

EFFECT OF MINISCREW IMPLANT SUPPORTED
INTRUSION ON MANDIBULAR ROTATION IN A GROUP
OF CHILDREN

Thesis

submitted to the faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the Master Degree in
Orthodontics.

By

Mai Hamdy AboulFotouh

BDS (Cairo University)

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

2009

Supervisors

Prof. Dr. Amr Emad El-Dakrouy

Professor of Orthodontics
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Sahar Taher Abdel-Aziz

Professor of Orthodontics
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to **Dr. Amr Emad EL-Dakroury**, Professor of Orthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University for his support, generous expert supervision and valuable advice throughout the course of this study.

Warm and sincere thanks are expressed to **Dr.Sahar Taher Abdelaziz**, Professor of Orthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University. In fact, this piece of work owes much to her pertinent criticism, keen and close supervision. Very glad to have worked under your supervision and to have learned from your valuable experience.

Special thanks goes to my dearest **mom and dad** for their tremendous efforts, endless love, continuous support and care all through my life. Very proud and honoured to be your daughter and hoping that you can find something in this work to be proud of, as well.

Another thank you message is due to **Adel Hamdy Aboulfotouh**, Ass. Lecturer of Oral and Maxillofacial surgery, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University. Your skill and talent in handling the surgical procedures were as impressive as always. Your great efforts in the surgical as well as the CT part of this study can never be denied.

I would like also to thank my tutor **Dr. Amr Ragab Elbeialy**, Ass. Lecturer Of Orthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University for offering continuous help throughout the course of this study.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to **Dr. Yahia Ahmed Mostafa**, Professor of Orthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University for his continuous encouragement, everlasting care and concern.

I wish to express my gratitude to all my colleagues and friends especially to my lifetime friends and sisters Heba and Reem for being their whenever I needed help.

A warm and sincere thank you message goes to my *mom and dad in-Law*. Very proud to be part of your family and thank you for everything you've done to make this day possible.

Last, but never the least, I would like to deeply thank my dear *husband* for being always by my side, for lending me strength, faith and courage, for tolerating me through the hard as well as the good days. Without your valuable contributions, this day would have never been achievable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

▪ LIST OF FIGURES.....	II
▪ LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
▪ INTRODUCTION	1
▪ REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	3
I. Characteristics of skeletal open bite.....	3
II. Treatment of skeletal open bite.....	5
1. Conventional modalities for management of skeletal open bite.....	6
2. Skeletal anchorage systems for posterior segment intrusion and management of skeletal open bite.....	12
III. Applications of three-dimensional computed tomography for the assessment of treatment results.....	25
▪ AIM OF THE STUDY.....	37
▪ MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	38
▪ RESULTS.....	68
▪ DISCUSSION.....	90
▪ SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	103
▪ RECOMMENDATIONS.....	105
▪ REFERENCES.....	106
▪ APPENDIX.....	118
▪ ARABIC SUMMARY.....	

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. (1):	A lateral cephalometric radiograph showing the stages of CVMI.....	39
Fig. (2):	Clinical manifestations of skeletal open bite.....	41
Fig. (3):	Orthodontic study model as a record for a skeletal open bite patient.....	42
Fig.(4):	Pretreatment extra oral and intra oral photographs for a skeletal open bite patient.....	47
Fig. (5):	Pre-treatment panoramic radiograph.....	48
Fig. (6):	Pre-treatment cephalometric radiograph.....	48
Fig. (7):	Diagrammatic representation for the skeletal measurements used in this study.....	49
Fig. (8):	Diagrammatic representation for the dento-alveolar and soft tissue measurements used in this study.....	50
Fig. (9):	Vaccum stent fabricated for each patient to bite on during taking computed tomograms.....	54
Fig. (10):	The working window of the Mimics software.	54
Fig. (11):	Determination of the miniscrew's implantation site for the left infrazygomatic crest on the computed tomogram.....	55
Fig. (12):	A coronal cut of the computed tomogram distal to the upper first molar showing enough amount of palatal bone for the miniscrew placement.....	55
Fig. (13):	The packaged miniscrews.....	58
Fig. (14):	Diagrammatic representation of palatal and buccal miniscrews and the screwdriver.....	58
Fig. (15):	Procedure for placement of the buccal miniscrews.....	59
Fig. (16):	Palatal miniscrews in place.....	60
Fig. (17):	Loading the buccal miniscrews.....	63
Fig. (18):	Loading of the palatal miniscrews.....	64

Fig. (19):	Procedure for superimposition of the computed tomographic images.....	67
Fig. (20):	An extra oral photograph showing a case of skeletal open bite before molar intrusion (Profile view).....	69
Fig. (21):	An extra oral photograph showing the same case after nine months of molar intrusion using miniscrews (Profile view).....	69
Fig. (22):	An intra oral photograph showing a 9mm open bite before molar intrusion.....	70
Fig.(23):	An intra oral photograph for the same patient showing 2mm reduction in the open bite after nine months of molar intrusion....	70
Fig. (24):	Intra oral photograph showing a 4mm open bite before molar intrusion.....	71
Fig.(25):	Intra oral photograph showing the same case with a 2mm reduction in the open bite after molar intrusion.....	71
Fig.(26):	Intra oral photograph showing a case with a 2mm open bite before molar intrusion.....	72
Fig. (27):	Intra oral photograph showing the same case with closure of the open bite after nine months of molar intrusion using miniscrews	72
Fig. (28):	The superimposed pretreatment and posttreatment three-dimensional volumes showing counter clockwise rotation of the mandible.....	73
Fig.(29):	The superimposed pretreatment and posttreatment three-dimensional volumes of the same case showing mandibular rotation with closure of the bite.....	73
Fig. (30):	A bar chart showing comparison of the pretreatment and posttreatment skeletal measurements.....	79
Fig. (31):	A bar chart showing the comparison of the pretreatment and posttreatment dentoalveolar and soft tissue measurements.....	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table (I):	Descriptive statistics for pre-treatment and post treatment skeletal measurements.....	76
Table (II):	Descriptive statistics for pre treatment and post treatment dentoalveolar and soft tissue measurements.....	77
Table (III):	Comparison of pre-treatment and post treatment skeletal measurements using paired t-test.....	78
Table (IV):	Comparison of the pre-treatment and post treatment dentoalveolar and soft tissue measurements using paired t-test.	80
Table (V):	The percentage of treatment change for skeletal measurements after 9 months of molar intrusion using miniscrews.....	83
Table (VI):	The percentage of treatment change for dentoalveolar and soft tissue measurements after 9 months of molar intrusion using miniscrews.....	84
Table (VII):	Cronbach's alpha and ICC results for pre-treatment and post treatment skeletal readings measured by the same observer (Intra-observer).....	86
Table (VIII):	Cronbach's alpha and ICC results for pre-treatment and post treatment dento alveolar and soft tissue readings measured by the same observer (Intra-observer).....	87
Table (IX):	Cronbach's alpha and ICC results for pre-treatment and post treatment skeletal readings measured by two observers (Inter-observer).....	88
Table (X):	Cronbach's alpha and ICC results for pre-treatment and post treatment dento alveolar and soft tissue readings measured by two observers (Inter-observer).....	89

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of orthodontics, skeletal open bite in growing children has been considered one of the most difficult and challenging malocclusions, not only to treat but also to maintain. The complexity of this malocclusion is usually attributed to its multifactorial nature, where combinations of skeletal, dental, and sometimes functional factors interact. It is often the outcome of a vertical growth pattern, where the downward descend of the posterior maxillary segment results in clockwise rotation of the mandible and swinging of the chin downward and backward.

Several morphological features distinguishing patients with a vertical growth tendency have been documented. These characteristics include: distal condylar inclination, short ramus, antegonial notching, obtuse gonial angle, excessive posterior maxillary height, thin and long symphysis, long anterior facial height, short posterior facial height, steep mandibular plane, divergent occlusal planes, acute interincisal angulation, anteriorly tipped –up palatal plane, as well as extruded molars.

The golden key to solving the problem of skeletal open bite is thus, to control or even intrude the posterior dentoalveolar region. Many treatment modalities to achieve posterior segment intrusion have been proposed such as, high pull head gear, vertical pull chin cup, posterior bite blocks, bite blocks augmented with repelling magnets or with springs, and finally functional appliances which are specifically designed and fabricated with posterior bite blocks to accomplish posterior segment intrusion. However, some more severe cases still called for orthognathic surgeries later in life. Unfortunately, the former treatment options are not without pitfalls. Most of these systems are limited by a number of factors, including the patients' compliance, the relative number of dental anchorage units available, allergy, and unfavorable reactionary tooth movements.

In recent years, numerous publications have introduced novel ways of reinforcing anchorage using a variety of devices temporarily anchored in bone and

were collectively named skeletal anchorage systems (SAS).⁹⁰ The use of such skeletal anchorage systems, is now growing in popularity because of their ability to provide absolute anchorage, lack of patients' compliance, their relatively small size offering a versatility of insertion sites, ease of insertion and removal, ability to be immediately loaded, as well as their few complications and low cost.

Concurrently, the use of such devices has expanded the boundaries of orthodontic treatment, where they are now heavily applied to many clinical situations, including anterior segment retraction, mesial / distal movement of multiple posterior teeth, anterior teeth intrusion, posterior teeth intrusion, intermaxillary traction as well as orthopaedic traction.

Despite the fact that many reports have been published regarding the successful use of SAS in the treatment of skeletal open bites, data concerning their use in children, and to a lesser extent in adolescents, is still scarce. Consequently, the present study was undertaken to investigate the use of miniscrews as anchorage units for intruding maxillary posterior teeth in children and subsequent effect on mandibular rotation in children with skeletal open bite.

*REVIEW OF
LITERATURE*

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

I. Characteristics of skeletal open bite

A variety of clinical and cephalometric characteristics for the skeletal open bite malocclusion have been tackled in the literature. A profound knowledge of the skeletal open bite morphology and etiology, greatly reduces the risk of misdiagnosis, allows for better chances for prevention and high lightens the mode of correction as well as that of the retention required.

Fields et al. (1984), studied the vertical facial morphology in long-faced children and adults and deduced that there was a tendency for having a greater posterior upper and lower dental heights in those subjects. Besides, a large gonial angle, increased mandibular plane angle to cranial base, and an increased mandibulo-palatal plane angle were also considered among the main characteristic features.

Ross et al. (1990), illustrated some of the clinical characteristics of skeletal open bite. It was declared that patients with high mandibular plane angle have narrow arch width with high arched palate and tendencies towards posterior cross bite. Posterior teeth of such patients often have excessive labial crown inclination with functionally long lingual cusps. A steeper occlusal plane to other cranial structures is always manifested.

Haralabakis et al. (1994), made use of lateral cephalograms for the identification of skeletal open bite characteristics. It was deduced that hyper divergent subjects are characterized by greater facial height, greater anterior maxillary and mandibular heights. Increased posterior maxillary height was also evident, together with a high mandibular plane angle, which greatly contributed to the development of the skeletal open bite.

Gurton et al. (2004) compared the parameters of skeletal to dentoalveolar open bites. Skeletal open bites tend to show more molar and incisor eruption

than do dental open bites. It has been mentioned that a steep mandibular plane, an obtuse gonial angle, increased lower facial height, and counter clockwise rotation of the palatal plane were the significant parameters of skeletal anterior open bites. On the other hand, parameters of dentoalveolar open bites were divergent maxillary and mandibular occlusal planes, mesial inclination of the posterior teeth, and lack of a normal curve of Spee in the lower arch.

Nanda (2005), defined open bite as being an occlusal characteristic, where the upper and lower teeth are not in contact and vertical overlap doesn't exist. The associated skeletal and dental characteristics were described as increased gonial angle, excessive maxillary height, thin and long symphysis, long anterior facial height, short posterior facial height, steep mandibular plane, and extruded molars. It was further pointed out that, the soft tissue features parallel those of the hard tissue, in addition to a large interlabial gap.

Martina et al. (2005) claimed that there was a correlation between the vertical craniofacial features and the posterior dentoalveolar height. This hypothesis was tested cephalometrically and it was found that the length of the anterior lower facial height had a positive influence on the amount of molar dentoalveolar heights. Moreover, the molar dentoalveolar heights were negatively influenced from the divergence of the jaws as indicated by the mandibulopalatal plane angle.

Cinsar et al. (2007), described some of the cephalometric and morphological features of skeletal open bite as, large anterior dentoalveolar height in both jaws, increased total and lower anterior facial height, decreased posterior facial height, backward rotation of the maxillomandibular skeleton, Class II tendency, downward rotation of the posterior portion of the palatal plane, increased gonial angle, high mandibular plane angle, divergent cephalometric planes, narrow maxillary arch, and marked antegonial notching.

Arat et al. (2008), attempted to emphasize the inconsistencies in the differential diagnosis of skeletal open bite malocclusions. Visual and

cephalometric judgements of 77 patients with skeletal open bites were compared. The visual judgement criteria taken into consideration were the length and width of the symphysis, the antegonial notching, the gonial angle, the lower facial height, soft tissue profile, nasopharyngeal airway deficiency, as well as the functional characteristics of the patient including thumb sucking habits, tongue and lip posture and mouth breathing. Accordingly, the sample was visually classified as belonging to one of the three groups; morphogenetic, functional, or a combination. The same sample was again cephalometrically evaluated and classified according to the mandibular plane angle into; hyper divergent, normodivergent, or hypodivergent. A weak level of agreement was found between the two assessment methods, where more than half of the cases cephalometrically evaluated as hyper divergent, were visually classified as functional. Consequently, cephalometric judgement alone can't be considered an adequate diagnostic tool for skeletal open bite determination.

II. Treatment of skeletal open bite

The main etiologic factor leading to a skeletal open bite was found to be the excessive alveolar growth and eruption of posterior teeth. It has also been suggested that, the palatal plane being tipped down posteriorly, resulted in the maxillary molars being located in a more inferior position acting as a fulcrum with the mandibular teeth leading to the downward and backward rotation of the mandible with an increase in the lower facial height and mandibular plane angle (Nanda 1988,1990). Thus, it would be wise to attempt to control the downward growth of the posterior segment through molar intrusion, in an attempt to produce true mandibular rotation and therefore treat the skeletal open bite malocclusion (LaHaye et al. 2006).