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ABSTRACT

Glandular odontogenic cyst is a rarely seen lesion and because of non-specific clinical and radiologic image, differential diagnosis is difficult. Therefore, it requires careful treatment and follow-up due to the aggressive nature. This type of unusual cyst’s diagnosis, treatment, and one case report was presented.
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Introduction

Glandular odontogenic cyst (GOC) is a rare developmental cyst of the jaw that is suggested to originate from the remnants of the dental lamina. This cyst was reported for the first time in 1987 by Padayache and Van Wyk as a sialo-odontogenic cyst, and was described as a glandular odontogenic cyst by Gardner et al in 1988 (1, 2). In 1992, the World Health Organization classified the lesion as a developmental odontogenic epithelial cyst and adopted GOC as the preferred term (3).

Although GOCs may be asymptomatic, they may also lead to pain, swelling, and tooth displacement (4, 5). Radiographically, the lesions appear as well-circumscribed unilocular or multilocular areas causing expansion, erosion, thinning and perforation (3).

Histological examinations support a dental lamina remnant origin for this lesion, with microscopic examinations showing a cystic cavity lined by non-keratinized, stratified, squamous epithelium, localized plaque-like thickenings of the epithelium and numerous mucous-secreting cells in the surface layer of the epithelium. Histopathologically, the superficial layer of the GOC resembles the botryoid odontogenic cyst and low-grade central mucoepidermoid carcinoma. Moreover, ameloblastoma, central giant-cell granuloma, odontogenic myxoma, BOC, and odontogenic keratocyst are radiographically similar to GOC, differential diagnosis more difficult for these lesions (3). Thus, the diagnosis of GOCs can be challenging because of their rare occurrence and the lack of distinctive diagnostic criteria (3, 5).

The treatment options for GOC vary and include marsupialization, cryotherapy, curettage and enucleation. Some authors recommend radical solutions like marginal resection because the recurrence rates are high (6, 7).

In this article, we report a rare case of this cyst with clinical, radiological, histological and treatment aspects.

Clinical Report

A 38-years-old Caucasian woman was referred to the Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Department of İnönü University Faculty of Dentistry with swelling at the palate mucosa last months. She experienced mild pain at the first clinical examination. Palatal expansion extending from the upper right central to the upper left first premolar was observed. The labial and palatal overlying mucosas were normal. She had no notable medical history.

The right central and left first premolar teeth responded to the vitality test with the electric pulp tester but the right central and right lateral teeth did not respond; thus, endodontic treatment was performed on the right central and right lateral teeth before surgery.

Panoramic and periapical radiographs were taken after the oral examination (Figure 1, Figure 2D). She had already undergone computed tomography (CT) radiograph. The radiological examinations revealed that a unilocular radiolucency of approximately as 12.3 × 18 mm in size surrounded the crown of the impacted left canine. The roots of the right central and right lateral teeth exhibited resorption. The lesion had caused destruction of the alveolar bone from both the palatal and labial aspects (Figure 2A, 2B, 2C).
Figure 1. Panoramic radiograph before surgery.

Figure 2. A: Transversal view of CT before surgery, B: Sagittal view of CT before surgery, C: Intraoperative view, D: Periapical radiograph before surgery.
A mucoperiosteal flap was raised between the right first premolar and left first molar with a palatal approach. The lesion was enucleated and the impacted canine was extracted under local anesthesia. The cystic material was sent to the Pathology Department of Inonu School of Medicine for pathological examination. During the 17 months follow-up period, there is no sign of recurrence at the surgery area (Figure 3).

Histopathological examination revealed a cystic lesion lined with stratified squamous epithelium that exhibited pseudoglandular spaces. Histochemical staining with periodic acid-Schiff (PAS) + Alcianblue (pH2.5) revealed mucinous material in the glandular spaces and the cytoplasmic areas of single cells. The histopathological diagnosis was reported as GOC (Figure 4A, 4B, 4C).

**Discussion**

Previously, the cyst described here in was called “sialo-odontogenic cyst.” However, Gardner et al. (2) called the lesion a “glandular odontogenic cyst” because the cyst wall epithelium contained only elements with no evidence of salivary tissue involvement. This term was later adopted by the World Health Organization (4).

To the best of our knowledge, only 114 cases of GOC have been reported in the literature (8). Further, Magnusson et al. (9) observed that this type of cyst accounts for only 0.012% of the cysts that are observed in the oral cavity among the odontogenic cysts. Although the cyst was located in the at the maxilla anterior region in this case, several papers have indicated that the anterior mandible is the most common site of occurrence. GOC has a clear preference for the mandible, with 70% of cases located in the mandible.
and 30% in the maxilla (7). GOC is slightly more common in males and occurs primarily in middle-aged patients (10).

Although the origin of GOC remains unclear, various cases of hybrid lesions of GOC and other odontogenic tumors appear to indicate an odontogenic origin. The minimal expression of markers such as epithelial membrane antigen and mammary serine protease inhibitor do not support a sialogenic origin (3, 5).

While the respective occurrences of resorption and tooth displacement are 22% and 24.4%, multilocularity (48%) and cortical expansion (87%) features are higher in these cysts compared to other odontogenic cysts. Further, GOC has a 50% perforation rate (4). Despite these aggressive properties, the cysts are usually asymptomatic.

GOC has no known radiographic pathognomonic features, although a smooth border (95%) that is unilocular (53.8%) or multilocular (46.2%) is commonly observed (4, 5, 7). The lesion size varies from 0.5 to 12 cm in length and 0.5 to 6 cm in width (4). These lesions can become very large; thus, a three-dimensional evaluation is important. CT can be used to determine the localization of the lesion and the features of multilocularity and to provide evidence of perforation.

A diagnosis may be difficult because these lesions lack specific clinical and radiological properties; therefore, the differential diagnosis should be considered carefully.

GOC is radiographically similar to the dentigerous cyst, ameloblastoma, central giant-cell granuloma, odontogenic myxoma, botryoid odontogenic cyst, and odontogenic keratocyst (3, 4, 7). Especially, even in present case, GOC can be misdiagnosed as a dentigerous cyst because of the clinical features and radiographic view (11).

The treatment of these cysts is a controversial issue. Most of the cases reported in the literature were treated with enucleation and curettage (83.5%). In addition, marsupialization and curettage in conjunction with Carnoy’s solution and cryotherapy have been used (7, 12). However, some authors suggest marginal or segmental resection because of the potential for relapse and the aggressive nature of these lesions (7, 13-15).

Many studies have shown that GOC is relatively aggressive and has a high potential for recurrence (16, 17). Some authors have postulated that the cell kinetics in the cyst epithelium is responsible for the tendency of these cysts to recur (18, 19). Increased positivity and decreased hold account for proliferation index and an immunohistochemical evaluation is recommended (3, 5). A postoperative follow-up period is crucial in these cases because the recurrence rate is high (20).

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the rarely observed GOC may be missed because its pathology is similar to that of many other conditions. Long-term follow-up is crucial because of the potential for recurrence (21%).
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