):26-32; discussion 3.
  21. Schumann P, Lindhorst D, Wagner ME, Schramm A, Gellrich N-C, Rücker M. Perspectives on resorbable osteosynthesis materials in craniomaxillofacial surgery. *Pathobiology*. 2013;80(4):211-7.
  22. Young SM, Sundar G, Lim T-C, Lang SS, Thomas G, Amrith S. Use of bioresorbable implants for orbital fracture reconstruction. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*. 2017;101(8):1080-5.
  23. Lee DJ, Kwon J, Kim Y-I, Kwon YH, Min S, Shin HW. Coating Medpor® Implant with Tissue-Engineered Elastic Cartilage. *Journal of Functional Biomaterials*. 2020;11(2):34.
  24. Hwang SM, Park SH, Lee JS, Do Kim H, Hwang MK, Kim MW. Improvement of Infraorbital Rim contour Using Medpor. *Archives of Craniofacial Surgery*. 2016;17(2):77.
  25. Lin I-C, Liao S-L, Lin LL. Porous polyethylene implants in orbital floor reconstruction. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association*. 2007;106(1):51-7.
  26. Boyette JR, Pemberton JD, Bonilla-Velez J. Management of orbital fractures: challenges and solutions. *Clinical Ophthalmology (Auckland, NZ)*. 2015;9:2127.
  27. Garibaldi DC, Iliff NT, Grant MP, Merbs SL. Use of porous polyethylene with embedded titanium in orbital reconstruction: a review of 106 patients. *Ophthalmic Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery*. 2007;23(6):439-44.
  28. Lieger O, Richards R, Liu M, Lloyd T. Computer-assisted design and manufacture of implants in the late reconstruction of extensive orbital fractures. *Archives of facial plastic surgery*. 2010;12(3):186-91.
  29. Zhang W-B, Mao C, Liu X-J, Guo C-B, Yu G-Y, Peng X. Outcomes of orbital floor reconstruction after extensive maxillectomy using the computer-assisted fabricated individual titanium mesh technique. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2015;73(10):2065. e1-. e15.
  30. Oh TS, Jeong WS, Chang TJ, Koh KS, Choi J-W. Customized orbital wall reconstruction using three-dimensionally printed rapid prototype model in patients with orbital wall fracture. *Journal of Craniofacial Surgery*. 2016;27(8):2020-4.
  31. Raisian S, Fallahi HR, Khiabani KS, Heidarizadeh M, Azdoo S. Customized titanium mesh based on the 3D printed model vs. manual intraoperative bending of titanium mesh for reconstructing of orbital bone fracture: a randomized clinical trial. *Reviews on recent clinical trials*. 2017;12(3):154-8.
  32. Stoor P, Suomalainen A, Lindqvist C, Mesimäki K, Danielsson D, Westermark A, et al. Rapid prototyped patient specific implants for reconstruction of orbital wall defects. *Journal of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2014;42(8):1644-9.
  33. Mommaerts MY, Büttner M, Vercruyse Jr H, Wauters L, Beerens M. Orbital wall reconstruction with two-piece puzzle 3D printed implants. *Cranio-maxillofacial Trauma & Reconstruction*. 2016;9(1):055-61.
  34. Rotaru H, Stan H, Florian IS, Schumacher R, Park Y-T, Kim S-G, et al. Cranioplasty with custom-made implants: analyzing the cases of 10 patients. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2012;70(2):e169-e76.
  35. Wilde F, Kasper R, Sakkas A, Pietzka S, Winter K, Schramm A, et al. Biomechanical in-vitro study concerning the stability of customized CAD/CAM mandibular reconstruction plates. Comparison of additively and subtractively manufactured as well as hand-bended plates. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2019;48:150-1.
  36. Strong EB, Fuller SC, Wiley DF, Zumbansen J, Wilson M, Metzger MC. Preformed vs intraoperative bending of titanium mesh for orbital reconstruction. *Otolaryngology--Head and Neck Surgery*. 2013;149(1):60-6.
  37. Smeets M, Snel R, Sun Y, Dormaar T, Politis C. Late reconstruction of extensive orbital floor fracture with a patient-specific implant in a bombing victim. *Journal of the Korean Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons*. 2020;46(5):353-7.
  38. Zimmerer RM, Ellis III E, Aniceto GS, Schramm A, Wagner ME, Grant MP, et al. A prospective multicenter study to compare the precision of posttraumatic internal orbital reconstruction with standard preformed and individualized orbital implants. *Journal of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2016;44(9):1485-97.

39. Fan B, Chen H, Sun Y-J, Wang B-F, Che L, Liu S-Y, et al. Clinical effects of 3-D printing-assisted personalized reconstructive surgery for blowout orbital fractures. *Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology*. 2017;255(10):2051-7.
40. Goranova KL, Kattenhøj Sloth Overgaard AK, Gitsov I. Hydroxyapatite-poly (D, L-lactide) nanografts. Synthesis and characterization as bone cement additives. *Molecules*. 2021;26(2):424.
41. Gradinaru S, Popescu LM, Piticescu RM, Zurac S, Ciuluvica R, Burlacu A, et al. Repair of the orbital wall fractures in rabbit animal model using nanostructured hydroxyapatite-based implant. *Nanomaterials*. 2016;6(1):11.
42. Archer E, Torretti M, Madbouly S. Biodegradable polycaprolactone (PCL) based polymer and composites. *Physical Sciences Reviews*. 2021.
43. Teo L, Teoh SH, Liu Y, Lim L, Tan B, Schantz J-T, et al. A novel bioresorbable implant for repair of orbital floor fractures. *Orbit*. 2015;34(4):192-200.
44. Lee HBH, Nunery WR. Orbital adherence syndrome secondary to titanium implant material. *Ophthalmic Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery*. 2009;25(1):33-6.
45. Anderson JM, Rodriguez A, Chang DT, editors. Foreign body reaction to biomaterials. *Seminars in immunology*; 2008: Elsevier.
46. Prasad K, Bazaka O, Chua M, Rochford M, Fedrick L, Spoor J, et al. Metallic biomaterials: Current challenges and opportunities. *Materials*. 2017;10(8):884.
47. Bose S, Robertson SF, Bandyopadhyay A. Surface modification of biomaterials and biomedical devices using additive manufacturing. *Acta biomaterialia*. 2018;66:6-22.
48. Bonda DJ, Manjila S, Selman WR, Dean D. The recent revolution in the design and manufacture of cranial implants: modern advancements and future directions. *Neurosurgery*. 2015;77(5):814-24.
49. Nyberg EL, Farris AL, Hung BP, Dias M, Garcia JR, Dorafshar AH, et al. 3D-printing technologies for craniofacial rehabilitation, reconstruction, and regeneration. *Annals of biomedical engineering*. 2017;45(1):45-57.
50. Verret D, Ducic Y, Oxford L, Smith J. Hydroxyapatite cement in craniofacial reconstruction. *Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery*. 2005;133(6):897-9.
51. Popescu L, Piticescu R, Antonelli A, Rusti C, Carboni E, Sfara C, et al. Recent advances in synthesis, characterization of hydroxyapatite/polyurethane composites and study of their biocompatible properties. *Journal of Materials Science: Materials in Medicine*. 2013;24(11):2491-503.
52. Matic DB, Manson PN. Biomechanical analysis of hydroxyapatite cement cranioplasty. *Journal of Craniofacial Surgery*. 2004;15(3):415-22.
53. Vasile VA, Istrate S, Iancu RC, Piticescu RM, Cursaru LM, Schmetterer L, et al. Biocompatible Materials for Orbital Wall Reconstruction—An Overview. *Materials*. 2022;15(6):2183.
54. Zemba M, Stamate A-C, Tataru CP, Branisteanu DC, Balta F. Conjunctival flap surgery in the management of ocular surface disease. *Experimental and Therapeutic Medicine*. 2020;20(4):3412-6.