International Journal of Zoology and Applied Biosciences **ISSN: 2455-9571**
Volume 10, Issue 6, pp: 272-277, 2025
https://doi.org/10.55126/ijzab.2025.v10.i06.031 **http://www.ijzab.com**

Review Article

DIGITAL REVOLUTION IN MAXILLOFACIAL PROSTHESIS ADVANCEMENT: THE ROLE OF 3D IMAGING AND PRINTING

[1]Sharukeshi Prahaladhan, [2]Afifa R, *[3]Shafath Ahmed A and [4]Vidyashree Nandini V

Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, SRM Kattankulathur Dental College and Hospital, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, 603 203. Tamil Nadu, India

Article History: Received 26th September 2025; Accepted 22nd October 2025; Published 4th November 2025

ABSTRACT

Maxillofacial prostheses contribute to esthetic and functional rehabilitation following trauma, cancer, congenital deformity, or craniofacial deformity. Imprints of hands and labs with low accuracy and high time requirements once dominated. 3D imaging, CAD, and 3D printing improved accuracy and customization. This paper assesses the digital revolution in maxillofacial prosthesis fabrication with 3D imaging and printing as focal points with developments, applications, advantages, disadvantages, and future directions reviewed. Thematic research analysis of 28 peer-reviewed articles from 2015 through 2025 was undertaken. PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar searched relevant terms. Clinical evidence supports CAD/CAM and 3D imaging for better diagnosis, fabrication, stability, and communication. Virtual surgical planning assists tumor cases as well as accident cases with children's treatment facilitating psychosocial support. DICOM standardization, AI images, and bioprinting customize and enrich regenerative rehab. Expensive expenditures, biocompatibility risks, learning curves, as well as regulatory limitations, suppress these advantages. Rural accessibility can be improved with car-mounted 3D printing tools. Maxillofacial prosthesis rehab is fast becoming digitalized with digitalization revolutionizing maxillofacial prosthesis rehab. 3D imaging, CAD, as well as additive manufacturing, increase accuracy, functionality, as well as customization. Although limitations hinder bioprinting's biocompatibility, AI's accuracy, as well as international access, bioprinting, AI, as well as international access are certain to increase customized prostheses' efficiency as well as wider accessibility.

Keywords: Maxillofacial prosthesis, 3D imaging, 3D printing, CAD/CAM, Digital dentistry, Prosthetic rehabilitation.

INTRODUCTION

Maxillofacial prosthetics is an essential subspecialty of surgery and dentistry that restores form and function of craniofacial structures lost due to cancer, trauma, congenital deformity, or other pathologies. Prosthetic rehabilitation previously depended on impression-taking by hand, wax modeling, and laboratory-controlled fabrication methods. Research shows although esthetics and partial functions were restored with these conventional techniques, they were hindered by inaccuracy, interoperator variability, prolonged fabrication time, and patient discomfort (Fayad et al., 2025). Also, the lack of reproducibility hindered uniform results, particularly in complex cases of maxillofacial defects. Imaging, CAD, and 3D printing have, thus, given birth to a revolution in the field of prostheses for the last twenty years. A study has observed that the unflinching upgrading and tailoring enabled by the evolution of imaging and printing technology introduced the revolution in prosthetic rehabilitation (Fayad et al., 2025). With digital integration, workflow-from diagnosis to ultimate delivery of the prosthesis-has revolutionized: rapid, esthetic, and biomechanically secure (Franco & Minervini, 2024).

Imaging has therefore been a driver of this paradigm shift. CBCT, intra-oral surface scanning, and application of DICOM standard file format have laid strong foundations in converting plaster models into transportable all-digital high-definition replicas for prosthetic production (Seelaus & Grant, 2024; Hegab, 2015). A review charted five decades of progress in dental and maxillofacial radiology

*Corresponding Author: Shafath Ahmed A, Professor, Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, SRM Kattankulathur Dental College and Hospital, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, TN. Email: shafatha@srmist.edu.in

and described how digital imaging has improved diagnosis and treatment planning over traditional radiography (Molteni, 2021). A study used the term DICOM standard to describe a breakthrough technology that facilitated integration of imaging and CAD workload (Kahn et al., 2007. These imaging types will also enable us to verify consequences, improve patient education, and minify chairside time. Parallel to imaging, 3D printing technologies have revolutionized the production of prosthesis. Research has outlined their use in producing anatomical models for surgical planning and in creating prostheses highly faithful to patient anatomy (Ghai et al., 2018). A study emphasized the ability of additive manufacturing to reproduce fine structures and enhance personalization (Sales et al., 2021). A review continued to advance the potential of material science and bioprinting in extending the limits towards biomimetic prostheses that can mimic the form and function of natural tissue (Shanmugam,2025).

Clinical applications have shown a steady increase, with research providing strong evidence that virtual planning and 3D printing significantly reduce surgical time while simultaneously enhancing outcomes in maxillofacial reconstruction (Zoabi et al., 2022). A study proved that the implementation of 3D printing in hospital operations improved efficiency as well as patient satisfaction (Lalaj et al., 2019). One study highlighted the advantages of orthognathic surgery, pointing out that digital workflows improve surgical accuracy and postoperative esthetics (Kim et al., 2022). 3D imaging and printing is in line with the Fourth Industrial Revolution, an era characterized by convergence of digital, biological, and physical technologies (Williamson,2024). The paradigm shift has been attributed to oral and maxillofacial surgery by a review, predicting that AI and machine learning will soon be part of imaging and fabrication (Han, 2018).

It has been observed that the growth of digital dentistry is hindered by cost and regulation but continues to be a disruptive force in clinical practice (González et al., 2025). One study has critically appraised 3D surface imaging and artificial intelligence systematically, illustrating how AI improves prosthetic fit and precision, while others outlined digitally integrated reconstructive workflows as a pillar of the future of surgery (Manjunatha et al., 2024; Ahmed et al., 2024). All such studies highlight collectively the way towards a data-driven, patient-tailored, and regenerative prosthetic management model. This review critically assesses the digital revolution of maxillofacial prosthesis development including technology evolution, it also discusses about the futuristic development like Artificial intelligence, regenerative bioprinting, and gold accessibility.

This review has been regarded as a narrative synthesis of literature in relation to innovations in maxillofacial prosthetics. It consists of 28 peer-reviewed articles published between 2015 and 2025 that include clinical trials, systematic reviews, narrative reviews, and book chapters. The references were chosen to demonstrate technological development, clinical applications, the disadvantages, and future prospects of 3D imaging and 3D printing for prosthetic rehabilitation. Data were collected, topically classified, and rigorously evaluated to identify the advantages and disadvantages of digital technologies in maxillofacial prosthesis.

INTEGRATION OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES INTO CLINICAL WORKFLOWS

The integration of digital technology in craniofacial prosthesis shifted the conventional process from time-consuming manual production to precision-based, patient-focused rehabilitation. A systematic review has shown how advanced digital methods in reconstructive surgery improve aesthetic and functional outcomes while reducing production defects and fostering greater interdisciplinary collaboration among biomedical engineers, prosthodontists, and surgeons (Ahmed et al., 2024). Another review showed how 3D printing ensures the reproducibility of prostheses; the complicated shapes were almost exactly copied as before, using analog impressions, which was not possible (Srinivasan et al., 2021). A study emphasized the significance of digital technology in personalization, specifically virtual surgical planning (VSP). VSP enables the concurrent design of surgical margins and prosthetic interfaces, reducing intraoperative uncertainty and improving postoperative rehabilitation (Daoud et al., 2025). One review stressed the significance of computer-aided design (CAD) and intraoral scanning in surgical planning, particularly in complex cases such as tumor resections, where rapid prosthesis production can be life-altering (Callahan *et al.* 2023) (Table 1).

Table 1. Digital Technology Applications in Maxillofacial Prosthesis Workflows.

Technology/Approach	Clinical Benefit	References
Systematic digital review	Improved outcomes, interdisciplinary care	Ahmed *et al*., (2024)
3D printing in prosthesis	Reproducibility, anatomical fidelity	Srinivasan *et al*., (2021)
Virtual surgical planning	Precision personalization	Daoud *et al*., (2025)
CAD & intraoral scanning	Real-time prosthesis fabrication	Callahan *et al*., (2023)

3D IMAGING, AI, AND DATA STANDARDIZATION IN PLANNING

Imaging is central to digital prosthesis processes, and its precision dictates both esthetics and biomechanical success of rehabilitation. Previous research showed the importance of conebeam computed tomography (CBCT) and 3D surface imaging for planning (Molteni 2021; Manjunatha et al., 2024). One study expanded on previous work by demonstrating how DICOM (Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine) standards revolutionized interoperability between different imaging modalities and 3D design software (Paul *et al.* 2024). The authors emphasized the role of DICOM protocols in accelerating the process of converting diagnostic imaging into CAD-based prosthetic manufacturing, thus minimizing the errors associated with data conversion. A review pointed out that imaging-linked customization directly contributes to the enhancement of prosthesis retention, marginal fit, and patient comfort, particularly in maxillary obturator production (Beefathimathul, 2025). These studies have shown that imaging and standardization raise the level of accuracy and also streamline the clinical processes in ensuring smooth integration of radiology, design, and manufacture (Table 2).

Table 2. Imaging and Data Workflow Innovations in Maxillofacial Prosthesis.

Innovation	Key Contribution	References
CBCT & 3D imaging	Accurate diagnosis and planning	Molteni (2021); Manjunatha *et al*., (2024)
DICOM standards	Seamless data transfer to CAD/printing	Paul *et al*., (2024)
Imaging-linked CAD	Better fit and improved retention	Beefathimathul (2025)

CUSTOMIZATION, BIOPRINTING, AND REGENERATIVE INTERFACES

One of the strongest achievements of the digital revolution is personalization. A presentation on customized prostheses, designed by imaging and CAD, not only restore form but also improve psychosocial well-being due to the fulfillment of esthetic requirements (Beefathimathul,2025). Another significant improvement presented was that of the low-cost 3D printing of dental care access in unreachable areas. It was not just a matter of putting machines together. Access disparities can be reduced by decentralizing prosthesis fabrication, especially in areas with few resources (Dimitrova, 2025). An explanation shows that bioprinting combines regenerative concepts into prosthetic rehabilitation, encouraging future biological integration of prostheses with host tissues (Tayebi et al., 2021). One systematic review of trauma reconstruction, recognized that additive manufacturing and bioprinting decrease intraoperative duration while enhancing restoration contour, which is essential in trauma and oncological reconstructions (Oley *et al*., 2024). These benefits are extrapolated into pediatric dentistry, and one study has demonstrated that individually fabricated pediatric prostheses enhance compliance and psychosocial development as the children accept functional as well as esthetic appliances (Greeshma et al., 2025).

APPLICATIONS IN TRAUMA, ONCOLOGY, AND PEDIATRICS

Application of computer technology has potential besides creating standard prostheses. In trauma, preoperative models and intraoperative guides coded through CAD/CAM have fewer complications, established in numerous studies (Callahan et al., 2025; Oley et al., 2024). In oncology, production of immediate obturator or mandibular prosthesis following resection can be done with digital workflow and reduce patient morbidity (Daoud et al., 2025; Beefathimathul, 2025). In pediatrics, the versatility of digital prostheses has been especially revolutionary. It is reported that the integration of 3D printing in pediatric dentistry reduces the stigma of traditional prostheses and increases compliance with treatment and parents' satisfaction (Greeshma et al., 2025). Such uses emphasize that digital prostheses are not just technological options but also could act as social and psychological rehabilitation tools.

ACCESSIBILITY, RURAL EXPANSION, AND GLOBAL EQUITY

Prosthetic rehabilitation is inhibited by geography, infrastructure, and cost. However economical, mobile 3D printing equipment could make maxillofacial rehabilitation attainable to isolated populations (Dimitrova,2025).. This decentralization resonates with more general demands for digital health equity, so that prosthetic treatment is not restricted to tertiary urban centers. The Fourth Industrial Revolution discussion provides a framework for this change, as digital technology becomes less costly, compact, and more user-friendly discussed by (Han, 2018). Future prosthetic access directions will depend significantly on cost-reducing policies, open-source prosthetic design repositories, and clinician education in rural settings.

CHALLENGES: MATERIALS, COSTS, TRAINING, AND REGULATION

Even with evident advantages, digital maxillofacial prosthetics continues to encounter challenges. Cost continues to be a hindrance, with institutions not being able to acquire high-resolution printers and biocompatible resins

Identified by (González et al., 2025). Training needs continue to restrict adoption since prosthodontists and surgeons need to learn new hardware and software (Kim et al., 2023). Even though contemporary materials facilitate high-resolution fabrication; however, long-term biocompatibility and durability remain concerns, particularly for intraoral prostheses subjected to mechanical stress and moisture exposure (Observed by Beefathimathul, 2025). The regulatory environment has lagged behind these technologies, and there are so many issues that have not been addressed concerning liability, patient safety, and quality assurance (Dimitrova,2025; Tayebi et al., 2024)

COMPARATIVE INSIGHTS ACROSS CLINICAL SETTINGS

The lessons drawn from the realities of other clinical settings in the comparisons generated here evoke a pertinent but diverse array of benefits of digital workflows. In high-resource settings, the technology of bioprinting and VSP would have been imposed as a normative local practice to successful results (Paul et al., 2024; Tayebi, 2021). Conversely, rural or resource-limited regions have been attracted to low-cost desktop printing methods, where simplicity trumps access (Dimitrova, 2025).

Table 3. Clinical and Patient-Centered Outcomes Across Contexts.

Setting/Context	Outcome Achieved	References
High-resource hospitals	Bioprinting, precision VSP, trauma care	Daoud et al., (2025); Oley *et al*., (2024)
Oncology surgery	Immediate prosthesis post-resection	Callahan *et al*., (2023)
Pediatric dentistry	Compliance, psychosocial rehabilitation	Greeshma *et al*., (2025)
Rural settings	Decentralized, low-cost 3D printing	Dimitrova (2025)

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

There are a number of benefits of digital technologies for maxillofacial prosthetics. First, 3D imaging, CAD/CAM, and additive manufacturing have enormously enhanced the accuracy, reproducibility, and specificity of prosthetic devices. This becomes a laboratory mistake in an elimination with chair-side clinical time, while maintaining patient satisfaction high. Conversely, technological developments like VSP have facilitated inter-disciplinary collaboration by enabling surgeons and prosthodontists to deliver predictable outcomes. Low-cost, decentralized 3D printing is an added benefit of these technologies, which may expand treatment accessibility in rural and underserved areas (Dimitrova, 2025). Children can be rehabilitated through digital workflows, which promote conformity and esthetic acceptability (Greeshma et al., 2025). Despite all this, there are also some disadvantages. Arguably the most important of these is the expense of higher-end materials and machinery, limiting adoption to resource-intensive laboratories, Long-term biocompatibility and stability of printable polymers remain to be fully investigated, with potential safety implications for intraoral use. Further limitation is the high learning curve for clinicians, necessitating ongoing training in software design, imaging algorithms, and digital workflows (Kim et al., 2023). Lastly, regulatory and ethical structures are in their infancy, with weaknesses in quality assurance and liability.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Three parallel paths will define future developments in maxillofacial prosthetics. Initially, bioprinted and regenerative integration will design prosthetics to biologically integrate with the host tissues. As theorized, regenerative-compatible material prosthetics can significantly shorten the time for surgery while also hastening healing (Oley et al., 2024). Second, machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence (AI) will also have a vital role to play in the design automation of prothesis. AI-assisted segmentation of MRI and CBCT will speed up diagnostic planning and minimize operator dependence, as has been emphasized in aspects of recent reviews of imaging. Third, more decentralized and cheaper 3D printing hubs can potentially democratize prosthetic treatment globally. It has been described that rural-friendly mobile phones as key in bridging gaps in equity (Dimitrova,2025). Open-source shared repositories of prosthetic models on a cloud platform could equally ease the financial strain on developing nations. Translational 3D printing can help maxillofacial prosthesis avoid problems of tissue integration and biomaterial choice (Ratheesh et al., 2022). Also, advances in 3D printing aid more precise, patient-defined prosthetic fabrication with better functional and esthetic outcomes (Muskan et al., 2022). All these objectives will be best addressed through cooperative action by engineers, clinicians, regulators, and industry. Standardized procedures, reliability-validating biomaterials, and education programs will facilitate the safe, scalable deployment of information-based technologies to prosthetic reconstruction.

CONCLUSION

The digital revolution has revolutionized the maxillofacial prosthesis sector from time- and labor-consuming fabrication to precision-guided reconstruction tailored to patient-specific requirements. Practitioners exchange aesthetically and functionally enhanced outcomes by means of integration of 3D imaging, CAD/CAM, 3D printing, and virtual planning for surgery. Customization, decentralization, and integration by regeneration are in the limelight with their clinical translatability in oncology, trauma, and rehabilitation in children. Despite all these developments, matters related to cost, training, life of materials, and regulatory control remain. These are met through ongoing research in all fields and geographies to make the access more equitable and better. AI, bioprinting, and distributed digital manufacturing will be forced to come together in the future and spur innovation but also facilitate and maintain. In short, computer science has revolutionized prosthetic science. Within the next few years, however, there is a window for highly individualized, physiologically integrated, and distributable alternatives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors express sincere thanks to the head of the Department of Prosthodontics and Crown & Bridge, SRM Kattankulathur Dental College and Hospital, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, for the facilities provided to carry out this research work.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare no conflict of interest

ETHICS APPROVAL

Not applicable

FUNDING

This study received no specific funding from public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agencies.

AI TOOL DECLARATION

The authors declares that no AI and related tools are used to write the scientific content of this manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data will be available on request

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S., Yahya, A. B., Alshammeri, A. N. A., Alhumaidi, M. A. I., & Alqarni, A. A. (2024). Systematic review: Current trends and recent advancements in reconstructive maxillofacial surgery. *Cahiers Magellanes-NS, 6*(2), 5620–5632.

Beefathimathul, H. (2025). Precision and customization: The role of 3D printing in modern prosthodontics. *European Journal of Dentistry, 19*(3), 580–586.

Callahan, N., Han, M., & Miloro, M. (2023). Clinical applications of digital dental technology in oral and maxillofacial surgery. In *Clinical Applications of Digital Dental Technology* (pp. 333–351).

Daoud, S., Shhadeh, A., Zoabi, A., Redenski, I., & Srouji, S. (2025). The role of digital technologies in personalized craniomaxillofacial surgical procedures. *Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Clinics of North America, 37*(3), 403–416.

Dimitrova, M. (2025). 3D printing revolutionizing rural dental care: Empowering healthier smiles. In *Teaching in the Age of Medical Technology* (pp. 227–278). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Fayad, M. I., Ahmed, M. A., Kothayer, M., Aboelnagga, M. M., Essa, E. E. S. F., Abu-Hammad, O., & Moussa, R. (2025). Innovations driving the future of maxillofacial prosthetics, part I: The technological leap in maxillofacial rehabilitation. *European Journal of Dentistry.* https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0045-1809180

Franco, R., & Minervini, G. (2024). Digitalization, technologies, new approaches, and telemedicine in dentistry and craniofacial/temporomandibular disorders. *Applied Sciences, 14*(13), 5871.

Ghai, S., Sharma, Y., Jain, N., Satpathy, M., & Pillai, A. K. (2018). Use of 3D printing technologies in craniomaxillofacial surgery: A review. *Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, 22*(3), 249–259.

González, A., Monzón, M., Paz, R., Suárez, L., García, J., Bordón, P., & Ortega, Z. (2025). The evolution of digital technologies in dentistry: Latest updates, challenges and barriers. *Open Research Europe, 5*, 276.

Greeshma, B., Sandeep, V., Rajavardhan, K., Sindhura, K., & Madhupreethi, T. (2025). A review on revolutionizing pediatric dental treatments with 3D printing technology: Current trends and future prospects. *Journal of Orofacial Research, 14*(2), 10–14.

Gupta, D., & Negi, N. P. (2022). 3D bioprinting: Printing the future and recent advances. *Bioprinting, 27*, e00211.

Han, S. (2018). The fourth industrial revolution and oral and maxillofacial surgery. *Journal of the Korean Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons, 44*(5), 205–206.

Hegab, A. (2015). The cutting edge in oral and maxillofacial surgery. *Journal of Oral Hygiene & Health, 3*(184), 2332–0702.

Kahn, C. E., Carrino, J. A., Flynn, M. J., Peck, D. J., & Horii, S. C. (2007). DICOM and radiology: Past, present, and future. *Journal of the American College of Radiology, 4*(9), 652–657.

Kim, J. Y., Lee, Y. C., Kim, S. G., & Garagiola, U. (2023). Advancements in orthognathic and oral maxillofacial surgery: A comprehensive review on 3D printing and virtual surgical planning. *Preprints.org, 13*(17), 9907.

Lalaj, K., Qiao, B., Alizada, M., Lalaj, K., & Hayatullah, G. (2019). Establishing 3D printing in reconstruction surgery of maxillofacial defects at a hospital setting: A review of literature. *International Journal of Scientific Inventions Today, 8*(2), 164–169.

Manjunatha, V. A., Parisarla, H., & Parasher, S. (2024). A systematic review on recent advancements in 3D surface imaging and artificial intelligence for enhanced dental research and clinical practice. *IP International Journal of Maxillofacial Imaging, 10*(4), 132–139.

Mohanan, P. V. (Ed.). (2025). *Compendium of 3D bioprinting technology.* CRC Press.

Molteni, R. (2021). The way we were (and how we got here): Fifty years of technology changes in dental and maxillofacial radiology. *Dento Maxillo Facial Radiology, 50*(1), 20200133.

Oley, M. H., Oley, M. C., Sukarno, V., & Faruk, M. (2024). Advances in three-dimensional printing for craniomaxillofacial trauma reconstruction: A systematic review. *The Journal of Craniofacial Surgery, 35*(7), 1926–1933.

Paul, S., Pachipulusu, B., Kumar, T., & Chandra, P. (2024). DICOM: A revolution in facet of maxillofacial imaging. *Journal of Clinical & Diagnostic Research, 18*(1), ZE16–ZE19.

Ratheesh, G., Cerezo, N. G., Gao, W., Mendhi, J., Sonar, P., & Xiao, Y. (2022). Current progress and technological challenges in translational 3D bioprinting. In *Biofabrication for Orthopedics: Methods, Techniques and Applications* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–23).

Sales, A., Singh, A., & Singh, A. (2023). The role of 3D printing in maxillofacial prosthetics. *Acta Biomed, 94*(2), 534–539.

Seelaus, R., & Grant, G. T. (2024). 3D printing and digital design for maxillofacial prosthetics. In *3D Printing at Hospitals and Medical Centers: A Practical Guide for Medical Professionals* (pp. 165–184).

Srinivasan, T. P., Sampath, T., Thamizharasan, S., & Saha, J. (2025). 3D printing in prosthetic devices. In *Compendium of 3D Bioprinting Technology* (pp. 256–270). CRC Press.

Tayebi, ., Masaeli, R., & Zandsalimi, K. (2021). *3D printing in oral and maxillofacial surgery* (pp. 119–166). Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Williamson, O. (2024). Advancing craniomaxillofacial surgery: The role of 3D printing on surgical practices. *Journal of Education and Health, 15*(4), 1060–1071.

Zoabi, A., Redenski, I., Oren, D., Kasem, A., Zigron, A., Daoud, S., Moskovich, L., Kablan, F., & Srouji, S. (2022). 3D printing and virtual surgical planning in oral and maxillofacial surgery. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 11*(9), 2385.