Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 14, No. 3 , 2024 (pp. 1222-1232)

RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Optimizing Draf III Frontal Sinusotomy: Anatomical Planning, Neo-Ostium Preservation, and Prevention of Surgical Failure

Adly Ahmed Tantawy, Magdy Ibrahim Gouda, Isamel Sedik Elnashar, Mohamed Abdelrahman Fatouha

Department of in Otorhinolaryngology, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University

Corresponding author: Mohamed Abdelrahman Fatouha

Abstract

Background: Draf III frontal sinusotomy, or the endoscopic modified Lothrop procedure, creates a common drainage pathway between both frontal sinuses and the nasal cavity. Although it provides extensive access and facilitates topical therapy, its long-term success is threatened by neo-ostium stenosis, recurrent polyposis, osteoneogenesis, residual obstructing cells, and persistent inflammatory disease. Surgical failure is rarely attributable to one factor alone; it usually reflects an interaction among unfavorable anatomy, incomplete dissection, excessive mucosal injury, insufficient neo-ostium dimensions, and inadequate postoperative disease control.

Aim: This review examines strategies for optimizing Draf III frontal sinusotomy, with emphasis on computed tomography–based anatomical planning, selection of inside-out versus outside-in access, definition of safe surgical boundaries, creation of an adequately sized neo-ostium, preservation and reconstruction of mucosa, postoperative surveillance, and management of early restenosis.

Conclusion: Successful Draf III surgery requires more than maximal removal of the frontal sinus floor. The objective is to create a broad, smooth, accessible, and preferably mucosa-lined common pathway that remains stable after postoperative contraction. Preoperative multiplanar computed tomography should define frontal recess cells, the intersinus septum, frontal beak thickness, anteroposterior drainage dimensions, orbital and skull-base boundaries, and areas of osteitis or prior surgical injury. An inside-out technique is appropriate when the natural frontal recesses can be safely entered, whereas outside-in drilling is advantageous when narrow or scarred anatomy prevents controlled instrumentation. Neo-ostium preservation depends on limiting mucosal stripping, avoiding thermal injury, removing residual bony shelves, and covering strategically exposed surfaces with vascularized flaps or free mucosal grafts. Stents should be used selectively because their potential benefits must be weighed against infection, crusting, and granulation. Long-term topical anti-inflammatory therapy and endoscopic follow-up are essential, particularly in patients with severe polyposis, aspirin-exacerbated respiratory disease, allergy, or revision disease. Early recognition of granulation, fibrotic webs, and progressive narrowing permits intervention before mature stenosis develops. An anatomy-driven, mucosa-preserving, and inflammation-conscious strategy provides the strongest basis for durable frontal neo-ostium patency.

Keywords: Draf III; frontal neo-ostium; surgical planning; restenosis prevention

Introduction

Draf III frontal sinusotomy is the most extensive procedure within the endoscopic Draf classification. It combines bilateral frontal sinus floor removal with superior septectomy and resection of the inferior intersinus septum, producing a single median drainage pathway for both frontal sinuses. The operation has become an important alternative to external frontal sinus procedures for refractory inflammatory disease, mucoceles, selected tumors, post-traumatic obstruction, and certain skull-base lesions. Nevertheless, the technical ability to create a common intraoperative opening does not ensure its long-term stability [1].

The principal delayed limitation is neo-ostium stenosis. Healing after Draf III occurs within an anatomically restricted region in which drilled bone, opposing mucosal surfaces, inflammatory secretions, and recurrent polyps interact. Edema and crusting dominate the early postoperative phase, followed by granulation, fibrosis, and sometimes osteoneogenesis. A neo-ostium that initially appears adequate may progressively narrow, while an irregular opening containing residual bony partitions may remain difficult to irrigate and examine even if it does not completely close [2].

The likelihood of failure is influenced by factors present before, during, and after surgery. Narrow anteroposterior anatomy, thick frontal beak, displaced intersinus septum, complex frontal cells, severe osteitis, and loss of landmarks after previous surgery increase technical difficulty. Intraoperative determinants include opening size, mucosal preservation, completeness of bony saucerization, thermal injury, and coverage of exposed bone. Postoperatively, uncontrolled type 2 inflammation, recurrent polyposis, infection, poor irrigation, delayed debridement, and inadequate surveillance may reverse an initially successful result [3].

Most published studies are retrospective and combine heterogeneous indications, techniques, and definitions of success. Anatomical patency, radiological ventilation, symptom improvement, medication reduction, and freedom from revision are frequently treated as equivalent outcomes despite measuring different aspects of disease control. Accordingly, the research gap is not whether Draf III can be effective, but how its planning, construction, and postoperative maintenance can be standardized to produce durable results across different anatomical and inflammatory risk profiles [4].

This review focuses on optimization rather than general description of the operation. It examines anatomical risk assessment, quantitative planning of the neo-ostium, selection of the drilling direction, mucosal preservation and reconstruction, postoperative strategies, predictors of restenosis, and management of impending or established surgical failure.

The Concept of an Optimized Draf III

An optimized Draf III is not necessarily the largest opening that can technically be drilled. Excessively aggressive dissection may expose additional bone, damage olfactory fibers, weaken nasal support, or increase orbital and intracranial risk without improving drainage. The desirable result is a sufficiently large common pathway with smooth contours, no functionally important partitions, stable structural boundaries, and maximal restoration of mucosal coverage [1].

The neo-ostium should permit direct postoperative endoscopic visualization, passage of instruments for debridement, and delivery of high-volume topical therapy to both frontal sinuses. These functional endpoints are important because Draf III does not cure the biological drivers of chronic rhinosinusitis. Instead, the operation converts an inaccessible and easily obstructed drainage system into a cavity that can be medically treated and endoscopically monitored [5].

Durability depends on anticipating postoperative contraction. A small frontal opening may be eliminated by modest circumferential scarring, whereas an adequately sized opening can narrow yet remain clinically functional. However, size alone is insufficient. A large neo-ostium surrounded by devascularized, thermally damaged bone may develop severe crusting, granulation, and osteoneogenesis. Conversely, a slightly smaller but smoothly contoured and well-mucosalized opening may demonstrate more stable healing [6].

Optimization therefore requires balance among three objectives: adequate removal of obstructing bone, preservation of critical anatomical structures, and rapid re-establishment of healthy mucosal coverage. These objectives should guide preoperative imaging, selection of the operative approach, drilling technique, reconstruction, and postoperative surveillance.

Anatomical Foundations of Surgical Success

Frontal sinus boundaries

The frontal sinus lies between the thick anterior table and the much thinner posterior table of the frontal bone. Inferiorly, its floor contributes to the orbital roof, while posteriorly the sinus is separated from the frontal lobes by the posterior table and dura. These close relationships explain the potential consequences of inaccurate drilling, including orbital injury, cerebrospinal fluid leakage, intracranial complications, and olfactory dysfunction [7].

The frontal drainage pathway is a three-dimensional space shaped by surrounding frontoethmoidal cells rather than a simple tubular duct. Its anterior boundary is generally related to the agger nasi and frontal beak, its posterior boundary to the ethmoid bulla and skull base, its lateral boundary to the lamina papyracea, and its medial boundary to the middle turbinate and cribriform region. The direction and dimensions of the pathway differ considerably between patients and often between the two sides of the same patient [8].

For Draf III surgery, the definitive lateral boundaries are the laminae papyraceae. The anterior limit is reached when drilling exposes the periosteum beneath the frontal process of the maxilla and nasal bones. The posterior boundary is defined by the first olfactory fibers and adjacent skull base. The nasal branch of the anterior ethmoidal artery lies near this posterior region and may be mistaken for an olfactory fiber. Reliable identification of these structures is essential before extensive drilling begins [1].

The first olfactory fiber is particularly important because it represents both a surgical landmark and a structure requiring preservation. Drilling posterior to this boundary increases the risk of skull-base injury and olfactory loss. Conversely, stopping too far anteriorly may leave a thick posterior shelf that restricts the anteroposterior diameter and predisposes to stenosis. Controlled exposure and accurate discrimination of vascular and neural structures are therefore fundamental to adequate but safe enlargement [9].

Frontal recess cells and drainage orientation

The International Frontal Sinus Anatomy Classification provides a practical method for understanding how frontoethmoidal cells displace the drainage pathway. Anterior cells, including supra-agger and supra-agger frontal cells, tend to push the pathway posteriorly. Posterior cells, including supra-bulla and supra-bulla frontal cells, shift it anteriorly. Frontal septal cells may displace the pathway laterally, while supraorbital ethmoid cells may create confusion between the true frontal sinus and a laterally pneumatized ethmoid compartment [10].

This classification has direct relevance to failure prevention. If a frontal recess cell is mistaken for the frontal sinus, the surgeon may create an apparently wide cavity while leaving the actual drainage pathway obstructed. Residual partitions can divide the postoperative space, impair irrigation, retain secretions, and prevent access to diseased lateral compartments. Systematic analysis in sagittal, coronal, and axial planes reduces the likelihood of incomplete dissection [11].

The intersinus septum is rarely perfectly midline throughout its course. It may deviate markedly, contain pneumatized cells, or attach asymmetrically to the frontal sinus floor. Assuming that the septum represents the craniofacial midline may result in incomplete opening on one side or unintended drilling toward the orbit or posterior table. Navigation and comparison with the nasal septum, crista galli, orbital walls, and frontal sinus contours help define its true orientation [10].

Frontal beak and anteroposterior dimensions

The frontal beak is a major determinant of the final anteroposterior diameter. A thick beak requires substantial drilling and produces a larger area of exposed bone, while a thin beak may allow broad access with less tissue trauma. Preoperative sagittal CT images should be used to estimate beak thickness, the distance between the posterior table and anterior soft tissues, and the space available for drilling [12].

Alicandri-Ciufelli and colleagues evaluated preoperative frontal outflow anteroposterior measurements in patients undergoing Draf III. The maximum diameter was greater among patients who did not experience recurrence and correlated positively with the postoperative diameter achieved. Although the cohort was small and cannot establish a universal threshold, the findings support the concept that measurable anatomical constraints affect both surgical construction and long-term outcome [12].

The distance from the posterior table to the skin overlying the nasofrontal region also requires attention. Extremely limited space may prevent adequate anterior drilling without risking soft-tissue injury. Similarly, a low posterior table or steep skull-base configuration may restrict safe posterior enlargement. These anatomical limitations should be identified before surgery and incorporated into patient counseling rather than discovered during drilling [1].

Preoperative Planning

Clinical risk stratification

Planning begins by identifying why previous treatment failed or why primary extensive surgery is being considered. A patient with a retained frontal cell requires a different strategy from one with circumferential osteitis, severe recurrent polyposis, or a far-lateral mucocele. Symptoms should correlate with objective frontal disease because persistent headache in the absence of endoscopic or radiological inflammation may not improve after additional surgery [5].

The number and nature of previous procedures should be reviewed. Earlier operative reports may reveal whether the natural frontal ostia were identified, whether the middle turbinate attachments were removed, and whether a prior cerebrospinal fluid leak or orbital injury occurred. Previous images are valuable for distinguishing pre-existing anatomical dehiscence from operative changes and for determining how the pattern of disease or stenosis evolved [3].

Inflammatory risk should be considered separately from anatomical difficulty. Chronic rhinosinusitis with nasal polyps, aspirin-exacerbated respiratory disease, asthma, cystic fibrosis, ciliary dyskinesia, allergy, and severe type 2 inflammation may produce recurrent edema and polyps despite technically successful surgery. These patients may still benefit substantially from Draf III because it improves topical access, but they require realistic counseling and long-term anti-inflammatory management [13].

Systemic inflammatory disease should be controlled before elective surgery whenever possible. Active granulomatous disease, vasculitis, or uncontrolled lower-airway inflammation may impair healing and make the postoperative response unpredictable. Similarly, smoking, poor adherence to irrigation, inability to attend debridement, or contraindications to topical treatment may reduce the likelihood of durable success [4].

Computed tomography roadmap

Thin-section CT is the primary anatomical roadmap. Images should be reconstructed in three planes and reviewed sequentially rather than assessed only by global sinus scores. The analysis should define each frontal drainage pathway, the pattern of IFAC cells, the thickness and slope of the frontal beak, orientation of the intersinus septum, position of the skull base and anterior ethmoidal arteries, supraorbital pneumatization, osteitis, bony dehiscence, and the dimensions of the intended surgical corridor [10].

Sagittal views are particularly useful for locating the frontal beak, skull base, anterior–posterior corridor, and posterior table. Coronal views help define the relationship between the sinus floor, orbit, middle turbinate, and intersinus septum. Axial images demonstrate asymmetry, lateral extension, orbital relationships, and the course of supraorbital cells. Each suspicious cell should be followed across adjacent slices to determine whether it communicates with the frontal sinus or represents a separate ethmoid compartment [11].

Osteitis appears as thickening and increased density of the bony walls. Extensive osteitis predicts greater drilling requirements, reduced mucosal availability, and a potentially stronger osteogenic healing response. Previous surgery may also produce irregular bony shelves or areas of dehiscence that increase both restenosis and complication risks. These findings should inform burr selection, reconstructive planning, and anticipated postoperative care [2].

The intended neo-ostium can be conceptually outlined on CT before surgery. The surgeon should estimate how much of the frontal floor and beak must be removed, whether entry through the natural ostia is feasible, and whether the final corridor will permit visualization of the relevant disease. If pathology extends beyond the reach of an optimized Draf III, the need for trephination or a combined approach should be recognized preoperatively [14].

Magnetic resonance imaging and navigation

MRI is not routinely required for uncomplicated inflammatory disease but is important when differentiating tumor from retained secretions, evaluating encephalocele or cerebrospinal fluid leakage, or defining orbital and intracranial extension. In mucoceles, MRI helps distinguish protein-rich contents from solid tissue, while contrast enhancement and diffusion patterns may identify superinfection or neoplastic disease [15].

Intraoperative navigation is recommended for revision surgery, distorted anatomy, tumors, mucoceles, far-lateral disease, skull-base defects, or major osteitis. It provides useful confirmation of the frontal sinus boundaries and disease location, but accuracy must be verified repeatedly against visible landmarks. Navigation drift or registration error can be dangerous when drilling near the orbit or posterior table, and the system should never substitute for anatomical orientation [1].

Reconstruction planning

Mucosal reconstruction should be planned before tissue is removed. Potential flaps may be harvested from the nasal septum, lateral nasal wall, middle turbinate region, or residual frontal recess mucosa. Free grafts can be obtained from septal or turbinate mucosa. If flap design is delayed until after drilling, usable mucosa may already have been destroyed or devascularized [6].

The surfaces most likely to benefit from coverage include the drilled frontal beak, posterior neo-ostium, and areas where opposing raw surfaces could form a fibrotic bridge. The surgeon should determine whether the available flap will reach without tension and whether it will interfere with frontal drainage. Reconstruction should facilitate epithelialization rather than merely occupy the neo-ostium [16].

Choosing Between Inside-Out and Outside-In Approaches

Inside-out approach

The inside-out technique begins by identifying and enlarging the natural frontal ostium on each side. It is most suitable when the frontal recess has an anteroposterior dimension of approximately 4–5 mm or greater and can safely accommodate angled instruments and drills. After bilateral frontal access is established, drilling progresses from the sinus lumen anteromedially toward the frontal beak and contralateral side [1].

This approach offers the reassurance of drilling outward from known frontal sinus cavities. It allows existing drainage pathways to guide dissection and may preserve more mucosa when the recesses are not severely scarred. However, limited access can constrain instrument movement, particularly in narrow, osteitic, or previously operated recesses. Forcing a drill through such anatomy may strip mucosa, injure adjacent structures, or produce an inadequate opening [9].

Inside-out surgery begins with complete removal of the superior uncinate process and obstructing frontoethmoidal cells. Bilateral frontal ostia should be confirmed rather than presumed. The skull base and medial orbital walls are exposed sufficiently to establish orientation, after which a superior septal window permits binarial work. Drilling is directed anteriorly and medially, with cutting burrs used for thick bone and diamond burrs near the skull base or orbit [1].

Outside-in approach

The outside-in approach avoids dependence on entering a narrow natural frontal ostium. After the posterior limit at the first olfactory fibers and the lateral orbital limits have been identified, drilling begins at the frontal beak below the sinus. Bone is removed progressively in a superior direction until the frontal sinuses are entered and connected [9].

This technique is particularly useful in severe scarring, very narrow recesses, osteitic obstruction, and revision surgery in which natural landmarks have been lost. It provides a wider working corridor earlier in the procedure and permits controlled exposure of the frontal sinus floors. Nevertheless, it requires confidence in the external boundaries because drilling begins before the natural frontal lumen has necessarily been entered [9].

The main hazard is posterior misdirection toward the skull base. Both first olfactory fibers should therefore be identified before extensive drilling. The anterior ethmoidal artery's nasal branch must not be confused with an olfactory fiber. Lateral drilling should remain medial to the lamina papyracea, while anterior drilling should stop when the periosteum beneath the frontal process of the maxilla or nasal bones is exposed [1].

Hybrid strategy

Anatomy does not always require a purely inside-out or outside-in procedure. One frontal recess may be widely accessible while the contralateral side is severely narrowed. In such cases, the surgeon can enter through the more accessible sinus, establish the midline and superior septal window, and extend drilling toward the opposite side under direct visualization. This hybrid approach avoids forcing instruments through the restricted recess while retaining the orientation provided by the accessible sinus [9].

Selection should be based on CT findings and intraoperative anatomy rather than surgeon habit. The optimal approach is the one that produces controlled exposure with the least mucosal trauma and lowest risk to the orbit, skull base, and olfactory structures.

Construction of a Durable Neo-Ostium

Superior septectomy

The superior septectomy provides binarial access and allows the endoscope and instruments to cross sides. It should be large enough to prevent instrument conflict but should preserve the caudal and dorsal septal support. Excessively anterior resection beyond the nasal bones may weaken the nasal dorsum and contribute to structural deformity [1].

Septal mucosa should be preserved when it can be used for reconstruction. Incisions may be planned to produce pedicled flaps rather than leaving circumferential raw surfaces. Hemostasis must be achieved without excessive cautery because thermal damage can impair flap viability and increase postoperative crusting [16].

Defining the posterior boundary

The first olfactory fibers represent the posterior limit of safe frontal floor drilling. Their identification should precede extensive removal of the middle turbinate attachment or skull-base-adjacent bone. The nasal branch of the anterior ethmoidal artery often lies immediately anterior to the first olfactory fiber and may appear similar endoscopically [9].

Drilling too posteriorly risks cerebrospinal fluid leakage, olfactory injury, and intracranial complications. Drilling too conservatively leaves a posterior shelf that limits neo-ostium size and facilitates secretion retention. A diamond burr with irrigation is preferred near this region, and bone should be removed under constant visualization without levering against the skull base [1].

Frontal beak drilling

The frontal beak is drilled until a smooth transition is created between the nasal cavity and frontal sinus. Thick anterior bone may initially be removed with a cutting burr, followed by diamond polishing near the periosteum and thin boundaries. Continuous irrigation limits heat transmission to adjacent mucosa, bone, and skin [7].

A common technical error is creating a large superior cavity while leaving a narrow inferior bottleneck. The opening should be saucerized so that its narrowest portion is not located at the frontal beak. Residual ridges can obstruct irrigations, impair endoscopic visualization, and serve as attachment points for crusts or fibrotic webs [2].

Anterior drilling ends when the periosteum over the frontal process of the maxilla is encountered. Continuing beyond this plane offers little drainage benefit and risks soft-tissue or cutaneous injury. The operative goal is a smooth bony contour rather than removal of every possible millimeter of anterior bone [1].

Frontal sinus floors and intersinus septum

The medial frontal sinus floors are removed bilaterally between the orbital walls. The inferior intersinus septum is then drilled to unify both sinuses. Septal deviation should be anticipated because the apparent midline within the frontal sinus may not correspond precisely to the nasal septum below [10].

Only the septum obstructing the common drainage pathway needs to be removed. Unnecessary drilling of superior septations increases exposed bone and operative risk without improving outflow. Residual inferior partitions should be smoothed because sharp shelves interfere with topical delivery and promote localized scar formation [1].

Lateral extent and difficult compartments

Draf III provides improved lateral access compared with limited frontal sinusotomy, but it does not guarantee unrestricted reach to every lateral compartment. The orbit, frontal beak angle, and depth of supraorbital pneumatization may limit straight-line instrumentation. Angled endoscopes, curved instruments, and angled burrs improve access, while periorbital suspension may provide additional lateral working space in selected cases [14].

Pathology that cannot be visualized or instrumented safely should not be pursued blindly. A small frontal trephination can provide complementary access for lateral mucoceles, tumors, or retained partitions. Combined endoscopic-external management may preserve the benefits of the common neo-ostium while avoiding hazardous lateral drilling [17].

Neo-Ostium Dimensions and Shape

Larger intraoperative dimensions are generally associated with a lower probability of complete postoperative closure because the opening can tolerate a degree of contraction. Nevertheless, reported target measurements vary because studies use different imaging planes, anatomical landmarks, and definitions. The frequently cited dimensions of approximately 20 mm in anteroposterior and transverse directions should be considered an aspirational anatomical range rather than a mandatory threshold for every patient [2].

Patient anatomy establishes the maximum safely obtainable diameter. Attempting to force a fixed dimension in a patient with a narrow frontal beak–posterior table distance may increase complication risk. Preoperative measurements should therefore inform individualized targets. The relevant endpoint is the largest safely achievable, smoothly contoured opening that remains accessible to endoscopic care [12].

Shape may be as important as absolute diameter. An irregular opening with a narrow inferior neck, residual intersinus spur, or prominent posterior shelf can behave functionally like a smaller ostium. A broad funnel-shaped transition distributes healing across a larger circumference and facilitates irrigation. Documentation should ideally include area and shape rather than a single diameter [6].

Mucosal Preservation and Reconstruction

Mechanisms of restenosis

Bone exposure initiates an inflammatory healing response involving fibrin deposition, crust formation, granulation tissue, and migration of epithelium from the wound margins. When large opposing surfaces remain denuded, fibrosis may bridge the opening. Prolonged inflammation can stimulate new bone formation, producing fixed stenosis that cannot be reversed by topical treatment alone [6].

Mucosal stripping may occur during cell removal, drill contact, suction trauma, or repeated manipulation. Thermal damage may extend beyond the visibly injured area and delay epithelialization. Preserving islands of healthy mucosa on the frontal sinus floor and surrounding recess provides sources for re-epithelialization and reduces the area requiring graft coverage [18].

Pedicled flaps

Pedicled mucosal flaps retain their vascular supply and can provide reliable coverage of the frontal beak or posterior neo-ostium. Designs include septal, septoturbinal, lateral nasal wall, and middle turbinate–based flaps. The optimal design depends on prior surgery, available mucosa, disease distribution, and the surfaces expected to remain exposed [16].

Flaps should lie flat without obstructing drainage. Their pedicles must not be compressed by packing or sharply angulated across the neo-ostium. The recipient bed should be free of loose bone dust, and the flap should be stabilized sufficiently to prevent displacement during early irrigation [18].

Free mucosal grafts

Free mucosal grafts are useful when pedicled tissue is unavailable or when small residual areas require coverage. Septal or turbinate mucosa may be harvested, oriented correctly, and placed over exposed bone. Grafts depend initially on plasmatic imbibition and subsequent revascularization, making stable contact with the recipient bed essential [16].

Free grafts are technically flexible but may migrate, curl, or fail if placed on heavily cauterized tissue or under unstable packing. They should not substitute for careful drilling or be expected to compensate for an inadequately sized opening. Their purpose is to improve healing of an otherwise well-constructed neo-ostium [6].

Evidence for reconstruction

Earlier reviews identified lower restenosis and revision rates in series using mucosal flaps, although evidence quality was limited. Contemporary systematic analyses continue to suggest improved neo-ostium patency with mucosal grafts and flaps. However, differences in disease severity, surgical experience, neo-ostium size, and postoperative care introduce substantial confounding [18].

In a series of 111 patients, Leventi and colleagues reported favorable long-term findings with grafts and flaps after Draf III. The available evidence supports reconstruction particularly in revision cases, extensive osteitis, or operations leaving broad areas of bare bone. Prospective standardized comparisons are still required to determine the most effective flap design and whether every patient benefits equally [19].

Stents and Drug-Eluting Implants

Traditional frontal stents are intended to maintain separation between healing surfaces and preserve the opening during early contraction. They may also stabilize mucosal grafts. However, nonabsorbable stents can accumulate crusts, harbor bacteria, cause pressure injury, and stimulate granulation tissue. Their removal may produce additional trauma [20].

Steroid-eluting implants combine mechanical support with localized anti-inflammatory therapy. Pooled evidence suggests that steroid-impregnated stents may improve patency in extended frontal surgery, but the underlying studies are heterogeneous and may be affected by selection bias. Implant type, duration, disease phenotype, and concomitant reconstruction vary considerably [21].

Routine stenting after every Draf III is therefore difficult to justify. Selective use may be considered in severe polypoid inflammation, unstable flaps, revision surgery, or early postoperative narrowing. The implant should not obstruct irrigation or surveillance, and the duration of placement should be predetermined. An inadequately drilled or poorly mucosalized opening cannot be rescued reliably by a stent [20].

Postoperative Preservation of the Neo-Ostium

High-volume saline irrigation is central to postoperative care because it removes clots, bone dust, crusts, and inflammatory secretions. Low-volume sprays are less likely to reach the frontal cavity even after Draf III. Irrigation should begin according to the surgeon's reconstruction and hemostatic strategy and continue throughout the healing phase [5].

Topical corticosteroid irrigation is particularly important for chronic rhinosinusitis with nasal polyps and type 2 inflammation. Draf III improves penetration into the frontal sinuses, converting surgery into a route for long-term medical treatment. Short courses of systemic corticosteroids may be appropriate for severe postoperative edema or recurrent polyposis, but repeated systemic therapy should prompt reconsideration of overall inflammatory control, including biologic treatment [13].

Antibiotics should be based on infection risk, intraoperative findings, culture results, and implants rather than prescribed automatically for prolonged periods. Purulence, exposed graft material, or suspected mucopyocele may justify culture-directed treatment. Excessive empirical antibiotic use does not prevent mechanically driven restenosis and may produce adverse effects [4].

Early postoperative endoscopy assesses graft position, crust burden, edema, infection, and neo-ostium dimensions. Conservative debridement removes obstructive material while protecting viable mucosa. Excessively aggressive instrumentation may restart the wound-healing cycle and worsen fibrosis. Follow-up intervals should be individualized, with closer surveillance for revision cases and high-risk inflammatory disease [1].

A fibrotic web commonly begins across the anterior neo-ostium or frontal beak during the first months. If recognized early, it may be divided in the office or operating room, followed by topical or intralesional corticosteroid treatment. Mature circumferential stenosis with osteoneogenesis is less responsive to minor intervention and often requires formal revision drilling [2].

Surveillance should continue beyond initial mucosalization because restenosis may develop for up to 2 years. Long-term review is particularly important in allergy, aspirin-exacerbated respiratory disease, cystic fibrosis, recurrent polyposis, and tumor cases requiring oncological surveillance [22].

Predictors of Surgical Failure

Unfavorable anatomy

A narrow maximum frontal outflow diameter limits the obtainable neo-ostium and has been associated with recurrence. A thick beak, low skull base, marked septal deviation, extensive supraorbital pneumatization, and far-lateral pathology also increase technical difficulty. These factors do not necessarily preclude surgery but should influence approach selection, reconstruction, and counseling [12].

Osteitis and previous surgery

Osteitis produces thick, poorly vascularized bone that requires extensive drilling and may have a greater tendency toward osteoneogenesis. Prior surgery compounds this problem by replacing anatomical landmarks with scar tissue and reducing available mucosa. Revision Draf III consequently has lower success than primary Draf III in pooled analyses [22].

Inflammatory phenotype

Allergy, severe polyposis, aspirin-exacerbated respiratory disease, and other type 2 inflammatory conditions increase the risk of recurrent mucosal obstruction. Georgalas and colleagues found allergy to be associated with restenosis, while more recent reviews also identify polyposis and allergic mechanisms as important adverse factors [23].

Surgery should therefore be integrated with phenotype-directed therapy. Biologic agents may reduce recurrent polyps and systemic corticosteroid requirements in eligible patients, but their optimal relationship with Draf III remains under investigation. A technically patent opening should not be revised merely because the mucosa remains inflamed if medical optimization has not been completed [13].

Technical factors

Incomplete removal of frontal cells, residual intersinus partitions, narrow inferior contours, extensive mucosal stripping, thermal injury, inadequate irrigation during drilling, and failure to cover critical raw surfaces contribute to stenosis. Excessive drilling can be as harmful as insufficient drilling if it creates unnecessary devascularized bone or violates structural boundaries [1].

Postoperative factors

Poor adherence to irrigation and topical corticosteroids, missed debridement, infection, crust retention, and delayed recognition of early narrowing may transform a manageable healing problem into mature stenosis. Postoperative burden should therefore be discussed before surgery. Patients unable to commit to prolonged care may have inferior outcomes even after technically excellent procedures [24].

Detection and Management of Impending Failure

Failure should be evaluated anatomically, inflammatoryly, and symptomatically. Endoscopy determines whether the opening is patent, narrowed, polyp-filled, crusted, infected, or divided by scar. CT shows retained compartments, osteoneogenesis, mucoceles, and inaccessible lateral disease. Symptoms should be correlated cautiously because persistent headache does not prove frontal obstruction [5].

Early edema and granulation may respond to improved irrigation, topical corticosteroids, culture-directed treatment, gentle debridement, and selected intralesional steroid injection. Thin fibrotic webs can be divided before they mature, while small adhesions may be released and separated with absorbable material or a short-term implant [2].

Polypoid obstruction through a structurally adequate opening should prompt medical escalation rather than immediate redrilling. Topical corticosteroid technique, adherence, systemic inflammatory comorbidities, and eligibility for biologic therapy should be reviewed. Revision surgery becomes appropriate when fixed scar, bone, retained partitions, or inaccessible disease prevents adequate drainage and topical treatment [13].

Formal revision Draf III involves removal of fibrotic tissue and osteoneogenic bone, restoration of smooth contours, and renewed mucosal reconstruction. Navigation is strongly recommended because normal landmarks may be absent and the skull base or orbit may be dehiscent. The surgeon should identify the mechanism of the first failure and explicitly correct it rather than merely reproducing the previous opening [22].

Some failures are not amenable to further midline endoscopy. Far-lateral mucoceles, extensive tumor attachment, posterior-table disease, major skull-base disruption, or repeated restenosis may require trephination, osteoplastic flap surgery, obliteration, cranialization, or a combined approach. The objective is durable disease control, not preservation of an exclusively endoscopic strategy at all costs [17].

Outcomes of Optimized Draf III Surgery

A large evidence-based review reported high overall patency after Draf III, confirming that the operation can provide durable access in appropriately selected patients. Nevertheless, variations in follow-up, indication, surgical technique, and definitions of success make pooled estimates difficult to interpret [4].

Naidoo and colleagues reported long-term outcomes in 229 frontal sinuses treated by frontal drillout, with a mean follow-up exceeding 10 years. The study demonstrated sustained benefit in many patients while also showing that late failure can occur. Long-term surveillance is therefore necessary even after apparently complete mucosalization [25].

Georgalas and colleagues evaluated 122 patients undergoing Draf III for predominantly recalcitrant frontal rhinosinusitis. Symptoms improved significantly, major complications were uncommon, and the procedure was considered a valid alternative to frontal obliteration. The association between allergy and restenosis reinforced the role of inflammatory biology in determining long-term patency [23].

A recent systematic review reported success rates of approximately 83.5% for primary and 71% for revision Draf III. Refractory chronic frontal rhinosinusitis remained the leading indication, followed by mucoceles and tumors. Mucosal flap use appeared to produce better patency than stenting, but interpretation is limited by retrospective study designs and technical heterogeneity [22].

The 2025 meta-analysis comparing Draf IIb and Draf III found pooled restenosis rates of approximately 7% and 20%, respectively, and revision rates of 5% and 12%. These figures should not be interpreted as proof that Draf IIb is technically superior because Draf III cohorts typically contain more severe, bilateral, and revision disease. They instead emphasize the importance of selecting the least extensive operation capable of controlling the pathology [21].

Complications Relevant to Optimization

Injury to the anterior ethmoidal artery may cause retraction of the vessel into the orbit and formation of a retrobulbar hematoma. Immediate recognition is essential because elevated orbital pressure may threaten vision. Defining the posterior limit and using controlled drilling near the artery reduce this risk [1].

Orbital complications include violation of the lamina papyracea, orbital fat exposure, extraocular muscle injury, diplopia, hematoma, and rare visual loss. Powered instruments should not be used blindly when orbital fat prolapses into the field. Preoperative identification of dehiscence and constant visualization of the lateral boundary are essential [3].

Posterior drilling beyond the first olfactory fibers may violate the cribriform plate or frontal skull base, producing cerebrospinal fluid leakage and intracranial infection. Recognized defects should be repaired immediately using an appropriate multilayer technique. Diamond drilling and continuous irrigation are preferred near thin bone [1].

Temporary or permanent olfactory dysfunction can arise from direct fiber injury, thermal damage, crusting, altered airflow, or postoperative inflammation. Limiting superior septectomy and preserving the first olfactory fibers reduce this risk. Structural complications such as excessive septal resection and saddle-nose deformity are preventable through preservation of dorsal and caudal support [9].

The most frequent clinically important delayed complication remains stenosis. Its prevention depends on the entire treatment pathway: anatomical planning, appropriate access, smooth drilling, mucosal reconstruction, inflammation control, irrigation, and surveillance. No isolated flap, stent, drug, or measurement can compensate for failure across several of these domains [22].

Research Priorities

Future studies should adopt standardized definitions of technical patency, clinically adequate patency, restenosis, and revision. Neo-ostium area should be measured at defined postoperative intervals, accompanied by endoscopic scores, CT findings, patient-reported outcomes, systemic medication requirements, and subsequent procedures. Inflammatory and neoplastic indications should be analyzed separately [22].

Prospective comparison of flap designs, free grafts, steroid-eluting implants, and no reconstruction is required. Studies should adjust for neo-ostium dimensions, primary versus revision surgery, osteitis, polyposis, aspirin-exacerbated respiratory disease, and postoperative topical therapy. Without such adjustment, apparent differences between reconstructive methods may mainly reflect differences in patient selection [18].

Quantitative preoperative planning may be enhanced through automated CT segmentation and three-dimensional modeling. Predictive models could combine frontal beak thickness, anteroposterior diameter, neo-ostium area, osteitis, prior surgery, and inflammatory phenotype. These tools may help determine when Draf IIb is sufficient, when primary Draf III is justified, and when a combined approach should be planned [12].

The interaction between Draf III and biologic therapy requires particular attention. Studies should establish whether biologics reduce restenosis after surgery, whether a widely patent frontal opening improves topical-treatment effectiveness sufficiently to delay biologic therapy, and which patients benefit most from combined surgical and biological treatment [13].

Conclusion

Optimization of Draf III frontal sinusotomy requires an individualized, anatomy-driven approach that anticipates healing and recurrent inflammation. Durable patency is most likely when preoperative imaging accurately defines the operative corridor, the safest drilling direction is selected, a broad and smooth neo-ostium is created without violating critical boundaries, viable mucosa is preserved or reconstructed, and postoperative inflammation and early scar formation are actively controlled through long-term surveillance.

How to cite this article: Optimizing Draf III Frontal Sinusotomy: Anatomical Planning, Neo-Ostium Preservation, and Prevention of Surgical Failure (2024). Adly Ahmed Tantawy, Magdy Ibrahim Gouda, Isamel Sedik Elnashar, Mohamed Abdelrahman FatouhaVol. 14, No. 3, 2024,1222-1232

Source of support: None.

Conflict of interest: Nil.

Accepted: 26.03.2024 **Received** 03.03.2024

References

1. Noller M, Fischer JL, Gudis DA, Riley CA. The Draf III procedure: a review of indications and techniques. *World J Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2022;8(1):1-7.
2. Wei CC, Sama A. What is the evidence for the use of mucosal flaps in Draf III procedures? *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2014;22(1):63-67.
3. Weber R, Draf W, Kratzsch B, Hosemann W, Schaefer SD. Modern concepts of frontal sinus surgery. *Laryngoscope*. 2001;111(1):137-146.
4. DeConde AS, Smith TL. Outcomes after frontal sinus surgery: an evidence-based review. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am*. 2016;49(4):1019-1033.
5. Fokkens WJ, Lund VJ, Hopkins C, et al. European Position Paper on Rhinosinusitis and Nasal Polyps 2020. *Rhinology*. 2020;58(suppl S29):1-464.
6. Lein A, Liu DT, Knerer B, et al. Mucosal grafts and flaps in Draf IIb and Draf III: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Published online 2025.
7. Chmielewski PP. Clinical anatomy of the paranasal sinuses and its terminology. *Anat Sci Int*. 2024;99(4):454-460.
8. Papadopoulou AM, Bakogiannis N, Skrapari I, Bakoyiannis C. Anatomical variations of the sinonasal area and their clinical impact on sinus pathology: a systematic review. *Int Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2022;26(3):e491-e498.
9. Papatsoutsos E, Kalyvas A, Drosos E, et al. Defining the limits and indications of the Draf III endoscopic approach to the lateral frontal sinus and maximizing visualization and maneuverability: a cadaveric and radiological study. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2022;279(10):4969-4976.
10. Wormald PJ, Hoseman W, Callejas C, et al. The International Frontal Sinus Anatomy Classification and an anatomic classification of the extent of endoscopic frontal sinus surgery. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol*. 2016;6(7):677-696.
11. Fawzi NEA, Lazim NM, Aziz ME, Mohammad ZW, Abdullah B. The prevalence of frontal cell variants according to the International Frontal Sinus Anatomy Classification and their associations with frontal sinusitis. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2022;279(2):765-771.
12. Alicandri-Ciufelli M, Cantaffa C, Basso M, Colacurcio V, Marchioni D, Lucidi D. Influence of pre-operative estimation of Draf III expected diameter on surgical outcome. *J Pers Med*. 2024;14(9):951.
13. Bachert C, Han JK, Desrosiers M, et al. Efficacy and safety of dupilumab in patients with severe chronic rhinosinusitis with nasal polyps: results from the randomized phase 3 SINUS-24 and SINUS-52 studies. *Lancet*. 2019;394(10209):1638-1650.
14. Tilak A, Purvis J, Peña-Garcia A, et al. Above and beyond: periorbital suspension for endoscopic access to difficult frontal sinus pathology. *Laryngoscope*. 2022;132(3):538-544.
15. Sileo G, Valentini M, Gravante G, et al. Sinonasal malignancies involving the frontal sinus: a mono-institutional experience of 84 cases and systematic literature review. *J Clin Med*. 2023;12(9):3186.
16. Leventi A, Chatzinakis V, Papargyriou GE, Georgalas C. Enhancing frontal sinus surgery: assessing the long-term impact of free grafts and flaps in Draf III procedures. *J Pers Med*. 2024;14(4):396.
17. Crocetta FM, Farneti P, Sollini G, et al. Endoscopic management of frontal sinus diseases after frontal craniotomy: a case series and review of the literature. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2021;278(4):1035-1045.
18. Illing EA, Cho DY, Riley KO, Woodworth BA. Draf III mucosal grafting technique: long-term results. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol*. 2016;6(5):514-517.
19. Leventi A, Chatzinakis V, Papargyriou GE, Georgalas C. Enhancing frontal sinus surgery: assessing the long-term impact of free grafts and flaps in Draf III procedures. *J Pers Med*. 2024;14(4):396.
20. Orlandi RR, Knight J. Prolonged stenting of the frontal sinus. *Laryngoscope*. 2009;119(1):190-192.
21. Hirayama Y, Shahid MS, Finney HA, et al. Comparison of outcomes for Draf IIb vs Draf III in endoscopic frontal sinus surgery: a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis. *Rhinology*. 2025;63(3):294-305.
22. Chiari F, Guarino P, Caporale CD, et al. Clinical features, operative management and surgical results of first Draf III procedure, revision Draf III approach and the use of mucosal flaps and stents: a systematic review. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2025;282(2):611-622.
23. Georgalas C, Hansen F, Videler WJM, Fokkens WJ. Long terms results of Draf type III frontal sinus drainage procedure in 122 patients: a single centre experience. *Rhinology*. 2011;49(2):195-201.
24. Jafari A, Tringale KR, Panuganti BA, DeConde AS. Short-term morbidity after the endoscopic modified Lothrop procedure compared with Draf IIa frontal sinusotomy. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol*. 2017;7(10):941-947.
25. Naidoo Y, Bassiouni A, Keen M, Wormald PJ. Long-term outcomes for the endoscopic modified Lothrop/Draf III procedure: a 10-year review. *Laryngoscope*. 2014;124(1):43-49