

·基础与临床研究·

个别托盘预留空间厚度与牙槽嵴低平无牙颌义齿修复效果的关系

姚玲玲 张娟 黄满英 徐晓华

(合肥市第二人民医院, 安徽医科大学附属合肥医院口腔科, 合肥 230011)

【摘要】 目的 探究个别托盘不同预留空间厚度与牙槽嵴低平无牙颌义齿修复的关系。**方法** 选择2020年3月至2023年3月期间于我院就诊的75例牙槽嵴低平无牙颌患者, 采用随机数字表法将患者分为A组($n=25$)、B组($n=25$)和C组($n=25$), 3组分别按无预留空间(0 mm), 预留空间(1.5 mm)和(2 mm)制作个别托盘并行全口义齿修复。对比3组患者的一般资料、修复有效率、VAS评分、TMD及PES评分, 并分析3组患者修复后的满意程度评分。采用广义估计方程模型评价3组患者各项指标的改善情况。**结果** 3组在终印与组织面的偏差值、复诊次数以及压痛位点之间存在显著差异, B组<C组<A组($P<0.05$)。B组患者的总有效率高A组和C组($P<0.05$)。术后3个月, 3组患者的VAS评分无明显差异, B组患者的TMD评分显著低于A组和C组, PES评分显著高于A组和C组($P<0.05$)。比较3组患者对固位效果、稳定性、咀嚼功能、舒适度的满意度, B组患者的满意度明显高于A组和C组($P<0.05$)。经广义估计方程分析可见: B组在TMD评分、PES评分、固位效果、稳定性、咀嚼功能、舒适度方面的改善情况优于A组和C组, C组在各方面的改善情况优于A组。**结论** 个别托盘预留空间为1.5 mm时制作终义齿组织面与粘膜形态适合性较好、复诊次数和压痛位点较少、修复效果较好、患者的满意度较高。

【关键词】 无牙颌 义齿修复 个别托盘 预留空间 广义估计方程模型

DOI: 10.11752/j.kqcl.2024.01.06

The relationship between the thickness of reserved space for individual trays and the restoration effect of low and flat alveolar ridge edentulous dentures

Yao Lingling Zhang Juan Huang Manying Xu Xiaohua

(The Second People's Hospital of Hefei, Department of Stomatology, Hefei Hospital Affiliated to Anhui Medical University, Hefei 230011)

【Abstract】 Objective Exploring the relationship between different reserved space thicknesses of individual trays and the restoration of edentulous dentures with a low and flat alveolar ridge. **Methods** 75 edentulous patients with low and flat alveolar ridge who were treated in the hospital from March 2020 to March 2023 were selected and randomly divided into Group A ($n=25$), Group B ($n=25$), and Group C ($n=25$) using a random number table method. The three groups were treated by fabricating individual trays and restoring dentures with no reserved space (0 mm), reserved space (1.5 mm) and (2 mm), respectively. Compare the general information, repair efficiency, VAS score, TMD, and PES scores of the three groups of patients, and analyze the satisfaction scores of the three groups of patients after restoration. Use a generalized estimation equation model to evaluate the improvement of various indicators in three groups of patients. **Results** There were significant differences among the three groups in the deviation values of the final impression from tissue surface, number of follow-up visits, and tenderness sites, with Group B < Group C < Group A ($P<0.05$). The total effective rate of Group B was higher than that of Group A and Group C ($P<0.05$). Three months after surgery, there was no significant difference in VAS scores