This is an author produced version of a paper published in Oral Diseases. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the published paper:

Chrcanovic, Bruno; Santiago Gomez, Ricardo. (2019). Odontogenic myxoma : an updated analysis of 1692 cases reported in the literature. Oral Diseases, vol. 25, issue 3, p. null

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/odi.12875>

Publisher: Wiley

This document has been downloaded from MUEP (<https://muep.mah.se>) / DIVA (<https://mau.diva-portal.org>).

DR BRUNO RAMOS CHRCANOVIC (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-3460-3374)

PROFESSOR RICARDO SANTIAGO GOMEZ (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-8770-8009)

Article type : Review Article

Odontogenic myxoma: an updated analysis of 1692 cases reported in the literature

Running title: Odontogenic myxoma: a review

Bruno Ramos Chrcanovic ^{1*}

Ricardo Santiago Gomez ²

¹ DDS, MSc, PhD; Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Odontology, Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden. bruno.chrcanovic@mau.se; bruno.chrcanovic@hotmail.com

² DDS, MSc, PhD; Department of Oral Surgery and Pathology, School of Dentistry, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil. rsgomez@ufmg.br

* Corresponding author:

Bruno Ramos Chrcanovic. Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Odontology, Malmö University, Carl Gustafs väg 34, SE-214 21, Malmö, Sweden. bruno.chrcanovic@mau.se; bruno.chrcanovic@hotmail.com Mobile: +46 725 541 545 Fax: +46 40 6658503

KEYWORDS

Odontogenic myxoma; fibromyxoma; myxofibroma; odontogenic tumors; clinical features; recurrence rate

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/odi.12875

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

Objective. To integrate the available data published on odontogenic myxoma (OM) into a comprehensive analysis of its clinical/radiologic features.

Methods. Electronic search undertaken in January/2018, looking for publications reporting cases of OM.

Results. 377 publications included. We identified 1692 lesions and 695 were used for analysis of recurrence. There is predominance of OM in females and in mandibles. OM usually present with bone expansion, asymptomatic cortical perforation, multilocular. Lesion location (maxilla/mandible), bone expansion, cortical bone perforation, locular radiological appearance, tooth resorption, odontogenic epithelial rests or angular septa are not associated with recurrence. While curettage (31.3%) showed the highest recurrence rate, marginal resection (1.3%) and segmental resection (3.1%) showed the lowest values. Enucleation + peripheral osteotomy (6.7%) showed better results than enucleation (13.1%) or enucleation + curettage (12.7%). In comparison to unilocular lesions, multilocular ones were significantly more prevalent in mandibles, more often presented expansion and cortical bone perforation, had larger mean size, and were more often treated by segmental resection.

Conclusion. Conservative surgical procedures are associated with higher probability of recurrence of OM. Taking into consideration the recurrence rate and morbidity associated with different surgical treatments, tumor enucleation followed by peripheral osteotomy should be considered as the first therapeutic choice.

INTRODUCTION

Odontogenic myxoma (OM) is a benign odontogenic neoplasm characterized by stellate and spindle-shaped cells dispersed in an abundant myxoid extracellular matrix, which may contain odontogenic epithelium. Its histogenesis is most likely related to the odontogenic ectomesenchyme of a developing tooth. The neoplasm often behaves in a locally aggressive and infiltrating fashion. It has been listed as the third most frequent odontogenic tumor after odontoma and ameloblastoma (WHO, 2017). The aim of the present study was to integrate the available data published in the literature on OM into an updated comprehensive comparative analysis of their clinical and radiologic features, as well as the frequency of recurrence.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study followed the PRISMA Statement guidelines (Moher et al., 2009).

Search strategies

An electronic search without time restrictions was undertaken in December 2017 in the following databases: PubMed/Medline, Web of Science, Science Direct, J-Stage, and Lilacs. The following terms were used in the search strategies:

(((((myxoma) OR myxofibroma OR fibromyxoma) OR “odontogenic myxoma”)) AND
(((maxilla) OR mandible) OR jaw) OR maxillofacial)

Google Scholar was also checked. A manual search of related journals, including *Acta Odontologica Scandinavica*, *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, *Annals of Otology Rhinology and Laryngology*, *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, *Cancer*, *Head & Neck*, *Head and Neck Pathology*, *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, *Japanese Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, *Journal of Dental Research*, *Journal of Craniofacial Surgery*, *Journal of Cranio-Maxillofacial*

Surgery, Journal of Japanese Society of Oral Oncology, Journal of the Japanese Stomatological Society, Journal of Laryngology and Otology, Journal of Maxillofacial and Oral Surgery, Journal of Nihon University School of Dentistry, Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Journal of Oral Pathology and Medicine, Journal of the Stomatological Society, Laryngoscope, Oral Diseases, Oral Oncology, Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology, Otolaryngology -- Head and Neck Surgery, and Quintessence International, was performed. The reference list of the identified studies and the relevant reviews on the subject were also checked for possible additional studies. Publications with lesions identified by other authors as being OM, even not having the term “odontogenic myxoma” in the title of the article, were also re-evaluated by an author of the present study.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Eligibility criteria included publications reporting cases of OM. Cases of OM described in epidemiological studies on odontogenic tumors were listed to analyze age distribution and its prevalence between different genders.

Only the studies containing enough clinical, radiological and histological information to confirm the diagnosis were included in the analyses of recurrence. For these cases, clinical trials, cohort studies, case-control studies, cross-sectional studies, case series, and case reports were included. Exclusion criteria were immunohistochemical studies, histomorphometric studies, radiological studies, genetic expression studies, histopathological studies, cytological studies, cell proliferation/apoptosis studies, *in vitro* studies, and review papers, unless any of these publication categories had reported any cases with enough clinical, radiological and histological information. Hybrid tumors containing parts of OM were not considered for this study, as they may behave differently from non-hybrid OM. Only central lesions were considered. Studies presenting the possibility of duplicated cases, usually originated from clinical series from the same service or University or other publications, were excluded.

The definitions and criteria of the World Health Classification of Tumors – Head and Neck Tumors book (WHO, 2017), last updated in 2017, were used to diagnose a lesion as OM.

Study selection

The titles and abstracts of all reports identified through the electronic searches were read independently by the authors. For studies appearing to meet the inclusion criteria, or for which there were insufficient data in the title and abstract to make a clear decision, the full report was obtained. Disagreements were resolved by discussion between the authors. The clinical and radiological aspects, as well as the histological description of the lesions reported by the publications were thoroughly assessed by one of the authors (R.S.G.) of the present study, an expert in oral pathology, in order to confirm the diagnosis of OM.

Data extraction

The review authors independently extracted data using specially designed data extraction forms. Any disagreements were resolved by discussion. For each of the identified studies included, the following data were then extracted on a standard form, when available: year of publication, number of patients, patient's sex, age and race, follow-up period, duration of the lesion previously to treatment, lesion location (maxilla/mandible), anterior/posterior location (three categories: [a] anterior: lesions in the incisors/canine region; [b] premolar region; [c] posterior: lesions in the molars/retromolar region), recurrence, recurrence period, lesion size, perforation of cortical bone, locularity appearance in radiological exams (unilocular/multilocular), the presence or absence (in radiological appearance) of fine, angular, or straight trabeculations (here called as "*angular septa*"), association of the lesion with a tooth (the tooth can either be erupted with the entire root(s) encompassed by the lesion or unerupted encompassing the entire tooth), tooth displacement and/or tooth root resorption due to lesion's growth, expansion of osseous region adjacent to the tumor, presence of clinical symptoms, presence of odontogenic epithelial rests, and treatment

performed (curettage, excision, enucleation, partial/marginal resection, resection with continuity, debulking, performance of additional curettage and/or peripheral osteotomy). The lesion size was determined according to the largest diameter reported in the publications. Contact with authors for possible missing data was performed.

Analyses

The mean, standard deviation (SD), and percentages were presented as descriptive statistics. Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was performed to evaluate the normal distribution of the variables, and Levene’s test evaluated homoscedasticity. The performed tests for two independent groups were Student’s t-test or Mann-Whitney test, depending on the normality. Pearson’s chi-squared or Fisher’s exact tests were used for categorical variables, depending on the expected count of events in a 2x2 contingency table. The probability of recurrence was calculated for some variables, whenever possible, in odds ratio (95% confidence interval). The degree of statistical significance was considered $p < 0.05$. All data were statistically analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

RESULTS

Literature search

The study selection process is summarized in Figure S1 (*see Supplemental Appendix*). The search strategy in the databases resulted in 4793 papers. Search in Google Scholar resulted in 19 eligible papers not found in the five main databases. A number of 1547 articles were cited in more than one database (duplicates). The reviewers independently screened the abstracts for those articles related to the aim of the review. Of the resulted 3265 studies, 2801 were excluded for not being related to the topic or not presenting clinical cases. Additional hand-searching of journals and of the reference lists of selected studies did not yield additional papers. The full-text reports of the remaining 464 articles led to the exclusion of 71 because they did not meet the inclusion criteria.

Moreover, 16 studies were excluded because their cases from the same service or University of the cases from other publications, presenting the possibility of duplicated cases. Thus, a total of 377 publications were included in the review (see *Supplemental Appendix*).

Description of the Studies and Analyses

377 publications reporting OMs were included in the present review, reporting 1692 odontogenic myxomas. Table 1 presents demographic and clinical features of all cases, of which 695 lesions were used for more a detailed characterization. The lesion was more prevalent in women than in men, at a 1.36:1 proportion. The mean age of the patients was 28.6 years (range 0-80), being more elevated in women. Figure 1 shows the distribution of the lesions according to age, with the highest prevalence in the third and then second and fourth decades of life. The lesions were more prevalent in the mandible in comparison to the maxilla, and at the posterior region in comparison to the anterior region (Figure 2). For those cases with available information, 86 out of 1261 lesions (6.8%) crossed the midline of the jaws, and the maxillary sinus was significantly affected in 163 out of 344 lesions (47.4%) located in the maxilla. Eighteen lesions reached the coronoid process and 20 the condylar process of the mandible. The race of the patient was reported in 425 cases, of which 171 cases (40.2%) were diagnosed in Asians, 90 in whites, 71 in blacks, 60 in Indians, 11 in Arabs, 10 in Hispanics, 7 in Turks, 4 in Persians, 1 in other. Odontogenic epithelial rests was seen in 13.0% of the cases.

About 75% of the lesions showed signs of cortical bone perforation, 62.9% of the lesions had a radiological multilocular appearance, and 34.7% of the OMs showed the presence of angular septa. Nearly 20% of the lesions presented root resorption of adjacent teeth and 53.8% of the cases showed tooth displacement and/or uneruption due to lesion's growth. The lesions had a mean size of 4.7 ± 2.8 cm (min-max, 0.5-25.0; n=322). The correlation between lesion size and age was very weak and not statistically significant ($y = 5.045 - 0.013x$, $R = 0.076$, $R^2 = 0.006$, $p = 0.174$).

Time of follow-up was informed for 426 lesions, with a mean $\pm$ SD of 49.1 $\pm$ 66.2 months (min-max, 0-420). One hundred and thirty two lesions (31.0%) were followed up to 12 months, and 53.8% for up to 24 months. Treatment of the lesions was known in 549 (out of 695, 79%) cases, of which 44.3% of the cases consisted of conservative surgery (35.3% enucleations, 8.6% curettage, 0.4% debulking), 55% of the cases were treated by resection (36.2% resection with continuity, 18.8% partial/marginal resection), and 0.7% by radiotherapy or no treatment. Additional curettage was used in 98 cases, mostly after enucleation (n=88), but also after marginal resection (n=5), segmental resection (n=3), and debulking (n=2). Additional curettage was followed by peripheral osteotomy in 3 of these cases, all treated by enucleation. Additional peripheral osteotomy was used alone (without previous additional curettage) after enucleation (n=15), marginal resection (n=1), segmental resection (n=2), and when one case was treated only by curettage (without a previous enucleation).

There were 44 recurrences (9.3%) in 475 lesions. There was no information about recurrence for 220 lesions. The interval from initial treatment to the first recurrence (information available for 38 out of the 44 recurrences) ranged from 3 to 180 months after treatment, with a mean interval of 24.5 $\pm$ 30.5 months. Sixteen recurrences (42.1%) occurred within 12 months after treatment, and 73.7% within 24 months. Table 2 shows the recurrence rate according to the treatment performed. Curettage was the treatment with the highest rate of recurrence (10/32, 31.3%), followed by enucleation (8/61, 13.1%). Additional curettage after enucleation (10/79, 12.7%) had a similar recurrence rate in comparison enucleation alone (13.1%), but the performance of peripheral osteotomy decreased the recurrence rate (1/15, 6.7%). Treatment by resection, regardless whether marginal or segmental, had the lowest recurrence rate, 1.3% (1/80) and 3.1% (5/161), respectively.

Lesions smaller than 2 cm were most often treated by enucleation (in 50% of the cases; and 27.3% by marginal resection, 18.2% by curettage, and 4.5% by segmental resection), as well as those lesions with size between 2 and 5 cm (39.8% treated by enucleation, 26.6% by marginal resection, 17.5% by segmental resection, and 16.1% by curettage). Neoplasms between 5 and 10 cm and those larger than 10 cm were most often treated by segmental resection – 52.9% and 61.5% of the cases, respectively.

Table 3 shows the recurrence rate according to the some variables. None of the variables analyzed showed a statistically significant influence on the recurrence rate. Table 4 shows a comparison between lesions of different radiological appearance. Multilocular lesions were statistically significantly more prevalent in mandibles than in maxilla in comparison to lesions with a unilocular radiological appearance. Moreover, multilocular OMs more often presented bone expansion and cortical bone perforation than the unilocular myxomas, and presented larger mean size in comparison to the unilocular ones. Multilocular tumors were more often treated by segmental resection and less often by enucleation than unilocular tumors.

DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to integrate the available data published in the literature on OM into an updated comprehensive comparative analysis of their clinical and radiologic features, as well as the frequency of recurrence. A review of pathological lesions is important because it provides information that can improve diagnostic accuracy, allowing pathologists and surgeons to make informed decisions and refine treatment plans to optimize clinical outcomes (Chrcanovic and Gomez, 2016, Chrcanovic and Gomez, 2017b, Chrcanovic and Gomez, 2017a).

Many publications were excluded from the present literature review after analysis of the clinical, radiographic and microscopical features available. This calls the attention to the fact that authors need to better describe their findings. When it comes to OM in particular, the histopathological features play an important role, because dental papillae could be erroneously interpreted as OM when no radiographic or surgical information is available (Li et al., 2006). Moreover, myxoid change in other neoplasms may mimic OM (Halfpenny et al., 2000). In that sense, many of the previous reviews could have included cases that may have the diagnosis questioned.

The present review observed a predominance of OM in females and in mandibles, which is in agreement with previous studies (Martínez-Mata et al., 2008, Noffke et al., 2007). OM usually present with bone expansion with asymptomatic cortical perforation, and radiographically the tumor is commonly multilocular. Although the presence of angular septa raises the suspicion of OM, this was not observed in most cases. Neither the presence of odontogenic epithelial rests nor of angular septa seems to have an impact on the biological behavior of the OM. Although there was a higher prevalence of cortical bone perforation in recurrent OM in relation to non-recurrent OM, it was not statistically significant. OM with a multilocular radiological appearance are more prevalent in mandibles in comparison to unilocular lesions, also showing higher prevalence of bone expansion and of cortical bone perforation, and having larger mean size than the unilocular ones. Still, there was no statistically significant association between these factors and an increase in recurrence rate.

The difference in treatment was the only factor suggested to have a statistically significant influence on the recurrence rate of OM. Curettage showed the highest risk for recurrence. It seems that an additional curettage after enucleation does not have any impact in the recurrence rates in comparison to enucleation alone, but the performance of additional peripheral osteotomy after enucleation may decrease the chance of recurrence. These relatively high recurrence rates with

curettage and enucleation can be attributed to the lack of encapsulation and the subtle local invasion of neoplasms between cancellous bone beyond radiographically visible margins (Pahl et al., 2000), which the peripheral osteotomy after enucleation seems to be able to remove, but not the additional curettage. Recurrences of OM could be more related to incomplete removal than to the intrinsic biologic behavior of the neoplasm (Batsakis, 1987). Despite the small number of cases treated with enucleation followed by peripheral osteotomy and the lower recurrence with marginal resection, it is of the authors' opinion that tumor enucleation followed by peripheral osteotomy should be the first choice of treatment due to the lower associated morbidity. However, cases compromising segments of the mandible in its whole caudal-cranial extension with extensive cortical thinning and large areas of cortical perforation should rather be treated by resection with continuity. These cases usually present no bone support left for the performance of an enucleation.

The results of the present study have to be interpreted with caution because of its limitations. First, all included studies were retrospective reports, which inherently result in errors, with incomplete records. Secondly, many of the published cases had a short follow-up, which could have led to an underestimation of the actual recurrence rate. However, it is hard to define what it would be considered a short follow-up period to evaluate the recurrence of these neoplasms. Considering that over half of the recurrences occurred after 1-year post-surgery and about one third of the lesions were followed up to 12 months, the actual recurrence rate might be underestimated. Thirdly, many of the cases described were published as isolated case reports or small case series.

CONCLUSIONS

More conservative surgical procedures are associated with higher probability of recurrence of OM. Despite the fact that resection showed the lowest recurrence rates, surgeons should bear in mind that tumor enucleation followed by peripheral osteotomy should be considered as the first choice of treatment due to the associated lower morbidity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the following people who provided us some articles: Mrs. Sabrina Avendaño and Mrs. Claudia Rossi (Librarians of the Asociación Odontológica Argentina), Mrs. Melissa Carman (Director of Publications of the Journal of the Massachusetts Dental Society), Mrs. Jill Runyan and Mrs. Jessica Lauria (Director of Communications and Communications and Media Coordinator, respectively, of the Florida Dental Association), Dr. Roberto Lo Giudice, Dr. Charles E. Anyanechi, Mr. Noko Reagan Mojela (Editorial Assistant, South African Dental Journal), and Dr. Daniel Oreadi. We would like to thank Dr. Rowland Agbara, who provided us some information about his article. Last but not least, we would like to thank the librarians of Malmö University (with a special thanks to Ms. Anneli Svensson), who helped us to obtain some articles.

RSG is a research fellow at CAPES, Brazil, Proc. 88881.119257/2016-0.

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Authors' individual contribution:

Bruno R. Chrcanovic: conception and design, acquisition of data, statistical analysis, interpretation of data, drafting the article, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, final approval of the version to be published

Ricardo S. Gomez: conception and design, interpretation of data, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, final approval of the version to be published

REFERENCES

Batsakis JG (1987). Myxomas of soft tissues and the facial skeleton. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol* **96**: 618-619.

- Chrcanovic BR and Gomez RS (2016). Peripheral calcifying cystic odontogenic tumour and peripheral dentinogenic ghost cell tumour: an updated systematic review of 117 cases reported in the literature. *Acta Odontol Scand* **74**: 591-597.
- Chrcanovic BR and Gomez RS (2017a). Gingival cyst of the adult, lateral periodontal cyst, and botryoid odontogenic cyst: An updated systematic review. *Oral Dis*. doi: 10.1111/odi.12808.
- Chrcanovic BR and Gomez RS (2017b). Glandular odontogenic cyst: An updated analysis of 169 cases reported in the literature. *Oral Dis*. doi: 10.1111/odi.12719.
- Halfpenny W, Verey A, Bardsley V (2000). Myxoma of the mandibular condyle. A case report and review of the literature. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* **90**: 348-353.
- Li TJ, Sun LS, Luo HY (2006). Odontogenic myxoma: a clinicopathologic study of 25 cases. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* **130**: 1799-1806.
- Martínez-Mata G, Mosqueda-Taylor A, Carlos-Bregni R *et al* (2008). Odontogenic myxoma: clinico-pathological, immunohistochemical and ultrastructural findings of a multicentric series. *Oral Oncol* **44**: 601-607.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Grp P (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Ann Intern Med* **151**: 264-269, W264.
- Noffke CE, Raubenheimer EJ, Chabikuli NJ, Bouckaert MM (2007). Odontogenic myxoma: review of the literature and report of 30 cases from South Africa. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* **104**: 101-109.
- Pahl S, Henn W, Binger T, Stein U, Remberger K (2000). Malignant odontogenic myxoma of the maxilla: case with cytogenetic confirmation. *J Laryngol Otol* **114**: 533-535.
- WHO. El-Naggar AK, Chan JKC, Grandis JR, Takata T, Slootweg PJ, eds (2017). *World Health Organization Classification of Head and Neck Tumours*, IARC Press: Lyon.

TABLES

Table 1. Demographic and clinical features of central odontogenic myxomas described in the literature.

Variables	
n	1692
Age (years), mean±SD (min-max)	28.6±14.2 (0-80; n=1655 ^a)
Men	26.6±16.3 (0-80; n=299)
Women	28.2±15.0 (1-79; n=383)
p value ^b	0.013
Gender, n (%) ^a	
Men	705 (42.4)
Women	957 (57.6)
Unknown	30
Jaw, n (%) ^a	
Maxilla	726 (43.6)
Mandible	939 (56.4)
Unknown	27
Bone expansion, n (%)	
Yes	502 (93.5)
No	35 (6.5)
Unknown	158
Symptomatic, n (%)	
Yes	92 (17.2)
No	444 (82.8)
Unknown	159
Cortical bone perforation, n (%)	
Yes	283 (75.1)
No	94 (24.9)
Unknown	318
Locularity, n (%)	
Unilocular	187 (37.1)
Multilocular	317 (62.9)
Unknown	191
Angular septa, n (%)	
Yes	181 (34.7)
No	341 (65.3)
Unknown	173
Tooth displacement/unerupted, n (%)	
Yes	253 (53.8)
No	217 (46.2)
Unknown	225
Tooth root resorption, n (%)	
Yes	82 (19.2)
No	344 (80.8)
Unknown	269
Odontogenic epithelial rests, n (%)	
Yes	65 (13)
No	435 (87)
Unknown	195
Treatment, n (%)	

None	3 (0.5)
Curettage	47 (8.6)
Enucleation	194 (35.3)
Marginal resection	103 (18.8)
Segmental resection ^c	199 (36.2)
Debulking	2 (0.4)
Radiotherapy ^d	1 (0.2)
Unknown	146
Recurrence, n (%)	
Yes	44 (9.3)
No	431 (90.7)
Unknown	
Follow-up time (months), mean±SD (min-max)	49.1±66.2 (0-420; n=426)
Lesion size (cm), mean±SD (min-max)	4.7±2.8 (0.5-25.0; n=322)

SD – standard deviation

^a It also considers data from epidemiological studies of odontogenic tumors

^b Comparison of the mean age between men and women (Mann-Whitney test)

^c Resection with continuity defect

^d Radiotherapy was applied as the main therapy in one case, but also as an adjunctive therapy in 5 cases (1 curettage, 2 enucleations, and 2 segmental resections). Chemotherapy was applied as an adjunctive therapy in one case (1 enucleation)

Table 2. Treatment recurrence – for the lesions with available information about treatment and recurrence.

Treatment	
Recurrence/total (% recurrence)	
Curettage	10/32 (31.3)
Enucleation	8/61 (13.1)
Enucleation + curettage	10/79 (12.7)
Enucleation + peripheral osteotomy	1/15 (6.7)
Marginal resection	1/80 (1.3)
Segmental resection ^a	5/161 (3.1)

^a Resection with continuity defect

Table 3. Recurrence rate for central odontogenic myxomas according to different factors – for the lesions with available information about both recurrence and the factors here included.

Factor	Recurrence/total (% recurrence)	<i>p</i> value	Odds ratio (95% CI)	<i>p</i> value
<i>Jaw</i>				
Maxilla	20/214 (9.3)	0.955 ^a	1	0.955
Mandible	24/261 (9.2)		0.982 (0.527, 1.831)	
<i>Bone expansion</i>				
No	3/23 (13)	0.280 ^b	1	0.372
Yes	31/339 (7.8)		0.562 (0.158, 1.995)	
<i>Cortical bone perforation</i>				
No	4/81 (4.9)	0.070 ^a	1	0.080
Yes	25/207 (12.1)		2.644 (0.890, 7.854)	
<i>Locularity</i>				
Unilocular	8/135 (5.9)	0.404 ^a	1	0.406
Multilocular	19/229 (8.3)		1.436 (0.611, 3.377)	
<i>Tooth root resorption</i>				
No	13/227 (5.7)	0.061 ^b	1	0.064
Yes	7/53 (13.2)		2.505 (0.947, 6.625)	
<i>Odontogenic epithelial rests</i>				
No	30/317 (9.5)	0.374 ^b	1	0.519
Yes	3/46 (6.5)		0.667 (0.195, 2.282)	
<i>Angular septa</i>				
No	13/215 (6.0)	0.415 ^a	1	0.417
Yes	10/119 (8.4)		1.426 (0.605, 3.358)	

CI - confidence interval

^a Pearson's chi-squared test

^b Fisher's exact test

Table 4. Comparison of demographic and clinical features of uni- and multilocular central odontogenic myxomas.

Variables	Unilocular	Multilocular	<i>p</i> -value
n	187	317	
Age (years), mean±SD (min-max)	28.5±16.7 (1-80; n=187)	29.8±15.0 (2-79; n=316)	0.402 ^a
Gender, n (%)			
Men	80 (44.2)	130 (41.1)	0.544 ^b
Women	101 (55.8)	184 (58.6)	
Unknown	6	3	
Jaw, n (%)			
Maxilla	93 (49.7)	105 (33.1)	<0.001 ^b
Mandible	94 (50.3)	212 (66.9)	
Unknown	0	0	
Bone expansion, n (%)			
Yes	140 (88.6)	257 (95.2)	0.011 ^b
No	18 (11.4)	13 (4.8)	
Unknown	29	47	
Symptomatic, n (%)			
Yes	24 (15.5)	52 (19.7)	0.280 ^b
No	131 (84.5)	212 (80.3)	
Unknown	32	53	
Cortical bone perforation, n (%)			
Yes	75 (61.5)	145 (78.4)	0.001 ^b
No	47 (38.5)	40 (21.6)	
Unknown	65	132	
Tooth displacement/unerupted, n (%)			
Yes	82 (50.6)	137 (53.7)	0.536 ^b
No	80 (49.4)	118 (46.3)	
Unknown	25	62	
Tooth root resorption, n (%)			
Yes	30 (20.3)	41 (17.8)	0.553 ^b
No	118 (79.7)	189 (82.2)	
Unknown	39	87	
Odontogenic epithelial rests, n (%)			
Yes	16 (11.3)	33 (13.7)	0.508 ^b
No	125 (88.7)	208 (86.3)	
Unknown	46	76	
Treatment, n (%)			
Curettage	10/146 (6.9)	20/253 (7.9)	0.721 ^b
Enucleation	78/146 (53.4)	70/253 (27.7)	0.001 ^b
Marginal resection	26/146 (17.8)	40/253 (15.8)	0.662 ^b
Segmental resection ^c	32/146 (21.9)	123/253 (48.6)	<0.001 ^b
Recurrence, n (%)			
Yes	8 (5.9)	19 (8.3)	0.404 ^b
No	127 (94.1)	210 (91.7)	
Unknown	52	88	
Follow-up time (months), mean±SD (min-max)	35.1±43.7 (1-276; n=123)	42.8±50.8 (0-420; n=202)	0.040 ^a
Lesion size (cm), mean±SD (min-max)	3.5±1.7 (0.7-8.0; n=101)	5.5±3.0 (1.5-25.0; n=150)	<0.001 ^a

^a Mann-Whitney test

^b Pearson chi-squared test

^c Resection with continuity defect

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Distribution of odontogenic myxomas according to age (for the cases which the patients' age were informed, n=1478).

Figure 2. Topographical distribution of the known precise locations (n=1002) of odontogenic myxomas. Cases involving multiple regions (or an entire quadrant) are indicated between arrows. Numbers at the top and bottom of the lines indicate cases involving both adjoining regions: anterior/premolar, premolar/molar. The asterisk (*) indicates the number of lesions from the mandibular body or anterior region that reached the angle and/or ramus. For the rest of the lesions (n=690), the location was the 'maxilla' (n=124), 'mandible' (n=121), 'anterior maxilla' (n=35), 'posterior maxilla' (n=88), 'anterior mandible' (n=48), 'posterior mandible' (n=124), 'palate' (n=9), 'maxillary sinus' (n=51), 'whole mandible' (n=10), 'nasolabial groove' (n=12), 'mandibular angle' (n=20), 'mandibular ramus' (n=9), 'mandibular body' (n=4), 'mandibular condyle' (alone) (n=4), 'mandibular ramus-condyle' (n=2), 'mandibular angle-ramus' (n=2), and unknown (n=27). For those cases with available information, 86 out of 1261 lesions (6.8%) crossed the midline of the jaws, and the maxillary sinus was significantly affected in 163 out of 344 lesions (47.4%) in the maxilla. 18 lesions reached the coronoid process and 20 the condylar process of the mandible.