



F1 **Orthodontic Surgery and Professional Liability: The Homozygote Twin Case**

Emilio Nuzzolese, DDS, PhD, Ambulatorio Nuzzolese, viale J.F. Kennedy 77, Bari, 70124, ITALY; and Nunzio Cirulli, DDS, PhD, Via Che Guevara 1, Bari, 70124, ITALY*

After attending this presentation, attendees will learn the importance of psychological support when a patient is undergoing maxillo facial surgical intervention to reposition one or both jaws. This allows to evaluate the expected/desired versus predictable/obtainable results.

This presentation will impact the forensic science community highlighting how somatic features modifications are involved a patient with unrealistic expectations should be discouraged from surgery.

Patients with dental and skeletal malocclusion may need not only several fixed orthodontic appliances but, under certain conditions, also one or more maxillo facial surgical interventions to reposition one or both jaws. This is the case when facial discrepancies are beyond the corrective range of a traditional orthodontic appliance and therapeutic results later may be considered a compromise. Nevertheless orthognatic surgery of jaws requires a full evaluation of expected/desired versus predictable/obtainable results. For this reason, in some cases, a compromise reached without surgery may be more appropriate.

Orthognatic surgery cases need a correct diagnosis and planning through frontal and lateral X-ray images of the patient along with cephalometric assessment and a jaw model study. As facial somatic features would be modified by the treatment, it is essential to provide psychological support to these patients before and after surgery, even when an aesthetic improvement is expected and/or effectively obtained. In some cases patients may have unrealistic expectations and should be discouraged from surgery.

A professional liability lawsuit of an orthodontic case, where the patient underwent several maxillofacial surgical interventions, is presented. The patient, unhappy with the results obtained consulted other orthodontists in order to achieve a more satisfactory outcome. The subsequent treatment resulted in increased temporomandibular discomfort and the patient requested a medico legal evaluation wishing to sue the dental and maxillofacial surgeons. An odontologist assisted by an orthodontist completed an expert witness report. Following the assessment it was determined that there were no indications for such interventions on the jaws, along with other examples of professional negligence: no psychological assessment or indications as to the aesthetic results post surgery were given. Unfortunately, the patient killed himself four years after the last surgery and the medico legal assessment was completed through the orthodontic study of his homozygote twin brother. This presented the same type of malocclusion but had never applied any orthodontic device, signifying the brother had he had not received any "corrective" jaw treatment.

Professional Liability, Orthodontics, Maxillo Facial Surgery