Journal of Dentistry and Dental Practices
ISSN: 2689-5994

Academic Strive
Researcher's perception is our reality

Review Article *Volume 6 Issue 2*

Role of Robotics in Complex Maxillofacial Reconstruction

Tiwari G*, Patil VV, Vaishya TP, Gazali A, Yadav V and Pandey S

D Y Patil University, India

***Corresponding author:** Gautam Tiwari, D Y Patil University, School of Dentistry, Maharashtra, India, Email: 18gautamtiwari@gmail.com

Received Date: November 26, 2024; **Published Date:** December 06, 2024

Abstract

Minimally invasive surgery (MIS) has revolutionized various medical disciplines, including oral and maxillofacial surgery, where challenges such as complex neurovascular pathways, vital anatomical structures, and functional aesthetics often complicate procedures. Robotic-assisted surgery, an innovation stemming from advances in imaging technologies and automation, has emerged as a transformative approach to overcome these limitations. This study explores the integration of robotic systems in maxillofacial surgery, focusing on their precision, enhanced visualization, and minimally invasive benefits. However, global disparities exist in the adoption of such technologies, with developed countries having greater access due to better infrastructure and financial resources compared to developing nations. Addressing these disparities requires policy support and international collaboration.

Minimally invasive surgery (MIS) has revolutionized various medical disciplines, including oral and maxillofacial surgery, where challenges such as complex neurovascular pathways, vital anatomical structures, and functional aesthetics often complicate procedures. Robotic-assisted surgery, an innovation stemming from advances in imaging technologies and automation, has emerged as a transformative approach to overcome these limitations. This study explores the integration of robotic systems in maxillofacial surgery, focusing on their precision, enhanced visualization, and minimally invasive benefits. A systematic review of literature, imaging methodologies, and case studies reveals that robotic systems offer unparalleled advantages in orthognathic surgeries, tumor resections, and temporomandibular joint reconstructions, ensuring superior outcomes with reduced surgical morbidity and faster recovery.

However, significant barriers, including high costs, steep learning curves, and the lack of tactile feedback, present challenges to widespread adoption. This research highlights the critical role of imaging technologies, such as CT and MRI, in preoperative planning and intraoperative navigation, emphasizing their synergy with robotic platforms. While robotic surgery demonstrates significant promise in addressing the aesthetic and functional demands of maxillofacial procedures, further advancements in technology, training protocols, and cost-efficiency are required to optimize its integration into routine clinical practice.

Keywords: Craniofacial Surgery; Jaw Reconstruction; Less Invasive Surgical Techniques; Robotic-Assisted Procedures; Advanced Surgical Imaging Systems

Tiwari G, et al. Role of Robotics in Complex Maxillofacial Reconstruction. Dentistry & Dent Pract J 2024, 6(2): 180086.

Copyright © 2024 Tiwari G, et al.

Abbreviations

MIS: Minimally Invasive Surgery; AI: Artificial Intelligence, ML: Machine Learning, AR: Augmented Reality; OSAS: Obstructive Sleep Apnea Syndrome.

Introduction

Advancements in minimally invasive surgery (MIS) have significantly progressed, particularly in head and neck procedures, where traditional techniques often result in visible scars due to the nature of required incisions. However, challenges such as navigating intricate neurovascular pathways, visualizing operative fields, and operating near critical anatomical structures have historically limited the adoption of MIS in oral and maxillofacial surgery [1,2].

The term "robot" derives from the Czech word robota, meaning "forced labor," and was introduced in Karel Čapek's 1921 play Rossum's Universal Robots. This plays envisioned robots taking over repetitive tasks to allow humans to focus on creative activities Zhu, G, et al. [3]. While this concept resonates with the integration of robotics into surgery, its practical use is geared toward improving precision, minimizing invasiveness, and enhancing patient outcomes. Robotic systems have transformed surgical practices since their introduction in 1988, where they assisted with brain biopsies [4,5].

In 1972, NASA proposed the concept of "robotic" or "telepresence" surgery to enable remote medical care for astronauts in space. Telepresence refers to the operation of robotic systems from a distance during surgical procedures [6]. The 1980s saw a surge in robotic surgical technologies, driven by the rising popularity of microinvasive techniques and the limitations of conventional surgical tools [7,8].

Historically, minimally invasive methods in head and neck surgery were avoided due to challenges such as limited visualization, the risk of damage to vital structures, and inadequate instrumentation [9]. Recent technological advancements, including robot-assisted surgery, have addressed these challenges, paving the way for safer and less traumatic procedures Lee CR, et al. [10,11].

Methodology

This study examines the role of robots in intricate maxillofacial reconstruction via a thorough literature review, imaging methodologies, and technological innovations. Prominent databases, including PubMed and IEEE Xplore, were examined, concentrating on imaging modalities such as CT, MRI, and ultrasonography. Applications in orthognathic surgery, tumor excision, and temporomandibular joint surgery were evaluated, focusing on precision, visualization, and results. The data gathering encompassed clinical trials and expert opinions, while theme analysis underscored patterns and problems. Ethical and financial factors, training initiatives, and system functionalities such as stereoscopic vision were assessed. The findings underscores the necessity for continued investigation to mitigate constraints and improve robotic integration.

Review

Imaging Technologies Related to Surgical Robotics

Medical imaging is pivotal in the domain of surgical robotics, enhancing visualization and precision during procedures. Non-invasive imaging techniques such as CT scans, MRI, X-rays, and ultrasound are extensively utilized to capture detailed anatomical data. These technologies offer high-resolution imagery that supports robotic systems in planning and performing surgical operations with minimal invasiveness [12].

Moreover, advanced sensors, including visual, optical, and electromagnetic ones, facilitate the creation of preoperative 3D models and navigation images. These tools generate real-time, high-precision spatial models that are instrumental for surgical planning and intraoperative guidance. Such 3D models provide surgeons with an improved understanding of intricate anatomical structures, ensuring accurate robotic maneuvers [13].

This discussion delves into the fundamental principles, benefits, drawbacks, and real-world applications of these imaging technologies in robotic surgery. It also examines potential challenges, such as radiation risks during imaging or errors arising from sensor inaccuracies, and explores strategies to mitigate these risks, ultimately prioritizing patient safety and optimizing surgical outcomes [14].

Image-Based Dual-Cross Categorization

Imaging technologies can be classified based on two key dimensions: the nature of the object being imaged and the frequency of target tracking. These are defined as direct or indirect imaging and continuous, intermittent continuous, or discontinuous imaging. The direct versus indirect classification pertains to how well the image reflects the morphological and anatomical features of the target tissue, which affects the precision and reliability of the information obtained.

Meanwhile, the continuous, intermittent continuous, and discontinuous distinction is based on how frequently the imaging system updates, often related to human visual perception and the speed of image acquisition and processing. To ensure patient safety, it is important to minimize the use of imaging techniques that may pose risks to living tissues whenever feasible.

This dual-dimensional framework offers a structured overview of the various imaging methods used in surgical robotics. Additionally, a graphical representation was created to illustrate the applications of these imaging techniques within the field of surgical robotics [15,16].

Application of Robotic Surgery in Maxillofacial Procedures

Orthognathic Surgery: Robotic surgery has transformed orthognathic procedures, particularly in the correction and alignment of the jaw. With robotic assistance, surgeons can execute highly detailed planning and perform intricate osteotomies with remarkable accuracy. This approach not only improves the precision of bone realignment but also contributes to enhanced facial aesthetics and functional outcomes. The three-dimensional visualization capabilities of robotic systems play a pivotal role in achieving these results by offering superior spatial awareness during surgery [17].

Tumor Resection: Maxillofacial tumors provide distinct complications owing to their closeness to vital tissues. Robotic surgery allows doctors to precisely locate and excise malignancies, reducing harm to adjacent tissues. This is especially vital for preserving facial attractiveness and ensuring good function following tumor removal [18].

TMJ surgery can significantly impact a patient's quality of life due to its complex nature. Robotic surgery allows precise manipulation and rebuilding of complicated TMJs. After surgery, discomfort is reduced and joint function improves [19].

Maxillofacial Robotic Surgery Benefits

Precision and Accuracy: Precision is a major benefit of robotic surgery. In delicate maxillofacial procedures, robotic technology are more accurate. Precision improves surgery, reduces complications, and boosts patient happiness.

Better visualization: Robotic systems give surgeons stunning three-dimensional views of the operating field. This better visual input simplifies surgical planning and execution. Surgeons can navigate complex anatomical structures with more confidence, improving their decision-making.

Minimal Invasion: Numerous robotic maxillofacial surgery procedures are less invasive than open procedures. Patients heal faster, have less postoperative pain, and damage fewer tissues.

Improved Surgeon Ergonomics: Robotic systems enhance surgical ergonomics. Surgeons use hand and foot controls to maneuver the robotic arms while seated comfortably. This reduces surgeon fatigue and improves efficacy during long surgeries.

Challenges: Cost and Accessibility: Robotic technology in craniofacial surgery may be costly to acquire and use, despite its benefits. This raises accessibility concerns, as not all medical facilities can afford this technology. Finding a balance between robotic surgery's cost-effectiveness and benefits is difficult.

Robotic surgical systems, while transformative, face challenges such as high costs, limited tactile feedback, and steep learning curves for surgical teams. Addressing these challenges involves developing cost-effective solutions, incorporating advanced haptic feedback technologies, and establishing comprehensive training programs. These measures are critical for expanding the accessibility and efficacy of robotic systems in diverse healthcare settings.

Learning and Training

Expert robotic surgery requires specific training for surgeons and teams. Institutions must undergo considerable training to safely and effectively use robotic technologies due of the learning curve. Continuous education is needed to keep surgical teams informed of new advances (Table 1).

Authors	Journal	Key Findings	Objectives
Mouret PH [1]	Digestive Surgery	Introduced laparoscopic cholecystectomy as a groundbreaking approach.	Exploring the future potential of laparoscopic surgery.
Zhu, G. et al. [3]	Hua Xi Kou Qiang Yi Xue Za Zhi	Detailed the evolution from endoscope-assisted to full endoscopic salivary gland surgeries.	Understanding trends in salivary gland resection techniques.
Rui, T. et al. [4]	International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery	Endoscopic approaches showed superior outcomes for preserving submandibular gland function.	Comparing endoscopic and conventional methods for benign submandibular tumors.
Chen, S. et al. [5]	Translational Cancer Research	A novel seven-step approach for gasless endoscopic parotidectomy.	Optimizing surgical steps for parotid gland surgeries.

Hargest, R. [6]	Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine	Described the organizational challenges and benefits of robotic surgeries.	Reviewing advancements in robotic and minimal access surgery.
Daykan, Y. et al. [7]	Best Practice & Research: Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology	Robot-assisted techniques provide improved precision in pelvic floor surgeries.	Analyzing the effectiveness of robotic systems in gynecological procedures.
Sampieri, C. et al. [9]	Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery	Multiport systems are superior in handling complex hypopharyngeal surgeries.	Comparing single-port vs multiport robotic systems for transoral surgeries.
Qin, X. et al. [11]	International Journal of Surgery	Robotic surgery demonstrated better quality-of-life outcomes than open surgery for thyroidectomy.	Assessing parathyroid function post-thyroidectomy using robotic vs open methods.
Woo, S. H, et al. [13]	Oral Oncology	Endoscope-assisted hairline approach reduces visible scarring in submandibular gland excisions.	Improving aesthetic outcomes for gland surgeries.
Liu, Y. et al. [17]	International Journal of Surgery	Kangduo system showed comparable short-term outcomes to the Da Vinci system in colon cancer surgeries.	Evaluating performance metrics of two robotic systems in colorectal surgeries.

Table 1: Literature Review Table.

Discussion

Ethical considerations in robotic surgery include ensuring data privacy and managing the risks associated with replacing human expertise with automated processes. Additionally, the integration of artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning (ML), and augmented reality (AR) can significantly enhance robotic-assisted maxillofacial surgery by improving decision-making, precision, and overall outcomes. These advancements necessitate robust training protocols and ethical oversight to ensure safe and effective application.

Advantages of robotic surgery

Two or more integrated cameras can make the surgical field stereoscopic and magnify it 10–15 times, helping the surgeon distinguish normal tissues from malignancies and save them [12]. Thus, the tumor can be removed en bloc, reducing morbidity and speeding recovery [13]. Robotic surgery can remove malignancies using transoral and retroauricular methods, decreasing complications and functional impairment [14]. No intraoperative or postoperative blood transfusions were needed, and blood loss was limited [15]. Internet and satellite technology enable remote and real-time collaborative surgery [16]. Optimizing healthcare workers. The robotic surgical system requires only one surgeon, anesthesiologist, and one or two nurses for complex surgeries [17-19].

Constraints of robotic surgery

Robotic surgical systems lack proprioception and tactile feedback, making it difficult to assess tissue resilience, detect radial pulses, or manage hemorrhages promptly. This limitation can lead to complications such as suture failure from excessive tension and a higher incidence of postoperative lingual edema compared to traditional techniques [20-23].

Conclusion

Future advancements in robotics for maxillofacial surgery should prioritize the integration of cutting-edge technologies such as AI, ML, and AR. These technologies can enhance precision, reduce complications, and improve patient outcomes. Collaborative efforts between researchers, clinicians, and policymakers are essential to overcoming current limitations and ensuring equitable access to these innovations.

Surgical procedures in the oral, maxillofacial, and cranial regions present significant challenges due to their complex anatomy, the proximity of critical structures, and the high expectations for both functional and aesthetic outcomes. Robotic-assisted surgery in these areas has shown encouraging benefits, such as reduced surgical complications, quicker recovery times, and effective management of diseases.

Despite these advancements, further research is needed to expand the use of robotic systems for treating conditions like head and neck tumors, cleft lip and palate, and obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS). This will require the development of innovative techniques and improvements in existing robotic technologies to better meet the specific demands of these procedures.

References

1. Mouret PH (1991) From the first laparoscopic cholecystectomy to the frontiers of laparoscopic surgery: The future prospectives. Digestive Surgery 8(2): 124-1245.
2. Steiner W, Ambrosch P (2000) Endoscopic laser surgery of the upper aerodigestive tract: With special emphasison cancer surgery. Thieme.
3. Zhu G, Li C (2023) Developments and trends of endoscopic salivary gland resection: from endoscope-assisted to full endoscopic. Hua Xi Kou Qiang Yi Xue Za Zhi 41(4): 377-384.
4. Rui T, Qiu P, Wang P, Wu G, Fu M, et al. (2023) Benign submandibular gland tumours: outcomes of gland-preserving excision by endoscopic or conventional approach. International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery 52(7): 760-767.
5. Chen S, Alkebsi K, Xuan M, Wang XY, Li LJ, et al. (2022) Single incision-plus approach for gasless endoscopic parotidectomy: a seven-step procedure. Transl Cancer Res 11(7): 2462-2472.
6. Hargest R (2021) Five thousand years of minimal access surgery: 1990-present: organisational issues and the rise of the robots. J R Soc Med 114(2): 69-76.
7. Daykan Y, Rotem R, O Reilly BA (2023) Robot-assisted laparoscopic pelvic floor surgery: review. Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol 91: 102418.
8. Taffinder N, Smith SG, Huber J, Russell RC, Darzi A (1999) The effect of a second-generation 3D endoscope on the laparoscopic precision of novices and experienced surgeons. Surg Endosc 13(11): 1087-1092.
9. Sampieri C, Pirola F, Costantino A, Kim D, Ho JJ, et al. (2023) Single-port versus multiport da Vinci system for transoral robotic surgery of hypopharyngeal and laryngeal carcinoma. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 169(3): 548-555.
10. Lee CR, Chung WY (2015) Robotic surgery for thyroid disease. Minerva Chir 70(5): 331-339.
11. Qin X, Luo J, Ma J, Cao X, Zhao J, et al (2023) Prospective cohort study of parathyroid function and quality of life after total thyroidectomy for thyroid cancer: robotic surgery vs. open surgery. Int J Surg 109(12): 3974-3982.
12. Guidera AK, Dawes PJD, Fong A, Stringer MD (2014) Head and neck fascia and compartments: no space for spaces. Head Neck 36(7): 1058-1068.
13. Woo SH, Park JJ, Kwon M, Kim JP (2017) Hidden scar' submandibular gland excision using an endoscope-assisted hairline approach. Oral Oncol 65: 83-88.
14. Fan S, Dai X, Yang K, Xiong S, Xiong G, et al. (2021) Robot-assisted pyeloplasty using a new robotic system, the KangDuo-Surgical Robot-01: a prospective, single-centre, single-arm clinical study. BJU Int 128(2): 162-165.
15. Fan S, Zhang Z, Wang J, Xiong S, Dai X, et al. (2022) Robot-assisted radical prostatectomy using the KangDuo Surgical Robot-01 system: a prospective, single-center, single-arm clinical study. J Urol 208(1): 119-127.
16. Xiong S, Fan S, Chen S, Wang X, Han G, et al. (2023) Robotic urologic surgery using the KangDuo-Surgical Robot-01 system: a single-center prospective analysis. Chin Med J 136(24): 2960-2966.
17. Liu Y, Wang Y, Wang C, Wang X, Zhang X, et al. (2024) Comparison of short-term outcomes of robotic-assisted radical colon cancer surgery using the Kangduo Surgical Robotic system and the Da Vinci Si Robotic system: a prospective cohort study. Int J Surg 110(3): 1511-1518.
18. Dai X, Fan S, Hao H, Yang K, Shen C, et al. (2021) Comparison of KD-SR-01 robotic partial nephrectomy and 3D-laparoscopic partial nephrectomy from an operative and ergonomic perspective: a prospective randomized controlled study in porcine models. Int J Med Robot 17(2): e2187.
19. Kiong KL, Iyer NG, Skanthakumar T, Fai Ng JC, Tan NC, et al. (2015) Transaxillary thyroidectomies: a comparative learning experience of robotic vs endoscopic thyroidectomies. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 152(2): 820-826.
20. Kashwani R, Ahuja G, Narula V, Jose AT, Kulkarni V, et al. (2024) Future of dental care: integrating AI, metaverse, AR/VR, teledentistry, CAD & 3D printing, blockchain and CRISPR innovations. Community Pract 21(106): 123-137.
21. Kashwani R, Kulkarni V, Salam S, Sharma S, Rathi P, et al. (2024) Virtual vs augmented reality in the field of dentistry. Community Pract 21: 603.
22. Yang TL, Li H, Holsinger FC, Koh YW (2019) Submandibular gland resection via the trans-hairline approach: a preclinical study of a novel flexible single-port surgical system and the surgical experiences of standard multiarm robotic surgical systems. Head Neck 41(7): 2231-2238.

23. Kashwani R, Sawhney H (2023) Dentistry and metaverse: A deep dive into potential of blockchain, NFTs, and crypto in healthcare. International Dental Journal of Student's Research 11(3): 94-98.