



Effect of Different Treatment Protocols for Mandibular Kennedy Class II Cases Using OT Attachment on the Supporting Structures

Thesis submitted to Oral and Maxillofacial Prosthodontic
department, Faculty of Dentistry Ain Shams University, for
the partial fulfillment of the Master Degree in Oral and
Maxillofacial Prosthodontics

BY

Ahmed Abd El-Latif Mohamed Zeidan

B.D.S, Ain Shams University (2010)

**Faculty of Dentistry
Ain Shams University
(2016)**

Supervisors

Dr. Rami Maher Ghali

Associated Professor of Prosthodontics

Prosthodontic department

Faculty of Dentistry

Ain shams University

Dr. Shimaa Lotfy Mohamed Ouda

Lecturer of Prosthodontics

Prosthodontic department

Faculty of Dentistry

Ain shams University

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

﴿ قالوا سبحانك لا علم لنا الا ما علمتنا

﴿ إنك انت العليم الحكيم

صدق الله العظيم
الآيه (32) سورة البقره

Acknowledgment

*First of all, I thank **Allah** for his great support in accomplishing this work.*

*I would like to express my deepest gratitude, sincere thanks and appreciation to **Dr. Rami Maher Ghali**, Associated professor of Prosthodontic Department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University, for his helpful supervision and guidance, as well as his beneficial advice and encouragement throughout the whole study.*

*No words can express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to **Dr. Shimaa Lotfy Mohamed Ouda**, Lecturer of Prosthodontic department, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University, for her excellent guidance, extraordinary support and great help that facilitated all the difficulties that faced me.*

I would like to thank my patients for their patience and cooperation.

Many thanks go to all staff members of Prosthodontic Department, Faculty of Dentistry; Ain shams University, for their support and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to express my love and appreciation to my great mother, sister and brothers. Thank you for your unlimited love, support and encouragement that keeps me going on through tough times.

AHMED ABD EL-LATIF MOHAMED ZEIDAN

Dedication

To my lovely wife and my son Adam:

I would like to dedicate this to you my lovely wife. I wouldn't have reached this point in my life without your love, help and support. Thank you for taking good care of me and helping me become the person I am today.

AHMED ABD EL-LATIF MOHAMED ZEIDAN

List of Contents

Title	page
<u>Introduction.....</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Review of Literature.....</u>	<u>3</u>
➤ Kennedy class II removable partial denture.....	4
➤ Problems of Kennedy class II removable partial denture.....	4
▪ Problem of support.....	5
▪ Problem of retention.....	6
▪ Problem of bracing stability.....	8
➤ Different treatment modalities of Kennedy class II.....	8
▪ Conventional removable partial dentures.....	9
▪ Attachment retained removable partial denture.....	16
▪ Implant supported Removable Partial Denture.....	22
▪ Shortened dental arch.....	24
▪ Fixed prosthodontics with implant or cantilever.....	24
➤ Extra coronal attachments.....	25
➤ Different types of extracoronal attachments.....	28
▪ Dalbo attachment system.....	28
▪ SA Swiss Anchor.....	28
▪ ASC 52 ball attachment.....	29
▪ O-Ring System-Distal Extension (ORS-DE).....	29
▪ Stern ERA and Stern-RV.....	29

▪ The OT attachment system.....	30
➤ Radiographic evaluation.....	33
▪ Conventional Radiography.....	33
- Intra-oral conventional parallel radiography.....	33
- Extra-oral conventional radiography.....	35
○ Panoramic radiography.....	35
○ Lateral cephalometric radiography.....	36
▪ Advanced Digital radiography.....	36
- Intra-oral digital radiography.....	37
○ Indirect digital radiography.....	37
○ Direct digital radiography.....	37
- Extra-oral digital radiography.....	38
○ Computed tomographic scans.....	38
○ Cone beam computed tomography.....	39
<u>Aim Of The Study.....</u>	<u>41</u>
<u>Materials and methods.....</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>Results.....</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>Discussion.....</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>Summary</u>	<u>77</u>
<u>conclusion.....</u>	<u>79</u>
<u>Refrences.....</u>	<u>80</u>
<u>Arabic summary.....</u>	<u>1</u>

Table of figures

FIG.	Description	Page
FIG. 1	Lower Kennedy Class II case	<u>45</u>
FIG. 2	Panoramic radiograph for lower Kennedy Class II case	<u>45</u>
FIG. 3	Periapical radiograph of the abutment teeth	<u>46</u>
FIG. 4	Primary impression for lower and upper arches	<u>48</u>
FIG. 5	Casts surveyed on a surveyor	<u>48</u>
FIG. 6	Reduced last two teeth	<u>49</u>
FIG. 7	Impression of the prepared abutments	<u>50</u>
FIG. 8	Metal try-in for the two crowns with OT attachment	<u>50</u>
FIG. 9	Metal try-in examined intraorally	<u>51</u>
FIG. 10	The crown with the attachment assembly rechecked intraorally	<u>51</u>
FIG. 11	Pick up impression for Attachment assembly	<u>52</u>
FIG. 12	Try in of metal framework intraorally	<u>53</u>
FIG. 13	Recording jaw relation	<u>54</u>
FIG. 14	Male and female part of attachment	<u>55</u>

FIG. 15	Checking occlusion of final prosthesis	<u>55</u>
FIG. 16	Metal try-in for the two crowns with single OT attachment	<u>56</u>
FIG. 17	Male and female part inserted in removable partial denture	<u>56</u>
FIG. 18	Final prosthesis and checking the occlusion	<u>57</u>
FIG. 19	A graph showing difference in bone resorption in group A between the two intervals of follow-up (from zero to 6 months and from 6 to 12 months)	<u>60</u>
FIG. 20	A graph showing difference in bone resorption in group B between the two intervals of follow-up (from zero to 6 months and from 6 to 12 months)	<u>61</u>
FIG. 21	A graph showing difference in bone resorption between the two groups from 0 to 6 months follow-up	<u>64</u>
Fig. 22	A graph showing difference in bone resorption between the two groups from 6 to 12 months follow-up	<u>65</u>
Fig. 23	A graph showing difference in bone resorption between the two groups through the whole follow-up period	<u>67</u>

List of tables

<i>Table</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table 1	Paired t test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for group A at the 2 intervals of follow up period.	<u>59</u>
Table 2	Paired t test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for group B at the two intervals of follow up period.	<u>61</u>
Table 3	Independent T Test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for group A (Unilateral retained double OT attachment removable partial denture) and group B (Bilateral retained single OT attachment removable partial denture) from zero (time of insertion) to 6 months follow up.	<u>63</u>
Table 4	Independent T Test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for group A and group B from 6 to 12 months follow up.	<u>65</u>
Table 5	Independent T Test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for group A and group B at overall period of follow up	<u>67</u>

Introduction

INTRODUCTION

Removable partial dentures remain an essential prosthetic consideration in many conditions of oral rehabilitation, especially when the edentulous spaces posterior to the remaining teeth are to be restored. Functional successful prosthetic rehabilitation requires careful attention and meticulous treatment planning. Rehabilitation of partially edentulous arch can be challenging when it is a distal extension situation classified under Kennedy's class I and class II situations because a natural tooth retained fixed prosthesis cannot be fabricated. Implant retained prosthesis is an option but this is sometimes impossible due to insufficient bone or economic reasons ^(1, 2).

Removable partial dentures (RPDs) serve as a simple and popular treatment option for partially edentulous patients, but the possibility for not accepting this treatment by patients should be considered ⁽³⁾.

Attachment retained removable partial dentures is a viable treatment alternative through which a significant number of patients could be benefited. In this particular case, an attachment retained removable partial dentures was chosen a treatment modality. An attachment is connector consisting of two or more parts. One part is connected to a root, tooth or implant and the other part to the prosthesis ⁽⁴⁾.

RHEIN OT Cap (Extracoronary castable semi-precision attachment) is a resilient distal extension attachment. It is indicated to be used with combined prostheses and removable partial dentures. For treatment plans

that require a rigid substructure with milling and adequate counter attachments, OT Cap functions as a stabilizing retentive connector. In addition, for treatment plans which require resiliency, OT Cap provides a "Cushion Effect" similar to a shock absorber.

For patients with unilateral edentulism in molar region, removable partial dentures with a unilaterally designed framework claimed to be more comfortable during mastication and speech, and more profound effect is anticipated on patients' acceptance due to its relative simplicity. However, clinical use of the unilaterally designed framework is criticized owing to the poor retention and stability and difference in effect on the supporting structure compared with the removable partial denture with bilaterally designed framework ⁽⁵⁾. Each treatment option has its own advantages and disadvantages, the question is can we substitute the bilateral prosthesis option with unilateral one in unilateral edentulous cases?

Review of literature

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The tooth-tissue supported removable partial denture is supported at one end by natural teeth, which essentially do not move, and at the other end by the denture bearing tissue (mucosa overlying bone) which moves because of the resiliency of the mucosa. The design of the tooth-tissue supported removable partial denture is one of the most controversial topics in prosthodontics. Several philosophies with specific RPD designs or construction techniques have been suggested to compensate for the difference in support provided by the natural teeth and denture foundation tissues⁽⁶⁾.

The clinical use of removable partial denture (RPD) is limited because of its poor stability and retention. A regular problem faced by partially edentulous patient is the difficulty of adapting to a removable prosthesis. A unilateral prosthesis is always less stable, because it lacks the effect of cross arch stabilization. Rehabilitation of Kennedy Class II partially edentulous patients can be challenging ⁽⁷⁾.

Posterior free end edentulous areas are more prevalent among population. Absence of posterior abutments to support and retain partial dentures affects the prognosis of prosthesis. Problems of support, retention and stability are usually associated with distal extension removable partial dentures (RPDs) ^(8, 9), so it requires planning following biomechanical design principles to obtain adequate support, retention and stability from both the ridge and abutments without eliciting any harm to the supporting structure ⁽⁹⁾. Also, it is important to restore masticatory function as well as preserve