Ameloblastoma: A Clinicopathological Retrospective study.

^{1.}Altaf H Malik,².Syed Wakeel Andrabi,³.Ajaz A Shah, ⁴.Ab Latief Najar,⁵.Shahid Hassan

(PG Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Govt Dental College Srinagar JK India) Corresponding Author; Altaf H Malik, Dept of OMFS Govt Dental College Srinagar.

Abstract

Objectives: The aim of the present study was to analyze the clinicopathological features from a series of ameloblastomas diagnosed and treated in our department.

Study Design: The records of all ameloblastoma patients were revisited and their clinical and radiological and histological information were obtained. Data were descriptively analyzed and a compared with respect to different ameloblastoma subtypes.

Results: Thirty ameloblastomas composed the final sample, including 24 (72.5%) solid/multicystic, 4(12%) unicystic, 1 (3%) desmoplastic and 1 (3%) peripheral ameloblastomas. Mean age of the affected patients was 38 years of life an. Most tumors presented as multilocularradiolucencies and were located in the posterior mandible and showed the follicular and plexiform histological patterns..

Conclusions: The clinicopathological features of the ameloblastomapatients in our study group were almost similar to the studies done on other worldwide populations.

Key words: Ameloblastoma, solid, unicystic,

Date of Submission: 01-02-2018

Date of acceptance: 17-02-2018

I. Introduction

Ameloblastoma is a benign, locally aggressive odontogenictumor that has a close histopathologic resemblance to the enamel organ. It belongs to the group of tumors arising from odontogenic epithelium with mature fibrous stroma without odontogenicectomesenchyme according to the World Health Organization (WHO) Classification of OdontogenicTumors in 2005. Ameloblastoma is divided into 4 types: unicystic, solid/ multicystic, desmoplastic, and peripheral.¹ It is believed to originate from remnants of tooth-forming apparatus, such as developing enamel organ, odontogenic rests, reduced enamel epithelium and the epithelial lining of odontogenic cysts, especially dentigerous cysts, or from the basal epithelial cells of the oral mucosa.^{2,3}.Ameloblastoma ranks as the most common odontogenictumor in Asia and Africa, whereas odontoma is listed as the most common odontogenictumor in Europe and America.⁴⁻⁶ The average age of patients afflicted with ameloblastoma in industrialized countries was 39.1 years, whereas in developing it was 27.7 years^{7,8.9}.

The aim of the present study was to analyze the clinicopathological features of ameloblastoma patients diagnosed and treated in Oral and Maxillofacial department Government Dental College Srinagar.

II. Materials And Methods

We carried out a retrospective study in a series of ameloblastoma cases using their clinical charts ,radiological records and histology slides and reports. We used 30 cases of ameloblastomas whose clinical ,radiological and histological record along with paraffin blocks was available..

For the clinical study, we collected data regarding the patients' gender and age, as well as anatomical location, symptoms and time of lesion development and radiological feature. For the histomorphological study, slides were revisited in pathology laboratory for confirmation and inference.

III. Results

From the 30 selected ameloblastomas 24 (72.5%) were diagnosed as solid/multicystic, 4 (12%) unicystic, 1 (3%) desmoplastic and 1(3%) peripheral. 16 patients (56%) were males and 14 (44%) females. Average age of all patients was 36 years (ranging from 16 to 70years) and there was no statistically significant difference on the mean age of males (38 years) and females (35 years). Age of the patients affected by both peripheral (65 years) and desmoplastic (48years) ameloblastomas was higher than mean age of the patients affected by the other two subtypes.

One third of the patients reported symptoms associated with the tumors, including especially swelling, pain and discharge. Mandible was affected in 88% of the cases, maxilla in 9% and the posterior region of the

mandible was affected in 26 cases (78.5%), in contrast with the anterior region 1 case 3%, 3 cases in maxilla 9%). 70% havemultilocular radiological appearance while 20% were unilocular, 6% were mixed and 3% have no radiological presentation. Radiological limits were considered well defined and ill-defined in, respectively, 80% and 20% of the cases. Root resorption was encountered in 48% of the tumors located in close proximity with the adjacent teeth. The greatest radiological diameter of the tumors ranged from 4 to 90 mm (mean of 46.2 mm).

Most common histological pattern found in solid ameloblastomafollicular followed by plexiform $\{16 (64\%) \text{ and } 8 (32\%)\}$, respectively. The 4 unicystic ameloblastomas were characterized by mural (3, 9%) and luminal (1, 3%) growing pattern and the 1 peripheral ameloblastomas were characterized by the presence of both follicular and plexiform histological subtypes.

Mean greatest diameter of solid (44.8 mm) and unicystic (35 mm) ameloblastomas were not statistically significant different. Females and males presented tumors with mean greatest diameter of 47.6 mm and 45.2 mm, respectively. There were also no statistically significant differences on the mean greatest diameter of the tumors when comparing patients with or without symptoms, with unilocular or multilocularradiolucencies, and tumors presenting follicular or plexiform histological patterns.

IV. Discussion

Apart from being classified as benign entities, these tumors can present local infiltrative growth and are able to produce extensive bone destruction and infiltration to the surrounding soft tissues. There are also some histologically benign ameloblastomas producing regional and distant metastasis (malignant ameloblastomas) and some malignant ameloblast-derived neoplasms (ameloblastic carcinomas) showing some histological characteristics superimposed to the ones found in ameloblastomas, bringing additional difficulties on their differential diagnosis. Thus it is very important to have early and accurate diagnosis for better management of amelobaltomaand its malignant counterparts.

Reichartet al.¹⁰ reviewed the biological profile of 3677 ameloblastomas; the largest series so far. The age of patients in their series ranged from 4 to 92 years. Our data were in accordance with this range. In our study average age of all patients was 36 years (ranging from 16 to 70 years) and there was no statistically significant difference on the mean age of males (38 years) and females (35 years). The peak incidence in Asia fell in the third decade of life as compared with the fifth decade of life in North America. The explanation for the lower average age of patients with ameloblastoma may reflect poor nutrition and reduced access to the health care system in developing countries, as proposed by Dodge's concept¹¹, however it may not be entirely applicable. The present study revealed an almost equal gender distribution, which is also in accordance with previous studies¹⁰.

The mandible is the site of predilection for odontogenictumors, including ameloblastoma. In the present study, 27 cases (81.66%) of intraosseousameloblastomas were encountered in the mandible. This figure is comparable with the 87.3% reported in a KoreanStudy¹⁴, 87.8% in a Sri Lankan series,¹⁶ 93.0% in a US data⁸, 93.5% in a Kenyan study19¹⁵ and 93.9% in a Thai study.¹³.In our study, the ratio of mandible:maxilla ranged from 9:1, compared with 3:1.00 to 6:1.00 in North America. Sriram and Shetty⁹ reported the mandible:maxilla ratio as high as 18:1.0

Most cases (78.5%) were located in the premolar/molar region of the mandible and about 70% were multilocular in radiological appearance This finding is consistent with studies by Sirichitra and Dhiravarangkura,¹³ Kim and Jang,¹⁴ and Buchner et al.⁸ The reason why mandible, particularly the premolar/molar region, is the favored site for ameloblastoma is still unknown. However, Adeline and coworkers¹⁵ found that the angle-ramus region was the most common site of ameloblastoma. studies revealed that multilocularradiolucencies outnumbered unilocular radiolucencies,^{13,15} whereas the contrary was true for others.^{12,14} In Asia, except Korea, multilocular radiolucency outnumbered unilocular radiolucency, whereas the contrary was true for North America.¹⁷

A previous study by Kim and Jang¹⁴ also supports this finding. Desmoplasticameloblastoma has been reported to account for 0.9% to 13.0% of all ameloblastomas.¹⁴In the present study, desmoplasticameloblastoma accounted for 3.1% of all ameloblastomas.

Regarding the histopathologic features, the follicular and plexiform patterns were the most common patterns, similar to previous reports.^{10,13,14,17} The follicular pattern by far is the most common histopathologic pattern encountered.Peripheral ameloblastoma has been reported to account for 0.5% to 9.3% of all ameloblastomas.³⁻¹⁷.In the present study, peripheral ameloblastoma accounted for 3.1% of all ameloblastomas.

V. Conclusion

Ameloblastoma is a benign, locally aggressive odontogenictumor. It mostly affects patients in the third to the fifth decades of life, with no gender predilection. The mandible, especially the posterior part, is the site of predilection. Radiographically, ameloblastomas mostly appear as multilocular or unilocularradiolucencies. The

most common histopathologicpatternfound in amelobalstoma is the follicular followed by plexiform pattern. In comparison to previous studies, there were no significant differences age, gender and radiographic features.

References

- Philipsen HP, Reichart P, Slootweg PJ, Slater LJ. Odontogenic tumours. In: Barnes L, Eveson JW, Reichart P, Sidransky D, editors. World Health Organization classification of tumors, pathology and genetics of head and neck tumors. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2005. p. 283-328.
- [2]. Waldron C. Odontogenic cysts and tumors. In: Neville BW, Damm DD, Allen CM, Bouquot JE, editors. Oral and maxillofacial pathology. St. Louis: W. B. Saunders; 2009. p. 678-740.
- [3]. Ide F, Mishima K, Miyazaki Y, Saito I, Kusama K. Peripheral ameloblastoma in-situ: an evidential fact of surface epithelium origin. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral RadiolEndod 2009;108:763-7.
- [4]. Lu Y, Xuan M, Takata T, Wang C, He Z, Zhou Z, et al. Odontogenictumors. A demographic study of 759 cases in a Chinese population. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral RadiolEndod 1998;86:707-14.
- [5]. Daley TD, Wysocki GP, Pringle GA. Relative incidence of odontogenictumors and oral and jaw cysts in a Canadian population. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1994;77:276-80.
- [6]. Gupta B, Ponniah I. The pattern of odontogenictumors in a government teaching hospital in the southern Indian state of Tamil Nadu. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral RadiolEndod 2010;110:e32-9.
- [7]. Mothes P, Kreusch T, Harms D, Donath K, Schmelzle R. Frequency of odontogenictumors in the growth period. DtschZahnarztl Z 1991;46:18-9.
- [8]. Buchner A, Merrell PW, Carpenter WM. Relative frequency of central odontogenictumors: a study of 1,088 cases from Northern California and comparison to studies from other parts of the world. J Oral MaxillofacSurg 2006;64:1343-52
- [9]. 9.Sriram G, Shetty RP. Odontogenictumors: a study of 250 cases in an Indian teaching hospital. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral RadiolEndod 2008;105:e14-21.
- [10]. Reichart PA, Philipsen HP, Sonner S. Ameloblastoma: biologicalprofile of 3677 cases. Eur J Cancer B Oral Oncol 1995;31B: 86-99.
- [11]. Dodge OG. Tumors of the jaw, odontogenic tissues and maxillary antrum (excluding Burkitt lymphoma) in Uganda Africans. Cancer 1965;18:205-15.
- [12]. Zhang J, Gu Z, Jiang L, Zhao J, Tian M, Zhou J, Duan Y. Ameloblastoma in children and adolescents. Br J Oral MaxillofacSurg 2010;48:549-54.
- [13]. Sirichitra V, Dhiravarangkura P. Intrabonyameloblastoma of the jaws. An analysis of 147 Thai patients.Int J Oral Surg 1984;13:187-93.
- [14]. Kim SG, Jang HS. Ameloblastoma: a clinical, radiographic, and histopathologic analysis of 71 cases. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral RadiolEndod 2001;91:649-53.
- [15]. Adeline VL, Dimba EA, Wakoli KA, Njiru AK, Awange DO, Onyango JF, et al. Clinicopathologic features of ameloblastoma in Kenya: a 10-year audit. J CraniofacSurg 2008;19:1589-93.
- [16]. DarshaniGunawardhana KS, Jayasooriya PR, Rambukewela IK, Tilakaratne WM.A clinico-pathological comparison between mandibular and maxillary ameloblastomas in Sri Lanka. J Oral Pathol Med 2010;39:236-41
- [17]. KittipongDhanuthai, DDS, MSc,aSoranunChantarangsuetalAmeloblastoma: a multicentric study. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral RadiolEndod2012;113:782-788

Altaf H Malik,"Ameloblastoma: A Clinicopathological Retrospective study ." IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS), vol. 17, no. 2, 2018, pp. 30-32.
