

**Qualitative and Quantitative
Evaluation of the Enamel Surface
Following Different
Reapproximation Techniques**

A
Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Dentistry
Ain Shams University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Master's Degree in Orthodontics

By

Lobna Adel Aly Elmy Shalaby
B.D.S (2001)
Ain Shams University

Faculty of Dentistry
Ain-Shams University

2010

Supervisors

Dr. Noha Ezzat Sabet

Professor of Orthodontics,
Orthodontic and Pediatric Dentistry Department
Faculty of Dentistry,
Ain Shams University

&

Dr. Islam Tarek Hassan

Lecturer of Orthodontics,
Orthodontic and Pediatric Dentistry Department
Faculty of Dentistry,
Ain Shams University

Dedication

**To My Dear Husband
& My Wonderful Family**

Acknowledgement

*I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to Professor **Dr. Noha E. Sabet**, Professor of Orthodontics, Orthodontic and Pediatric Dentistry Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University, for her endless support, great help, meticulous advice, valuable instructions and magnificent encouragement through out the long journey.*

*Words fail to express my deepest thanks as well as gratefulness to **Dr. Islam Tarek Hassan**, Lecturer of Orthodontics, Orthodontic and Pediatric Dentistry Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University. His enormous effort through out the past years, his remarkable help, and unique cooperation are highly appreciated and will always be remembered. This work would have never been completed without his extraordinary assistance and sincere guidance.*

I would also like to express my great appreciation and sincere gratitude to my professors, colleagues and staff members of orthodontic Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University for their valuable time, impressive advice, great support, encouragement and cooperation.

Lobna Shalaby

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5
III	AIM OF THE STUDY.....	31
IV	MATERIAL AND METHODS.....	33
V	RESULTS.....	53
VI	DISCUSSION.....	81
VII	SUMMARY.....	93
VIII	CONCLUSIONS.....	97
IX	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	99
X	REFERENCES.....	101
XI	ARABIC SUMMARY.....	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:	Medium garnet disk.....	34
Figure 2:	Coarse diamond bur.....	34
Figure 3:	Lightning strip single sided diamond coated medium abrasive.....	35
Figure 4:	Stripper handle.....	35
Figure 5:	Medium (left) and fine (right) Sof-Lex disc.....	36
Figure 6:	Mechanical vice.....	36
Figure 7:	Digital caliper.....	37
Figure 8:	Schematic diagram for the experimental design and group assignment.....	39
Figure 9:	Acrylic blocks.....	40
Figure 10:	The reference line that connected the mesial and distal marginal ridges at the point of maximum convexity on the occlusal surface.....	41
Figure 11:	Talysurf machine.....	44
Figure 12:	Surtronic sensor.....	44
Figure 13:	Stereomicroscope assembly.....	46
Figure 14:	Images taken before (left) and after (right) reapproximation and polishing.....	46
Figure 15:	The cut specimens.....	47
Figure 16:	Pyrex glass containing the labeled specimens.....	48
Figure 17:	The beaker containing the labeled specimens.....	48

Figure 18:	Ultrasonic machine.....	49
Figure 19:	Sputter coater device.....	50
Figure 20:	Specimens secured in aluminum stubs after gold sputtering.....	50
Figure 21:	Joel Scanning electron microscope.....	51
Figure 22:	Box plot showing the distribution of (Ra) data of side (A).....	57
Figure 23:	Box plot showing the distribution of (Ra) data of side (B).....	57
Figure 24:	Bar chart representing the mean (Ra) of GI and GII (DD, DB, and DS subgroups)	59
Figure 25:	Bar chart representing the mean (Ra) of the two sides in each subgroup.....	61
Figure 26:	Box plot showing the distribution of values of the amount of enamel removed from side (A) in GII subgroups as determined by the digital caliper.....	65
Figure 27:	Box plot showing the distribution of values of the amount of enamel removed from side (B) in GII subgroups as determined by the digital caliper	65
Figure 28:	Bar chart representing the mean amount of enamel removed in the three subgroups of GII as determined by the digital caliper	67
Figure 29:	Bar chart representing the mean amount of enamel removed from both sides (A) and (B) in each subgroup as determined by the digital caliper.....	68
Figure 30:	Box plot showing the distribution of values of amount of enamel removed from side (A) in GII subgroups as determined by the zoom stereomicroscope.....	71

Figure 31:	Box plot showing the distribution of values of amount of enamel removed from side (B) in GII subgroups as determined by zoom stereomicroscope.....	72
Figure 32:	Bar chart representing the mean amount of enamel removed in the three subgroups of GII as determined by zoom stereomicroscope.....	74
Figure 33:	Bar chart representing the mean amount of enamel removed from both sides (A) and (b) in each subgroup as determined by zoom stereomicroscope.....	75
Figure 34:	SEM micrograph of normal permanent enamel at magnification x 500.....	76
Figure 35:	SEM micrograph of normal permanent enamel at magnification x 1500.....	76
Figure 36:	SEM micrograph of permanent enamel after reapproximation by diamond coated metal abrasive strips at magnification x 500.....	77
Figure 37:	SEM micrograph of permanent enamel after reapproximation by diamond coated metal abrasive strips at magnification x 1500.....	77
Figure 38:	SEM micrograph of side (B) in DS group after polishing with medium and fine Sof-Lex disc at magnification x 500.....	78
Figure 39:	SEM micrograph of side (B) in DS group after polishing with medium and fine Sof-Lex disc at magnification x 1500.....	78
Figure 40:	SEM micrograph of permanent enamel after reapproximation with coarse diamond bur at magnification x 500.....	78
Figure 41:	SEM micrograph of permanent enamel after reapproximation with coarse diamond bur at magnification x 1500.....	78
Figure 42:	SEM micrograph of side (B) in DB subgroup after	

	polishing with medium and fine Sof-Lex discs at magnification x 500.....	79
Figure 43:	SEM micrograph of side (B) in DB subgroup after polishing with medium and fine Sof-Lex discs at magnification x 1500.....	79
Figure 44:	SEM micrograph of permanent enamel after reapproximation with diamond coated disk at magnification x 500.....	80
Figure 45:	SEM micrograph of permanent enamel after reapproximation with diamond coated disk at magnification X 1500.....	80
Figure 46:	SEM micrograph of side (B) in DS subgroup after polishing with medium and fine Sof-Lex discs at magnification X 500.....	80
Figure 47:	SEM micrograph of side (B) in DS subgroup after polishing with medium and fine Sof-Lex discs at magnification X 1500.....	80

List of Tables

Table 1:	Descriptive statistics for surface roughness (Ra) values in GI and GII subgroups (DB, DD, and DS).....	55
Table 2:	Kolmogrov-Smirnov test of normality for surface roughness value.....	56
Table 3:	ANOVA and Tukey’s test comparing the (Ra) values of GI and the three subgroups of GII.....	58
Table 4:	Paired t-test for comparison between (Ra) values of the two sides (A) and (B) in each GII subgroup.....	60
Table 5:	Descriptive statistics for amount of the enamel removed from both sides (A) and (B) in GII subgroups (DB, DD, and DS) as measured by the digital caliper.....	63
Table 6:	Kolmogrov-Smirnov test of normality for the values of the amount of enamel removed from GII subgroups as determined by the digital caliper..	64
Table 7:	ANOVA and Tukey’s test comparing between the amounts of enamel removed in GII subgroups as determined by the digital caliper.....	66
Table 8:	Paired t-test for comparison between the amounts of enamel removed in both sides (A) and (B) of GII subgroups as determined by the digital caliper.....	68
Table 9:	Descriptive statistics for the amount of enamel removed from both sides (A) and (B) in GII subgroups (DB, DD, and DS) as determined by zoom stereomicroscope.....	70
Table 10:	Kolmogrov-Smirnov test of normality for the values of the amount of enamel removed from GII subgroups as determined by zoom stereomicroscope	70
Table 11:	ANOVA and Tukey’s test comparing between the amount of enamel removed from sides (A) and (B) in the three subgroups of GII as determined by zoom stereomicroscope.....	73
Table 12:	Paired t-test for comparison between the amounts of enamel removed in the two sides of GII subgroups as determined by zoom stereomicroscope.....	74

INTRODUCTION

In the last few years, orthodontists have shown particular interest in non-extraction therapy and consequently this has led to the increased popularity of enamel reapproximation technique as a mean of achieving this goal.

Enamel reapproximation is defined as the clinical act of removing part of dental enamel from the interproximal contact area.¹ This clinical procedure was commonly referred to as “stripping”, but it has also been called “slandering,” “slicing,” “Hollywood trim,” “selective grinding,” “mesiodistal reduction,” “reapproximation,” “interproximal enamel reduction,” “interproximal wear,” and “coronoplasia.”²⁻⁴

This technique has been introduced by Ballard⁵ in the mid-forties. Since that time, it has been widely indicated in many clinical situations which included reshaping the proximal contact area in cases of tooth size asymmetry, solving Bolton discrepancy problems, treating mild or moderate crowding which in turn eliminated the need for extraction of permanent teeth in arch-length discrepancy cases. Additionally, it has been used for reshaping some teeth to improve finishing and dental esthetics, normalization of gingival contour and eliminating black triangular spaces between maxillary and mandibular incisors. Correcting the curve of spee through creating few millimeters of space in the arch and camouflage of class II and class III malocclusions could be possible by this technique.

The utilization of this technique has been contraindicated in few clinical situations including severe crowding (more than 8mm per arch), poor

oral hygiene and/or poor periodontal environment, small teeth and hypersensitivity to cold to avoid the appearance of or increase in dental sensitivity, susceptibility to decay or multiple restorations, square teeth with straight proximal surfaces and wide bases as reapproximation might produce broad contact surfaces leading to food impaction and reduction of interseptal bone.

Although enamel reapproximation is a well recognized clinical procedure, it has always been an issue of debate.

There were many arguments in favor of this technique stating that (1) continuous loss of tooth substance by attrition is a normal functional process, (2) adverse consequences of four premolar extraction, (3) flattening the contact surfaces of lower incisors will help resisting labiolingual crown displacement thus eliminating the need for lower retention, (4) more favorable overbite-overjet relationship is produced that improves anterior function in the mutually protected occlusion, (5) areas of interproximal gingival recession could be improved.

On the other hand, few arguments claimed that this technique had deleterious effect on enamel as it produced enamel furrows and scratches that were not removed by polishing. However, other studies failed to establish a significant relationship between enamel reapproximation and caries susceptibility.

Previous studies have shown several possibilities regarding the amount of enamel that could be safely reapproximated from proximal enamel, but it has been widely accepted that 50% of existing enamel was the

maximum amount that could be reapproximated without causing risk to dental and periodontal health. In most situations, this corresponded to 0.5 mm per dental surface.

Enamel reapproximation is carried out by different methods according to the previous orthodontic literature. These methods could be divided into two main categories, either manual or mechanical.

The manual method consisted of metallic strips impregnated with abrasive metal oxides and numerous holding devices. The use of this technique has diminished lately because it is time consuming, difficulty in working in posterior teeth, and some studies claimed that it produced deeper grooves than those caused by mechanical instrumentation.

The mechanical method consisted of hand- piece mounted diamond coated disks, tungsten-carbide or diamond burs mounted on high-speed hand-pieces as well as mechanical files for contra-angle heads.

The availability of various techniques, and our great concern on enamel integrity and health, inspired the idea of our study in order to investigate the changes in surface morphology, the degree of surface roughness produced and the amount of enamel removed from permanent teeth after various enamel reapproximation techniques.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Enamel reapproximation, also known as enamel stripping or interproximal enamel reduction (IER), is the removal and reshaping of enamel from the interproximal contact areas of adjacent teeth, most commonly the mandibular incisors. This reduction is often performed before, during or after orthodontic treatment, with either fixed or removable appliances. This procedure became widely used lately in many clinical circumstances such as creating spaces for alignment of crowded teeth, correcting tooth size discrepancies, giving teeth the suitable shape whenever there were misshaped teeth and improving stability⁶.

A comprehensive review of literature for enamel reapproximation will discuss five main topics: I. Historical background, II. Applications, III. Techniques, IV. enamel thickness available for reduction and V. Possible iatrogenic effects including caries as well as periodontal risk factors.

I- Historical background of Enamel Reapproximation

Enamel reapproximation was first mentioned by **Ballard**⁵ in **1944**. He carried out a study to investigate “Asymmetry in tooth size” between teeth of opposite sides in the same dental arch. He took a sample of 500 models, where he measured the mesiodistal width of each permanent tooth. This measurement was compared with that of the same tooth in the other side. He found that 90 % of the cases showed left-right discrepancy of 0.25 mm or more. He recommended careful reapproximation of the interproximal surfaces, mainly from the anterior segment, when there was a lack of balance.