

Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Hybrid Reconstruction in Head and Neck Surgery: Integration of Virtual Planning, Navigation, and Robotic Microsurgery

[Thomas J. Sorenson](#)*, [Rebecca Lisk](#), Alexis B. Jacobson, Adam Jacobson, Jamie P. Levine

Posted Date: 17 March 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202603.1247.v1

Keywords: head and neck reconstruction; virtual surgical planning; CAD/CAM; robotic microsurgery; free flap reconstruction; surgical navigation



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Review

Hybrid Reconstruction in Head and Neck Surgery: Integration of Virtual Planning, Navigation, and Robotic Microsurgery

Thomas J Sorenson ^{1,*}, Rebecca Lisk ¹, Alexis B Jacobson ², Adam Jacobson ³ and Jamie P Levine ¹

¹ Hansjorg Wyss Department of Plastic Surgery, NYU-Langone Health, New York, NY

² NYU-Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY

³ Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, NYU-Langone Health, New York, NY

* Correspondence: jamie.levine@nyulangone.org

Abstract

Reconstruction in head and neck surgery requires restoration of complex functions, including speech, swallowing, and breathing, while preserving as much facial form and patient identity as possible. Over the past decade, advances in preoperative digital planning, intraoperative technologies, and robotic platforms have reshaped reconstructive strategies, giving rise to the concept of hybrid reconstruction. Hybrid approaches integrate free tissue transfer with computer-aided design and manufacturing, virtual surgical planning, intraoperative navigation, and robot-assisted microsurgery to enhance precision, reproducibility, and functional outcomes. This narrative review examines the principles and applications of hybrid reconstruction in head and neck surgery with particular emphasis on osseous reconstruction of the mandible, maxilla, and midface. The roles of intraoperative navigation and robotic assistance as enabling tools are discussed, along with their potential benefits and current limitations. Functional and morphologic outcomes, patient-reported quality of life, and challenges related to cost, access, training, and evidence heterogeneity are critically reviewed. Hybrid reconstruction represents an advancement toward outcomes-driven, patient-centered care; however, thoughtful integration of emerging technologies and continued emphasis on rigorous outcome assessment are essential to guide responsible adoption in contemporary head and neck reconstructive surgery.

Keywords: head and neck reconstruction; virtual surgical planning; CAD/CAM; robotic microsurgery; free flap reconstruction; surgical navigation

Introduction

Reconstruction of head and neck defects remains among the most technically demanding challenges in reconstructive surgery[1]. Surgeons must simultaneously restore essential functions, including speech, swallowing, and airway patency, while preserving facial morphology and the patient's sense of identity[1,2]. Historically, reconstructive success was measured primarily by flap survival and defect coverage[3–5]. Contemporary reconstruction, however, has evolved toward a more nuanced objective: reliable restoration of function and form with reproducible outcomes and minimized morbidity[6,7]. Over the past decade, the reconstructive landscape has undergone substantial transformation. The increasing complexity of oncologic resections, combined with heightened expectations for functional and aesthetic outcomes, has driven adoption of advanced technologies, such as computer-aided design and manufacturing (CAD/CAM), virtual surgical planning, intraoperative navigation, robotic-assisted surgery, and emerging bioengineered solutions[8–15].

Within this evolving framework, hybrid reconstruction has emerged as a unifying concept. Hybrid reconstruction refers to the integration of traditional free flap reconstruction with modern technological adjuncts. Hybrid approaches integrate established reconstruction techniques with digital planning and intraoperative technologies to enhance accuracy, efficiency, and functional outcomes[8,9,13,16]. This paradigm shift is particularly evident in osseous reconstruction of the mandible and midface where virtual planning and patient-specific implants have become increasingly common[17,18]. More recently, robot-assisted approaches have expanded the reconstructive armamentarium, enabling improved ergonomics and precision in select microsurgical applications[15,19–21]. This article presents a narrative review of hybrid reconstructive strategies in head and neck surgery with a focus on the integration of free tissue transfer, advanced planning technologies, intraoperative navigation, and robot-assisted microsurgery. Emphasis is placed on functional and morphologic outcomes, current challenges, and future directions in this rapidly evolving field.

Hybrid Reconstruction in Head and Neck Surgery

Hybrid reconstruction refers to the intentional integration of free tissue transfer with advanced digital and intraoperative technologies to optimize reconstructive accuracy, reproducibility, and patient-centered outcomes[10]. Unlike traditional reconstruction, where only intraoperative decision-making and surgeon experience largely determine outcomes, hybrid reconstruction additionally relies on preoperative planning, technological augmentation, and multidisciplinary coordination to guide execution[10]. At its core, hybrid reconstruction acknowledges that modern head and neck defects often exceed the limitations of single-modality solutions[10]. Complex three-dimensional skeletal defects, composite soft-tissue losses, and functionally critical anatomical regions demand precise reconstruction that balances form, function, and durability[1,22–24]. Digital planning platforms enable surgeons to preoperatively simulate resections and reconstructions, anticipate challenges, and design patient-specific solutions[9,25]. Intraoperative navigation further translates these plans into the operative field with improved accuracy[13].

Robotic assistance represents a complementary extension of the hybrid paradigm. In head and neck reconstruction, robotic platforms facilitate access to anatomically-constrained spaces, enhance visualization, and offer motion scaling and tremor reduction that may be advantageous in microsurgical tasks[15,21,26,27]. While clinical adoption remains limited, early experiences suggest potential benefits in flap harvest and microsurgical anastomosis, particularly in ergonomically challenging scenarios[19,28]. In the following sections, we review these components, examine their application in osseous and soft-tissue reconstruction, and critically evaluate the evidence supporting their use in contemporary head and neck reconstructive surgery.

Medical Advances and Their Impact on Hybrid Reconstruction

Advances in systemic therapies and radiation delivery have significantly altered the oncologic landscape of head and neck cancer with important downstream implications for reconstructive surgery[29–34]. Improvements in chemotherapeutic regimens, targeted therapies, immunotherapy, and precision radiation techniques have enabled more effective tumor control while minimizing collateral damage to surrounding tissues[30,31,35–37]. As a result, surgical resections in selected patients have become more focused, facilitating reconstruction with reduced complexity and morbidity[38].

Contemporary chemotherapy and targeted systemic therapies have improved tumor response rates and local disease control, particularly in advanced-stage and previously unresectable disease[39–41]. Neoadjuvant treatment strategies may reduce tumor burden prior to surgery, allowing for more limited resections that preserve critical anatomic structures[42–45]. In some cases, improved oncologic responses even enables organ-preserving approaches or smaller composite

defects, directly influencing reconstructive planning by decreasing the need for extensive chimeric or multilevel reconstruction[43].

Similarly, radiation therapy has undergone substantial refinement over the past decade. The widespread adoption of intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT), image-guided radiation therapy, and adaptive radiation planning has improved conformality and reduced radiation exposure to adjacent normal tissues, which has several important implications[30,46–49]. Better preservation of recipient vessels and decreased surrounding soft tissue fibrosis expands reconstructive options and improves flap reliability, particularly in delayed or salvage settings[50,51]. Reduced radiation-associated tissue injury may also facilitate simpler soft-tissue reconstruction, decrease wound-healing complications, and lower rates of fistula formation[50–52]. In select cases, improved tissue quality even allows for reconstruction using smaller flaps or less extensive composite approaches[53,54].

Importantly, advances in oncologic therapy have also influenced the timing and sequencing of reconstruction. Enhanced systemic disease control and improved patient tolerance of multimodal therapy have enabled more predictable coordination between oncologic resection and reconstruction[55,56]. This predictability supports preoperative planning and integration of hybrid reconstructive strategies, allowing surgeons to tailor reconstruction to anticipated defect size and functional requirements with greater confidence[2,8,57].

Despite these benefits, modern oncologic therapies introduce new considerations for reconstruction. Immunotherapy and targeted agents may affect wound healing and inflammatory responses, while cumulative radiation dose remains a critical determinant of tissue quality[58–61]. As survival improves, reconstructive goals increasingly emphasize long-term functional durability and quality of life, necessitating careful consideration of how prior and planned therapies influence reconstructive choice[62,63]. Overall, advances in chemotherapy and radiation therapy have contributed to a shift toward smaller, more precise resections in appropriately selected patients, reducing reconstructive burden and enabling more tailored approaches[31,42–45,49,64]. These oncologic developments complement advances in hybrid reconstruction by creating an environment in which precision planning, focused reconstruction, and function-driven outcomes can be more consistently achieved[2,8,57,62,63].

Preoperative Digital Planning and Virtual Surgical Simulation

Preoperative digital planning has become a foundational component of hybrid reconstruction in head and neck surgery[8,25,65]. Computer-aided design and manufacturing (CAD/CAM) and virtual surgical planning (VSP) enable surgeons to transition from intraoperative improvisation toward predefined, patient-specific reconstructive strategies, particularly in complex osseous and composite defects[9,11,66]. Virtual planning platforms allow three-dimensional reconstruction of patient anatomy using preoperative imaging, facilitating precise assessment of defect geometry, occlusion, and spatial relationships[9,10,67–70]. In mandibular and midface reconstruction, this capability is especially valuable for defining osteotomy location, segment length, and orientation prior to surgery[68–70]. By simulating both resection and reconstruction, surgeons can anticipate reconstructive challenges and optimize flap design, fixation strategies, and implant selection before entering the operating room[8,10,25,65,68].

One of the principal advantages of digital planning is reproducibility. Patient-specific cutting guides and prebent or custom-fabricated fixation plates translate virtual plans into predictable intraoperative execution, reducing variability associated with freehand techniques[71–74]. Multiple studies have demonstrated improved accuracy of bony reconstruction, restoration of mandibular contour, and occlusal alignment when CAD/CAM-assisted techniques are employed, particularly in complex or multi-segment reconstructions[71–73,75]. Beyond skeletal accuracy, digital planning contributes to operative efficiency. Predefined osteotomies and fixation strategies have been found to reduce ischemia time, shorten operative duration, and streamline multidisciplinary coordination

between ablative and reconstructive teams[8,75–79]. These efficiencies are particularly relevant in high-risk patients or prolonged oncologic resections, where operative time and physiologic stress are critical considerations[80].

Despite these advantages, digital planning is not without limitations. Preoperative plans are inherently static and may not fully account for intraoperative findings such as unexpected tumor extent, tissue quality, or vascular variability[10,25,69,81]. Additionally, reliance on external vendors, production timelines, and increased costs may limit accessibility, particularly in resource-constrained settings[82–84]. Surgeon familiarity with planning software and interpretation of virtual models also introduces a learning curve that may affect early adoption[11,85].

Importantly, digital planning should be viewed as an enabling framework rather than a rigid protocol, particularly because oncologic resections may occasionally exceed anticipated margins. In these situations, surgeons must have additional plans in place as well as be able to fall back on their traditional surgical principles. The true value of CAD/CAM lies in its ability to enhance precision while preserving the surgeon's capacity to adapt intraoperatively[25,86].

Hybrid Bone Reconstruction in Head and Neck Surgery

Osseous reconstruction represents one of the most technically demanding domains in head and neck surgery and has become the primary setting in which hybrid reconstructive principles have been most widely adopted[1,17,88]. Restoration of skeletal continuity, occlusion, facial projection, and load-bearing function often requires a level of precision that exceeds what can reliably be achieved with biologic tissue transfer alone[89,90]. As a result, hybrid bone reconstruction, integrating free osseous flaps with digital planning and technological adjuncts, has emerged as a contemporary standard for complex mandibular, maxillary, and midface defects[8,91,92].

Mandibular Reconstruction

Mandibular reconstruction exemplifies the evolution toward hybrid approaches. The fibula free flap remains the workhorse for mandibular defects due to its reliable vascular anatomy, length, and capacity for multi-segment osteotomies[93,94]. However, traditional freehand fibula reconstruction is limited by variability in osteotomy accuracy, plate contouring, and occlusal alignment[87,95–99]. CAD/CAM-assisted planning has addressed these limitations by enabling precise definition of defect geometry, osteotomy sequence, and fixation strategy prior to surgery[95,96].

Hybrid mandibular reconstruction typically combines virtual surgical planning, patient-specific cutting guides, and precontoured or custom fixation plates with free fibula transfer[73,100–102]. This integration improves alignment of bony segments, restoration of mandibular contour, and reproducibility of occlusion[18,68,86,103–105]. Several studies have demonstrated improved accuracy and reduced intersegmental gaps when compared with conventional techniques, particularly in large or multi-segment defects[68,95,100,103]. Beyond geometric accuracy, hybrid approaches may enhance functional outcomes[105–110]. Improved occlusal alignment facilitates mastication and speech rehabilitation, while more anatomic mandibular contour contributes to facial symmetry and patient-reported satisfaction[105–110]. Importantly, hybrid planning also allows reconstruction to be designed with future dental rehabilitation in mind, aligning reconstructive goals with long-term functional restoration[89,105–108].

Maxillary and Midface Reconstruction

Hybrid reconstruction has also gained prominence in maxillary and midface defects, where three-dimensional complexity and proximity to critical structures pose substantial challenges[92,111–114]. Restoration of midface projection, orbital support, and palatal integrity is essential for speech, swallowing, ocular function, and facial aesthetics[112,115–117]. Virtual planning enables accurate reconstruction of skeletal buttresses and facilitates integration of free tissue transfer with patient-specific implants or fixation systems[113,118–121].

In maxillary reconstruction, hybrid strategies often combine free tissue transfer, such as fibula or scapular flaps, with CAD/CAM-designed plates or implants to reestablish midfacial architecture[92,114,122,123]. Digital planning allows precise positioning of bony segments relative to the cranial base and orbit, improving symmetry and reducing postoperative malocclusion or enophthalmos[119,121,123,124]. These benefits are particularly relevant in extensive defects or secondary reconstructions, where anatomic landmarks may be distorted or absent[124–126].

Functional Considerations in Hybrid Bone Reconstruction

A defining feature of hybrid bone reconstruction is its emphasis on functional restoration as a primary endpoint[127]. Skeletal accuracy alone is insufficient if reconstruction fails to support speech, swallowing, mastication, and airway stability[10]. Hybrid approaches facilitate preoperative consideration of functional outcomes by enabling surgeons to simulate occlusion, anticipate soft-tissue requirements, and coordinate multidisciplinary input from dental specialists, speech-language pathologists, and maxillofacial prosthodontists[78,128,129]. Additionally, hybrid reconstruction promotes consistency across cases, which is particularly valuable in high-volume centers and teaching institutions[11,85,130]. Standardized planning and execution may reduce variability in outcomes, improve efficiency, and enhance training by providing reproducible reconstructive frameworks[8,10,11,85,130].

Limitations and Current Challenges

Despite its advantages, hybrid bone reconstruction is not universally applicable. Increased costs, dependence on specialized infrastructure, and extended preoperative planning timelines may limit accessibility[25,82–84]. Furthermore, unanticipated intraoperative findings, such as altered resection margins or vascular anomalies, may necessitate deviation from preoperative plans[86,131]. In these scenarios, surgeon experience and adaptability remain paramount[86,131]. Hybrid bone reconstruction therefore represents an augmentation rather than a replacement of traditional reconstructive principles[10,25,85]. Its success depends on thoughtful integration of technology with sound surgical judgment, appropriate patient selection, and institutional support[25,85].

Intraoperative Technologies as Enabling Tools in Hybrid Reconstruction

While preoperative digital planning establishes the foundation for hybrid reconstruction, intraoperative technologies are essential for translating virtual plans into accurate and reproducible surgical execution[15]. In head and neck reconstruction, intraoperative navigation and robot-assisted techniques function as enabling tools that bridge the gap between planning and performance, particularly in anatomically complex and spatially constrained reconstructions[13,15,132].

Intraoperative Navigation and Real-Time Guidance

Intraoperative navigation has emerged as a valuable adjunct in hybrid head and neck reconstruction, particularly for osseous reconstruction of the mandible, maxilla, and midface[13,126,133]. Navigation systems allow real-time spatial tracking of surgical instruments relative to preoperative imaging, facilitating accurate execution of planned osteotomies, implant positioning, and skeletal alignment[71,133–136].

When integrated with CAD/CAM planning, navigation enhances the fidelity of reconstruction by verifying that intraoperative steps adhere to the virtual plan[70,87,137]. This capability is particularly relevant in scenarios where anatomic landmarks are distorted or absent, such as revision surgery, secondary reconstruction, or extensive oncologic resections[126,137,138]. Navigation may also serve as a confirmatory tool, allowing surgeons to assess alignment and symmetry intraoperatively before definitive fixation[87]. Several studies have demonstrated improved accuracy of bone placement and reduced deviation from planned reconstructions when navigation is

employed[13,70,87,139]. However, its routine use remains limited by increased operative setup time, equipment costs, and the need for institutional expertise[87,140].

Robot-Assisted Microsurgery

Robot-assisted surgery represents a more recent addition to the hybrid reconstructive paradigm[141]. In head and neck reconstruction, robotic platforms have been utilized to improve access to anatomically constrained regions, enhance visualization, and address ergonomic challenges inherent to microsurgical work[15,19,21,26]. Robot-assisted approaches have been described in flap harvest, inset, and, more recently, microsurgical anastomosis[15,19,142,143]. Potential advantages include motion scaling, tremor filtration, and improved surgeon ergonomics, which may be particularly beneficial during prolonged procedures or in confined operative fields[15,19,144–146]. In reconstructive settings, robotic assistance may facilitate precise flap inset in deep oropharyngeal or skull base defects where conventional exposure is limited[28,147].

Robot-assisted microsurgery remains in an early phase of clinical adoption, with limited but growing evidence supporting its feasibility[15,19,26,148]. While initial reports suggest technical advantages, robust comparative data demonstrating superiority over conventional microsurgery are lacking[19,148]. Barriers to widespread adoption include cost, system availability, extended operative times during the learning phase, and the need for specialized training[26,148–150]. Importantly, robotic platforms must be viewed as adjunctive tools rather than replacements for microsurgical expertise[148]. Their role in hybrid reconstruction is best understood as expanding the surgeon's technical capabilities in selected scenarios, rather than redefining reconstructive principles[129,148].

Integration of Intraoperative Technologies within Hybrid Reconstruction

The true value of intraoperative technologies lies in their integration within a broader hybrid reconstructive framework. Navigation and robotic assistance are most effective when guided by thoughtful preoperative planning and applied selectively based on defect complexity, anatomic constraints, and institutional resources[151–153]. When used appropriately, these tools enhance reconstruction without undermining surgical adaptability[15,20,26,151]. As hybrid reconstruction continues to evolve, future studies will be necessary to define evidence-based indications for intraoperative technologies, assess their impact on long-term functional outcomes, and determine cost-effectiveness[26,151,154,155]. Until such data are available, adoption should remain judicious and outcomes-driven.

Functional and Morphologic Outcomes in Hybrid Head and Neck Reconstruction

Contemporary head and neck reconstruction has shifted from a primary focus on defect coverage and flap survival toward a more comprehensive evaluation of functional and morphologic outcomes[16,156]. Speech intelligibility, swallowing efficiency, airway stability, facial symmetry, and patient-reported quality of life are now recognized as critical endpoints[157–159]. Hybrid reconstruction, by enhancing precision and reproducibility, has the potential to improve these outcomes across a range of complex defects[8,104,160].

Functional Outcomes

Functional restoration is central to successful head and neck reconstruction[89]. Accurate skeletal reconstruction plays a foundational role in speech articulation, mastication, and swallowing by reestablishing appropriate anatomic relationships between the mandible, maxilla, tongue, and pharynx[89,115,161,162]. Hybrid bone reconstruction facilitates precise restoration of occlusion and mandibular continuity, which in turn supports more effective oral intake and speech rehabilitation[70,105,108,133,163,164].

Several studies have suggested that CAD/CAM-assisted reconstruction may improve early functional outcomes by reducing malocclusion, segmental misalignment, and instability[8,11,12,91,165,166]. Improved accuracy may also facilitate earlier initiation of oral feeding and speech therapy, particularly in complex mandibular and midface reconstructions[12,163,165]. While long-term functional data remain limited, early results support the role of hybrid approaches in enhancing functional predictability[65].

Airway management is another critical consideration, particularly in extensive midface or mandibular reconstructions[167–169]. Accurate skeletal positioning and soft-tissue support may reduce the risk of airway compromise and improve long-term airway stability[170–173]. In select cases, hybrid planning enables anticipation of airway challenges and coordination of reconstructive strategies that minimize postoperative respiratory morbidity[124,174,175].

Morphologic and Aesthetic Outcomes

Preservation and restoration of facial morphology are essential to patient identity and psychosocial well-being[7,176,177]. Hybrid reconstruction enables more accurate restoration of facial contours, projection, and symmetry by replicating pre-morbid anatomy through virtual planning[9,11,124,178]. This precision is particularly valuable in the midface and mandible, where small deviations in skeletal alignment can result in significant aesthetic asymmetry[104,175].

Patient-specific implants and precontoured fixation systems contribute to consistent facial contouring, reducing reliance on intraoperative estimation[179–182]. Improved morphologic outcomes may translate into higher patient satisfaction and reduced need for secondary revision procedures, although high-quality comparative data remain limited[165,180].

Importantly, hybrid reconstruction also supports planning for secondary aesthetic refinements and dental rehabilitation[106,107,183–185]. By restoring skeletal architecture with greater accuracy, subsequent interventions, such as dental implants or soft-tissue contouring, can be performed more predictably, contributing to long-term aesthetic and functional success[106,107].

Patient-Reported Outcomes and Quality of Life

Patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) are increasingly recognized as essential in evaluating reconstructive success[186,187]. While data specific to hybrid reconstruction are limited, available evidence suggests that improvements in functional and morphologic accuracy correlate with enhanced quality of life and patient satisfaction[8,106,109,188,189]. Hybrid approaches may reduce variability in outcomes, which is particularly relevant for patients undergoing extensive or staged reconstruction[8,10,11,85,130].

However, the literature remains heterogeneous, with inconsistent use of validated PROMs and limited long-term follow-up[11,62,109,190]. Future studies incorporating standardized outcome measures will be critical to fully defining the patient-centered benefits of hybrid reconstruction.

Challenges, Limitations, and Controversies in Hybrid Head and Neck Reconstruction

Despite the growing adoption of hybrid reconstructive strategies, significant challenges and unresolved controversies remain. While advanced technologies offer clear advantages, their integration into routine clinical practice raises important questions regarding cost, accessibility, training, and evidence-based utilization.

Cost, Resource Utilization, and Access

One of the primary barriers to widespread adoption of hybrid reconstruction is increased cost. Virtual surgical planning, patient-specific implants, intraoperative navigation, and robotic platforms require substantial financial investment and institutional infrastructure[82–84]. These costs may be difficult to justify in settings with limited resources or in healthcare systems under increasing

pressure to demonstrate value-based care[82–84]. Furthermore, access to hybrid technologies is uneven across institutions and geographic regions. High-volume tertiary centers are more likely to possess the necessary expertise and equipment, potentially exacerbating disparities in reconstructive care[191,192]. The absence of standardized cost-effectiveness data further complicates decision-making, as improved accuracy does not always translate directly into measurable economic or clinical benefit[8,65,179,193].

Training, Learning Curves, and Workflow Integration

Hybrid reconstruction introduces additional complexity into surgical workflows and training paradigms. Surgeons must acquire familiarity with digital planning platforms, navigation systems, and robotic interfaces, often requiring collaboration with engineers and industry partners[9,10,178,194]. These learning curves may initially increase operative times and complicate team coordination[10,25]. In training environments, the balance between standardization and surgical education presents a particular challenge. While hybrid planning can enhance reproducibility, excessive reliance on preoperative plans may limit opportunities for trainees to develop intraoperative decision-making skills[25,85,195]. Ensuring that technology augments rather than replaces foundational reconstructive principles is critical for sustainable adoption.

Evidence Gaps and Outcome Heterogeneity

Although hybrid reconstruction is increasingly utilized, the supporting evidence remains heterogeneous. Many published studies are retrospective, single-institution series with limited sample sizes and variable outcome measures[66,83,85,160,165,190,196]. Comparative data demonstrating superiority over conventional techniques, particularly with respect to long-term functional and patient-reported outcomes, are limited[175,190,197].

The role of robot-assisted microsurgery is especially controversial. While early reports suggest technical feasibility and potential ergonomic advantages, robust evidence demonstrating improved clinical outcomes is lacking[15,19,148,198,199]. Without high-quality comparative trials, it remains unclear which patient populations derive meaningful benefit from robotic assistance in reconstruction[144].

Risk of Technology-Driven Overuse

A central controversy in hybrid reconstruction is the potential for technology-driven overuse. The availability of advanced tools may encourage their application in cases where conventional techniques would suffice, without clear evidence of added benefit[175,200]. This risk underscores the importance of outcomes-driven adoption and careful patient selection[200]. Hybrid reconstruction should not be viewed as a universal solution, but rather as a selective strategy for complex defects that justify technological augmentation[10]. Maintaining this distinction is essential to avoid unnecessary escalation of cost and complexity[10].

Future Directions in Hybrid Head and Neck Reconstruction

Hybrid reconstruction in head and neck surgery continues to evolve as technological innovation, multidisciplinary collaboration, and outcome-driven practice converge. Future advances are likely to focus on improving personalization, and efficiency, while addressing current limitations in access and evidence generation[201–203]. Artificial intelligence–assisted planning represents a promising extension of digital reconstruction[204–206]. Machine learning algorithms may enhance preoperative planning by optimizing osteotomy design, predicting functional outcomes, and streamlining workflow integration[204–208]. Automation of routine planning steps could reduce reliance on external vendors and shorten preoperative timelines, increasing accessibility[207,209]. Advances in bioengineered tissues and scaffold technologies may further expand the hybrid paradigm[210–213]. The integration of bioresorbable or bioactive constructs with free tissue transfer has the potential to

improve tissue regeneration, reduce donor-site morbidity, and enhance long-term reconstructive durability[16,214,215]. As these technologies mature, hybrid reconstruction may increasingly combine biologic and engineered solutions in a patient-specific manner.

Robot-assisted microsurgery is also likely to evolve as platforms become more refined and specialized for reconstructive applications. Improvements in haptic feedback, instrument dexterity, and microsurgical precision may expand the role of robotics beyond selected cases[21,27,148,216]. Future research should prioritize defining evidence-based indications, evaluating functional outcomes, and assessing cost-effectiveness to guide responsible adoption. Finally, standardized reporting of functional and patient-reported outcomes will be essential to advancing the field[217]. Consensus-driven outcome measures will enable meaningful comparison across reconstructive strategies and facilitate evidence-based integration of emerging technologies[217].

Conclusions

Hybrid reconstruction represents a paradigm shift in head and neck reconstructive surgery, reflecting a broader transition from survival-focused care toward restoration of function, form, and patient identity. By integrating free tissue transfer with digital planning, intraoperative navigation, and robot-assisted techniques, hybrid approaches enhance precision, reproducibility, and functional predictability in complex reconstructions. Importantly, technology should serve as an adjunct to, rather than a replacement for, sound surgical judgment. Thoughtful, outcomes-driven application of hybrid strategies is essential to maximize benefit while minimizing unnecessary complexity and cost. As the field continues to evolve, continued emphasis on multidisciplinary collaboration, rigorous outcome assessment, and patient-centered care will define the future of head and neck reconstruction.

Funding: The authors have no funding sources to report.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no financial conflicts of interest related to this paper to report.

Acknowledgements: The authors have no acknowledgments related to this paper to report.

Author Contributions: TJS, RL, ABJ contributed to the conceptualization, literature search, and writing of the manuscript. AJ, JPL contributed to the conceptualization, and critical review and editing of the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.

References

1. Hanasono MM, Matros E, Disa JJ. Important aspects of head and neck reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Dec 2014;134(6):968e-980e. doi:10.1097/PRS.0000000000000722
2. Ragbir M, Brown JS, Mehanna H. Reconstructive considerations in head and neck surgical oncology: United Kingdom National Multidisciplinary Guidelines. *J Laryngol Otol*. May 2016;130(S2):S191-S197. doi:10.1017/S0022215116000621
3. Gerressen M, Pastaschek CI, Riediger D, et al. Microsurgical free flap reconstructions of head and neck region in 406 cases: a 13-year experience. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Mar 2013;71(3):628-35. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2012.07.002
4. Wu CC, Lin PY, Chew KY, Kuo YR. Free tissue transfers in head and neck reconstruction: complications, outcomes and strategies for management of flap failure: analysis of 2019 flaps in single institute. *Microsurgery*. Jul 2014;34(5):339-44. doi:10.1002/micr.22212
5. Ho MW, Nugent M, Puglia F, et al. Results of flap reconstruction: categorisation to reflect outcomes and process in the management of head and neck defects. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Nov 2019;57(9):935-937. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2019.08.005
6. Gao RW, Nuyen BA, Divi V, Sirjani D, Rosenthal EL. Outcomes in Head and Neck Resections That Require Multiple-Flap Reconstructions: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Aug 1 2018;144(8):746-752. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2018.0835

7. Zebolsky AL, Patel N, Heaton CM, Park AM, Seth R, Knott PD. Patient-Reported Aesthetic and Psychosocial Outcomes After Microvascular Reconstruction for Head and Neck Cancer. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Dec 1 2021;147(12):1035-1044. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2021.1563
8. Padilla PL, Mericli AF, Largo RD, Garvey PB. Computer-Aided Design and Manufacturing versus Conventional Surgical Planning for Head and Neck Reconstruction: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Jul 1 2021;148(1):183-192. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000008085
9. Nyirjesy SC, Heller M, von Windheim N, et al. The role of computer aided design/computer assisted manufacturing (CAD/CAM) and 3- dimensional printing in head and neck oncologic surgery: A review and future directions. *Oral Oncol.* Sep 2022;132:105976. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2022.105976
10. Largo RD, Garvey PB. Updates in Head and Neck Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Feb 2018;141(2):271e-285e. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000004070
11. Rodby KA, Turin S, Jacobs RJ, et al. Advances in oncologic head and neck reconstruction: systematic review and future considerations of virtual surgical planning and computer aided design/computer aided modeling. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* Sep 2014;67(9):1171-85. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2014.04.038
12. Bengur FB, Humar P, Saadoun R, et al. Computer-Aided Design and Manufacturing in Free Fibula Reconstruction of the Mandible: Comparison of Long-Term Outcomes. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* May 1 2025;155(5):910e-920e. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000011701
13. Soh HY, Hu LH, Yu Y, Wang T, Zhang WB, Peng X. Navigation-assisted maxillofacial reconstruction: accuracy and predictability. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Jul 2022;51(7):874-882. doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2021.11.008
14. Rotter N, Haisch A, Bucheler M. Cartilage and bone tissue engineering for reconstructive head and neck surgery. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* Jul 2005;262(7):539-45. doi:10.1007/s00405-004-0866-1
15. Rehman U, Whiteman E, Sarwar MS, Brennan PA. Reconstruction of head and neck oncological soft tissue defects post-resection using robotic surgery: a systematic review of the current literature. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Oct 2023;61(8):514-521. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2023.07.011
16. Staricha KL, Smith JD, Raad RA, et al. Next generation of head and neck free flap reconstruction: the future of innovation and refinement. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Oct 1 2025;33(5):324-330. doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000001077
17. Barr ML, Haveles CS, Rezzadeh KS, et al. Virtual Surgical Planning for Mandibular Reconstruction With the Fibula Free Flap: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Ann Plast Surg.* Jan 2020;84(1):117-122. doi:10.1097/SAP.0000000000002006
18. Pucci R, Weyh A, Smotherman C, Valentini V, Bunnell A, Fernandes R. Accuracy of virtual planned surgery versus conventional free-hand surgery for reconstruction of the mandible with osteocutaneous free flaps. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Sep 2020;49(9):1153-1161. doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2020.02.018
19. Sudarman JP, Triatmoko SE, Siburian ES, Budiarty A. Effectiveness and safety of robotic microsurgery in free-flap reconstruction: A systematic review and single-arm meta-analysis. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* Feb 15 2026;115:1-10. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2026.02.021
20. Song SS, Lee ZH, Yu JZ. Transoral Robotic Surgery (TORS) in Head and Neck Reconstruction. *J Clin Med.* Aug 15 2025;14(16)doi:10.3390/jcm14165775
21. Innocenti M, Malzone G, Menichini G. First-in-Human Free Flap Tissue Reconstruction Using a Dedicated Microsurgical Robotic Platform. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* May 1 2023;151(5):1078-1082. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000010108
22. Ghantous Y, Nashef A, Mohanna A, Abu-El-Naaj I. Three-Dimensional Technology Applications in Maxillofacial Reconstructive Surgery: Current Surgical Implications. *Nanomaterials (Basel).* Dec 16 2020;10(12)doi:10.3390/nano10122523
23. Molteni G, Gazzini L, Plotegher C, et al. Reconstruction of Complex Oromandibular Defects in Head and Neck Cancer: Role of the Chimeric Subscapular Free Flap. *J Craniofac Surg.* May/June 2020;31(3):e266-e270. doi:10.1097/SCS.00000000000006277
24. Patel SA, Chang EI. Principles and practice of reconstructive surgery for head and neck cancer. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am.* Jul 2015;24(3):473-89. doi:10.1016/j.soc.2015.03.005
25. Jones EA, Huang AT. Virtual Surgical Planning in Head and Neck Reconstruction. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am.* Aug 2023;56(4):813-822. doi:10.1016/j.otc.2023.04.013

26. Liu Y, Zhao X, Xu C, Yu D, Liu X. Robotic surgery: The convergence of digital innovations in head and neck surgery. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*. Nov 2025;53(11):2005-2011. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2025.08.018
27. Ballestin A, Malzone G, Menichini G, Lucattelli E, Innocenti M. New Robotic System with Wristed Microinstruments Allows Precise Reconstructive Microsurgery: Preclinical Study. *Ann Surg Oncol*. Nov 2022;29(12):7859-7867. doi:10.1245/s10434-022-12033-x
28. Lai CS, Lu CT, Liu SA, Tsai YC, Chen YW, Chen IC. Robot-assisted microvascular anastomosis in head and neck free flap reconstruction: Preliminary experiences and results. *Microsurgery*. Nov 2019;39(8):715-720. doi:10.1002/micr.30458
29. Aboaid H, Khalid T, Hussain A, et al. Advances and challenges in immunotherapy in head and neck cancer. *Front Immunol*. 2025;16:1596583. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2025.1596583
30. Gupta T, Kannan S, Ghosh-Laskar S, Agarwal JP. Systematic review and meta-analyses of intensity-modulated radiation therapy versus conventional two-dimensional and/or or three-dimensional radiotherapy in curative-intent management of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(7):e0200137. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0200137
31. Frank SJ, Busse PM, Lee JJ, et al. Proton versus photon radiotherapy for patients with oropharyngeal cancer in the USA: a multicentre, randomised, open-label, non-inferiority phase 3 trial. *Lancet*. Jan 10 2026;407(10524):174-184. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(25)01962-2
32. Imamura Y, Kanno M, Fujieda S. Comparative review of KEYNOTE-689 and NIVOPOSTOP trials and their impact on perioperative immunotherapy in locally advanced head and neck cancer. *Cancer Treat Rev*. Nov 2025;140:103018. doi:10.1016/j.ctrv.2025.103018
33. Peterson DE, Koefman SA, Yarom N, et al. Prevention and Management of Osteoradionecrosis in Patients With Head and Neck Cancer Treated With Radiation Therapy: ISOO-MASCC-ASCO Guideline. *J Clin Oncol*. Jun 1 2024;42(16):1975-1996. doi:10.1200/JCO.23.02750
34. Saba NF, Zalaquett NG, Rashid S, et al. Head and Neck Cancer Salvage Surgery in the Era of Immunotherapy and Beyond: A Review. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Nov 1 2025;151(11):1091-1097. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2025.3204
35. Leeman JE, Romesser PB, Zhou Y, et al. Proton therapy for head and neck cancer: expanding the therapeutic window. *Lancet Oncol*. May 2017;18(5):e254-e265. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30179-1
36. Mody MD, Rocco JW, Yom SS, Haddad RI, Saba NF. Head and neck cancer. *Lancet*. Dec 18 2021;398(10318):2289-2299. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01550-6
37. Ritter A, Koirala N, Wieland A, Kaumaya PTP, Mitchell DL. Therapeutic Cancer Vaccines for the Management of Recurrent and Metastatic Head and Neck Cancer: A Review. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Feb 1 2023;149(2):168-176. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2022.4264
38. Feng Y, Qiao W, Li Z, Li Y. Comparative efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy vs chemotherapy in resectable head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: an umbrella review of randomized controlled trials and single-arm studies. *BMC Med*. Nov 5 2025;23(1):610. doi:10.1186/s12916-025-04441-z
39. Petit C, Lacas B, Pignon JP, et al. Chemotherapy and radiotherapy in locally advanced head and neck cancer: an individual patient data network meta-analysis. *Lancet Oncol*. May 2021;22(5):727-736. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(21)00076-0
40. Fulcher CD, Haigentz M, Jr., Ow TJ, Education Committee of the American H, Neck S. AHNS Series: Do you know your guidelines? Principles of treatment for locally advanced or unresectable head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Head Neck*. Apr 2018;40(4):676-686. doi:10.1002/hed.25025
41. Chow LQM. Head and Neck Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. Jan 2 2020;382(1):60-72. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1715715
42. Huang QY, Xu LF, Wu Y, Chen J. Neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy in patients with locally advanced squamous head and neck cancer: A retrospective study. *Front Oncol*. 2025;15:1576800. doi:10.3389/fonc.2025.1576800
43. Zhang Z, Wu B, Peng G, et al. Neoadjuvant Chemoimmunotherapy for the Treatment of Locally Advanced Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma: A Single-Arm Phase 2 Clinical Trial. *Clin Cancer Res*. Aug 2 2022;28(15):3268-3276. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-22-0666

44. Liu Z, Wang D, Li G, et al. Neoadjuvant with low-dose radiotherapy, tislelizumab, albumin-bound paclitaxel, and cisplatin for resectable locally advanced head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: phase II single-arm trial. *Nat Commun*. May 17 2025;16(1):4608. doi:10.1038/s41467-025-59865-1
45. Georgy JT, Regi SS, Georgy RV, et al. Low-dose nivolumab plus induction chemotherapy for locally advanced or unresectable head and neck cancer is associated with high response rates and conversion to definitive therapy. *Sci Rep*. Oct 8 2025;15(1):35110. doi:10.1038/s41598-025-19197-y
46. Vergeer MR, Doornaert PA, Rietveld DH, Leemans CR, Slotman BJ, Langendijk JA. Intensity-modulated radiotherapy reduces radiation-induced morbidity and improves health-related quality of life: results of a nonrandomized prospective study using a standardized follow-up program. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. May 1 2009;74(1):1-8. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2008.07.059
47. Den RB, Doemer A, Kubicek G, et al. Daily image guidance with cone-beam computed tomography for head-and-neck cancer intensity-modulated radiotherapy: a prospective study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. Apr 2010;76(5):1353-9. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2009.03.059
48. Hsieh CH, Shueng PW, Wang LY, et al. Impact of postoperative daily image-guided intensity-modulated radiotherapy on overall and local progression-free survival in patients with oral cavity cancer. *BMC Cancer*. Feb 23 2016;16:139. doi:10.1186/s12885-016-2165-9
49. Castelli J, Simon A, Lafond C, et al. Adaptive radiotherapy for head and neck cancer. *Acta Oncol*. Oct 2018;57(10):1284-1292. doi:10.1080/0284186X.2018.1505053
50. Miller H, Bush K, Delancy M, et al. Effect of preoperative radiation on free flap outcomes for head and neck reconstruction: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. Feb 2022;75(2):743-752. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2021.09.050
51. Makiuchi Y, Kageyama D, Arikawa M, Akazawa S. Vessel Selection in Head and Neck Reconstruction After Neck Dissection or Radiotherapy. *Microsurgery*. Sep 2025;45(6):e70116. doi:10.1002/micr.70116
52. Dormand EL, Banwell PE, Goodacre TE. Radiotherapy and wound healing. *Int Wound J*. Jun 2005;2(2):112-27. doi:10.1111/j.1742-4801.2005.00079.x
53. Alessia DR, Alice B, Renaud P, et al. Head and neck radiotherapy after reconstructive flap surgery: Results of the multicentric XFLAP1 study. *Radiother Oncol*. Feb 10 2026;218:111437. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2026.111437
54. Dunn LA, Ho AL, Pfister DG. Head and Neck Cancer: A Review. *JAMA*. Feb 10 2026;335(6):531-541. doi:10.1001/jama.2025.21733
55. Sun K, Tan JY, Thomson PJ, Choi SW. Influence of time between surgery and adjuvant radiotherapy on prognosis for patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: A systematic review. *Head Neck*. Aug 2023;45(8):2108-2119. doi:10.1002/hed.27401
56. Price JM, Garcez K, Hughes C, et al. The effect of time from surgery to commencing adjuvant radiotherapy for patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Oral Oncol*. Feb 2025;161:107138. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2024.107138
57. Fenske J, Lampert P, Kreiker H, et al. Reconstructing complexity: Indications for simultaneous and chimeric free flaps in extensive maxillofacial defects. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*. Nov 2025;53(11):2043-2048. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2025.09.003
58. Mays AC, Yarlagadda B, Achim V, et al. Examining the relationship of immunotherapy and wound complications following flap reconstruction in patients with head and neck cancer. *Head Neck*. May 2021;43(5):1509-1520. doi:10.1002/hed.26601
59. Pedroso CM, de Pauli Paglioni M, Normando AGC, et al. Preoperative neoadjuvant chemotherapy or immunotherapy in head and neck cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis of surgical risk and pathologic response. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. Aug 2025;212:104742. doi:10.1016/j.critrevonc.2025.104742
60. Kuo PJ, Lin PC, Hsieh CH. Wound healing in cancer patients under immunotherapy. *Int J Surg*. Oct 1 2025;111(10):7087-7098. doi:10.1097/JS9.0000000000002819
61. Sindt JE, Fitzgerald LA, Kuznicki J, Prelewicz S, Odell DW, Brogan SE. Antiplatelet and Wound Healing Implications of Immunotherapy and Targeted Cancer Therapies in the Perioperative Period. *Anesthesiology*. Oct 1 2023;139(4):511-522. doi:10.1097/ALN.0000000000004669

62. van Rooij JAF, Roubos J, Vrancken Peeters N, Rijken BFM, Corten EML, Mureau MAM. Long-term patient-reported outcomes after reconstructive surgery for head and neck cancer: A systematic review. *Head Neck*. Sep 2023;45(9):2469-2477. doi:10.1002/hed.27450
63. You Q, Jing X, Fan S, Wang Y, Yang Z. Comparison of functional outcomes and health-related quality of life one year after treatment in patients with oral and oropharyngeal cancer treated with three different reconstruction methods. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Sep 2020;58(7):759-765. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2020.01.010
64. Nutting CM, Morden JP, Harrington KJ, et al. Parotid-sparing intensity modulated versus conventional radiotherapy in head and neck cancer (PARSPORT): a phase 3 multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol*. Feb 2011;12(2):127-36. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70290-4
65. Tang NSJ, Ahmadi I, Ramakrishnan A. Virtual surgical planning in fibula free flap head and neck reconstruction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. Sep 2019;72(9):1465-1477. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2019.06.013
66. Chang EI, Jenkins MP, Patel SA, Topham NS. Long-Term Operative Outcomes of Preoperative Computed Tomography-Guided Virtual Surgical Planning for Osteocutaneous Free Flap Mandible Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Feb 2016;137(2):619-623. doi:10.1097/01.prs.0000475796.61855.a7
67. Fletcher J. Methods and Applications of 3D Patient-Specific Virtual Reconstructions in Surgery. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 2022;1356:53-71. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-87779-8_3
68. Elsharabasy IM, Elhafez H, Ahmed SAE, Ayad WM. Evaluation of the Accuracy of Three-Dimensional Virtual Surgical Planning for Reconstruction of Mandibular Defects Using Free Fibular Flap. *J Craniofac Surg*. Jun 2020;31(4):950-955. doi:10.1097/SCS.00000000000006280
69. Yang LH, Merema BBJ, Kraeima J, et al. Three-Dimensional Surgical Planning in Mandibular Cancer: A Decade of Clinical Experience and Outcomes. *Cancers (Basel)*. Jan 15 2026;18(2)doi:10.3390/cancers18020271
70. Yu Y, Zhang WB, Liu XJ, Guo CB, Yu GY, Peng X. Three-Dimensional Accuracy of Virtual Planning and Surgical Navigation for Mandibular Reconstruction With Free Fibula Flap. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Jul 2016;74(7):1503 e1-1503 e10. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2016.02.020
71. Bernstein JM, Daly MJ, Chan H, et al. Accuracy and reproducibility of virtual cutting guides and 3D-navigation for osteotomies of the mandible and maxilla. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(3):e0173111. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0173111
72. Yang WF, Choi WS, Wong MC, et al. Three-Dimensionally Printed Patient-Specific Surgical Plates Increase Accuracy of Oncologic Head and Neck Reconstruction Versus Conventional Surgical Plates: A Comparative Study. *Ann Surg Oncol*. Jan 2021;28(1):363-375. doi:10.1245/s10434-020-08732-y
73. Lee ZH, Alfonso AR, Ramly EP, et al. The Latest Evolution in Virtual Surgical Planning: Customized Reconstruction Plates in Free Fibula Flap Mandibular Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Oct 2020;146(4):872-879. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000007161
74. Mollmann HL, Apeltrath L, Karnatz N, et al. Comparison of the Accuracy and Clinical Parameters of Patient-Specific and Conventionally Bended Plates for Mandibular Reconstruction. *Front Oncol*. 2021;11:719028. doi:10.3389/fonc.2021.719028
75. Shergill KS, Aulakh AS, Robibo E, et al. The utility of patient-specific surgical plates in free flap mandibular reconstruction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Oral Oncol*. Sep 2025;168:107497. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2025.107497
76. Blanc J, Fuchsmann C, Nistiriuc-Muntean V, Jacquenot P, Philouze P, Ceruse P. Evaluation of virtual surgical planning systems and customized devices in fibula free flap mandibular reconstruction. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. Dec 2019;276(12):3477-3486. doi:10.1007/s00405-019-05625-z
77. Toto JM, Chang EI, Agag R, Devarajan K, Patel SA, Topham NS. Improved operative efficiency of free fibula flap mandible reconstruction with patient-specific, computer-guided preoperative planning. *Head Neck*. Nov 2015;37(11):1660-4. doi:10.1002/hed.23815
78. Glas HH, Vosselman N, de Visscher S. The use of 3D virtual surgical planning and computer aided design in reconstruction of maxillary surgical defects. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Apr 2020;28(2):122-128. doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000000618

79. Alhefzi M, Redwood J, Hatchell AC, et al. Identifying Factors of Operative Efficiency in Head and Neck Free Flap Reconstruction. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Sep 1 2023;149(9):796-802. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2023.1638
80. Irawati N, Every J, Dawson R, et al. Effect of operative time on complications associated with free flap reconstruction of the head and neck. *Clin Otolaryngol.* Mar 2023;48(2):175-181. doi:10.1111/coa.14000
81. Pu JJ, Lo AWI, Wong MCM, et al. A quantitative comparison of bone resection margin distances in virtual surgical planning versus histopathology: a prospective study. *Int J Surg.* Jan 1 2024;110(1):111-118. doi:10.1097/JS9.0000000000000780
82. Xiao JB, Banyani N, Tran KL, Prisman E. Cost Outcomes of Virtual Surgical Planning in Head and Neck Reconstruction: A Systematic Review. *Head Neck.* Mar 2025;47(3):1037-1057. doi:10.1002/hed.28035
83. Mazzola F, Smithers F, Cheng K, et al. Time and cost-analysis of virtual surgical planning for head and neck reconstruction: A matched pair analysis. *Oral Oncol.* Jan 2020;100:104491. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2019.104491
84. Fatima A, Hackman TG, Wood JS. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Virtual Surgical Planning in Mandibular Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Apr 2019;143(4):1185-1194. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000005418
85. Awad L, Reed B, Adams J, et al. Virtual surgical planning in microsurgical head and neck reconstruction: The Newcastle experience. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* Jan 2025;100:254-261. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2024.11.007
86. Maniskas S, Pourtaheri N, Chandler L, Lu X, Bruckman KC, Steinbacher DM. Conformity of the Virtual Surgical Plan to the Actual Result Comparing Five Craniofacial Procedure Types. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Apr 1 2021;147(4):915-924. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000007776
87. Harbison RA, Shan XF, Douglas Z, et al. Navigation Guidance During Free Flap Mandibular Reconstruction: A Cadaveric Trial. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Mar 1 2017;143(3):226-233. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2016.3204
88. Balasundaram I, Al-Hadad I, Parmar S. Recent advances in reconstructive oral and maxillofacial surgery. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Dec 2012;50(8):695-705. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2011.11.022
89. Bevans S, Hammer D. Tenants of Mandibular Reconstruction in Segmental Defects. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am.* Aug 2023;56(4):653-670. doi:10.1016/j.otc.2023.04.009
90. Taylor GI, Corlett RJ, Ashton MW. The Evolution of Free Vascularized Bone Transfer: A 40-Year Experience. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Apr 2016;137(4):1292-1305. doi:10.1097/PRS.0000000000002040
91. Wuster J, Voss PJ, Tunn SM, et al. Comparison of CAD/CAM and conventional microvascular free bone flaps in reconstructive head and neck surgery: a retrospective analysis of over 110 cases. *Clin Oral Investig.* Nov 3 2025;29(11):548. doi:10.1007/s00784-025-06573-1
92. D'Alpaos D, Badiali G, Ceccariglia F, Nosrati A, Tarsitano A. Use of CAD/CAM Workflow and Patient-Specific Implants for Maxillary Reconstruction: A Systematic Review. *J Clin Med.* Jan 13 2026;15(2)doi:10.3390/jcm15020647
93. Cordeiro PG, Disa JJ, Hidalgo DA, Hu QY. Reconstruction of the mandible with osseous free flaps: a 10-year experience with 150 consecutive patients. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Oct 1999;104(5):1314-20. doi:10.1097/00006534-199910000-00011
94. Awad ME, Altman A, Elrefai R, Shipman P, Looney S, Elsalanty M. The use of vascularized fibula flap in mandibular reconstruction; A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of the observational studies. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* Apr 2019;47(4):629-641. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2019.01.037
95. Powcharoen W, Yang WF, Yan Li K, Zhu W, Su YX. Computer-Assisted versus Conventional Freehand Mandibular Reconstruction with Fibula Free Flap: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Dec 2019;144(6):1417-1428. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000006261
96. Roser SM, Ramachandra S, Blair H, et al. The accuracy of virtual surgical planning in free fibula mandibular reconstruction: comparison of planned and final results. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Nov 2010;68(11):2824-32. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2010.06.177
97. Stirling Craig E, Yuhasz M, Shah A, et al. Simulated surgery and cutting guides enhance spatial positioning in free fibular mandibular reconstruction. *Microsurgery.* Jan 2015;35(1):29-33. doi:10.1002/micr.22229

98. Chen J, Zhang R, Liang Y, Ma Y, Song S, Jiang C. Deviation Analyses of Computer-Assisted, Template-Guided Mandibular Reconstruction With Combined Osteotomy and Reconstruction Pre-Shaped Plate Position Technology: A Comparative Study. *Front Oncol.* 2021;11:719466. doi:10.3389/fonc.2021.719466
99. Chang YM, Chana JS, Wei FC, Tsai CY, Chen SH. Osteotomy to treat malocclusion following reconstruction of the mandible with the free fibula flap. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Jul 2003;112(1):31-6. doi:10.1097/01.PRS.0000065910.66161.DD
100. Wang YY, Zhang HQ, Fan S, et al. Mandibular reconstruction with the vascularized fibula flap: comparison of virtual planning surgery and conventional surgery. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Nov 2016;45(11):1400-1405. doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2016.06.015
101. Bao T, He J, Yu C, et al. Utilization of a pre-bent plate-positioning surgical guide system in precise mandibular reconstruction with a free fibula flap. *Oral Oncol.* Dec 2017;75:133-139. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2017.11.011
102. Ren W, Gao L, Li S, et al. Virtual Planning and 3D printing modeling for mandibular reconstruction with fibula free flap. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal.* May 1 2018;23(3):e359-e366. doi:10.4317/medoral.22295
103. May MM, Howe BM, O'Byrne TJ, et al. Short and long-term outcomes of three-dimensional printed surgical guides and virtual surgical planning versus conventional methods for fibula free flap reconstruction of the mandible: Decreased nonunion and complication rates. *Head Neck.* Aug 2021;43(8):2342-2352. doi:10.1002/hed.26688
104. Garajei A, Modarresi A, Arabkheradmand A, Shirkhoda M. Functional and esthetic outcomes of virtual surgical planning versus the conventional technique in mandibular reconstruction with a free fibula flap: A retrospective study of 24 cases. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* Apr 2024;52(4):454-463. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2024.01.018
105. Kang YF, Ding MK, Qiu SY, Cai ZG, Zhang L, Shan XF. Mandibular Reconstruction Using Iliac Flap Based on Occlusion-Driven Workflow Transferred by Digital Surgical Guides. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Nov 2022;80(11):1858-1865. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2022.07.140
106. Salinero L, Boczar D, Barrow B, et al. Patient-centred outcomes and dental implant placement in computer-aided free flap mandibular reconstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Dec 2022;60(10):1283-1291. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2022.09.006
107. Zhu H, Zhang L, Cai Z, Shan X. Dental Implant Rehabilitation After Jaw Reconstruction Assisted by Virtual Surgical Planning. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants.* September/October 2019;34(5):1223-1230. doi:10.11607/jomi.7278
108. Antunez-Conde R, Salmeron JI, Diez-Montiel A, et al. Mandibular Reconstruction With Fibula Flap and Dental Implants Through Virtual Surgical Planning and Three Different Techniques: Double-Barrel Flap, Implant Dynamic Navigation and CAD/CAM Mesh With Iliac Crest Graft. *Front Oncol.* 2021;11:719712. doi:10.3389/fonc.2021.719712
109. Crosetti E, Tos P, Berrone M, Battiston B, Arrigoni G, Succo G. Long-Term Follow-Up of Computer-Assisted Microvascular Mandibular Reconstruction: A Retrospective Study. *J Clin Med.* Jul 3 2024;13(13)doi:10.3390/jcm13133899
110. Al-Sabahi ME, Jamali OM, Shindy MI, Moussa BG, Amin AA, Zedan MH. Aesthetic Reconstruction of Onco-surgical Mandibular Defects Using Free Fibular Flap with and without CAD/CAM Customized Osteotomy Guide: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. *BMC Cancer.* Dec 2 2022;22(1):1252. doi:10.1186/s12885-022-10322-y
111. Eskander A, Kang SY, Teknos TN, Old MO. Advances in midface reconstruction: beyond the reconstructive ladder. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Oct 2017;25(5):422-430. doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000000396
112. Lee ZH, Cripps C, Rodriguez ED. Current Concepts in Maxillary Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Jul 1 2022;150(1):168e-175e. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000009195
113. McCrary HC, Seim NB, Old MO. History, Innovation, Pearls, and Pitfalls in Complex Midface Reconstruction. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am.* Aug 2023;56(4):703-713. doi:10.1016/j.otc.2023.04.010
114. Melville JC, Manis CS, Shum JW, Alsuwied D. Single-Unit 3D-Printed Titanium Reconstruction Plate for Maxillary Reconstruction: The Evolution of Surgical Reconstruction for Maxillary Defects-A Case Report

- and Review of Current Techniques. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Apr 2019;77(4):874 e1-874 e13. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2018.11.030
115. Cordeiro PG, Chen CM. A 15-year review of midface reconstruction after total and subtotal maxillectomy: part I. Algorithm and outcomes. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Jan 2012;129(1):124-136. doi:10.1097/PRS.0b013e318221dca4
 116. Matsui Y, Ohno K, Shirota T, Imai S, Yamashita Y, Michi K. Speech function following maxillectomy reconstructed by rectus abdominis myocutaneous flap. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* Jun 1995;23(3):160-4. doi:10.1016/s1010-5182(05)80005-8
 117. Dugast S, Longis J, Anquetil M, et al. Reconstruction techniques of the orbit after Brown class III maxillectomy: A systematic review. *Head Neck.* Jun 2023;45(6):1581-1593. doi:10.1002/hed.27352
 118. Verdoy SB, Sadeghi P, Ojeda AL, et al. Evaluation of virtual surgical planning and three-dimensional configurations for reconstruction of maxillary defects using the fibula free flap. *Microsurgery.* Nov 2022;42(8):749-756. doi:10.1002/micr.30957
 119. Wang Y, Qu X, Jiang J, Sun J, Zhang C, He Y. Aesthetical and Accuracy Outcomes of Reconstruction of Maxillary Defect by 3D Virtual Surgical Planning. *Front Oncol.* 2021;11:718946. doi:10.3389/fonc.2021.718946
 120. Swendseid BP, Roden DF, Vimawala S, et al. Virtual Surgical Planning in Subscapular System Free Flap Reconstruction of Midface Defects. *Oral Oncol.* Feb 2020;101:104508. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2019.104508
 121. Navarro Cuellar C, Martinez EB, Navarro Cuellar I, et al. Primary Maxillary Reconstruction With Fibula Flap and Dental Implants: A Comparative Study Between Virtual Surgical Planning and Standard Surgery in Class IIC Defects. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Jan 2021;79(1):237-248. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2020.08.003
 122. Lim HK, Choi YJ, Choi WC, Song IS, Lee UL. Reconstruction of maxillofacial bone defects using patient-specific long-lasting titanium implants. *Sci Rep.* May 9 2022;12(1):7538. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-11200-0
 123. Zhang WB, Mao C, Liu XJ, Guo CB, Yu GY, Peng X. Outcomes of Orbital Floor Reconstruction After Extensive Maxillectomy Using the Computer-Assisted Fabricated Individual Titanium Mesh Technique. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Oct 2015;73(10):2065 e1-15. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2015.06.171
 124. Qing H, Liu Z, Yang J, et al. Assessment of the efficacy of 3D virtual surgical planning compared with traditional planning in maxillofacial reconstruction for facial traumatic deformity. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* Feb 8 2026;54(4):104472. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2026.104472
 125. Stranix JT, Stern CS, Rensberger M, et al. A Virtual Surgical Planning Algorithm for Delayed Maxillomandibular Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* Apr 2019;143(4):1197-1206. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000005452
 126. Nwagu U, Swendseid B, Ross H, Ganti R, Kane A, Curry JM. Maxillectomy Reconstruction Revision Using Virtual Surgical Planning and Intraoperative Navigation. *Laryngoscope.* Oct 2021;131(10):E2655-E2659. doi:10.1002/lary.29543
 127. Prucher GM, Gaggio L, Neri F, et al. Conformational Reconstruction in Head and Neck Bone Cancer: Could Fibula Free Flap Become the Gold Standard Flap? *J Clin Med.* Nov 18 2025;14(22)doi:10.3390/jcm14228159
 128. Vosselman N, Alberga J, Witjes MHJ, et al. Prosthodontic rehabilitation of head and neck cancer patients- Challenges and new developments. *Oral Dis.* Jan 2021;27(1):64-72. doi:10.1111/odi.13374
 129. Wax MK. Reconstruction-The Final Dimension in Head and Neck Surgery: The 2017 Hayes Martin Lecture. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Dec 1 2017;143(12):1252-1254. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2017.1846
 130. Velarde K, Cafino R, Isla A, Jr., et al. Virtual surgical planning in craniomaxillofacial surgery: a structured review. *Comput Assist Surg (Abingdon).* Dec 2023;28(1):2271160. doi:10.1080/24699322.2023.2271160
 131. Pu JJ, Choi WS, Yang WF, Zhu WY, Su YX. Unexpected Change of Surgical Plans and Contingency Strategies in Computer-Assisted Free Flap Jaw Reconstruction: Lessons Learned From 98 Consecutive Cases. *Front Oncol.* 2022;12:746952. doi:10.3389/fonc.2022.746952
 132. Zavattero E, Ramieri G, Volpe F, Borbon C. Navigation-Assisted Resection and Fibula Free-Flap Reconstruction of an Extensive Maxillary Tumor. *J Craniofac Surg.* Jul-Aug 01 2021;32(5):e450-e452. doi:10.1097/SCS.00000000000007304
 133. Wu J, Sun J, Shen SG, Xu B, Li J, Zhang S. Computer-assisted navigation: its role in intraoperatively accurate mandibular reconstruction. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* Aug 2016;122(2):134-42. doi:10.1016/j.oooo.2016.02.001

134. Brouwer de Koning SG, Geldof F, van Veen RLP, et al. Electromagnetic surgical navigation in patients undergoing mandibular surgery. *Sci Rep*. Feb 25 2021;11(1):4657. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-84129-5
135. Hasan W, Daly MJ, Chan HHL, Qiu J, Irish JC. Intraoperative cone-beam CT-guided osteotomy navigation in mandible and maxilla surgery. *Laryngoscope*. May 2020;130(5):1166-1172. doi:10.1002/lary.28082
136. Liu TJ, Ko AT, Tang YB, Lai HS, Chien HF, Hsieh TM. Clinical Application of Different Surgical Navigation Systems in Complex Craniomaxillofacial Surgery: The Use of Multisurface 3-Dimensional Images and a 2-Plane Reference System. *Ann Plast Surg*. Apr 2016;76(4):411-9. doi:10.1097/SAP.0000000000000429
137. Nguyen A, Vanderbeek C, Herford AS, Thakker JS. Use of Virtual Surgical Planning and Virtual Dataset With Intraoperative Navigation to Guide Revision of Complex Facial Fractures: A Case Report. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Apr 2019;77(4):790 e1-790 e17. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2018.08.024
138. Ranz-Colio A, Almeida-Parra F, De Leyva-Moreno P, Cardenas-Serres C, Garcia-Cosio M, Acero-Sanz J. Navigation-guided resection of locally advanced midface malignancies. Does it improve the safety of oncologic resection? *Oral Oncol*. Aug 2023;143:106455. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2023.106455
139. Le PH, Hoang HT, Lam PH, Nguyen TV, Le CT. Comparison of customized plate navigation and traditional methods in mandibular reconstruction: enhanced accuracy and efficiency. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Jan 31 2026;doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2026.01.019
140. Austin RE, Antonyshyn OM. Current applications of 3-d intraoperative navigation in craniomaxillofacial surgery: a retrospective clinical review. *Ann Plast Surg*. Sep 2012;69(3):271-8. doi:10.1097/SAP.0b013e31822a3ec3
141. Sundar TA, Shetty P, Hegde P, S S. From static to robotic: evolving navigation systems in oral and maxillofacial surgery. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol*. Feb 2026;141(2):e1-e9. doi:10.1016/j.oooo.2025.10.015
142. Chow VL, Ho VW, Lo AS. Trans-hairline robotic neck dissection and robotic microvascular free flap reconstruction in oral cavity cancer. *Oral Oncol*. Jan 2026;172:107819. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2025.107819
143. Selber JC. Can I Make Robotic Surgery Make Sense in My Practice? *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Mar 2017;139(3):781e-792e. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000003151
144. Seth I, Lim K, Chang E, Rozen WM, Ng SK. Evaluating the Clinical Utility of Robotic Systems in Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery: A Systematic Review. *Sensors (Basel)*. May 21 2025;25(10)doi:10.3390/s25103238
145. Feng AL, Razavi CR, Lakshminarayanan P, et al. The robotic ENT microsurgery system: A novel robotic platform for microvascular surgery. *Laryngoscope*. Nov 2017;127(11):2495-2500. doi:10.1002/lary.26667
146. Struebing F, Kneser U, Bigdeli A, et al. Ergonomic Considerations in Robotic-assisted Microsurgery. *J Craniofac Surg*. Jan-Feb 01 2025;36(1):349-353. doi:10.1097/SCS.00000000000010610
147. Selber JC. Transoral robotic reconstruction of oropharyngeal defects: a case series. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Dec 2010;126(6):1978-1987. doi:10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181f448e3
148. Awad L, Bollen E, Reed B, et al. Clinical, Preclinical, and Educational Applications of Robotic-Assisted Flap Reconstruction and Microsurgery: A Systematic Review. *Microsurgery*. Nov 2024;44(8):e31246. doi:10.1002/micr.31246
149. Lechien JR. Learning process of transoral robotic surgery for head and neck cancers: a scoping review. *Oral Oncol*. Dec 2025;171:107788. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2025.107788
150. Oliveira CM, Nguyen HT, Ferraz AR, Watters K, Rosman B, Rahbar R. Robotic surgery in otolaryngology and head and neck surgery: a review. *Minim Invasive Surg*. 2012;2012:286563. doi:10.1155/2012/286563
151. Holsinger FC, Ismaila N, Adkins DR, et al. Transoral Robotic Surgery in the Multidisciplinary Care of Patients With Oropharyngeal Squamous Cell Carcinoma: ASCO Guideline. *J Clin Oncol*. Apr 10 2025;43(11):1369-1392. doi:10.1200/JCO-24-02755
152. Lechien JR, Paleri V, Baudouin R, et al. European surgical guidelines: transoral robotic surgery for head and neck cancers. *Oral Oncol*. Feb 2026;173:107826. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2025.107826
153. Liu H, Wang Y, Wu C, et al. Robotic compared with open operations for cancers of the head and neck: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Dec 2019;57(10):967-976. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2019.08.023
154. Lira RB, Kowalski LP. Robotic Head and Neck Surgery: Beyond TORS. *Curr Oncol Rep*. Jul 9 2020;22(9):88. doi:10.1007/s11912-020-00950-7

155. Eu D, Daly MJ, Irish JC. Imaging-based navigation technologies in head and neck surgery. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Apr 1 2021;29(2):149-155. doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000000686
156. Arrighi-Allisan AE, Brody RM, Cannady SB. Review of recent advancements in oropharyngeal reconstruction for transoral robotic surgery defects: emerging techniques, functional preservation, and technological innovations. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Feb 5 2026;doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000001115
157. Graboyes EM, Barbon CEA. Optimizing Function and Appearance After Head and Neck Reconstruction: Measurement and Intervention. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am.* Aug 2023;56(4):835-852. doi:10.1016/j.otc.2023.04.017
158. Lewis CM, Aloia TA, Shi W, et al. Development and Feasibility of a Specialty-Specific National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (NSQIP): The Head and Neck-Reconstructive Surgery NSQIP. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Apr 2016;142(4):321-7. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2015.3608
159. Mendez A, Seikaly H, Eurich D, et al. Development of a Patient-Centered Functional Outcomes Questionnaire in Head and Neck Cancer. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* May 1 2020;146(5):437-443. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2019.4788
160. Sabiq F, Cherukupalli A, Khalil M, et al. Evaluating the benefit of virtual surgical planning on bony union rates in head and neck reconstructive surgery. *Head Neck.* Jun 2024;46(6):1322-1330. doi:10.1002/hed.27759
161. Tabet P, Bellavance S, Harris JR, et al. Prefabricated Fibula Flap vs Bone-Driven and Delayed Implant Installation for Jaw Reconstruction. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Jun 1 2024;150(6):483-491. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2024.0425
162. Linsen SS, Oikonomou A, Martini M, Teschke M. Mandibular kinematics and maximum voluntary bite force following segmental resection of the mandible without or with reconstruction. *Clin Oral Investig.* May 2018;22(4):1707-1716. doi:10.1007/s00784-017-2263-3
163. Mahendru S, Jain R, Aggarwal A, et al. CAD-CAM vs conventional technique for mandibular reconstruction with free fibula flap: A comparison of outcomes. *Surg Oncol.* Sep 2020;34:284-291. doi:10.1016/j.suronc.2020.04.012
164. Ritschl LM, Mucke T, Fichter AM, et al. Axiographic results of CAD/CAM-assisted microvascular, fibular free flap reconstruction of the mandible: A prospective study of 21 consecutive cases. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg.* Jan 2017;45(1):113-119. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2016.11.001
165. Sun R, Zhou Y, Malouta MZ, et al. Digital surgery group versus traditional experience group in head and neck reconstruction: a retrospective controlled study to analyze clinical value and time-economic-social effect. *World J Surg Oncol.* Jun 30 2022;20(1):220. doi:10.1186/s12957-022-02677-0
166. Lagana F, Marzi Manfroni A, Arcuri F, Ferri A, Bianchi B. Computer Aided Design/Computer Aided Manufacturing-Guided Scapular Tip Free Flap Reconstruction for Complex Maxillofacial Defects. *Microsurgery.* Jan 2026;46(1):e70176. doi:10.1002/micr.70176
167. Ledderhof NJ, Carlson ER, Heidel RE, Winstead ML, Fahmy MD, Johnston DT. Are Tracheotomies Required for Patients Undergoing Composite Mandibular Resections for Oral Cancer? *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Aug 2020;78(8):1427-1435. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2020.03.027
168. Schuderer JG, Reider L, Wunschel M, et al. Elective Tracheotomy in Patients Receiving Mandibular Reconstructions: Reduced Postoperative Ventilation Time and Lower Incidence of Hospital-Acquired Pneumonia. *J Clin Med.* Jan 22 2023;12(3)doi:10.3390/jcm12030883
169. Lapis PN, DeLacure MD, Givi B. Factors in Successful Elimination of Elective Tracheotomy in Mandibular Reconstruction With Microvascular Tissue. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Jan 2016;142(1):46-51. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2015.2845
170. Tan SK, Leung WK, Tang ATH, Zwahlen RA. How does mandibular advancement with or without maxillary procedures affect pharyngeal airways? An overview of systematic reviews. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(7):e0181146. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0181146
171. Niskanen I, Kurimo J, Jarnstedt J, Himanen SL, Helminen M, Peltomaki T. Effect of Maxillomandibular Advancement Surgery on Pharyngeal Airway Volume and Polysomnography Data in Obstructive Sleep Apnea Patients. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* Aug 2019;77(8):1695-1702. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2019.04.001

172. Trevisiol L, Bersani M, Sanna G, Nocini R, D'Agostino A. Posterior airways and orthognathic surgery: What really matters for successful long-term results? *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. May 2022;161(5):e486-e497. doi:10.1016/j.ajodo.2021.11.013
173. Jiang C, Yi Y, Jiang C, Fang S, Wang J. Pharyngeal Airway Space and Hyoid Bone Positioning After Different Orthognathic Surgeries in Skeletal Class II Patients. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Jul 2017;75(7):1482-1490. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2017.02.021
174. Benito Anguita M, Khayat S, Lopez Martin S, et al. Virtual Guided and Customized Orthognathic Surgery in Patients with Obstructive Sleep Apnea Syndrome: Accuracy and Clinical Outcomes. *J Clin Med*. May 28 2025;14(11)doi:10.3390/jcm14113780
175. Joachim MV, Miloro M. The Evolution of Virtual Surgical Planning in Craniomaxillofacial Surgery: A Comprehensive Review. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Mar 2025;83(3):294-306. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2024.11.001
176. Chang EI, Hanasono MM. State-of-the-art reconstruction of midface and facial deformities. *J Surg Oncol*. Jun 2016;113(8):962-70. doi:10.1002/jso.24150
177. Hwang K. The Wounded Face in Uniform: Surgical Reconstruction and Identity Restoration in Military Facial Trauma. *J Craniofac Surg*. Dec 9 2025;doi:10.1097/SCS.00000000000012251
178. Day KM, Kelley PK, Harshbarger RJ, et al. Advanced Three-Dimensional Technologies in Craniofacial Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Jul 1 2021;148(1):94e-108e. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000008212
179. Ettinger KS, Mohamed AK, Nathan JM, et al. Patient-specific Implants Improve Volumetric Surgical Accuracy Compared to Stock Reconstruction Plates in Modern Paradigm Virtual Surgical Planning of Fibular Free Flaps for Head and Neck Reconstruction. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Oct 2024;82(10):1311-1328. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2024.06.166
180. Tran KL, Mong ML, Durham JS, Prisman E. Benefits of Patient-Specific Reconstruction Plates in Mandibular Reconstruction Surgical Simulation and Resident Education. *J Clin Med*. Sep 9 2022;11(18)doi:10.3390/jcm11185306
181. Wurm MC, Hagen J, Nkenke E, Neukam FW, Schlittenbauer T. The fitting accuracy of pre-bend reconstruction plates and their impact on the temporomandibular joint. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*. Jan 2019;47(1):53-59. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2018.05.033
182. Ong HS, Liu JN, Ahmed A, et al. Improved accuracy of hemimandibular reconstructions involving the condyle by utilizing hydroformed reconstruction plates rather than hand-bent stock plates. *Head Neck*. Sep 2019;41(9):3168-3176. doi:10.1002/hed.25809
183. Seier T, Hingsammer L, Schumann P, Gander T, Rucker M, Lanzer M. Virtual planning, simultaneous dental implantation and CAD/CAM plate fixation: a paradigm change in maxillofacial reconstruction. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. Jul 2020;49(7):854-861. doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2019.11.010
184. Ochandiano S, Garcia-Mato D, Gonzalez-Alvarez A, et al. Computer-Assisted Dental Implant Placement Following Free Flap Reconstruction: Virtual Planning, CAD/CAM Templates, Dynamic Navigation and Augmented Reality. *Front Oncol*. 2021;11:754943. doi:10.3389/onc.2021.754943
185. Zweifel D, Bredell MG, Lanzer M, Rostetter C, Rucker M, Studer S. Precision of Simultaneous Guided Dental Implantation in Microvascular Fibular Flap Reconstructions With and Without Additional Guiding Splints. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. May 2019;77(5):971-976. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2018.12.025
186. Sharma K, Steele K, Birks M, Jones G, Miller G. Patient-Reported Outcome Measures in Plastic Surgery: An Introduction and Review of Clinical Applications. *Ann Plast Surg*. Sep 2019;83(3):247-252. doi:10.1097/SAP.0000000000001894
187. Voineskos SH, Nelson JA, Klassen AF, Pusic AL. Measuring Patient-Reported Outcomes: Key Metrics in Reconstructive Surgery. *Annu Rev Med*. Jan 29 2018;69:467-479. doi:10.1146/annurev-med-060116-022831
188. Alwadeai M, Al-Aroomy L, Amin A, Shindy M, Zedan M, Baz S. Virtual Surgical Guidance Improves Quality of Life Following Scapular Free-Flap Reconstruction of Maxillary Defects. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. May 2024;82(5):600-609. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2024.02.006
189. Petrides GA, Dunn M, Charters E, et al. Health-related quality of life in maxillectomy patients undergoing dentoalveolar rehabilitation. *Oral Oncol*. Mar 2022;126:105757. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2022.105757
190. Chan TJ, Long C, Wang E, Prisman E. The state of virtual surgical planning in maxillary Reconstruction: A systematic review. *Oral Oncol*. Oct 2022;133:106058. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2022.106058

191. Madrigal J, Mukdad L, Han AY, et al. Impact of Hospital Volume on Outcomes Following Head and Neck Cancer Surgery and Flap Reconstruction. *Laryngoscope*. Jul 2022;132(7):1381-1387. doi:10.1002/lary.29903
192. Morita Y, Uzawa N. Current status and prospects of computer-assisted surgery (CAS) in oral and maxillofacial reconstruction. *Int J Clin Oncol*. Oct 21 2025;doi:10.1007/s10147-025-02896-x
193. Sharaf BA, Abushehab A, Michaelcheck CE, et al. Virtual surgical planning in craniomaxillofacial surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis of accuracy, operative time, and cost-effectiveness. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. Jun 2025;105:305-314. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2025.04.037
194. Sharaf B, Kuruoglu D, Cantwell SR, Alexander AE, Dickens HJ, Morris JM. EPPOCRATIS: Expedited Preoperative Point-of-Care Reduction of Fractures to Normalized Anatomy and Three-Dimensional Printing to Improve Surgical Outcomes. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Mar 1 2022;149(3):695-699. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000008871
195. Ferretti F, Nonis F, Novaresio A, et al. Virtual reality and 3D printing in head and neck cancer: an educational experience. *Front Oncol*. 2025;15:1695870. doi:10.3389/fonc.2025.1695870
196. Vranckx JJ, Desmet O, Bila M, Wittesaele W, Wilssens N, Poorten VV. Maxillomandibular Reconstruction Using Insourced Virtual Surgical Planning and Homemade CAD/CAM: A Single-Center Evolution in 75 Patients. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Jul 1 2023;152(1):143e-154e. doi:10.1097/PRS.00000000000010142
197. Hansen EE, Sethi RKV. Advances in virtual surgical planning for free tissue transfer. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Aug 1 2025;33(4):192-198. doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000001059
198. Sorensen RBA, Chakari W, Thomsen JB, Sorensen JA. Evaluation of microsurgical free flap procedures utilizing the Symani Surgical System: A preliminary analysis. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg*. Mar 2025;102:66-70. doi:10.1016/j.bjps.2025.01.037
199. Muaddi H, Hafid ME, Choi WJ, et al. Clinical Outcomes of Robotic Surgery Compared to Conventional Surgical Approaches (Laparoscopic or Open): A Systematic Overview of Reviews. *Ann Surg*. Mar 1 2021;273(3):467-473. doi:10.1097/SLA.00000000000003915
200. Wilson CB. Adoption of new surgical technology. *BMJ*. Jan 14 2006;332(7533):112-4. doi:10.1136/bmj.332.7533.112
201. Teh MT. The Precision Frontier: Revolutionising Head and Neck Cancer Management Through Theranostics, Liquid Biopsy, and AI-Powered Imaging. *Cancers (Basel)*. Nov 27 2025;17(23)doi:10.3390/cancers17233792
202. Holsinger FC, Birkeland AC, Topf MC. Precision head and neck surgery: robotics and surgical vision technology. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Apr 1 2021;29(2):161-167. doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000000706
203. Nassar SI, Suk A, Nguyen SA, Adilbay D, Pang J, Nathan CO. The Role of ctDNA and Liquid Biopsy in the Diagnosis and Monitoring of Head and Neck Cancer: Towards Precision Medicine. *Cancers (Basel)*. Sep 11 2024;16(18)doi:10.3390/cancers16183129
204. Alter IL, Chan K, Lechien J, Rameau A. An introduction to machine learning and generative artificial intelligence for otolaryngologists-head and neck surgeons: a narrative review. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. May 2024;281(5):2723-2731. doi:10.1007/s00405-024-08512-4
205. Zhong NN, Wang HQ, Huang XY, et al. Enhancing head and neck tumor management with artificial intelligence: Integration and perspectives. *Semin Cancer Biol*. Oct 2023;95:52-74. doi:10.1016/j.semcancer.2023.07.002
206. Makitie AA, Alabi RO, Ng SP, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Head and Neck Cancer: A Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews. *Adv Ther*. Aug 2023;40(8):3360-3380. doi:10.1007/s12325-023-02527-9
207. Rana M, Sakkas A, Zimmermann M, Kostyuk M, Schwarz G. Artificial Intelligence in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery: Integrating Clinical Innovation and Workflow Optimization. *J Clin Med*. Jan 6 2026;15(2)doi:10.3390/jcm15020427
208. Fung E, Patel D, Tatum S. Artificial intelligence in maxillofacial and facial plastic and reconstructive surgery. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Aug 1 2024;32(4):257-262. doi:10.1097/MOO.0000000000000983
209. Ostas D, Almasan O, Ilesan RR, et al. Point-of-Care Virtual Surgical Planning and 3D Printing in Oral and Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery: A Narrative Review. *J Clin Med*. Nov 8 2022;11(22)doi:10.3390/jcm11226625

210. Nayak VV, Slavin B, Bergamo ETP, et al. Bone Tissue Engineering (BTE) of the Craniofacial Skeleton, Part I: Evolution and Optimization of 3D-Printed Scaffolds for Repair of Defects. *J Craniofac Surg*. Oct 1 2023;34(7):2016-2025. doi:10.1097/SCS.00000000000009593
211. Yazdanian M, Alam M, Abbasi K, et al. Synthetic materials in craniofacial regenerative medicine: A comprehensive overview. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*. 2022;10:987195. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2022.987195
212. Najafi N, Vartanian KB, Eskandar T, Ghookas K, Rostomian E, Agrawal DK. Bioprinting for craniofacial reconstruction: A review of advancements, clinical use, and challenges. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*. Dec 2025;53(12):2255-2269. doi:10.1016/j.jcms.2025.10.010
213. Wu Z, Wu Y, Alam J, et al. Hydrogels in head and neck cancer: Innovations and translational advances in research and therapy. *Biomaterials*. Feb 5 2026;330:124049. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2026.124049
214. Accorona R, Gazzini L, Grigolato R, et al. Free Periosteal Flaps with Scaffold: An Overlooked Armamentarium for Maxillary and Mandibular Reconstruction. *Cancers (Basel)*. Aug 30 2021;13(17)doi:10.3390/cancers13174373
215. Patel S, Ziai K, Lighthall JG, Walen SG. Biologics and acellular dermal matrices in head and neck reconstruction: A comprehensive review. *Am J Otolaryngol*. Jan-Feb 2022;43(1):103233. doi:10.1016/j.amjoto.2021.103233
216. Rapolti D, Neumeister MW. Technology in Microsurgery. *Clin Plast Surg*. Jan 2026;53(1):183-186. doi:10.1016/j.cps.2025.09.003
217. Foroutan A, Phuyal D, Babb G, et al. Robotic Horizons in Plastic Surgery: A Look Toward the Future. *J Clin Med*. Jan 12 2026;15(2)doi:10.3390/jcm15020602

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.