# Post-Operative Lower Eyelid Massage Versus Standard Care for Prevention of the Lower Eyelid Scar Contracture after Subciliary Approach in Traumatic Facial Fracture Repair: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Nitchamon Kuawatcharawong, MD<sup>1</sup>, Wimon Sirimaharaj, MD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plastic Surgery Unit, Department of Surgery, Chiang Mai University Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand

**Background:** Subciliary incision, a common technique for traumatic facial repair, associates with lower eyelid scar contracture and malpositioning. Despite proposed management techniques like eyelid massage, the efficacy of post-operative massage remains unexplored in preventing and treating these issues.

**Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of lower eyelid massage in preventing lower eyelid scar contracture and malposition following the subciliary approach for traumatic facial repair, compared to standard care without massage.

**Materials and Methods:** A randomized controlled trial enrolled patients with traumatic facial fractures slated for subciliary approach repair. Patients were randomly allocated to the lower eyelid massage as the experimental group or standard care as the control group. The massage group received post-operative instructions. Data on demographics, injury profiles, lower eyelid scar contracture as graded by the grading of lower eyelid scar contracture (GLESCO) criteria, eyelid malpositioning, comfort scores, and complications were gathered over a 6-month follow-up.

**Results**: The present study included 59 patients, with 30 in the massage group and 29 in the control group. There were no significant differences in demographic characteristics, injury profiles, or complications between the two groups. Post-operative assessments revealed the massage group exhibited a trend towards lower GLESCO grades with an average decrease of 0.72 grade per week (95% CI –1.46 to 0.02, p=0.058) and lower eyelid malpositioning grades with an average decrease of 0.49 grade per week (95% CI –1.03 to 0.05, p=0.073) compared to the control group. However, there was no significant difference in comfort scores between the two groups with an average difference of 0.18 score per week (95% CI –1.08 to 1.45, p=0.775).

**Conclusion:** Lower eyelid massage demonstrated potential benefits in preventing lower eyelid scar contracture following traumatic facial repair. However, its impact on eyelid malpositioning and comfort scores was not statistically significant in the present study. Further study with larger sample sizes is warranted to validate these findings.

Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT06311318

Keywords: Subciliary incision; Subciliary approach; Lower eyelid massage; Facial fracture; Scar contracture; Eyelid malposition; Ectropion

Received 21 August 2023 | Revised 11 March 2024 | Accepted 12 March 2024

#### J Med Assoc Thai 2024;107(4):272-8

Website: http://www.jmatonline.com

Various surgical techniques are utilized for traumatic facial repair, including subciliary, subtarsal, transconjunctival incisions, and traumatic wound management<sup>(1,2)</sup>. Since 1990, the subciliary incision

#### **Correspondence to:**

Department of Plastic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand. Phone: +66-81-9168588, Fax: +66-53-936132

Email: sirimaharaj.wimon@gmail.com

#### How to cite this article:

Kuawatcharawong N, Sirimaharaj W. Post-Operative Lower Eyelid Massage Versus Standard Care for Prevention of the Lower Eyelid Scar Contracture after Subciliary Approach in Traumatic Facial Fracture Repair: A Randomized Controlled Trial. J Med Assoc Thai 2024;107:272-8. DOI: 10.35755/jmedassocthai.2024.4.13967 has gained popularity due to its concealed scar, optimal fracture site exposure, and capacity to extend wounds without lateral canthotomy, similar to the transconjunctival approach. However, it still poses complications such as lower eyelid scar contracture for 2.5%, hypertrophic or visible scarring for 0.9% to 3.6%, and lower eyelid malposition for 0.5% to 42% ranging from scleral show at 2.5% to ectropion at 0.5% to  $37\%^{(1-6)}$ .

Normal lower eyelid position covers the lower limbus by at least 1 mm. Lower eyelid scar contracture, lower eyelid malposition, and ectropion can all lead to aesthetic problems, dry eye, conjunctivitis, and epiphora<sup>(1,7)</sup>.

Transconjunctival and extended trans-

Sirimaharaj W.

conjunctival incision were developed to avoid the subciliary approach complications<sup>(2)</sup>. However, the transconjunctival approach presents additional complications, including entropion and lacrimal canaliculus transaction.

Previous studies have indicated that complications associated with the subciliary approach can be managed conservatively through observation, lower eyelid massage, and steroid injection. However, in some instances, complications persist, necessitating surgical intervention. This escalation in care complexity may induce patient discomfort and potentially result in further consequences<sup>(2,6)</sup>.

No previous research has investigated the efficacy of post-operative lower eyelid massage in preventing and treating lower eyelid scar contracture and malposition. Additionally, some surgeons omit lower eyelid massage from post-operative care regimens, and consensus guidelines for managing complications following the subciliary approach are lacking in the medical literature.

The authors aimed to investigate the effectiveness of lower eyelid massage in preventing lower eyelid scar contracture and malposition following the subciliary approach in traumatic facial repair, compared to standard care without massage. Both the incidence and severity of complications were assessed. It was anticipated that the study findings would contribute to the development of guidelines for preventing post-operative lower eyelid scar contracture and malposition, thereby enhancing outcomes, reducing complications, and informing future surgical interventions.

The authors developed a preliminary guideline for managing lower eyelid scar contracture and malposition, serving as a pilot guideline. Additionally, they formulated a novel grading system for lower eyelid scar contracture, intended for incorporation as a parameter in patient evaluations.

## **Materials and Methods**

The present study was ethically reviewed and approved by the research ethics committee, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, bearing the certificate of approval number 490/2016. Patients diagnosed with zygomatic and Lefort II fractures necessitating infraorbital rim fixation following motorcycle accidents, and presenting without external lower eyelid wounds, were recruited from the plastic surgery unit at Chiang Mai University Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, between November 2016 and November 2019. Informed



consent was obtained from all participants. Exclusion criteria included pre-existing lower eyelid retraction from previous scar, neurogenic cause, myogenic cause or Graves' disease, incision alteration, communication barriers, inability to perform daily activities or lower eyelid massage of ECOG of 2 or more, PPS Adult Suandok of 60 or less, inability to attend follow-up visits, and patient refusal. Patients were randomly assigned, using concealed block of four randomization, to either the experimental group receiving lower eyelid massage or the control group receiving standard care. While the authors, acting as massage trainers, were unblinded, an independent plastic surgeon, serving as the assessor, remained blinded to the study interventions.

A preliminary review of medical records from Chiang Mai University Hospital was conducted. Subsequently, sample size determination was performed based on two independent proportions, which were 0.95 for good outcome in the massage group versus 0.60 in the non-massage group, with an alpha of 0.05, beta of 0.10, and a 1 to 1 ratio. The calculated minimum sample size was 28 cases per group. Accounting for a 10 percent dropout rate, a sample size of 30 patients per group was adopted. The intended study population comprised 30 patients in each group. Patients in the experimental group received training and guidance from trained investigators regarding post-operative lower eyelid massage.

The massage technique was executed with the patient in a fully open-eyed state, maintaining an upward gaze. The lateral aspect of the distal phalanx of the index finger was employed, exerting pressure on the lower eyelid to bring its margin into contact with the upper eyelid margin for a 10 second duration per repetition. This procedure comprised 10 repetitions per set, administered once hourly, spanning 10 hours daily (Figure 1). The massage instruction was provided either by the authors or plastic surgical residents.

Facial fracture surgery was conducted by





experienced plastic surgeons and/or proficient fourth- or fifth-year plastic surgical residents at Chiang Mai University Hospital, utilizing the skinmuscle flap subciliary approach. Cauterization was applied two millimeters from the eyelid margin to control bleeding, followed by closure of the incision using Vicryl 4-0 for periosteum, Vicryl 5-0 for muscle, and Prolene 6-0 for the skin. All patients underwent surgery one week after the injury to mitigate soft tissue swelling, which had subsided by that time.

Consistent pre-operative, peri-operative, and post-operative care protocols were administered to both patient groups. Stitches at the subciliary incision site were extracted on post-operative day 5. Patients in the massage group were instructed to commence lower eyelid massage on the day when stitches were removed.

The follow-up assessments occurred at 1-week, 3-week, 6-week, 3-month, and 6-month intervals post-operatively. Evaluation criteria included the grading of lower eyelid scar contracture (GLESCO). This was an anatomical score adapted by the authors (Figure 2), which was not independently validated as it relies on consistent anatomy across patients. Additionally, grading of lower eyelid malpositioning<sup>(8)</sup> (Figure 3), comfort scores that represent subjective clinical evaluations by patients, assessing the overall comfort of the eye, including factors like dryness and tightness of the eyelid, rated on a scale of 0 to 10, adapted from POSAS<sup>(9)</sup> and Verbal Rating Scale<sup>(10)</sup>, wound infection, dehiscence, eyelid comfort, and management related to the subciliary incision were assessed and documented by the plastic surgeon, which is the author, and plastic surgery resident (Figure 4).

Patients presenting with GLESCO and concurrent clinical symptoms such as dry eye or conjunctivitis were categorized as failed-prevention cases. The treatment protocol for these patients involved intra-

#### Grading of eyelid malpositioning

Patient in normal neutral gaze, examiner observe position and characteristic of lower eyelid



scar steroid injection and release of scar contracture utilizing a needle with hanging suture (Figure 5). In cases where notable improvement was not achieved following these interventions, surgical release of scar contracture was contemplated.

Categorical data were analyzed utilizing Fisher's exact test and subsequently presented in frequency and percentage formats. Continuous data underwent analysis employing Student's t-test and were expressed in terms of mean and standard deviation. Statistical significance was established at a p-value



less than 0.05. In instances where patients underwent bilateral subciliary incision, the side exhibiting the poorer clinical outcome was selected for analysis. Statistical analyses were conducted using the standard statistical software, Stata Statistical Software, version 16 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA). Post-operative assessment encompassing evaluation of GLESCO, grading of lower eyelid malpositioning, and assessment of comfort fort score at 1-week, 3-week, 6-week, 3-month, and 6-month intervals was conducted utilizing repeated measurement analysis with a mixed model.



Figure 5. Release scar technique: using needle with hanging suture.

#### Results

Between November 2016 and November 2019. sixty-four patients were enrolled in the present study, with 32 patients assigned to the intervention or massage group and 32 patients to the control or non-massage group. Among them, five patients were excluded from the analysis due to aggravated comorbid conditions, voluntary withdrawal from the study, remote residency, and inability to adhere to the study protocol-specifically, two cases from the massage group and three cases from the non-massage group. Nonetheless, the overall participant count remained sufficient for the predetermined sample size calculation. The demographic characteristics of the patients, including fracture site, operation, and operative time in each group, are presented in Table 1. Notably, no statistically significant differences were observed between the two groups in terms of severity of facial injury, age, or other health conditions.

| Characteristics                                    | Group          |                    | p-value |
|--|----------------|--------------------|---------|
|  | Massage (n=30) | Non-massage (n=29) |         |
| Age (year); mean [SD]                              | 28.33 [12.37]  | 26.14 [11.13]      | 0.477   |
| Sex; n (%)   |                |                    | 0.252   |
| Male   | 19 (63.33)     | 23 (79.31)         |         |
| Female   | 11 (36.67)     | 6 (20.69)          |         |
| Education degree; n (%)                            |                |                    | 0.605   |
| Lower than junior high school                      | 4 (13.33)      | 5 (17.24)          |         |
| Junior high school                                 | 11 (36.67)     | 6 (20.69)          |         |
| High school  | 10 (33.33)     | 13 (44.83)         |         |
| Bachelor's degree or higher                        | 5 (16.67)      | 5 (17.24)          |         |
| Duration from injury to operation (day); mean [SD] | 12.33 [6.80]   | 11.27 [7.40]       | 0.897   |
| Operative time (minutes); mean [SD]                | 189.67 [95.03] | 223.03 [119.57]    | 0.134   |
| Operation; n (%)                                   |                |                    | 0.601   |
| ORIF with PAS                                      | 19 (63.3)      | 16 (55.2)          |         |
| ORIF with PAS with MMF                             | 11 (36.7)      | 13 (44.8)          |         |
| Operative duration (minute); mean [SD]             | 189.67 [95.03] | 223.03 [119.57]    | 0.223   |
| Duration from injury to operation (day), mean [SD] | 12.33 [6.80]   | 11.27 [7.40]       | 0.897   |

ORIF=open reduction with internal fixation; PAS=plate and screw; MMF=mandibulomaxillary fixation; SD=standard deviation

Table 1. Patients' characteristic data

| Table 2. Post-operative grading of lower eyelid scar contracture and grading of eyelid malpositioning | rer eyelid sc     | ar contractur         | e and gra | ding of eye       | elid malpositi        | ioning     |                |                       |         |                   |                        |         |                |                        |         |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------|---------|----------------|------------------------|---------|
| Outcome   | 1-we              | 1-week post-operative | e         | 3-wee             | 3-week post-operative | <b>C</b> ) | 6-wet          | 6-week post-operative | re      | 3-mo1             | 3-month post-operative | ve      | 6-mon          | 6-month post-operative | re.     |
|   | Massage<br>(n=27) | Non-massage<br>(n=22) | p-value   | Massage<br>(n=23) | Non-massage<br>(n=23) | p-value    | Massage (n=11) | Non-massage<br>(n=11) | p-value | Massage<br>(n=10) | Non-massage<br>(n=5)   | p-value | Massage (n=10) | Non-massage<br>(n=6)   | p-value |
| Grading of lower eyelid scar contracture; n (%)   |                   |                       |           |                   |                       |            |                |                       |         |                   |                        |         |                |                        |         |
| Grade 0   | 11(40.74)         | 8 (36.36)             | 0.952     | 5 (22.73)         | 1(4.35)               | 0.057      | 5 (45.45)      | 1 (9.09)              | 0.010   | 9 (90.00)         | 1 (20.00)              | 0.003   | 10(100)        | 0 (0.00)               | 0.003   |
| Grade 1   | 4(14.81)          | 2 (9.09)              |           | 4 (18.18)         | 1(4.35)               |            | 1(9.09)        | 0 (0.00)              |         | 1(10.00)          | 0 (0.00)               |         | 0 (0.00)       | 2 (66.67)              |         |
| Grade 2   | 6 (22.22)         | 5 (22.72)             |           | 0 (00.0)          | 3 (13.04)             |            | 0 (0.00)       | 2 (18.18)             |         | 0 (0.00) 0        | 1 (20.00)              |         | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)               |         |
| Grade 3   | 1(3.70)           | 1(4.55)               |           | 1(4.55)           | 1(4.35)               |            | 4 (36.36)      | 0 (0.00)              |         | 0 (0.00) 0        | 1 (20.00)              |         | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)               |         |
| Grade 4   | 5 (18.52)         | 6 (27.27)             |           | 11 (50.00)        | 17 (73.91)            |            | 1(9.09)        | 8 (72.73)             |         | 0 (0.00) 0        | 2 (40.00)              |         | 0 (0.00)       | 1 (33.33)              |         |
| Grading of eyelid malpositioning; n (%)   |                   |                       |           |                   |                       |            |                |                       |         |                   |                        |         |                |                        |         |
| Grade 0   | 16 (59.26)        | 16 (59.26) 13 (59.09) | 0.600     | 10(45.45)         | 3 (13.04)             | 0.163      | 5 (45.45)      | 2 (18.18)             | 0.331   | 7 (70.00)         | 2 (40.00)              | 0.171   | 7 (70.00)      | 1 (33.33)              | 0.315   |
| Grade 1   | 6 (22.22)         | 6 (27.27)             |           | 5 (22.73)         | 7 (30.43)             |            | 3 (27.27)      | 2 (18.18)             |         | 1(10.00)          | 0 (0.00)               |         | 1(10.00)       | 1 (33.33)              |         |
| Grade 2   | 5 (18.52)         | 2 (9.09)              |           | 3 (13.64)         | 6 (26.09)             |            | 1(9.09)        | 4 (36.36)             |         | 2 (20.00)         | 1 (20.00)              |         | 2 (20.00)      | 1 (33.33)              |         |
| Grade 3   | 0(0.00)           | 1(4.55)               |           | 1  (4.55)         | 1(4.35)               |            | 1 (9.09)       | 1(9.09)               |         | 0 (0.00) 0        | 2 (40.00)              |         | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)               |         |
| Grade 4   | 0 (00.0)          | 0 (000) 0             |           | 3 (13.64)         | 6 (26.09)             |            | 0 (0.00) 0     | 2 (18.18)             |         | 0 (0.00) 0        | 0 (0.00)               |         | 0 (0.00) 0     | 0 (0.00)               |         |
|   |                   |                       |           |                   |                       |            |                |                       |         |                   |                        |         |                |                        |         |







**Figure 7.** Grading of lower eyelid malpositioning in massage and non-massage group.

No occurrences of surgical site infection or wound dehiscence were observed in either study cohort. The GLESCO and lower eyelid malpositioning for each group across post-operative follow-up intervals were delineated in Table 2, Figure 6, and Figure 7. Notably, the GLESCO scores in the massage group were consistently lower than those in the non-massage group at the 6-week, 3-month, and 6-month post-operative assessments, with corresponding p-values of 0.010, 0.003, and 0.003, respectively. Additionally, the comfort scores for each group throughout the post-operative followup periods are presented in Table 3 and Figure 8.

Eleven cases were identified as failed-prevention patients, with five cases in the massage group and six cases in the non-massage group. The proportions of failed-treatment patients in the massage and non-massage groups were 19.35% and 28.57%, respectively, with a p-value of 0.542. These patients underwent TA injection and scar release using

| Post-operative comfort score | Total | Massage group<br>mean (SD) | Non-massage group<br>mean (SD) | p-value |
|------------------------------|-------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| 1-week                       | 15    | 7.00 (2.60)                | 6.50 (1.64)                    | 0.684   |
| 3-week                       | 15    | 7.86 (0.38)                | 7.75 (1.58)                    | 0.864   |
| 6-week                       | 10    | 8.60 (0.89)                | 7.60 (1.14)                    | 0.161   |
| 3-month                      | 8     | 8.60 (1.14)                | 9.33 (1.16)                    | 0.414   |
| 6-month                      | 10    | 8.38 (1.60)                | 8.50 (0.71)                    | 0.919   |

SD=standard deviation



Figure 8. Mean and SD of comfort score in massage and nonmassage group.

needle and hanging suture techniques. Following the interventions, GLESCO improved from grade 4 to grade 0 in eight cases (72%), from grade 4 to grade 1 in one case (9%), and from grade 4 to grade 3 in one case where partial contracture occurred and the patient declined further treatment. Additionally, one case was lost to follow-up after treatment.

The GLESCO in the massage group exhibited a significant average decrease of 0.07 grade per week (95% CI -0.11 to -0.03, p<0.001), while in the non-massage group, it decreased by 0.01 grade per week, which was not statistically significant (95% CI -0.06 to 0.06, p=0.955). Furthermore, the massage group demonstrated an average decrease of 0.72 grade per week compared to the non-massage group (95% CI -1.46 to 0.02, p=0.058) (Figure 6).

Regarding the grading of eyelid malpositioning, there was no significant change observed. In the massage group, the grading decreased by an average of 0.02 grade per week but did not reach statistical significance (95% CI –0.05 to 0.02, p=0.374), while in the non-massage group, it increased by 0.02 grade per week, also without statistical significance (95% CI –0.04 to 0.07, p=0.535). Additionally, the massage group displayed an average decrease of 0.49 grade per week compared to the non-massage group (95%)

CI -1.03 to 0.05, p=0.073) (Figure 7).

Regarding the comfort score, both the massage and non-massage groups exhibited significant increases, with the massage group showing a rise of 0.06 score per week (95% CI 0.01 to 0.10, p=0.024), and the non-massage group showing a rise of 0.11 score per week (95% CI 0.02 to 0.19, p=0.016). However, the difference between the massage and non-massage groups, with the massage group having an average increase of 0.18 score per week higher than the non-massage group, did not reach statistical significance (95% CI –1.08 to 1.45, p=0.775) (Figure 8).

#### Discussion

In patients undergoing traumatic facial repair, the subciliary incision has gained popularity since the 1990s due to its advantages, including concealed scarring, excellent exposure of fracture sites, and the ability to extend the wound without necessitating lateral canthotomy, as seen with the transconjunctival approach. However, despite its widespread use, this approach is not without complications. Reported complications associated with the subciliary incision include lower eyelid scar contracture for 2.5%, hypertrophic or visible scarring for 0.9% to 3.6%, and lower eyelid malposition ranging from 0.5% to 42%, which may manifest as scleral show for 2.5% to ectropion for 0.5% to 37%<sup>(1-6)</sup>.

The development of transconjunctival and extended transconjunctival incisions has provided alternatives with lower incidence rates of certain complications compared to the traditional subciliary approach. These include lower lid malposition/ ectropion in 0% to 10% and hypertrophic or visible scarring in 0%, while introducing new complications such as entropion in 0% to 30%, which may necessitate surgical correction in 0% to 4.4% of cases, and lacrimal canaliculus transaction in 1.1%, which may require surgical correction in 1.1% of cases. It is noteworthy that these complications, although less frequent, often necessitate surgical intervention more frequently than complications associated with the subciliary approach. Such considerations should inform the selection of the surgical approach $^{(1,2,4)}$ .

In the present study, the majority of lower eyelid complications were identified at 3-week and 6-week post-operative intervals.

The lower eyelid massage group demonstrated significantly improved GLESCO scores at 6-week, 3-month, and 6-month post-operative intervals. These findings suggest the potential efficacy of massage techniques in preventing lower eyelid scar contracture. However, no significant differences were observed in the prevention of lower eyelid malpositioning.

The present study encountered limitations with a lower than anticipated number of cases completing the follow-up protocol at 16 (27%). Several factors may have contributed to this, including logistical challenges for patients residing in remote rural areas, the extended duration of the follow-up protocol, and the presence of low to non-troublesome clinical symptoms in some patients. Furthermore, the present study did not assess the negative and positive vectors of lower eyelid support, which could significantly influence the occurrence of ectropion. Patient compliance also served as an uncontrolled and significant confounding factor throughout the study.

# Conclusion

Lower eyelid massage demonstrates benefits in preventing lower eyelid scar contracture. Nevertheless, the impact of massage on eyelid malpositioning and comfort scores remain statistically insignificant. Further investigations with larger sample sizes are warranted. However, the authors advocate the incorporation of lower eyelid massage into postsurgical care protocols for all patients.

# What is already known on this topic?

The subciliary incision technique is associated with potential complications, including lower eyelid scar contracture and eyelid malpositioning. Studies have proposed various management strategies for addressing these complications, including observation, lower eyelid massage, steroid injection, or surgical intervention<sup>(1-6)</sup>.

#### What does this study add?

Patients who were educated and advised to perform post-operative lower eyelid massage exhibited significant improvements in the grading of lower eyelid scar contracture.

## Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their gratitude for the research grant provided by the Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University. The present study could not have been completed without the indispensable assistance of our plastic surgical team, both in the in-patient and out-patient departments. Additionally, the authors express our gratitude to Dr. Wasana Ko-iam for her contribution to data analysis in the present study.

#### **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare no conflict of interest pertaining to this study.

#### References

- Ridgway EB, Chen C, Colakoglu S, Gautam S, Lee BT. The incidence of lower eyelid malposition after facial fracture repair: a retrospective study and meta-analysis comparing subtarsal, subciliary, and transconjunctival incisions. Plast Reconstr Surg 2009;124:1578-86.
- 2. Ishida K. Evolution of the surgical approach to the orbitozygomatic fracture: From a subciliary to a transconjunctival and to a novel extended transconjunctival approach without skin incisions. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 2016;69:497-505.
- Patrocinio TG, Loredo BA, Arevalo CE, Patrocinio LG, Patrocinio JA. Complications in blepharoplasty: how to avoid and manage them. Braz J Otorhinolaryngol 2011;77:322-7.
- Giraddi GB, Syed MK. Preseptal transconjunctival vs. subciliary approach in treatment of infraorbital rim and floor fractures. Ann Maxillofac Surg 2012;2:136-40.
- Czerwinski M, Martin M, Lee C. Quantitative comparison of open reduction and internal fixation versus the Gillies method in the treatment of orbitozygomatic complex fractures. Plast Reconstr Surg 2005;115:1848-54; discussion 55-7.
- Ellis E 3rd, Perez D. An algorithm for the treatment of isolated zygomatico-orbital fractures. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2014;72:1975-83.
- Rubin P, Mykula R, Griffiths RW. Ectropion following excision of lower eyelid tumours and full thickness skin graft repair. Br J Plast Surg 2005;58:353-60.
- McGraw BL, Adamson PA. Postblepharoplasty ectropion. Prevention and management. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 1991;117:852-6.
- Draaijers LJ, Tempelman FR, Botman YA, Tuinebreijer WE, Middelkoop E, Kreis RW, et al. The patient and observer scar assessment scale: a reliable and feasible tool for scar evaluation. Plast Reconstr Surg 2004;113:1960-5; discussion 6-7.
- 10. Glossary. Spine 2000;25:3200-2.