

REVIEW ARTICLE



Effective management of ameloblastoma: A review

Indraniil Roy¹, Archana Louis¹, Akhilesh Verma², Omkar Shetye¹

¹Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Government Dental College and Hospital, Bambolim, Goa, India, ²Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Government Dental College and Hospital, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

Correspondence

Dr. Indraniil Roy, d-102, Socorro Gardens,
Porvorim, Goa, India.
Phone: +91-9168390722,
Tel.: +91-(832)-2418010.
E-mail: dr.indraniilroy@gmail.com

Received 12.12.2014;
Accepted 14.01.2015

doi: 10.15713/ins.ijcdmr.19

How to cite the article:

Indraniil Roy, Archana Louis,
Akhilesh Verma, Omkar Shetye, "Effective
management of ameloblastoma: A review," Int
J Contemp Dent Med Rev, Vol. 2014,
Article ID 081214, 2014.
doi: 10.15713/ins.ijcdmr.19

Abstract

In order to evaluate typically the relevant literature as well as figure out the best modality of cure pertaining to ameloblastomas. An electronic literature search utilizing Medline was first performed regarding released articles about management of ameloblastomas. Terms utilized in the search were ameloblastoma and treatment method; ameloblastoma as well as surgical management. An endeavor was done to execute an organized critique about the subject; however because of inconsistency in vocabulary, treatment method process, insufficient randomized controlled trial and insufficient follow-up and analysis in the majority of the articles researched, a narrative imperative overview of chosen pertinent literature concerning treatments for ameloblastoma was performed. It is extensively documented that the recurrence of an ameloblastoma mainly displays the ineffectiveness or perhaps lack of success of the main surgical treatment. Recent reports have unquestionably indicated that every time an analysis of ameloblastoma is done, the method has to be intense as well as radical in order to steer clear of recurrence. The recurrence rates of 55-90% regarding solid or multicystic lesions handled through conventional strategy (enucleation or curettage) and in many cases metastases have been documented. Concerning unicystic ameloblastoma, methodical overview of the literary works indicates that the extreme method of treatment led to minimum recurrence rate. For ameloblastomas, the initial surgical treatment (particularly radical) offers the best chance to the patient. There is actually a lack of agreement over the most suitable treatment method with regard to ameloblastomas. Yet, much more radical strategy (whenever feasible) definitely seems to be the most effective method for the control over these benign, however locally aggressive, lesions having inclination for numerous repeated episodes.

Keywords: Ameloblastoma, pathology, review, tumor

Introduction

Out of all the tumors and cysts of the jaws, ameloblastoma is cited to comprise the about one-three percent of them.^[1,2] Mandibular cases are more common than maxillary and demonstrate predilection for varied regions of the mandible in numerous ethnic groups. Almost always, an ameloblastoma manifests itself as a slow-growing, painless swelling, causing expansion of the cortical bone, perforation of the lingual and/or buccal bone along with infiltration of the surrounding soft tissue.^[2] There's frequently a lag time in the investigation simply because of their slow-growing character and confusing nature.^[3,4] In the continents of Africa and Asia, this tumor is seen very commonly^[5-10] and in USA it is the second most common odontogenic tumor.^[11-13] The purpose of the current research was to earnestly assess the present literary works and figure out

the best method of treatment for ameloblastomas and present it to all operating surgeons alike.

Method of Search

An electronic search for literary works by means of Medline was carried out pertaining to written and published articles on management of ameloblastomas. MeSH terms utilized in the query were ameloblastoma and treatment method; surgical treatment of ameloblastomas. An effort was designed to execute a systematic evaluation about the subject, however as a result of inconsistency in vocabulary, procedure protocol, absence of randomized controlled trial as well as insufficient follow-up and evaluation for most of the reports researched, a narrative critical audit regarding specific related literary works concerning therapy for ameloblastoma was carried out. The full-texts coming from all

this content ended up being extensively evaluated by a couple of experts. The majority of the content ended up being case reports, retrospective case series or non-randomized controlled research. Only one instance of methodical overview of retrospective case series pertaining to management of unicystic ameloblastoma was found in the literature. An effort was designed in order to execute a scientific review on the topic. Having said that there was clearly an inconsistency in language, patients' attributes, severity of the tumor, therapy protocol and follow-up period. Meta-analysis is barely feasible when there is adequate similarity within the variables analyzed such as patients' characteristics, therapy provided, the final result and follow-up. As a result, a critical evaluation regarding chosen literature for therapy (conservative or radical) of ameloblastoma was performed. The subsequent treatment methods were recognized in the literature: Enucleation with or without the use of Carnoy's solution, curettage, surgery with adjuvant cryotherapy, marsupialization, as well as resection (marginal, segmental).

Management

Overview of pattern of growth

Ameloblastomas usually are potent benign tumors of epithelial origin that could develop out of the enamel organ, remains of dental lamina, the lining of any odontogenic (dentigerous) cyst, or even perhaps from the basal epithelial cellular material of the oral mucosa.^[4] The clinicopathological characteristics tend to be benign having a slow-growing development, yet locally infiltrative. The clinical response could be viewed as being somewhere within benign and malignant, and the real dilemma for specialists is the recurrence.^[14] They will often display a variety of biologic patterns, from cystic enlargement to much more ruthless infiltration of surrounding tissue.^[15] In contrast to carcinomas, ameloblastomas tend to be circumferentially delineated by way of a constant basement membrane layer, plus they often propagate directly into tissue gaps simply by broadening their inner compartment volumes.^[16] The design structure of the ameloblastoma is that the edge of the tumor inside cancellous bone is situated outside the obvious macroscopic area and the radiographic limitations of the lesion.^[4] There are contradictory studies in the literature with regards to the expansion traits of ameloblastomas as well as its association to the inferior alveolar nerve.^[15,17] Based on a study by Tingchun *et al.* a tumor, which is placed close to, or possibly is covered within, the mandibular canal might demolish and develop within the canal.^[17] On the other hand, however, Nakamura *et al.* found no intrusion into the neural sheath neither incursion into the nerve itself by ameloblastomas in most cases.^[15] The classification of ameloblastoma previously has been inadequately outlined. The existing notion is to label ameloblastomas as solid/multicystic, conventionally within bone; peripheral; or unicystic subtypes.^[4] This classification carries a strong referral to the pathologic response of these varieties of the disease. Solid or

multicystic types of ameloblastomas are generally regionally hostile, and reoccur in the event that they are improperly excised. Nevertheless, unicystic ameloblastoma has been recognized as a prognostically unique type with significantly less potent response.^[18] The most typical histologic subtypes of ameloblastoma usually are follicular, plexiform, acanthomatous, granular and desmoplastic.^[14,19] Hong *et al.* lately demonstrated that the histopathology associated with an ameloblastoma is considerably connected with the chances of recurrence.^[14] It was proven that the follicular, granular cell and acanthomatous kinds possess a comparatively substantial probability of recurrence. In comparison, the desmoplastic, plexiform along with unicystic types display a fairly reduced likelihood for recurrence.

Treatment

Cure of ameloblastoma is undoubtedly surgical. There initially was a lot of controversy concerning the most suitable technique for surgery of ameloblastomas. These vary ranging from conventional to radical methods of therapy. The traditional techniques involve curettage, enucleation as well as cryosurgery; while the extreme techniques are marginal, segmental as well as composite resections. There's a lack of agreement regarding the best-suited procedure.

Advocates of conventional procedures reckon that ameloblastomas, however, regionally intrusive, tend to be basically benign by nature, as a result, they must be dealt with as such.^[20-22] Ueno *et al.* recommended that "unnecessary resection" of the mandible constituted an extreme procedure,^[20] and Feinberg and Steinberg mentioned that this may be very true in younger individuals, in whom a disruption in development and growth might hinder long-term functionality as well as appearance.^[21] Sammartino *et al.* additionally endorsed for conventional management of massive ameloblastomas because of "reduced morbidity" related to most of these methods. As per the writers and experts, extreme treatment methods are related to severe cosmetic, functional and reconstructive problems.^[12,22] Some others have likewise endorsed enucleation for the cure of ameloblastomas with the maintenance of sound periosteum that is certainly essential for bone regrowth particularly in infants.^[23] Numerous experts in addition have suggested enucleation instead of partial or complete jaw bone resection to deal with unicystic ameloblastoma, thought to arise primarily in the paediatric group.^[18,21,24] Supporters of extreme procedures for the management of ameloblastomas have the viewpoint that, even though, these types of tumors are generally histologically benign by nature, they can be locally hostile and the clinical conduct could be viewed as lying anywhere between benign and cancerous lesions. Few also suggest that enucleation and curettage of ameloblastomas bring about unwanted recurrence rates.^[25] The recurrence rates for enucleation or curettage for multicystic lesions are between 55 and 90%.^[26] Metastases subsequent to conventional treatment has also been documented.^[27]

Discussion

Existing thoughts and opinions relating to the management of ameloblastomas is largely based upon case reviews, historical data, retrospective reviews, and histological evidence. The benign nature of such lesions usually leads the doctors to undertake less complicated extirpative techniques to prevent the possible morbidity related to huge resections. This strategy continues to be frequently employed, in spite of documented recurrence rates of 55-90% for solid multicystic ameloblastomas dealt with by enucleation or curettage alone and in many cases spontaneous metastases has also been seen.^[14,25,27] Sammartino *et al.* offered a fresh treatment protocol to support surgeons to build up a “rational” analytical standard protocol as well as establish efficient and quick operative management in individuals with mandibular ameloblastomas using a 10 year experience in their own establishment. As per the authors small ameloblastomas were addressed through extensive resection which incorporates a minimum of 1 cm of healthy bone around the tumor margin. Large lesions with no perforation of the cortex were handled conservatively (curettage), whilst those with cortical overture were addressed through resection with overlying soft tissues.^[22] Accordingly, good follow-up seemed to be essential in patients addressed conservatively to be able to determine resulting recurrences early on and handle them more assertively. The experts addressed about 15 patients of ameloblastoma, which included 10 solid multicystic ameloblastomas, as well as 5 unicystic ameloblastomas. From the 15 cases, 7 (46.7%) recurred following the initial procedure, and practically only one of these had been inside of 5 years of surgical treatment. The peak stage of recurrence appeared to be 3 years. From the 7 cases which recurred, 6 were solid multicystic kind. Regardless of the apparent high recurrence rate throughout their research, the writers suggested that enormous ameloblastomas without any cortical penetration possibly be treated by curettage with 0.5-1 cm of clinically uninvolved encompassing bone.^[22] The explanation regarding management of small ameloblastomas using resection and huge types (no bone perforation) using less than radical strategy; simply to loose time, waiting for recurrence prior to radical therapy, might not be medically defensible because of the hostile character and overpowering proof regarding high recurrence rate when ameloblastomas have been handled cautiously. One good reason provided by Sammartino *et al.* with regard to conservative management of large ameloblastoma was “low morbidity.” According to him, extreme treatment solutions are linked to severe aesthetic, functional and reconstructive difficulties. In spite of the “radical” character of a surgical resection, it could in fact be much less morbid than substantial soft and hard tissue resection along with related considerable morbidity, which might be justified in the event of recurrence subsequent to insufficient primary therapy.^[25] Actually, having present day reconstructive alternatives, the necessity for reconstruction following operative resection shouldn't be the sole basis for managing ameloblastomas using a simple approach.

The cost-effectiveness of conventional treatment is an

additional concern. Management of huge ameloblastomas using less than radical method, simply to loose time waiting for recurrence previous to radical therapy being implemented, is costly with regards to expense to the client as well as intensive follow-up is necessary. It is often noted that the recurrence associated with an ameloblastoma displays the ineffectiveness or inability of the main surgical treatment.^[14,28] Shatkin and Hoffmeister looked at the initial information starting from 1918 onwards and showed that persisted under-treatment of ameloblastomas may bring about substantial and at that period, unresectable recurrences.^[13] They noted a fatality rate of 30% coming from recurrent ameloblastomas within an early sequence of 13 cases. Hong *et al.* in a retrospective evaluation associated with 239 individuals with ameloblastomas of the oral cavity claimed recurrences of 4.5% in individuals dealt with by segmental resection or maxillectomy, 11.6% in individuals handled through resection with bone edge and 29.3% addressed by using conventional treatment (enucleation, curettage and marsupialization).^[14] Disease-free survival with regard to treatment method strategies demonstrated a statistically substantial distinction ($P = 0.01$) whenever “segmental resection or maxillectomy” as well as resection with bone border are analyzed, compared to “conservative” treatment.^[14]

Disease-free existence is typically utilized to evaluate outcomes of the approach to localized disease that makes the individual seemingly ailment free, such as surgical treatment or surgery with adjuvant treatment. In an additional latest survey by Ghandi *et al.*, the principal control through conventional strategy triggered a recurrence in roughly 80% of cases, and this included instances of unicystic ameloblastoma. Of the 41 instances of solid/multicystic ameloblastoma, 20 had been dealt with radically and 21 conservatively. There ended up being virtually no recurrences within the radically addressed group. Among the conventional group of people, 16 (76.2%) out of 21 cases had recurrence. Each of the recurrent cases was originally addressed with radical surgery. A couple of cases had a second recurrence; one of them demonstrated propagation towards the base of the cranium.^[29] Segmental or composite resection generates great results particularly if accomplished as a primary treatment.^[25] In the event that the tumor infiltrates the nearby soft tissues, the incidence associated with recurrence will increase. This really is due to the fact of the trouble in determining the tumor limit. Even considerable surgical treatment are unable to warrant a 0% recurrence rate. Satkin and Hoffmeister likewise evaluated twenty instances of ameloblastoma and discovered a recurrence rate of 19% whenever addressed with resection as opposed to 86% pertaining to curettage.

The predisposition for a substantial recurrence associated with ameloblastoma has also been confirmed to a 60% recurrence rate regarding solid or multicystic variety treated by enucleation or curettage by advocates of traditional management.^[22] Sampson and Pogrel evaluated the data of 26 sequential individuals with mandibular ameloblastomas.^[25] From the 26 cases, 10 were referred to having a recurrence following unsuccessful cure (curettage) elsewhere, and 16 had been

referenced with regard to primary treatment. As a whole, 11 affected individuals experienced recurrences all treated primarily by curettage alone. A few of the patients happen to be addressed with numerous efforts at curettage, with all of the lesions repeating in a couple of cases and patients required multiple additional procedures in order to do away with the disease. Six of the 11 patients experienced recurrence along with soft tissue involvement and ended up addressed with resection. Two of the 6 patients developed secondary soft tissue repeated episodes. These particular two patients each went through numerous supplementary modalities of treatment in order to eliminate the disease, such as neck dissections, as well as skull base resections. Several repeated episodes right after traditional therapy of ameloblastomas happen to be noted by other authors as well.^[14,29] Stories coming from Africa have likewise ascertained the fact that resection using bone edge is definitely the remedy of choice for ameloblastomas.^[28,30]

Chidzonga recounted that the suggested treatment for ameloblastomas in small children ought to be radical resection. 0.5-1 cm past what seems to be an uninfected bone.^[30] Radical approach has also been the method of choice used by Arotiba *et al.*^[31] Additional research have in addition found, that any time an analysis of ameloblastoma is prepared, the therapy should be intense and revolutionary.^[4,14,28] For solid-multicystic ameloblastoma of the mandible, resection needs to be about 1.5-2 cm aside from the radiological limit, so as to make sure every one of the “microcysts” and “daughter cysts” are eliminated.^[14,28]

The unicystic ameloblastoma should get special consideration on the foundation of its clinical and radiologic appeal, its histopathology, and its response to therapy.^[18] In 1977, Robinson and Martinez revealed a subset of ameloblastoma, referred to as unicystic ameloblastoma, perceived as an individual entity.^[18] Most of these tumors usually arise to be a painless swelling concerning the posterior area of your mandible. Radiographically, they will display largely as a unilocular radiolucency and diagnosis are frequently created just after histologic review with the enucleated sample. This variation of ameloblastoma was initially revealed to have shown considerably less aggressive behavior than the conventional ameloblastoma. Robinson and Martinez in the beginning advised old-fashioned treatment with regard to unicystic ameloblastoma simply because its conduct was believed to be slightly different from the multicystic variety.

In a recent analysis, Hong *et al.* described a recurrence rate of 15.5% (11 of 77) of unicystic ameloblastoma treated cautiously, as against 9% (1 out of 11) recurrence for resection with bone margin.^[14,31,32] A critique of the literature taken from the case reviews and reviews from 1976 to 2007 disclosed a total of 128 case reports of unicystic ameloblastoma, of which 18 (14.6%) had recurred. In addition, a current systematic overview demonstrated that the enucleation of unicystic ameloblastoma resulted in the greatest recurrence rate; and also the lowest recurrence rate was linked with resection with the tumor.^[32] Enucleation on its own yielded 30.5% recurrence rate, associated with a recurrence rate of 18%

regarding marsupialization, 16% regarding enucleation with application Carnoy's solution and 3.6% for resection. The actual clarification is two-fold. For starters, the cystic lining in the tumor is insufficiently removed. Occasionally, especially in posterior maxillary ameloblastomas, the tumor just is not completely rounded or oval in appearance therefore the enucleation might not always be as basic as expected, and remnants can be abandoned in complicated anatomy without getting found. Next, the ameloblastic tumor tissue can easily invade the cancellous bone to a certain degree.^[32]

Marx *et al.* indicated that ameloblastoma cellular material could broaden from 2 to 8 mm over and above the radiographic perimeter of the tumor. Hence by enucleation alone, the ameloblastic cellular material will probably be remaining in spite of the tumor being enucleated completely.^[33] Three histologic varieties of unicystic ameloblastoma are mentioned within the literature.^[20] Within the first kind, luminal ameloblastoma, the actual tumor is limited to the luminal surface of the cyst. In the second kind, which is intraluminal ameloblastoma, tumor nodules project from the cystic lining into the lumen of the cyst. In the third type, mural ameloblastoma, the fibrous wall structure of the cyst is penetrated with tumor nodules. The third kind is regarded as probably the most hostile, with a recurrence rate as high as 35.7%.^[33,20] Various possibilities happen to be documented between different locations of the unicystic ameloblastoma relating to its spreading potential. It has been seen that the tumor nodes in the cyst wall have higher proliferating cell nuclear antigen.^[34] This particular breakthrough offered a biologic groundwork to advocate a much more revolutionary surgical removal as the therapy of choice for unicystic ameloblastoma.

Conclusion

Ameloblastoma is recognized as benign, however locally intrusive odontogenic tumor having a substantial amount of recurrence. Fundamentally, the majority of research confirmed that the prognosis for ameloblastoma is a lot more reliant on the technique of surgical procedure rather than the histologic form of tumor. Resection by incorporating risk-free border (marginal, segmental or composite resection based on the location and dimensions of the lesion) is the ideal principal solution to managing solid/multicystic ameloblastomas to prevent recurrence. Due to the surfacing unsatisfactory recurrence rate of unicystic ameloblastoma, marginal resection ought to be the bare minimum norm for the treatment solution associated with unicystic ameloblastoma of the mandible. In spite of the “radical” dynamics of an operative resection, it might in fact entail significantly less morbidity compared with considerable hard and soft tissue resection along with involved considerable morbidity that could be justified in the event of recurrence right after insufficient primary treatment. Nevertheless, a conventional (curettage, not enucleation) approach could be thought of in the instance of unicystic ameloblastoma of the

anterior mandible without soft tissue involvement, with regard to individuals within their first decade of life. In this instance, patient conformity and watchful follow-up are essential. In the case of a recurrence, resection with regular bone border is strongly suggested. Finally, in light of the reality that there exists an insufficient comprehensive agreement on the most suitable treatment method with regard to ameloblastomas, there exists a need to carry out additional evidence-based scientific studies for clinical practice principles in the handling of ameloblastomas of the oral cavity.

References

- Neville BW, Damn DD, Allen CM, Bouqout JK, editors. *Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: WB Saunders Co.; 2002. p. 610-5.
- Torres-Lagares D, Infante-Cossio P, Hernández-Guisado JM, Gutiérrez-Pérez JL. Mandibular ameloblastoma. A review of the literature and presentation of six cases. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal* 2005;10:231-8.
- Zachariades N. Recurrences of ameloblastoma in bone grafts. Report of 4 cases. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1998;17:316-8.
- Lodwick GS, Wilson AJ, Farrell C, Virtama P, Dittrich F. Determining growth rates of focal lesions of bone from radiographs. *Radiology* 1980;134:577-83.
- Ueno S, Mushimoto K, Shirasu R. Prognostic evaluation of ameloblastoma based on histologic and radiographic typing. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1989;47(1):11-5.
- Meer S, Galpin JS, Altini M, Coleman H, Ali H. Proliferating cell nuclear antigen and Ki67 immunoreactivity in ameloblastomas. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2003;95:213-21.
- Gardner DG, Heikinheimo K, Shear M, Philipsen HP, Coleman H. Ameloblastomas. In: Barnes L, Eveson JW, Reichart P, Sidransky D, editors. *World Health Organization Classification of Tumors. Pathology & Genetics of Head and Neck Tumours*. Lyon: IARC Press; 2005. p. 296-300.
- Takahashi K, Miyauchi K, Sato K. Treatment of ameloblastoma in children. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1998;36:453-6.
- Walke VA, Munshi M, Raut W, Bobahate S. Cytological diagnosis of acanthomatous ameloblastoma. *J Cytol* 2008;25(2):62.
- Vasan NT. Recurrent ameloblastoma in an autogenous bone graft after 28 years: a case report. *N Z Dent J* 1995;91:12-3.
- Cawson RA, Binnie WH, Speight PM, Barrett AW, Wright JM, Thorogood P. *Lucas's Pathology of Tumors of the Oral Tissues*. 5th ed. London: Churchill Livingstone; 1998. p. 25-44.
- Shatkin S, Hoffmeister FS. Ameloblastoma: a rational approach to therapy. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 1965;20:421-35.
- Mehlich DR, Dahlin DC, Masson JK. Ameloblastoma: a clinicopathologic report. *J Oral Surg* 1972;30:9-22.
- Hong J, Yun PY, Chung IH, Myoung H, Suh JD, Seo BM, *et al.* Long-term follow up on recurrence of 305 ameloblastoma cases. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2007;36:283-8.
- Nakamura N, Mitsuyasu T, Higuchi Y, Sandra F, Ohishi M. Growth characteristics of ameloblastoma involving the inferior alveolar nerve: a clinical and histopathologic study. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2001;91:557-62.
- Vedtofte P, Hjorting-Hansen E, Jensen BN, Roed-Peterson B. Conservative surgical treatment of mandibular ameloblastomas. *Int J Oral Surg* 1978;7:156-61.
- Wu TC, Chen Z, Tian FC, Tian QZ, You CT. Ameloblastoma of the mandible treated by resection, preservation of the inferior alveolar nerve, and bone grafting. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1984;42:93-6.
- Robinson L, Martinez MG. Unicystic ameloblastoma: a prognostically distinct entity. *Cancer* 1977;40:2278-85.
- Gardner DG. A pathologist's approach to the treatment of ameloblastoma. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1984;42:161-6.
- Hertog D, Schulten EA, Leemans CR, Winters HA, Van der Waal I. Management of recurrent ameloblastoma of the jaws; a 40-year single institution experience. *Oral Oncol* 2011;47:145-6.
- Feinberg SE, Steinberg B. Surgical management of ameloblastoma. Current status of the literature. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 1996;81:383-8.
- Sammartino G, Zarrelli C, Urciuolo V, di Lauro AE, di Lauro F, Santarelli A, *et al.* Effectiveness of a new decisional algorithm in managing mandibular ameloblastomas: A 10-years experience. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2007;45:306-10.
- Nakamura N, Higuchi Y, Mitsuyasu T, Sandra F, Ohishi M. Comparison of long-term results between different approaches to ameloblastoma. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2002;93:13-20.
- Chiapasco M, Colletti G, Romeo E, Zaniboni M, Brusati R. Long-term results of mandibular reconstruction with autogenous bone grafts and oral implants after tumor resection. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2008;19:1074-80.
- Sampson DE, Pogrel MA. Management of mandibular ameloblastoma: the clinical basis for a treatment algorithm. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1999;57:1074-7.
- Zemann W, Feichtinger M, Kowatsch E, Kärcher H. Extensive ameloblastoma of the jaws: surgical management and immediate reconstruction using microvascular flaps. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2007;103:190-6.
- Infante-Cossio P, Gacto-Sanchez P, Gomez-Cia T, Gomez-Ciriza G. Stereolithographic cutting guide for fibula osteotomy. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol* 2012;113:712-3.
- Chiapasco M, Abati S, Ramundo G, Rossi A, Romeo E, Vogel G. Behavior of implants in bone grafts or free flaps after tumor resection. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 2000;11:66-75.
- Ghandhi D, Ayoub AF, Pogrel MA, MacDonald G, Brocklebank LM, Moos KF. Ameloblastoma: a surgeon's dilemma. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2006;64:1010-4.
- Chidzonga MM. Ameloblastoma in children. The Zimbabwean experience. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 1996;81:168-70.
- Arotiba GT, Ladeinde AL, Arotiba JT, Ajike SO, Ugboko VI, Ajayi OF. Ameloblastoma in Nigerian children and adolescents: a review of 79 cases. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2005;63:747-51.
- Lau SL, Samman N. Recurrence related to treatment modalities of unicystic ameloblastoma: a systematic review. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2006;35:681-90.
- Marx RE, Smith BH, Smith BR, Fridrich KL. Swelling of the retromolar region and cheek associated with limited opening. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1993;51:304-9.
- Ackermann GL, Altini M, Shear M. The unicystic ameloblastoma: a clinicopathological study of 57 cases. *J Oral Pathol* 1988;17:541-6.