

The Long Term Stability of the Le Fort I Osteotomy

Dr. GEOFF DANCE

i

B.D.Sc., FRACDS (OMS).

Oral Maxillofacial Surgery Unit

Faculty of Dentistry The University of Adelaide South Australia

1999

Table of Contents

٠

Titlei
Table of Contentsii
List of Figuresix
List of Tablesx
Abstractxxi
Declarationxxiv
Acknowledgementsxxv

I Introduction
Chapter 1 The Le Fort I osteotomy for the correction of the
maxillary position in three dimensions2
1.1 Overview and Aims
II Review of the Literature
Chapter 2 Dentofacial discrepancies involving the maxilla
2.1 History5
2.2 Classifications of maxillary discrepancies7
2.3 Incidence10
2.4 Maxillary growth -normal growth of the maxilla11

181
2.5 Surgery for the treatment of maxillary discrepancies15
2.5.1 South Australian Protocol19
2.6 Bone grafting25
2.7 Complications of maxillary procedures
2.7.1 Intraoperative complications28
2.7.2 Immediate post operative complications
2.7.3 Delayed post operative complications
Chapter 3 Cephalometry44
3.1 Introduction44
2.2 Emers of projection

3.1 Introduction
3.2 Errors of projection
3.3 Errors of landmark identification49
3.4 Errors of superimposition
3.5 Errors of digitising55
3.6 Errors of measurement
3.7 Selection of a suitable line of reference

Chapter 4 Relapse following Le Fort I osteotomy	}
4.1 Defining post surgical relapse63	}
4.2 Measurement of post surgical relapse	3
4.3 Early, intermediate and long term relapse	Ś

iii

iv

Chapter 5 Factors associated with post surgical relapse following
Le Fort I osteotomy
5.1 Introduction
5.2 Orthodontics and occlusion
5.3 Direction of repositioning the maxilla73
5.4 Magnitude of shift of the maxilla179
5.5 Influence of bimaxillary surgery80
5.6 Plating verses wire fixation
5.7 Bone grafting and stability90
5.8 Segmental vs single piece osteotomy93
5.9 Anterior Open Bite94
5.10 Muscular interactions
5.11 Vascular considerations of osseous segments100
5.12 Growth and Stability101
5.13 Le Fort III / Syndromal patients / Cleft palate patients104
5.14 Conclusion
Chapter 6 Biomechanics of fixation108
III Materials and Method
Chapter 7 Evaluation of post surgical relapse114

-		
7.1 Selection of patients	records	

V
7.2 Radiographic technique
7.3 Tracing and digitising procedure120
7.4 Reference points and lines
7.4.1 Hard and soft tissue points122
7.4.2 Cephalometric lines126
7.4.3 Calculation of linear and angle variables126
7.5 Statistical analysis129
Chapter 8 Errors of Method
8.1 Errors of Method131
IV Results
Chapter 9 Early, intermediate and long term dentoskeletal effect
following Le Fort I osteotomy
9.1 Introduction
9.2 Demographics136
9.3 Analysis of variables by group143
9.3.1 Superior repositioning of the Maxilla143
9.3.1.1. Points A, ANS , PNS and MAX143
9.3.2 Inferior repositioning of the Maxilla166
9.3.2.1. Points A, ANS, PNS
9.3.3 Anterior repositioning of the Maxilla186
9.3.3.1. Points A, ANS, PNS

vi 9.3.4 Points UMC and LMC (In the vertical and
Horizontal)
9.3.5 SNA and Frankfort horizontal (For each
direction of movement)
9.3.6 Anterior facial height : Nasion to Menton (Na -
Me) for each direction of movement219
9.3.7 Posterior facial height (S - Go) for each
direction of movement223
9.4 Dentoskeletal changes227
9.4.1 Maxillary incisal angle.(SNA - Max)227
9.4.2 Interincisal angle231
9.4.3 Overjet235
9.4.4 Overbite239
9.5 Influence of mandibular surgery243
9.5.1 Angle SNB243
9.5.2 Influence of mandibular surgery247
9.6 Influence of occlusal plane (Occlusal plane to Frankfort
horizontal)251
9.7 Other factors255
9.7.1. Single jaw surgery (Maxilla only) vs
Bimaxillary surgery255
9.7.2. Early relapse vs late relapse
9.8 Complications following surgery267
9.8.1. intraoperative haemorrhage

	VII
9.8.2	. immediate post operative complications268
9.8.3	. delayed post operative complications269
9.8.3.2	l Parathesia of the infraorbital nerve
	9.8.3.2. Infections
	9.8.3.3. Plate removal270
	9.8.3.4. TMJ disorders270
	9.8.3.4. Dental complications270

Chapter 10 Results : Errors of the method	'1
---	----

V Discussion	
Chapter 11 Discussion of Experimental Design	
11.1 Patient selection	
11.2 Materials and method	

Chapter 12 Discussion of factors in the relapse of Le Fort I

osteotomy2	91
12.1 Definition of relapse29	91
12.2 Orthodontics and occlusion2	92
12.2.1 Orthodontics versus no orthodontics2	:92
12.2.2 Orthodontics - overjet and overbite2	.94

12.2.3 Orthodontics - Maxillary incisal angle and	
interincisal angle295	,
12.2.4 Orthodontics - Occlusal plane angle	7

12.2.5 Orthodontics - Upper molar and lower molar
crown position298
12.3 Magnitude and direction of movement
12.4 Type of fixation
12.4.1 Fixation305
12.4.2 Bone grafts
12.5 Growth
12.6 Surgeon
12.7 Segmentalisation of the maxilla vs one piece
12.8 Influence of mandibular surgery
12.9 Gender
12.10 Relapse timing
VI Conclusion
Chapter 13 Conclusion

viii

VII Appendix	319
I Bone grafts - Anterior Iliac Crest (surgical technique)	
II. Le fort I Osteotomy - surgical technique	

III.	Bone Plate	removal	protocol	statement.	 329

VIII	Bibliography	7
------	--------------	----------

List of Figures.

17
Figure 2.1 Le Fort osteotomy levels17
Figure 3.1 Reference lines
Figure 5.1 Diagram hierarchy of stability74
Figure 7.1 Enlargement factor : Adelaide Dental Hospital Lateral
Cephalogram119
Figure 7.2 Hard tissue points listed in order of digitising sequence125
Figure 7.3 Angular and linear variables used to evaluate dentoskeletal
changes following Le Fort I osteotomies (and concurrent
Mandibular procedures)128
Figure 7.4 Summary of statistics used130
Figure 8.1 Statistical analysis of the experimental error133
Figure 9.1 Scatter plot of maxillary landmarks for superior
repositioning145
Figure 9.2 Scatter plot of maxillary landmarks for inferior
repositioning167
Figure 9.3 Scatter plot of maxillary landmarks for anterior
repositioning187
Figures 10.1 - 10.21. Double determinations for cephalometric
landmarks used274 -284

List of Tables.

Table 9.1 Age and gender distribution of patients undergoing surgery136
Table 9.2 Age and gender distribution of patients who underwent surgery
but had incomplete records136
Table 9.3 Age and gender distribution of patients who underwent surgery
who were syndromal patients137
Table 9.4 Distribution of patients involved in the study assigned by
direction of maxillary movement137
Table 9.5 Distribution of patients assigned by direction of maxillary
movement whose records were incomplete
Table 9.6 Distribution of patients assigned by direction of maxillary
movement who were syndromal patients
Table 9.7 Distribution of patients by direction of movement and
concurrent mandibular surgery139
Table 9.8 Distribution of patients by direction of movement and
concurrent mandibular surgery (Combining groups 2 & 5;
groups 3 & 4 from Table 9.7)139
Table 9.9 Distribution of patients by direction of movement and
surgeon140
Table 9.10. Patient numbers receiving pre/postsurgical or no orthodontics
by direction141
Table 9.11. Number of patients having segmental/non segmental Le fort I
operations by direction141
Table 9.12. Magnitude of movement by direction
Table 9.13. Patient numbers using either wire or rigid fixation by
direction142
Table 9.14. Patient numbers using bone grafts or no graft by direction142
Table 9.15. Mean maxillary impaction (mm)143

xi
Table 9.16. T -Test : Superiorly repositioned maxilla
Table 9.17. Correlations - superiorly repositioned maxilla (Pearson
Correlations145
Table 9.18. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by gender146
Table 9.19. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by gender ANOVA147
Table 9.20. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by age149
Table 9.21. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by age -ANOVA150
Table 9.22. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by surgeon152
Table 9.23. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by surgeon - ANOVA153
Table 9.24. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by operation154
Table 9.25. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement by operation - ANOVA155
Table 9.26. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by segmentalisation (Seg.) versus one piece maxilla
(Nonseg.)156
Table 9.27. Magnitude of shift in superior direction and postsurgical
movement when segmentalised or one piece -ANOVA157
Table 9.28. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by wire or rigid fixation (R.F.)
Table 9.29. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement fixated with wire or rigid fixation -ANOVA159

Xii Table 9.30. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by orthodontics or no orthodontics160
Table 9.31. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by orthodontics or no orthodontics ANOVA161
Table 9.32. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by the magnitude of movement162
Table 9.33. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by the magnitude of that movementANOVA163
Table 9.34. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by bone graft or no bone graft165
Table 9.35. Movement in the superior direction and postsurgical
movement by bone graft or no bone graft - ANOVA
Table 9.36. Mean maxillary inferior repositioning (mm)
Table 9.37. T -Test : Inferiorly repositioned maxilla
Table 9.38. Correlations - inferiorly repositioned maxilla (Pearsons
Correlations)167
Table 9.39. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by gender168
Table 9.40. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by gender - ANOVA169
Table 9.41. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by age170
Table 9.42. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical171
Table 9.43. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by surgeon172
Table 9.44. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by surgeon - ANOVA173

xii

Xiii
Table 9.45. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical 174
movement by operation
Table 9.46. Magnitude of shift in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by operation ANOVA175
Table 9.47. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by segmentalisation (Seg.) versus one piece
maxilla (Nonseg.)176
Table 9.48. Magnitude of shift in inferior direction and postsurgical
movement when segmentalised or one piece - ANOVA177
Table 9.49. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by wire or rigid fixation (R.F.)
Table 9.50. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement fixated with wire or rigid fixation - ANOVA179
Table 9.51. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by orthodontics or no orthodontics
Table 9.52. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by orthodontics or no orthodontics ANOVA181
Table 9.53. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by the magnitude of movement182
Table 9.54. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by the magnitude of that movement ANOVA183
Table 9.55. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by bone graft or no bone graft
Table 9.56. Movement in the inferior direction and postsurgical
movement by bone graft or no bone graft ANOVA185
Table 9.57. Mean maxillary advancement (mm). 186
Table 9.58. T -Test : Anteriorly repositioned maxilla

XIV Table 9.59. Correlations - anteriorly repositioned maxilla (Pearsons
Correlations.)187
Table 9.60. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by gender188
Table 9.61. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by gender - ANOVA189
Table 9.62. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by age190
Table 9.63. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by age - ANOVA191
Table 9.64. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by surgeon192
Table 9.65. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by surgeon - ANOVA193
Table 9.66. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by operation195
Table 9.67. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by operation - ANOVA195
Table 9.68. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by segmentalisation (Seg.) versus one piece maxilla
(Nonseg.)196
Table 9.69. Magnitude of shift in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement when segmentalised or one piece - ANOVA197
Table 9.70. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by wire or rigid fixation (R.F.)
Table 9.71. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement fixated with wire or rigid fixation ANOVA199

xiv

X V
A V

Table 9.72. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by orthodontics or no orthodontics
Table 9.73. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by orthodontics or no orthodontics ANOVA201
Table 9.74. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by the magnitude of movement
Table 9.75. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by the magnitude of that movement ANOVA203
Table 9.76. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by bone graft or no bone graft
Table 9.77. Movement in the anterior direction and postsurgical
movement by bone graft or no bone graft ANOVA205
Table 9.78. Mean movement of points LMC and UMC in the
horizontal (X) and vertical (Y) planes for superior
repositioning206
Table 9.79. T -Test for points UMC and LMC for superior repositioning207
Table 9.80. Mean movement of points LMC and UMC in the
horizontal (X) and vertical (Y) planes for inferior
repositioning208
Table 9.81. T -Test for points UMC and LMC for inferior repositioning
Table 9.82. Mean movement of points LMC and UMC in the
horizontal (X) and vertical (Y) planes for anterior
repositioning210
Table 9.83. T -Test for points UMC and LMC for advancement
Table 9.84. Movement in each direction and postsurgical movement
at points UMC, LMC in both the vertical (Y) and
horizontal (X) - ANOVA212

xvii superior
Table 9.103. Mean maxillary incisal angle (SN - Max) for superior 227
repositioning
Table 9.104. T -Test for maxillary incisal angle for superior repositioning228
Table 9.105. Mean maxillary incisal angle (SN - Max) for inferior
repositioning
Table 9.106. T -Test for maxillary incisal angle for inferior repositioning229
Table 9.107. Mean maxillary incisal angle (SN - Max) for advancement230
Table 9.108. T - Test for maxillary incisal angle for advancement
Table 9.109. Mean interincisal angle for superior repositioning
Table 9.110. T -Test for interincisal angle for superior repositioning
Table 9.111. Mean interincisal angle for inferior repositioning. 232
Table 9.112. T -Test for interincisal angle for inferior repositioning
Table 9.113. Mean interincisal angle for advancement. 234
Table 9.114. T -Test for interincisal angle for advancement
Table 9.115. Mean overjet (mm.) for superior repositioning
Table 9.116. T -Test for overjet for superior repositioning
Table 9.117. Mean overjet for inferior repositioning
Table 9.118. T -Test for overjet for inferior repositioning
Table 9.119. Mean overjet for advancement
Table 9.120. T -Test for overjet for advancement
Table 9.121. Mean overbite (mm.) for superior repositioning
Table 9.122. T -Test for overbite for superior repositioning
Table 9.123. Mean overbite (mm.) for inferior repositioning. 240
Table 9.124. T - Test for overbite for inferior repositioning
Table 9.125. Mean overbite (mm.) for advancement. 242
Table 9.126. T -Test for overbite for advancement
Table 9.127. Mean SNB angle for superior repositioning

xviii

Table 9.128.	T -Test for SNB angle for superior repositioning	244
Table 9.129.	Mean SNB for inferior repositioning.	244
Table 9.130.	T -Test for angle SNB for inferior repositioning	245
Table 9.131.	Mean angle SNB for advancement	245
Table 9.132.	T -Test for angle SNB for advancement	246
Table 9.133.	Mean mandibular plane angle (MPA) for superior	
	repositioning	247
Table 9.134.	T -Test for mandibular plane angle for superior repositioning	248
Table 9.135.	Mean mandibular plane angle for inferior repositioning	248
Table 9.136.	T -Test for mandibular plane angle for inferior repositioning?	249
Table 9.137.	Mean mandibular plane angle for advancement2	249
Table 9.138.	T -Test for mandibular plane angle for advancement	250
Table 9.139.	Mean occlusal plane angle for superior repositioning2	251
Table 9.140.	T -Test for occlusal plane angle for superior repositioning	252
Table 9.141.	Mean occlusal plane angle for inferior repositioning	252
Table 9.142.	T -Test for occlusal plane angle for inferior repositioning	253
Table 9.143.	Mean occlusal plane angle for advancement	253
Table 9.144.	T -Test for occlusal plane angle for advancement2	254
Table 9.145.	Single jaw surgery (Le fort only) versus two jaw surgery	
	(Others) for superiorly repositioned maxillae	255
Table 9.146.	Single jaw surgery (Le fort only) versus two jaw surgery	
	(Others) for superiorly repositioned maxillae before and	
	after surgery utilising points A, ANS and PNS -ANOVA	256
Table 9.147.	Single jaw surgery (Le fort only) versus two jaw surgery	
	(Others) for inferiorly repositioned maxillae	257

xix

Table 9.148. Single	e jaw surgery (Le fort only) versus two jaw surgery
	ers) for inferiorly repositioned maxillae before and after
surge	ery utilising points A, ANS and PNS - ANOVA258
Table 9.149. Single	e jaw surgery (Le fort only) versus two jaw surgery
(Oth	ers) for anteriorly repositioned maxillae259
Table 9.150. Single	e jaw surgery (Le fort only) versus two jaw surgery
(Oth	ers) for anteriorly repositioned maxillae before and after
surg	ery utilising points A, ANS and PNS - ANOVA260
Table 9.151. Com	parison of patients followed up for less than
	rage time (2.6 years) and those followed up longer .
Exa	mines patients before and after surgery utilising points A,
ANS	5, PNS and MAX. Superior repositioning
Table 9.152. Com	parison of patients followed up for less than
	rage time (2.6 years) and those followed up longer.
Sup	perior repositioning - ANOVA262
Table 9.153. Com	parison of patients followed up for less than
	erage time (2.6 years) and those followed up longer .
Exa	amines patients before and after surgery utilising points A,
AN	S , PNS and MAX. Inferior repositioning263
Table 9.154. Con	nparison of patients followed up for less than
	rerage time (2.6 years) and those followed up longer.
In	ferior repositioning - ANOVA264
Table 9.155. Con	nparison of patients followed up for less than
	verage time (2.6 years) and those followed up longer .
	xamines patients before and after surgery utilising points A,
AN	NS , PNS and MAX.Anterior repositioning

XX
Table 9.156. Comparison of patients followed up for less than
average time (2.6 years) and those followed up longer. Anterior
repositioning - ANOVA266
Table 9.157. Complication rates for the 100 patients undergoing Le Fort I
osteotomies
Table 10.1 Error for 20 hard tissue points (Horizontal axis) by Double
determination272
Table 10.2 Error for 20 hard tissue points (Vertical axis) by Double
determination273

xxi Abstract

The Le Fort I osteotomy is a surgical procedure designed to correct certain types of maxillary deformities. It enables the maxilla to be repositioned within certain limits in three dimensions. These shifts can be performed leaving the maxillary arch intact or the arch can be cut into segments and expanded or compressed. Bone grafts may or may not be required. The procedure has gained world wide acceptance and has been widely performed over the last three decades . It was however first described last century. The maxilla is shifted into a preplanned position and fixated via various methods, however over a period of time relapse has been shown to occur.

The aim of this research was to measure relapse and to identify the factors that influence relapse over a long period of time (minimum of one year). The incidence and timing of relapse has been documented in many studies. These have largely been conflictive and inconclusive. Most of these studies have been of short duration.

The research is a retrospective study based on cephalometric analysis of pre and post operative radiographs to determine the extent of relapse. Patients who had undergone a Le Fort I osteotomy in the period 1984 to 1997 at the Royal Adelaide Hospital were included if they had a complete set of lateral cephalograms and other records greater than one year post surgery. Out of 287 patients undergoing this procedure, 100 fulfilled these requirements.

Utilising a standardised approach these cephalograms were analysed to determine changes in the maxillae from pre to post surgery, and then post surgery to greater than one year. This quantified the amount and direction of movement with the original surgery and also any long term post surgical

xxii

instability.

After a review of the literature various factors that may influence the stability of the surgery were identified. These included whether orthodontics were utilised or not, the direction of movement, the magnitude of movement, concurrent mandibular surgery, the type of fixation, the use of bone grafts, and segmental versus non segmental treatments. The age, sex and growth status of the patient were also assessed for their influence on stability, as was the experience of the surgeon performing the operation.

A close examination of the errors of method was undertaken and discussed. This identified limitations that are inherent in this form of study. The major factors identified and addressed were accurate landmark identification.

This study showed that all Le Fort I osteotomies have a degree of post surgical instability. As has been found in other short term studies the direction of maxillary movement altered the amount of instability post surgery. Advancement osteotomies are more stable than the superior repositioned maxilla, which in turn are more stable than the inferior repositioned maxilla.

The occurrence of the instability was within the first twelve months after the operation was performed. After minor early instability the Le Fort I osteotomy can be considered stable in the long term.

Instability with superior repositioning can occur either in a further superior direction or relapse in an inferior direction. Identification of aetiological factors that may aid the recognition of the patients in each of these groups prior to surgery was not achieved.

xxiii

No significant difference in stability could be assigned to age or gender. Whether orthodontic treatment was performed or not had no influence on the stability of the Le Fort I osteotomy. The type of fixation used at surgery generally had no bearing on the amount of post-surgical instability. In the inferiorly repositioned group there was a slight improvement in stability when bone plates were used rather than intra-osseous wiring.

Bone graft use, growth in the patient, and the experience of the surgeon performing the Le Fort I osteotomy had no effect on the amount of long term stability. Concurrent mandibular osteotomies performed with the maxillary osteotomy also had no influence on the long term stability of the Le Fort I procedure. Segmentalised maxillae, either for transverse or vertical discrepancies in the maxilla, had similar relapse rates as one piece maxillary osteotomies.

This study confirms that the Le Fort I osteotomy is versatile, robust and essentially stable.

xxiv Declaration

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Dental Surgery. I declare that the text of this thesis has not been previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made. The findings are the results of my personal investigations. No part of this work has been previously submitted for a degree in any University. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

> Geoff Dance, B.D.Sc. (Melb), F.R.A.C.D.S. (O.M.S.). The University of Adelaide, December 1999.

xxv Acknowledgements

This research study on the Long Term Stability of the Le Fort I Osteotomy is submitted as part requirement for the Master of Dental Science , Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery at the University of Adelaide , South Australia.

Many thanks must be given to my supervisors , Professor Alastair Goss and Dr. Robert H.B. Jones, for their direction and support during this project which commenced in 1995. The advice of the other consultants within the unit was also greatly appreciated - Dr Paul Duke, Dr Paul Sambrook and Dr Miles Doddridge. Thanks must also go to those consultants and registrars who performed the surgery on patients up to fifteen years prior to this study who have since left the unit. Particular thanks is directed to Professor Henk Tideman, former Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, University of Adelaide (1983 - 1989), currently Professor of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, University of Hong Kong.

Professor Goss provided constant encouragement, guidance and constructive criticism which enabled me not only to complete the research component of the Masters degree but the four years of clinical experience that culminated in the successful completion of my Fellowship examinations.

Dr. Jones has always been a source of inspiration in both my personal and professional life. He has taught me a great deal about the finer points of academic pursuits and surgical skills. On a personal level the support of my partner Jodie, has enabled me to endure the low points and revel in the highs. Thank you Jodie.

> Geoff Dance December 1999