CASE REPORT

Longitudinal Success of Artery-Only Microanastomosis in Pediatric Lower Lip Replantation: A Seven-Year Case Study and Review of the Literature



Aline Ceulemans, MD¹^{*}; Casper Sommeling, MD²; Pieter Luyten, MD³; Koenraad Van Landuyt, MD, PhD¹; Filip Stillaert, MD, PhD¹

¹ Department of Plastic and Reconstructive surgery, Ghent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium ² Department of Plastic and Reconstructive surgery, AZ Alma Hospital, Eeklo, Belgium ³ Department of Plastic and Reconstructive surgery, AZ Groeninge Hospital, Kortrijk, Belgium

ABSTRACT

In Belgium, the incidence of dog bite injuries stands at 22 per thousand for children under the age of fifteen, a demographic particularly vulnerable to severe facial trauma. While prompt microsurgical replantation within the craniofacial region is linked to enhanced recovery outcomes, its adaptation for pediatric care presents distinct challenges. This report examines the case of a 2.5-year-old girl who sustained a severe full-thickness avulsion of the lower lip, measuring 2 x 1.5 cm, due to a dog bite. Successful microsurgical intervention involved retrieving the right inferior labial artery for an end-to-end anastomosis with the arterial stump of the amputated segment. Venous congestion was managed with leech therapy, which facilitated complete motor and sensory recovery, including the restoration of normal speech and oral continence. Accompanying this case, a review of microsurgical lip replantation in children aged 12 and under was conducted through PubMed and Google Scholar, using keywords such as "lip amputation," "lip avulsion," "lip replantation," and "lip reimplantation." This review identified 17 cases and underscored that ischemia times up to 6 hours do not preclude successful replantation in children, given their reduced susceptibility to ischemia-reperfusion injury. Finding an appropriate vein for anastomosis proves difficult, resulting in a reliance on artery-only anastomosis in 41% of cases, equating to seven patients. Nonetheless, a notable 82% of cases, totaling fourteen patients, achieved complete replant survival. In conclusion, this study underscores the long-term success of microsurgical replantation for severe lower lip avulsion in pediatric patients, highlighting significant functional and aesthetic benefits. It stresses the necessity for specialized centers, comprehensive postoperative surveillance, and effective venous drainage strategies to improve outcomes. The findings reveal gaps in long-term data, reinforcing the need for standardized treatment protocols and specialized fo

INTRODUCTION

In Belgium, there is a reported annual incidence of 22 dog bite injuries per 1000 children under the age of 15, with most incidents occurring at home with familiar dogs [1]. This age group is especially susceptible to severe facial injuries from such encounters, emphasizing the importance of robust treatment protocols [2,3]. Maintaining a functional oral sphincter is critical for normal development in children, and adhering to the "replace like with like" principle in microsurgical replantation in the head and neck area not only preserves essential functions but also delivers superior aesthetic outcomes [4–8]. Despite the challenges posed by smaller arteries and less defined labial veins in pediatric patients [4,9,10], replantation is recommended as the preferred method. This preference is supported by observations of less severe ischemia-reperfusion injuries in younger patients, which contribute to more favorable recovery results [11].

Significant gaps persist in longitudinal follow-up studies concerning pediatric patients after lip replantation, with scarce data on the post-surgical functional and aesthetic outcomes. This dearth of information underscores critical concerns regarding the long-term efficacy of these surgeries and the ongoing quality of life for the affected individuals.

This paper details a case of a 2.5-year-old patient who experienced a severe lower lip avulsion, impacting more than two-thirds of the lip, following a dog bite. The focus of this study is on assessing long-term surgical outcomes for such pediatric injuries, which present substantial challenges, requiring refined surgical approaches and elaborate postoperative care plans. Complementing the case analysis, this article includes a comprehensive review of the literature on pediatric lip avulsions and microvascular repair techniques. The intent is to contextualize this individual case within a broader spectrum of similar incidents, critically examining the variety of available treatment methodologies and their respective outcomes in young patients. Through meticulous evaluation, this study aims to critique and enhance current medical protocols, identifying key areas for innovation in pediatric facial reconstructive surgery.

CASE PRESENTATION

A 2.5-year-old girl was admitted following a dog bite that resulted in a severe full-thickness avulsion of her lower lip, affecting over two-thirds of the lip area and causing considerable tissue damage. This condition necessitated sophisticated microsurgical intervention.

On admission, the extent of the injury was immediately apparent, and the initial state of the injury is captured in Figure 1A. The amputated segment of the lower lip, measuring 2×1.5 cm, was successfully retrieved as a single tissue unit and is shown in Figure 1B. Crucially, both oral commissures were preserved.

Microscopic inspection revealed the presence of the small arterial stump of the inferior labial artery embedded within the avulsed orbicularis oris muscle, and its corresponding part was located in the wound bed.



Figure 1. (A) A 2.5-year-old female presents with a significant full-thickness avulsion of the lower lip, comprising over two-thirds of the area, due to a canine assault. (B) The amputated tissue, recovered as a cohesive unit, measures 2 x 1.5 cm. The integrity of both oral commissures is preserved. (C) Microscopic examination uncovers the diminutive arterial stump of the inferior labial artery embedded within the avulsed orbicularis oris muscle. Its counterpart in the wound bed is also discerned. A meticulous isolation of the artery extends 3 mm within the excised tissue, paralleled by a careful dissection in the wound's recipient bed. (D) A post-operative overview demonstrates the successfully reattached segment of the lip, where each anatomical layer has been sutured distinctively.

Surgical Procedure

During the operation, meticulous care was taken to isolate the artery over a 3 mm segment in both the amputated part and the recipient wound bed, as shown in Figure 1C. An end-to-end microsurgical anastomosis was carefully performed with interrupted Ethilon 11/0 sutures. Upon releasing the vascular clamp, successful reperfusion and visible capillary refill were observed, confirming the restoration of arterial inflow; however, no veins were identified post-restoration. The anatomical layers, comprising both muscle and mucosa, were individually and meticulously sutured using Vicryl 7/0. Closure of the surgical wounds was achieved using Ethilon 8/0 sutures, as illustrated in Figure 1D. It is notable that no nerves were retrieved during the procedure.

Postoperative Care

Following the surgical intervention, the young patient was intubated for 11 days to ensure stable breathing. To mitigate the risk of thrombosis and infection, she was administered low molecular weight heparin for 8 days and a course of intravenous antibiotics (amoxicillin/clavulanic acid) spanning 12 days. Anticipating complications from venous congestion, medicinal leech therapy was employed for 5 days, during which the child required blood transfusions totaling 4 units of packed red blood cells, adhering to a dosage of 10ml/kg. Nutritional support was provided through nasogastric tube feedings and parenteral nutrition until she was capable of adequate oral intake. Her recovery progressed smoothly, and on the 19th day post-surgery, she was transferred from the pediatric intensive care unit to the pediatric ward. The patient was subsequently discharged on the 23rd day, marking a significant milestone in her recovery journey.

Outcome and Follow-up

The replanted segment of the lip experienced complete recovery. Throughout a comprehensive seven-year follow-up period, the patient fully regained motor and sensory functions. This restoration was demonstrated through her maintained oral continence, normal speech, and ability to whistle. Sensory recovery was specifically verified by a two-point discrimination test on the lip, which measured at 2 mm (Figure 2). Additionally, supplementary video material is available at https://doi.org/10.24983/scitemed.imj.2024.00183, providing further visual documentation of the extensive recovery process. This detailed follow-up underscores the long-term success of the surgical intervention and postoperative care.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A comprehensive literature search focusing on microvascular lip replantation in children was conducted up until October 2023, utilizing the electronic databases PubMed and Google Scholar. The search employed specific keywords: "lip amputation," "lip avulsion," "lip replantation," and "lip reimplantation." Additionally, the bibliographies of retrieved articles were scrutinized to identify any cases not previously detected through the initial search. The inclusion criteria were strict, considering only studies involving children younger than 12 years of age and excluding those that described replantation as a composite graft without vascular anastomosis. The collected data encompassed a variety of variables where available, including the age of the patients, the cause and location of the avulsion, ischemia times, the use of anticoagulant and antibiotic therapies, specifics of vascular anastomoses, the employment of leech therapy, and the duration of follow-up alongside outcomes and any complications. Due to a small sample size, the analysis was confined to descriptive statistics, providing foundational insights into the efficacy and challenges of lip replantation procedures in the pediatric demographic.

DISCUSSION

Overview of Pediatric Lip Replantation

A focused review of the literature revealed 17 cases of microsurgical lip replantation in children aged 12 years and younger (Table 1) [9,10,12–20]. The average age of these patients was 5.7 years, which aligns with findings that younger children are more susceptible to facial injuries from dog bites [1]. The youngest patient in these studies was only 14 months old at the time of surgery [20]. Each case involved avulsions of the lip rather than the crush or cutting lesions more typical in adult incidents. Such injuries in children often affect longer segments of the intima, significantly complicating the replantation process [7]. This overview underscores the unique surgical challenges posed by pediatric lip avulsions and highlights the need for specialized approaches in these delicate cases.

Challenges in Pediatric Vascular Anastomosis

The average ischemia time reported in pediatric lip replantation cases is 5.9 hours, typically within the 6-8 hour range considered tolerable for muscle



Figure 2. Sequential evaluation over seven years of functional and sensory restitution following reconstructive surgery for a full-thickness avulsion of the lower lip in a young patient. (A) At rest, the lip exhibits symmetrical alignment. (B) Volitional movement reveals intact motor function, coupled with preserved oral continence during a smile. (C) Whistling, a demonstration of muscular dexterity and recovery. The patient achieves complete sensory reacquisition, with a two-point discrimination threshold refined to 2 mm, and full motor restoration is documented, including unimpaired speech. Access the video at https://doi.org/10.24983/scitemed.imj.2024.00183 for a comprehensive visual narrative.

tissue preservation. Notably, in the case discussed, the cold ischemia time was only 4 hours, comfortably within this safe range, although durations of up to 9 hours have also been managed without complications [9]. This suggests that extending ischemia times beyond six hours does not necessarily preclude successful replantation in children, as ischemia-reperfusion injuries are generally milder in this demographic [9].

Ischemia-reperfusion injuries in children are predominantly mediated by neutrophils. Studies have documented age-related impairments in neutrophil activity in human neonates, where neutrophil migration to injured tissue is less effective, and oxidative burst activity is significantly reduced [11]. Additionally, mast cells, which also play a significant role in ischemia-reperfusion injuries, are known to increase in number with age, adding another layer of complexity in adult cases [21]. These factors potentially contribute to the better outcomes observed in younger patients undergoing replantation [9]. However, the understanding of these mechanisms in the pediatric population remains incomplete, warranting further research into age-related differences in ischemia-reperfusion injury responses.

Finding a suitable vein for anastomosis remains a substantial challenge in pediatric replantation cases, exacerbated by the smaller vessel sizes, which decrease in diameter from lateral to medial [5,7,10]. Despite these challenges, our findings and additional literature confirm that replantation is indeed feasible in very young patients, highlighting the importance of specialized surgical techniques and careful planning in managing these delicate procedures.

Artery-Only Anastomosis Techniques

In our review, 41% of the seventeen documented cases of pediatric lip replantation reported employing artery-only anastomosis [5,10,22]. In

scenarios lacking venous anastomosis, securing an alternative method for venous drainage becomes critical for the viability of the replanted tissue. The strategies adopted typically involve a multimodal approach aimed at alleviating venous congestion, which includes both topical and systemic anticoagulation combined with leech therapy.

Among these cases, a substantial proportion received anti-thrombotic therapy: 18% were treated with anti-platelet medication alone, another 18% with only anticoagulants, while a significant 44% received a combination of both treatments. Notably, two of the three patients who experienced partial necrosis were undergoing treatment with systemic heparin. The use of anticoagulants in such surgeries, particularly to prevent clot formation and maintain blood flow in free flap surgeries, remains a controversial topic with limited supporting evidence [22–24]. This issue is even more pronounced in the pediatric population, where research on the effectiveness and safety of anticoagulants in microvascular anastomosis is scarce, highlighting a critical gap in current medical literature and underscoring the need for further investigation.

Medicinal Leeches in Venous Congestion Relief

In scenarios of artery-only anastomosis, medicinal leeches have been consistently utilized to alleviate venous congestion, as outlined in Table 2. This method of venous drainage was also employed in our specific case study. Notably, even among cases that successfully achieved venous anastomosis, four out of ten still required the use of leech therapy. One significant concern with this approach is the substantial blood loss involved; all patients required blood transfusions, with one extreme case necessitating as much as 29 liters of blood [19]. This rate of transfusion contrasts sharply with adult cases, where typically only about one-third of patients undergoing leech therapy need transfusions [25]. In our observations, the du-

Case No.	Age, years	Injury cause	Affected region	Injury size, cm ²	lschemia time, hours	Arterial anastomosis	Artery	Venous anastomosis	Necrosis
1 [12]	3	Dog bite	Upper lip + Nose	15	3.5	1	SLA	1	Partial
2 [13]	3.5	Dog bite	Upper lip + Nose + Cheek	NR	7	1	FA	2	None
3 [14]	12	Horse bite	Lower lip + Chin	NR	>8	1	ILA	1	None
4 [10]	5.4	Dog bite	Upper lip	8	5.6	2	LA	1	None
5 [10]	12	Dog bite	Lower lip	10	5.6	1	LA	0	None
6 [10]	2.7	Dog bite	Upper lip	36	5.6	1	LA	0	None
7 [10]	9	Dog bite	Upper lip	7	5.6	1	SLA	2	None
8 [10]	6.7	Dog bite	Upper lip	3	5.6	1	LA	0	Partial
9 [10]	5.1	Dog bite	Upper lip	6	5.6	1	LA	1	None
10 [10]	10.1	Dog bite	Upper lip	6	5.6	1	LA	0	None
11 [15]	7	Dog bite	Upper lip	NR	9	1	SLA to FV	0	None
12 [16]	7	Dog bite	Upper + Lower lip + Commissure + Cheek	NR	8	1	SLA	1	None
13 [17]	6	Dog bite	Upper + Lower lip + Commissure	8	4	1	FA	1	None
14 [9]	1.7	Dog bite	Upper lip + Cheek	NR	9	1	SLA	0	Partial
15 [18]	2	Dog bite	Upper lip + Nose	21	3	1	SLA	3	None
16 [19]	2	Dog bite	Upper lip + Nose + Cheek	NR	6.25	1	FA	0	None
17 [20]	1.2	Dog bite	Upper lip	6	3	1	FA	1	None
18 Current case	2.5	Dog bite	Lower lip	3	4	1	ILA	0	None

Table 1. Comprehensive Review of Pediatric Lip Replantation Following Animal Bite Injuries

ration of leech therapy across cases averaged 5.7 days, a period typically necessary for neoangiogenesis to effectively proceed [5]. This highlights both the utility and the complexities of using leeches in managing venous congestion in pediatric microsurgical procedures.

Risks of Leech Therapy in Pediatric Patients

The use of medicinal leech therapy in pediatric patients is associated with significant risks and potential complications. Notably, this therapy often leads to considerable blood loss, frequently requiring transfusions, and increases the risk of infection, underscoring the critical need for vigilant monitoring and proactive antibiotic prophylaxis. The increased need for blood transfusions in young patients demands careful consideration due to the inherent risks involved. Additionally, while not widely reported, the need for sedation during leech therapy, particularly for facial applications, is a realistic possibility and should be carefully considered. Effective communication with patients and their families is essential to navigate these complexities and manage expectations appropriately. Given these challenges, further investigation into alternative, non-traditional methods of venous drainage for this demographic is recommended to enhance safety and efficacy.

Postoperative Antibiotic Protocols

The application of postoperative antibiotics follows specific regional guidelines, with Belgian and Dutch protocols recommending the use of amoxicillin-clavulanic acid for a period of 5-14 days following facial injuries from dog bites [3]. Additionally, the role of antibiotic prophylaxis is particularly emphasized in cases involving medicinal leech therapy, as supported by multiple articles and guidelines that advocate for its use to prevent potential infections [26–28].

In the scope of the literature reviewed, antibiotics were recorded as part of the treatment strategy in approximately 71% of the cases, equating to twelve instances. This highlights a general adherence to recommended practices in the majority of instances. However, there is a notable gap in documentation for the remaining cases; the reports do not specify whether antibiotics were used or omitted. This lack of explicit reporting underscores the need for more thorough documentation and adherence to standardized treatment protocols to ensure comprehensive patient care and infection control in postoperative management.

Replantation Outcome Analysis

No instances of complete flap failure were reported in the reviewed cases. However, three cases did experience partial flap failure, accounting for 18.8% of the cases, with one being attributed to iatrogenic causes. Impressively, 82% of the cases, or fourteen patients, achieved complete survival of the replanted lips, an outcome that stands out positively when compared to general survival rates in head and neck replantation [7]. It is important to note, however, that there is a potential for these results to be influenced by publication bias.

Typically, normal two-point discrimination for the upper and lower lip is measured at 3 ± 1.1 mm using a static sharp object [29]. Walton et al. have recommended that at least 1 cm of moving two-point discrimination is necessary for adequate protective sensibility, noting that their pediatric studies averaged 6 mm [10]. While some studies have not confirmed sensitive recovery, fifteen out of seventeen cases successfully attained full oral

therapy days wherapy days Antiplatelet bodys far says, days far s	Table 2. Outcome	s of Pediatric Lip	Replantati	on After Ani	mal Bites: A Cor	mprehensive Postoperativ	ve Analysis			
thrombosis Destran * Systemic heparin 2[13] No No NA NR Acetylsalloylic acid Yes, NR RR Full recovery Oral competence 2[14] No No NA NR Acetylsalloylic acid NR Full recovery Oral competence 4[10] No Yes 7 300 Destran + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 4 mm Oral competence 5[10] No Yes 4 3000 Acetylsalloylic acid + Ceph + Pen + 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence 5[10] No Yes 6 1200 Destran + Topical Ceph + Pen + 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence 7[10] No Yes 1 4250 Systemic heparin Caph + Pen + 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence 7[10] No Na 120 Destran + Systemic heparin Caph + Pen + 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence 7[10] Ye	Case No.	Revision		therapy duration,		0	Antibiotics	hospital stay,	Sensory recovery	Motor recovery
1414NoNoNANRAcetylsalicylic acid+ DextranNR15Full recoveryOral competence Oral competence1410NoYes7300Dextran + Systemic MeparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 4 nmOral competence51101NoYes43000Acetylsalicylic acid + Systemic heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 10 nmOral competence51101NoYes61200Dextran + Topical heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 8 nmOral competence71101NoYes14250Systemic heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 8 nmOral competence71101NoYes1250Hyaluronidase + HeparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 8 nmOral competence71101NoYes81250Dextran + Coumadin + Systemic heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 8 nmOral competence71101NoYes810 PUAcetylsalicylic acid + toymen heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 3 nmOral competence711115Full-hickness skin graftYes810 PUAcetylsalicylic acid + toymen heparinNR15NRNR711115Full-hickness skin graftYesNRNRNRNROral competence Normal speechNRS711115Full-hickness skin graft <td>1 [12]</td> <td></td> <td>NR</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NR</td> <td>Dextran + Systemic</td> <td>NR</td> <td>NR</td> <td>NR</td> <td>NR</td>	1 [12]		NR	NA	NR	Dextran + Systemic	NR	NR	NR	NR
Dextran Dextran Ceph Pen Heat 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 4 mm Oral competence (7 a) [10] No Yes 4 300 Dextran + Systemic (Paprin) Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 10 mm Oral competence (Paprin) [10] No Yes 4 3000 Dextran + Topical (Paprin) Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence (Paprin) [10] No Yes 6 1200 Dextran + Topical (Paprin) Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence (Paprin) [10] No Yes 1 250 Hyaluronidase + (Paprin) Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence (Paprin) [10] Yes No NA 2100 Dextran + Coumadin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence (Paprin) [10] Yes Na 1200 Dextran + Systemic (Paprin) Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence (Paprin) [111] Fulthickness 8<	2 [13]	No	No	NA	NR	Acetylsalicylic acid	Yes, NFR	NR	Full recovery	Oral competence
Image Vanc 5[10] No Yes 4 3000 Acetylsalicylic acid + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 10 mm Oral competence (710) No Yes 6 1200 Dextran + Formal Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence (710) No Yes 1 4250 Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence (710) R(I0) Yes 1 250 Hyaluronidase + Heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence (710) R(I0) Yes No NA 250 Dextran + Coumadin + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence (710) R(I0) Yes NA 2100 Dextran + Coumadin + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence (710) R(I1) No Yes 8 1250 Dextran + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) NR NR	3 [14]	No	No	NA	NR		NR	15	Full recovery	Oral competence
Systemic heparin Vanc 5[10] No Yes 6 1200 Dextran + Topical heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence Vanc 7[10] No Yes 1 4250 Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence Vanc 8[10] Yes 1 4250 Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence Vanc 9[10] Yes No NA 2100 Dextran + Coumadint Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence Vanc 9[10] Yes No NA 2100 Dextran + Coumadint Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence Vanc 10 [10] No Yes 8 1250 Dextran + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 11.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence Vanc 11 [15] Full-thickness skin graft Yes 8 10 PU Acetylsalicylic acid + Neparin NR Sis <	4 [10]	No	Yes	7	300	-	•	11.9 (7–18)	2PD: 4 mm	Oral competence
Image Vanc 7[10] No Yes 1 4250 Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence 3[10] Yes Yes 1 250 Hyaluronidase + Heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence 9[10] Yes No NA 2100 Dextran + Coumadin + Vanc Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence 9[10] No Yes 8 1250 Dextran + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence 10[10] No Yes 8 1250 Dextran + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence 11[15] Singraft Yes 8 1250 Dextran + Systemic heparin NR 15 NR NR 12[16] No Ne NR Sels NR Sels Sels NR Sels NR Sels NR	5 [10]	No	Yes	4	3000		-	11.9 (7–18)	2PD: 10 mm	Oral competence
Vanc Vanc 8[10] Yes Yes 1 250 Hyaluronidase + Heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 8 mm Oral competence 9[10] Yes No NA 2100 Dextran + Coumadin + Systemic heparin Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence 9[10] No Yes 8 1250 Dextran + Systemic Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence 10 [10] No Yes 8 1250 Dextran + Systemic Ceph + Pen + Vanc 1.9 (7-18) 2PD: 3 mm Oral competence 11 [15] Kull-thickness Yes 8 10 PU Acetylsalicylic acid + Systemic heparin NR 15 NR NR 12 [16] No No NA NR Acetylsalicylic acid + Low molecular weight heparin Cephalotin + Clindamycin 15 NR Oral competence 13 [17] No Yes NR 545 NR NR Removicillar weight heparin NR NR Pull recovery Oral competence 15 [18] Evil verous	6 [10]	No	Yes	6	1200	•	·	11.9 (7–18)	2PD: 8 mm	Oral competence
HeparinVancP[10]YesNoNA2100Dextran + Coumadin + Systemic heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 3 mmOral competence Oral competence10 [10]NoYes81250Dextran + Systemic heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc1.9 (7-18)2PD: 3 mmOral competence Oral competence11 [15]Full-thicknessYes81250Dextran + Systemic heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc1.9 (7-18)2PD: 3 mmOral competence Oral competence12 [16]NoYes810 PUAcetylsalicylic acid + Low molecular weight heparinNR15NRNROral competence Normal speech13 [17]NoYesNRS45NRNR8Full recoveryOral competence Normal speech15 [18]Full-thickness skin graftYes5NR*NRNRNRNRNr15 [19]NoYes829000NRCepharin14Full recoveryOral competence Normal speech16 [19]NoYes829000NRCefepime21NROral competence Normal speech17 [20]NoYes54 PUSystemic heparin + Topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speech18 Current caseNoYes54 PUSystemic heparin + Topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speech	7 [10]	No	Yes	1	4250	Systemic heparin	•	11.9 (7–18)	2PD: 8 mm	Oral competence
InitialSystemic heparinVanc10 [10]NoYes81250Dextran + Systemic heparinCeph + Pen + Vanc11.9 (7-18)2PD: 3 mmOral competence Name11 [15]Full-thickness skin graftYes810 PUAcetylsalicylic acid + Systemic heparinNR15NRNR12 [16]NoNoNANRAcetylsalicylic acid + Low molecular weight heparinCephalotin + Clindamycin15NROral competence Normal speech13 [17]NoYesNR545NRNR8Full recoveryOral competence Normal speech14 [9]Full-thickness skin graftYes5NRNRNRNRNROral competence Normal speech15 [18]Extra venous anastomosisNANRNRNRAmoxicillin/ clavulanic acid14Sell recoveryOral competence Normal speech16 [19]NoYes829000NRCefepime21NROral competence Normal speech17 [20]NoYes93730Systemic heparin + Topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speech18 Current caseNoYes54 PUSystemic heparinAmoxicillin/ Systemic heparin23Full recoveryOral speech, Normal speech	8 [10]	Yes	Yes	1	250	-	-	11.9 (7–18)	2PD: 8 mm	Oral competence
InterpretationNameNameNameI1 [15]Full-thickness skin graftYes810 PUAcetylsalicylic acid + Systemic heparinNR15NRNRI2 [16]NoNoNANRAcetylsalicylic acid + Low molecular weightCephalotin + Clindamycin15NROral competence Normal speechI3 [17]NoYesNR545NRNR8Full recoveryOral competence Normal speechI4 [9]Suin graftYesSNRNRNRNRNRNRI5 [18]Kara venous anastomosisNoNANRNRAcetylsalicylic acid + Low molecular weight heparinNRNRNRNRI6 [19]NoYes829000NRCefepime21NROral competence Normal speech Normal speech Topical heparin + Topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral competence Normal speechI7 [20]NoYes54 PUSystemic heparin + Topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speechI8 Current caseNoYes54 PUSystemic heparinAmoxicillin/ Amoxicillin/23Full recoveryOral speech, Normal speech	9 [10]	Yes	No	NA	2100		·	11.9 (7–18)	2PD: 3 mm	Oral competence
skin graftSystemic heparinI2 [16]NoNoNANRAcetylsalicylic acid + Low molecular weight heparinCephalotin + Clindamycin15NROral competence Normal speechI3 [17]NoYesNR545NRNR8Full recoveryOral competence Normal speechI4 [9]Full-thickness skin graftYes5NR*NRNRNRNRNROral competence Normal speechI5 [18]Extra venous anastomosisNoNANR*NRAmoxicillin/ clavulanic acid14Full recovery Normal speechOral competence Normal speechI6 [19]NoYes829000NRCefepime21NROral competence Normal speechI7 [20]NoYes54 PUSystemic heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speech18 Current caseNoYes54 PUSystemic heparinAmoxicillin/ Amoxicillin/23Full recoveryOral speech, Normal speech	10 [10]	No	Yes	8	1250	-	•	11.9 (7–18)	2PD: 3 mm	Oral competence
Low molecular weight heparinClindamycin13 [17]NoYesNRS45NRNRRS4Full recoveryOral competence Normal speech14 [9]Full-thickness skin graftYes5NR*NRNRNRNROral competence Normal speech15 [18]Extra venous anastomosisNANR*NRAmoxicillin/ clavulanic acid14Full recoveryOral competence Normal speech Normal speech16 [19]NoYes829000NRCefepime21NROral competence Normal speech Normal speech Normal speech17 [20]NoYes93730Systemic heparin + topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speech Normal speech18 Current caseNoYes54 PUSystemic heparinAmoxicillin/ 23Full recoveryOral speech, Normal speech	11 [15]		Yes	8	10 PU	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	NR	15	NR	NR
International systemNRNRNRNRNRNROral competence14 [9]Full-thickness skin graftYes5NR*NRNRNRNROral competence15 [18]Extra venous anastomosisNoNANR*NRAmoxicillin/ clavulanic acid14Full recovery Normal speechOral competence16 [19]NoYes829000NRCefepime21NROral competence Normal speech17 [20]NoYes93730Systemic heparin + Topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speech18 Current caseNoYes54 PUSystemic heparinAmoxicillin/ Amoxicillin/23Full recoveryOral speech, Oral speech, Normal speech	12 [16]	No	No	NA	NR	Low molecular weight	•	15	NR	Oral competence
skin graft15 [18]Extra venous anastomosisNaNRNRAmoxicillin/ clavulanic acid14Full recovery Normal speech Normal speech16 [19]NoYes829000NRCefepime21NROral competence Normal speech17 [20]NoYes93730Systemic heparin Topical heparinYes, NFR19NROral speech, Normal speech18 Current caseNoYes54 PUSystemic heparinAmoxicillin/ Amoxicillin/23Full recoveryOral speech, Normal speech	13 [17]	No	Yes	NR	545	NR	NR	8	Full recovery	Oral competence, Normal speech
anastomosis clavulanic acid Normal speech 16 [19] No Yes 8 29000 NR Cefepime 21 NR Oral competence 17 [20] No Yes 9 3730 Systemic heparin + Topical heparin Yes, NFR 19 NR Oral speech, Normal speech 18 Current case No Yes 5 4 PU Systemic heparin Amoxicillin/ 23 Full recovery Oral speech,	14 [9]		Yes	5	NRª	NR	NR	NR	NR	Oral competence
I7 [20] No Yes 9 3730 Systemic heparin + Topical heparin Yes, NFR 19 NR Oral speech, Normal speech 18 Current case No Yes 5 4 PU Systemic heparin Amoxicillin/ 23 Full recovery Oral speech, Normal speech	15 [18]		No	NA	NR♭	NR		14	Full recovery	Oral competence, Normal speech
Topical heparin Normal speech 18 Current case No Yes 5 4 PU Systemic heparin Amoxicillin/ 23 Full recovery Oral speech,	16 [19]	No	Yes	8	29000	NR	Cefepime	21	NR	Oral competence
	17 [20]	No	Yes	9	3730	,	Yes, NFR	19	NR	•
	18 Current case	No	Yes	5	4 PU	Systemic heparin		23	Full recovery	•

^aTransfusion protocol specified 14-24 ml/kg/day over 5 days; however, the actual volume administered remains unspecified.

^bA single transfusion of packed red blood cells was given at a dose of 10 ml/kg; however, the precise volume administered is not detailed.

Abbreviations: 2PD, two-point discrimination; Ceph, 1st generation cephalosporin; NA, not applicable; NFR, not further specified; NR, not reported; Pen, semi-synthetic penicillin; PU, pediatric units; Vanc, vancomycin.

continence, a crucial objective in the reconstruction of the oral stoma [4].

Research Limitations and Potential Bias

This article acknowledges several limitations that may impact the interpretation of its findings. Most notably, there exists a significant risk of publication bias, with the possibility that the documented results are biased toward successful outcomes, potentially underrepresenting less favorable results. The conclusions drawn from this review are based on a relatively small cohort of cases, which necessitates caution in generalizing the findings, especially regarding extended ischemia times where individual responses can vary. The complexities of ischemia-reperfusion injury in children are not yet fully understood, adding another layer of uncertainty. Additionally, research into the efficacy and safety of anticoagulants and leech therapy in pediatric patients is still limited, highlighting an urgent need for more comprehensive, controlled studies to develop more definitive clinical guidelines.

Key Lessons from Pediatric Replantation Studies

The insights derived from these studies offer several important lessons for clinical practice. First, surgeons are urged to consider microsurgical replantation as a preferred option when feasible, due to its proven superior functional and aesthetic results in pediatric cases. Second, the importance of meticulous post-operative monitoring cannot be overstated, and having effective alternatives for venous drainage at hand is crucial to manage potential complications. Lastly, it is critical to recognize that surgical replantation in children is a high-risk procedure that demands not only technical expertise but also effective communication with both the patient and their family throughout the treatment journey to ensure optimal outcomes and patient satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the successful long-term effects of microsurgical replantation for severe lower lip avulsion in pediatric patients, with a particular emphasis on significant functional and aesthetic benefits. Supported by an extensive literature review, the findings affirm consistent treatment efficacy in this age group, while also exposing notable gaps in long-term data. These insights underscore the necessity for standardized treatment protocols, specifically tailored to pediatric patients, and emphasize the importance of prolonged follow-up. Despite potential challenges, such as costs and medical complications, replantation of substantial avulsed lip segments remains the preferred treatment for children younger than 12, due to its superior outcomes. Efforts to enhance surgical results in pediatric cases include potential transfers to specialized centers and the development of alternative methods for venous relief, designed specifically to address the frequent venous congestion observed in children.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

*Correspondence: Aline Ceulemans, MD, Department of Plastic and Reconstructive surgery, Ghent University Hospital, Corneel Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Gent, Belgium. Email: aline.ceulemans@gmail.com

Received: Nov. 30, 2023; Accepted: Mar. 14, 2024; Published: May 06, 2024

DOI: 10.24983/scitemed.imj.2024.00183

Disclosure: The manuscript has not been presented or discussed at any scientific meetings, conferences, or seminars related to the topic of the research.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate: The study adheres to the ethical principles outlined in the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its subsequent revisions, or other equivalent ethical standards that may be applicable. These ethical standards govern the use of human subjects in research and ensure that the study is conducted in an ethical and responsible manner. The researchers have taken extensive care to ensure that the study complies with all ethical standards and guidelines to protect the well-being and privacy of the participants.

Funding: The author(s) of this research wish to declare that the study was conducted without the support of any specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The author(s) conducted the study solely with their own resources, without any external financial assistance. The lack of financial support from external sources does not in any way impact the integrity or quality of the research presented in this article. The author(s) have ensured that the study was conducted according to the highest ethical and scientific standards.

Conflict of Interest: In accordance with the ethical standards set forth by the SciTeMed publishing group for the publication of high-quality scientific research, the author(s) of this article declare that there are no financial or other conflicts of interest that could potentially impact the integrity of the research presented. Additionally, the author(s) affirm that this work is solely the intellectual property of the author(s), and no other individuals or entities have substantially contributed to its content or findings.

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s). The article presented here is openly accessible under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY). This license grants the right for the material to be used, distributed, and reproduced in any way by anyone, provided that the original author(s), copyright holder(s), and the journal of publication are properly credited and cited as the source of the material. We follow accepted academic practices to ensure that proper credit is given to the original author(s) and the copyright holder(s), and that the original publication in this journal is cited accurately. Any use, distribution, or reproduction of the material must be consistent with the terms and conditions of the CC-BY license, and must

not be compiled, distributed, or reproduced in a manner that is inconsistent with these terms and conditions. We encourage the use and dissemination of this material in a manner that respects and acknowledges the intellectual property rights of the original author(s) and copyright holder(s), and the importance of proper citation and attribution in academic publishing.

Publisher Disclaimer: It is imperative to acknowledge that the opinions and statements articulated in this article are the exclusive responsibility of the author(s), and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of their affiliated institutions, the publishing house, editors, or other reviewers. Furthermore, the publisher does not endorse or guarantee the accuracy of any statements made by the manufacturer(s) or author(s). These disclaimers emphasize the importance of respecting the author(s)' autonomy and the ability to express their own opinions regarding the subject matter, as well as those readers should exercise their own discretion in understanding the information provided. The position of the author(s) as well as their level of expertise in the subject area must be discerned, while also exercising critical thinking skills to arrive at an independent conclusion. As such, it is essential to approach the information in this article with an open mind and a discerning outlook.

REFERENCES

- De Keuster T, Lamoureux J, Kahn A. Epidemiology of dog bites: A Belgian experience of canine behaviour and public health concerns. *Vet* / 2006;172(3):482–487.
- Kahn A, Bauche P, Lamoureux J, Dog Bites Research Team. Child victims of dog bites treated in emergency departments: A prospective survey. *Eur J Pediatr* 2003;162(4):254–258.
- De Meyere D, Halsberghe C, De Meyere M. Secundaire preventie en behandeling van hondenbeten: Een aantal mythes doorprikt [Secondary prevention and treatment of dog bites: Dispelling a number of myths]. *Huisarts Nu*. 2010;39(9):352–355.
- Thorne CH. Grabb and Smith's Plastic Surgery. 7th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins;2013.
- Gustafsson J, Liden M, Thorarinsson A. Microsurgically aided upper lip replantation - Case report and literature review. *Case Reports Plast Surg Hand Surg* 2016;3(1):66–69.
- Liliav B, Zaluzec R, Hassid VJ, Ramasastry S, Kalimuthu R. Lip replantation: A viable option for lower lip reconstruction after human bites, a literature review and proposed management algorithm. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 2012;65(7):e197– 199.
- Efanov JI, Montoya JJ, Huang KN, et al. Microvascular replantation of head and neck amputated parts: A systematic review. *Microsurgery* 2017;37(6):699–706.
- Daraei P, Calligas JP, Katz E, Etra JW, Sethna AB. Reconstruction of upper lip avulsion after dog bite: Case report and review of literature. *Am J Otolaryngol* 2014;35(2):219–225.
- Deleyiannis FW, Powers MA. Lip replantation in an infant after prolonged ischemia: Age as a factor affecting success. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2014;133(2):240e–241e.
- Walton RL, Beahm EK, Brown RE, et al. Microsurgical replantation of the lip: A multi-institutional experience. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1998;102(2):358–368.
- Mowlavi A, Reynolds C, Neumeister MW, et al. Age-related differences of neutrophil activation in a skeletal muscle ischemia-reperfusion model. *Ann Plast Surg* 2003;50(4):403–411.
- James NJ. Survival of large replanted segment of upper lip and nose. Case report. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1976;58(5):623–625.
- Tschopp HM. Reconstructive surgery after severe animal bite injuries of the head and neck area. *Chirurgia plastica* 1983;7(2):89–102.
- Schubert W, Kimberley B, Guzman-Stein G, Cunningham BL. Use of the labial artery for replantation of the lip and chin. *Ann Plast Surg* 1988;20(3):256–260.
- Hendrick RG Jr, Tiwari P. Successful replantation of upper lip avulsion injury using an arterialized venous anastomosis. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2012;130(4):628e–630e.
- De la Parra-Márquez M, Mondragón-González S, López-Palazuelos J, Naal-Mendoza N, Rangel-Flores JM. [Face replantation using labial artery for revascularization. Case report]. Cir Cir 2013;81(3):221–224.
- DeLeon AN, Rinard JR, Mahabir RC. Successful replantation of a portion of the upper and lower lip with the oral commissure. *Ann Plast Surg* 2014;72(1):3–4.
- Baptista RR, Barreiro GC, Alonso N. Pediatric lip replantation: A case of supermicrosurgical venous anastomosis. *J Reconstr Microsurg* 2015;31(2):154–156.
- 19. Macias D, Kwon DI, Walker PC, Peterson NR. Microvascular replantation of a

composite facial avulsion in a 24-month-old child after dog bite. *Microsurgery* 2018;38(2):218–221.

- Williams AJ, Powers JM, Rhodes JL, Pozez AL. Microvascular replantation following facial dog bites in children: Systematic review and management algorithm. *Ann Plast Surg* 2018;81(1):106–112.
- 21. Harris NR, Rumbaut RE. Age-related responses of the microcirculation to ischemia-reperfusion and inflammation. *Pathophysiology* 2001;8(1):1–10.
- 22. Taylor HO, Andrews B. Lip replantation and delayed inset after a dog bite: A case report and literature review. *Microsurgery* 2009;29(8):657–661.
- Dawoud BES, Kent S, Tabbenor O, Markose G, Java K, Kyzas P. Does anticoagulation improve outcomes of microvascular free flap reconstruction following head and neck surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2022;60(10):1292–1302.
- 24. Lee KT, Mun GH. The efficacy of postoperative antithrombotics in free flap surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2015;135(4):1124–1139.
- 25. Whitaker IS, Josty IC, Hawkins S, et al. Medicinal leeches and the microsur-

geon: A four-year study, clinical series and risk benefit review. *Microsurgery* 2011;31(4):281–287.

- 26. Belgian Antibiotic Policy Coordination Commission. Guide belge de traitement anti-infectieux en pratique ambulatoire/belgische gids voor anti-infectieuze behandeling in de ambulante praktijk [Belgian guide for anti-infective treatment in outpatient practice]. Available at: https://organesdeconcertation.sante. belgique.be/fr/documents/guide-belge-de-traitement-anti-infectieux-en-pratique-ambulatoire-2022. Accessed november 30, 2023.
- South Eastern Sydney Local Health District. Leech therapy (medicinal). Available at: https://www.seslhd.health.nsw.gov.au/node/9157. Accessed november 30, 2023.
- McCracken JA, Koehler SM, Sharma R. Rethinking antimicrobial prophylaxis in patients receiving medicinal leech therapy. *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 2022;79(1):e14–e19.
- Won SY, Kim HK, Kim ME, Kim KS. Two-point discrimination values vary depending on test site, sex and test modality in the orofacial region: A preliminary study. *J Appl Oral Sci* 2017;25(4):427-435.