

# Teenage Rhinoplasty

Abdoljalil Kalantar-Hormozi<sup>1\*</sup>, Roozbeh Ravar<sup>1</sup>, Ali Abbaszadeh-Kasbi<sup>2</sup>,  
Nazanin Rita Davai<sup>3</sup>

1. Department of Plastic and Craniofacial Surgery, Medical College of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, 15 Khordad Hospital, Tehran, Iran;
2. School of Medicine, Tehran university of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran;
3. Clinical Psychiatrist, Private Practice, Tehran, Iran

## ABSTRACT

### BACKGROUND

Rhinoplasty is among the most popular aesthetic surgical procedures selected by teenagers. When it comes to teenagers' rhinoplasty, almost all surgeons believe that modified techniques should be considered because the nose is still growing. In this article, we prospectively followed teenagers who had undergone septorhinoplasty to assess the safety of procedure and its possible complications.

### METHODS

All the patients who were under 18 years old but for those who had a bleeding disorder, allergic rhinitis, and cleft lip nose were included in the study. All the patients were operated by the Senior author through closed rhinoplasty. Age, gender, indication for surgery, postoperative complications, need for revision surgery, postoperative satisfaction, and disturbance in facial growth until puberty were gathered for each of patients.

### RESULTS

Of all 40 patients, 38 (95%) patients were female and 2 (5%) patients were male. Mean age and follow up of patients was  $16.1 \pm 0.8$  years and  $29.5 \pm 12.1$  months, respectively. Fourteen (35%) patients had some degrees of nasal obstruction. Thirty-five (87.5%) patients expressed complete satisfaction with their rhinoplasty outcome. None of patients underwent revision rhinoplasty.

### CONCLUSION

The study indicates that patients' craniofacial growth was not affected by the procedure, and it seems that septorhinoplasty is safe in teenagers.

### KEYWORDS

Rhinoplasty; Septorhinoplasty; Teenagers; Pediatric; Nasoseptal growth

Please cite this paper as:

Kalantar-Hormozi A, Ravar R, Abbaszadeh-Kasbi A, Rita Davai N. Teenage Rhinoplasty. World J Plast Surg 2018;7(1):97-102.

## INTRODUCTION

According to the Cosmetic Surgery National Data Bank Statistics (2016), 39,709 candidates under the age of 18 underwent cosmetic surgery procedures. Within these surgical procedures, rhinoplasty, commonly known as a nose job, which is one of the most complex

### \*Corresponding Author:

Abdoljalil Kalantar-Hormozi, MD;  
Department of Plastic and Craniofacial Surgery,  
Medical College of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Science,  
15 Khordad Hospital, Azodi street,  
Karim Khan Blvd,  
Tehran, Iran

**Tel:** +98-21-88901108

**Fax:** +98-21-88909193

**E-mail:** kalantarj@yahoo.com

**Received:** July 19, 2016

**Revised:** September 23, 2017

**Accepted:** October 3, 2017

and challenging procedures of plastic surgery in which for aesthetic and functional goals surgeon reshape the components of the nose is a popular surgical procedure among teenagers.<sup>1,2</sup>

Rhinoplasty in teenagers is more crucial than in adults because craniofacial is still growing in teenagers, unlike adults, and altering cartilaginous structure may lead to complications, postsurgical distortion, or disturbance of craniofacial growth. Moreover, secondary rhinoplasty rate is greater in teenagers than in adults. On the other hand, chronic rhinitis, turbinate and adenoid hypertrophy, choanal atresia, and deviated nasal septum leading to nasal obstruction may lead to growth inhibition of the nose, paranasal sinuses, and midface, so performing septorhinoplasty is helpful when indicated.<sup>3-11</sup>

Even though studies indicating safety of rhinoplasty in teenagers are increasing, patients and their families should be counseled regarding possible complications, possibility of secondary rhinoplasty, and even its possible adverse effects on craniofacial growth, and also, psychologic counselling should be considered for whom aesthetic aspects is initial motivation.<sup>12-16</sup> Here, we conducted a prospective study involving teenage patients who were the candidates for septorhinoplasty to assess the safety of procedure among them and possible complications.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

This is a prospective study carried out in a private setting from January 2013 to April 2017. All the patients who were under 18 years old and underwent septorhinoplasty were included in the study. Patients with a bleeding disorder, allergic rhinitis, or cleft lip nose were excluded from the study.<sup>3</sup> A thorough medical history and physical examination were obtained for all the patients. Routine lab tests as well as radiographic imaging were performed for all the patients. Further tests were tailored to each individual conditions. All the patients were operated by the Senior Author, and closed technique for rhinoplasty was applied for all the patients. Age, gender, indication for surgery, postoperative complications, need for revision surgery, postoperative satisfaction, and disturbance in facial growth until puberty were gathered for each of patients.

The youngest patient was a 14-year-old girl whose bone age study had demonstrated

structural maturity (Figure 1) before the septorhinoplasty. Statistical analysis was accomplished using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16, SPSS Inc., Chicago, US). Data are expressed as number (%) or mean±standard deviation (SD).



**Fig. 1:** A 14-year old girl who underwent rhinoplasty. Left sided photos were taken before the rhinoplasty (Preoperative photos). Right sided photos were taken after a 60-month period (Postoperative photos).

## RESULTS

Forty patients were included in this study, and 38 (95%) patients were female while 2 (5%) of those were male. Mean age of patients was 16.1±0.8 years (Table 1). Indications for surgery for 40 (100%) patients were aesthetic, and, also, 14 (35%) of these patients had some degrees of nasal obstruction. Among these 14 patients, Cottle test was positive but external nasal valve collapse was negative. Mean follow up period was 29.5±12.1 months for all the patients. Thirty-five (87.5%) patients expressed complete satisfaction with their rhinoplasty outcome. None of patients underwent revision rhinoplasty (Figure 2). Table 2 outlines postoperative complications (both short term and long term). Craniofacial growth

**Table 1:** Characteristics of patients.

Variable	Male Patients	Female Patients	Whole Patients
Number N (%)	2 (5)	38 (95)	40 (100)
Age Mean±SD	17.1±0.7	16.1±0.7	16.1±0.8
Follow up period Mean±SD	12.5±0.7	26.3±8.2	29.5±12.1
Primary motivation			
Only Aesthetic N (%)	0 (0.0)	26 (100)	26 (100)
Only Functional N (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Both N (%)	2 (14.2)	12 (85.8)	14 (100)
Revision Surgery N (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)



**Fig. 2:** A 17-year old girl who underwent rhinoplasty. Left sided photos were taken before the rhinoplasty (Preoperative photos). Right sided photos were taken after a 12-month period (Postoperative photos).

of patients was not affected by the procedure in any patients.

## DISCUSSION

Anatomically speaking, in comparison to adults, teenagers have a greater nasal cartilage-to-bone ratio and a larger nasolabial angle as well as less projected dorsum and nasal tip.<sup>4,17</sup> Meanwhile, the nose continues to grow until some 12 to 16 years of age in girls and 15 to 18 years of age in boys, so any acquired or congenital nasal abnormalities leading to abnormal nasal growth must be corrected through elective rhinoplasties,

**Table 2:** outlines both short term and long term complications of surgery.

Variable	Number of patients No (%)
Septal hematoma	0 (0.0)
Infection	1 (2.5)
Nasal deviation	0 (0.0)
Tip depression	0 (0.0)
Wide dorsum	0 (0.0)
Short nose	0 (0.0)
Nostril asymmetry	0 (0.0)
Broad nasal bones	0 (0.0)
Transient nasal pain	0 (0.0)
Worsening nasal obstruction	0 (0.0)
Swelling around stitches	2 (5)
Epistaxis	1 (2.5)
Graft migration or resorption	0 (0.0)
Disturbing facial growth	0 (0.0)
Satisfaction with the outcome	
Low	5 (12.5)
Deep	35 (87.5)

such as septoplasty, rhinoplasty, rhinoseptoplasty, to restore normal nasal growth, function, and aesthetics.<sup>11,18-22</sup>

To the best of our knowledge, Freer and Killian, in 1902 and 1905, respectively, were among the first surgeons who performed septorhinoplasty in pediatrics, and consequently the procedures including wide resection of cartilages led to the severe disturbance of nasal growth and retropositioning of the maxillary bone.<sup>23,24</sup> Yet, today, with the application of more conservative approaches septorhinoplasty in teenagers is performed without any major consequences for the craniofacial growth.<sup>4</sup>

Besides closed septorhinoplasty technique, open septorhinoplasty, external septorhinoplasty,

may be used for teenagers' septorhinoplasty. Although external septorhinoplasty, indicated to operate dermoid cyst, septal abscess, cleft lip nose, or severe septal deformity, has more advantages than closed septoplasty, including better access to the nasal septum to manipulate the nasal components, there was a tendency for the operated noses through this method to be shorten after completing craniofacial growth as well as columellar scar.<sup>25-29</sup>

Although, based on several studies, open septoplasty should be postponed until after the age of 16 years, patients suffering from severe septal deformities causing nasal obstruction and consequently adverse effects on craniofacial growth should undergo septoplasty regardless of age, even at birth.<sup>5,7,14,30-33</sup> Among operated patients in the study, we did not have any long term problems, but 4 (10%) patients had short term complications, not severe, resolved without any sequelae within a few hours to days. Also, 35 (87.5%) patients had deep satisfaction with the outcome of the rhinoplasty.

Crysdale and Tatham reported that approximately 70% of their patients had satisfactory outcome.<sup>25</sup> Koltai *et al* mentioned neither postop complications nor long term complications.<sup>34</sup> Locke and Kubba in 2011 reported that their rhinoplasties did not affect the craniofacial growth and all the patients were satisfied with their postoperative nasal appearance.<sup>35</sup> Chung *et al* in 2014 reported that all of their patients after a 90 day period were satisfied with the outcome of their operation.<sup>36</sup> Constantian in 2012 reported that 97% of his patients expressed happiness with their postoperative outcome.<sup>9</sup>

Within the operated patients, there was no need for the revision surgery, and Constantian explicated that the major reason why patients undergo revision surgery is development a new deformity after the primary rhinoplasty.<sup>9</sup> In a study by Neaman *et al* in 2013, including both adults and teenagers, they reported that the revision surgery rate was 9.8%.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, it is claimed that revision surgery rate in teenagers is greater than that of adults.<sup>37,38</sup> Male to female ratio was 0.05 in current study, but some studies suggest that male to female ratio is greater than that of our study because boys are more prone to engage in high contact sports or street fighting.<sup>39-41</sup> Current study revealed that craniofacial growth was not affected

by the procedure among teenagers who had undergone closed septorhinoplasty, and, hence, septorhinoplasty may be safely performed when is indicated.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors thank Mr. Chitsazan for his work in preparing photos of the patients.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Rohrich RJ, Janis JE, Kenkel JM. Male rhinoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2003;**112**:1071-85.
- 2 Cosmetic surgery sational data bank statistics. The American Society for Aesthetic Plastic Surgery. 2016.
- 3 McGrath MH, Mukerji S. Plastic surgery and the teenage patient. *J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol* 2000;**13**:105-18.
- 4 Gupta A, Svider PF, Rayess H, Sheyn A, Folbe AJ, Eloy JA, Zuliani G, Carron MA. Pediatric Rhinoplasty: A discussion of perioperative considerations and systematic review. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2017;**92**:11-16.
- 5 Bertossi D, Albanese M, Turra M, Favero V, Nocini P, Lucchese A. Combined rhinoplasty and genioplasty: long-term follow-up. *JAMA Facial Plast Surg* 2013;**15**:192-7.
- 6 Shapiro P. Effects of nasal obstruction on facial development. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 1988;**81**:967-71.
- 7 Grymer LF, Bosch C. The nasal septum and the development of the midface. A longitudinal study of a pair of monozygotic twins. *Rhinology* 1997;**35**:6-10.
- 8 Naclerio RM, BC, Baraniuk JN. Pathophysiology of nasal congestion. *Int J Gen Med* 2010;**3**:47-57.
- 9 Constantian MB. What Motivates Secondary Rhinoplasty? A Study of 150 Consecutive Patients. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2012;**130**:667-78.
- 10 Shariati MM, Meymane Jahromi A. Cavernous Sinus and Generalized Venous Thrombosis Following Rhinoplasty in a Young Patient. *World J Plast Surg* 2012;**1**:107-11.
- 11 Manafi A, Hamed ZS, Manafi A, Rajabiani A, Rajae AR, Manafi F. Injctable Cartilage

- Shaving: An Autologous and Long Lasting Filler Material for Correction of Minor Contour Deformities in Rhinoplasty. *World J Plast Surg* 2015;**4**:93-100.
- 12 Maniglia CP, Maniglia JV. Rhinoseptoplasty in children. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol* 2017;**83**:416-9.
  - 13 D'Ascanio L, Manzini M. Safe and rapid approach to the deviated nasal septum in children. *Laryngoscope* 2009;**119**:2000-3.
  - 14 Huizing EH. Septum surgery in children; indications, surgical technique and long-term results. *Rhinology* 1979;**17**:91-100.
  - 15 Manafi A, Kaviani A, Hamed ZS, Rajabiani A, Manafi N. Evidence Based Efficacy of Autologous Grated Cartilage in Primary and Secondary Rhinoplasty. *World J Plast Surg* 2017;**6**:137-43.
  - 16 Omranifard M, Abdali H, Rasti Ardakani M, Ahmadnia AY. Comparison of the Effects of Spreader Graft and Overlapping Lateral Crural Technique on Rhinoplasty by Rhinomanometry. *World J Plast Surg* 2013;**2**:99-103.
  - 17 Bae JS1, Kim ES, Jang YJ. Treatment outcomes of pediatric rhinoplasty: the Asan Medical Center experience. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2013;**77**:1701-10.
  - 18 Akgüner M1, Barutçu A, Karaca C. Adolescent growth patterns of the bony and cartilaginous framework of the nose: a cephalometric study. *Ann Plast Surg* 1998;**41**:66-9.
  - 19 van der Heijden P, Korsten-Meijer AG, van der Laan BF, Wit HP, Goorhuis-Brouwer SM. Nasal growth and maturation age in adolescents: a systematic review *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2008;**134**:1288-93.
  - 20 Zielnik-Jurkiewicz B, Olszewska-Sosińska O. The nasal septum deformities in children and adolescents from Warsaw, Poland. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2006;**70**:731-6.
  - 21 Willemot J, Pirsig W. Indications, technic and long-term results of surgery of the nasal pyramid and septum in children. *Acta Otorhinolaryngol Belg* 1984;**38**:427-32.
  - 22 Dennis SC1, den Herder C, Shandilya M, Nolst Trenité GJ. Open rhinoplasty in children. *Facial Plast Surg* 2007;**23**:259-66.
  - 23 Freer OT. The correction of deflections of the nasal septum with a minimum of traumatism. *JAMA* 1902;**38**:636-42.
  - 24 Kilian G. The submucous window resection of the nasal septum. *Ann Otolaryngol* 1905;**14**:363-73.
  - 25 Crysdale WS. External septo-rhinoplasty in children. *Laryngoscope* 1985;**95**:12-6.
  - 26 Triglia JM, Pech A. Septo-rhinoplasty in children: outcome and effect on growth of septal excision and reimplantation. *J Otolaryngol* 1990;**19**:274-8.
  - 27 Shandilya M, Den Herder C, Dennis SC, Nolst Trenité G. Pediatric rhinoplasty in an academic setting. *Facial Plast Surg* 2007;**23**:245-57.
  - 28 El-Hakim H1, Crysdale WS, Abdollel M, Farkas LG. A study of anthropometric measures before and after external septoplasty in children. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2001;**127**:1362-6.
  - 29 Goodman WS, Charles DA. Why external rhinoplasty? *J Otolaryngol* 1978;**7**:6-8.
  - 30 Dispenza F1, Saraniti C, Sciandra D, Kulamarva G, Dispenza C. Management of naso-septal deformity in childhood: long-term results. *Auris Nasus Larynx* 2009;**36**:665-70.
  - 31 Kvinnsland S. Partial resection of the cartilaginous nasal septum in rats; its influence on growth. *Angle Orthod* 1974;**44**:135-40.
  - 32 Mellion ZJ1, Behrens RG, Johnston LE Jr. The pattern of facial skeletal growth and its relationship to various common indexes of maturation. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2013;**143**:845-54.
  - 33 Lawrence R. Pediatric septoplasty: a review of the literature. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2012;**76**:1078-81.
  - 34 Koltai PJ1, Hoehn J, Bailey CM. The external rhinoplasty approach for rhinologic surgery in children. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 1992;**118**:401-5.
  - 35 Locke R, Kubba H. The external rhinoplasty approach for congenital nasal lesions in children. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2011;**75**:337-41.
  - 36 Chung V, Lee AS, Scott AR. Pediatric nasal valve surgery: short-term outcomes and complications. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2014;**78**:1605-10.
  - 37 Neaman KC1, Boettcher AK, Do VH, Mulder C, Baca M, Renucci JD, VanderWoude DL. Cosmetic rhinoplasty: revision rates revisited. *Aesthet Surg J* 2013;**33**:31-7.
  - 38 Rettinger G. Risks and complications in rhinoplasty. *GMS Curr Top Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2007;**6**:Doc08. Epub

2008 Mar 14.

- 39 Hojjat H, Svider PF, Lin HS, Folbe AJ, Shkoukani MA, Eloy JA, Zuliani G. Adding Injury to insult: a national analysis of combat sport-related facial injury. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol* 2016;**125**:652-9.
- 40 Lawrence LA1, Svider PF, Raza SN, Zuliani G, Carron MA, Folbe AJ. Hockey-related facial injuries: a population-based analysis. *Laryngoscope* 2015;**125**:589-93.
- 41 Svider PF, Chen M, Burchhardt D, O'Brien PS, Shkoukani MA, Zuliani GF, Folbe AJ. The vicious cycle: Pediatric facial trauma from bicycling. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2016;**154**:371-6.