Obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS) continues to be a therapeutic challenge despite the advances achieved over recent decades. Among the many treatment options available, the choice between them still depends more on the professional’s preferences and tendencies rather than on the needs indicated by the disease. The scarcity of randomized and controlled comparative studies makes it difficult to assess the differences between the various therapeutic modalities currently accessible [1].

The treatment options for OSAS include nasal, oropharyngeal, lingual and face as well as neck skeletal surgical procedures (separately or in conjunction) using a wide range of techniques and combinations. Among these methods, facial skeletal surgery has been found to be poorly accepted by patients, despite the cure rates achieved. Continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) continues to be the first-choice therapeutic option in many institutions. Adherence to use of CPAP remains a barrier to be surmounted and its efficacy has been questioned on many fronts [1]. Intraoral devices also have a place among the vast range of therapeutic options that can be selected. However, neither intraoral devices nor CPAP has the capacity to cure OSAS. These methods are only a means for maintaining the patency of the airways while they are in use [2].

New methods for treating OSAS such as stimulation of the hypoglossal nerve and transcutaneous electrical stimulation have been studied, with promising preliminary results [3].

Yet, what would the alternative be, when conventional surgery, CPAP and intraoral devices fail? Such failures have constantly been observed.

Expansion of the maxilla (ERM) was created by Angle in 1860 to treat dental-maxillary discrepancies in children and adolescents. Since then, a variety of techniques and types of devices have been proposed in the literature and the indications for their use have gone beyond the limits of dental occlusion treatments [4].

ERM in children is widely accepted and is based on opening the palatine suture, which in this age group has not yet become calcified. Its benefits in relation to OSAS have already been discussed, and this forms a promising route for dealing with OSAS in childhood [5].

Expansion of the maxilla has the beneficial side effect of increasing the width of the nose, which would diminish the nasal resistance to the passage of air. Another matter that remains unclear relates to the increased size of the upper dental arch: this would increase the buccal space, thus giving the tongue more room and enabling it to occupy a more anterior position, which theoretically would diminish the collapsibility of the airway. Furthermore, it can be supposed that if the maxilla is expanded, there will be tension in the muscles that connect it to the palate, such as the palatoglossal and palatopharyngeal muscles, with anterior displacement associated with these muscles. Therefore, this could also reduce the collapsibility of the upper airways during sleep [6].

Expansion of the maxilla in adults has been studied recently, initially with a view to using this treatment to correct dental malocclusion (unilateral or bilateral crossbite and maxillary atresia). It has been observed that, in addition to obviously increasing the intraoral space, this expansion also gives rise to expansion of neighboring structures, especially the nasal structures. Expansion in adults was initially done at the cost of surgically opening the sutures of the middle third of the face. Thus, this was a major surgical procedure [7].

Yoon et al., proposed the distraction osteogenesis maxillary expansion (DOME) technique, in which orthopedic expansion of the maxilla is performed using mini-implants, with the expander apparatus fixed bilaterally to the palatine suture [8]. DOME involves use of limited LeFort I osteotomy, which does not require breakage of the pterygoid sutures but only breakage of the anterior part of the palatine suture. This study [8] presented promising results from this technique for treating OSAS in adults. Moreover, it brought up a matter that has repeatedly been discussed: does maxillary expansion occur in adults? Is there a need to surgically break the sutures for expansion to take place?

The presentation of DOME demonstrated how surgical techniques for maxillary expansion have evolved, such that only the most anterior part of the suture has to undergo resection. Alternatively, would it be possible to achieve palatine expansion without any surgery?

For more than a decade, studies have been showing that this is possible. The concept of nonsurgical maxillary expansion is a matter that has cropped up repeatedly in the literature, although the consensus is that, as patients leave adolescence behind them, this type of expansion ceases to be viable; and that instead of this, surgically assisted rapid expansion becomes necessary. This dilemma still seems to be accepted as an orthodontic paradigm to be overcome. Nonetheless, there are around 10 studies, both new and not so new, that support the hypothesis that maxillary expansion in adults can be done without the need to surgically open up the sutures [6,9–17].

This was expressed well by Dr Chester Handelman: “The specialty of orthodontics has been reluctant to accept expansion in most situations. However, when the evidence-based literature demonstrates success in cases of nonsurgical expansion in adults, it is time to change the paradigm” [6].

Is it time to change the paradigm? The article by Audrey Yoon, Christian Guillenmault, Sorosh Zaghi and Stanley Yung-Chuan Liu certainly invites us to apply an old tool in a new way, to treat a condition that remains challenging: OSAS [8].
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