

# **Implementation of 3D Imaging In Precise Bracket Positioning**

Thesis Submitted to the

Department of Orthodontics

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of Master Degree in  
Clinical Dental Science of Orthodontics

**By**

**Ahmed Medhat El Temamy**

**B.D.S Cairo University**

**(2007)**

**Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine**

**Cairo University**

**2014**

# **Supervisors**

**Dr. Faten H. K. Eid**

**Professor of Orthodontics**

**Head of Orthodontic Department**

**Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine**

**Cairo University**

**Dr. Fouad A. El Sharaby**

**Lecturer of Orthodontics**

**Faculty of Oral and Dental medicine**

**Cairo University**

To

My Parents,

My Family,

My Wife

&

My Lovely

Daughter

# **CONTENTS**

AKNOWLEDGMENT.....	i
LIST OF FIGURES .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
INTRODUCTION .....	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	3
AIM OF THE STUDY .....	23
MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	24
RESULTS .....	49
DISCUSSION .....	67
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	76
RECOMMENDATION.. .....	78
REFERENCES .....	79
APPENDIX.....	85
ARABIC SUMMARY .....	

# ***Acknowledgment***

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor **Dr. Faten H. Eid**, Professor of Orthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine , Cairo university, whose expertise, understanding, and patience added considerably to my research experience. I appreciate her vast knowledge and skills. I doubt that I will be able to convey my appreciation fully, but I owe her my eternal gratitude.

My deepest appreciation also goes to **Dr. Fouad A. El Sharaby**, Lecturer of Orthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for the assistance he provided at all levels of my research journey. His continuous support, patience, motivation, enthusiasm and immense knowledge have been a guiding light that helped me tremendously throughout the process of writing my thesis.

Very special thanks to **Dr. Mohamed Abd Ghafour**, resident of Orthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, who has saved no effort in helping me. Thank you for being there when I most needed you.

I also want to express my gratitude to **Dr. Samer El Kilani**, postgraduate student, Orthodontic Department, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, whose help was very important to complete the research

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

<b>Figure</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1</b> Well-trimmed study model.	<b>27</b>
<b>2</b> Drawing the long axis of the teeth.	<b>27</b>
<b>3</b> Boone Gauge with pencil tips.	<b>28</b>
<b>4</b> Using Boone Gauge for marking the distance from incisal edges and cusp tips as guided by MBT recommendation.	<b>28</b>
<b>5</b> Marking of vertical and horizontal reference lines for bracket positioning.	<b>29</b>
<b>6</b> Using a fine disc to create a 0.5mm groove over the pencil markings.	<b>29</b>
<b>7</b> Fine grooves over the pencil markings.	<b>31</b>
<b>8</b> 0.016 inch wires glued over the grooves.	<b>31</b>
<b>9</b> Cast scanning by CBCT with a piece of sponge in between the upper and the lower casts.	<b>32</b>
<b>10</b> Segmentation of DICOM image on Antomage Software.	<b>32</b>
<b>11</b> Separation of the upper and lower cast's image and conversion to Model (STL format).	<b>34</b>
<b>12</b> Locating the mesial and the distal line angles to detect facial plane.	<b>34</b>
<b>13</b> Identification of the original long axis of the tooth.	<b>36</b>
<b>14</b> Tracing of the points on the 3D volume rendering.	<b>36</b>
<b>15</b> Points used for tracing on patient's 3D volume.	<b>37</b>
<b>16</b> Points used for tracing on the models.	<b>37</b>

<b>17</b>	Conversion of the surface of the cast to meshwork to facilitate superimposition.	<b>39</b>
<b>18</b>	Superimposition of casts over patient's CBCT using best fit method.	<b>39</b>
<b>19</b>	Moving casts over each for manual registration.	<b>40</b>
<b>20</b>	Magnified image in order to obtain best fit between the models.	<b>40</b>
<b>21</b>	Superimposition of the casts over each other.	<b>41</b>
<b>22</b>	Colour-coded superimposition.	<b>41</b>
<b>23</b>	All the three CBCT images to the duplicates model superimposed on patient's CBCT image.	<b>42</b>
<b>24</b>	Preparation of patient's cone beam image to isolate the teeth with their roots.	<b>44</b>
<b>25</b>	Placement of the brackets using Mimics Software.	<b>44</b>
<b>26</b>	Placement of the brackets accurately with visulization of the roots.	<b>45</b>
<b>27</b>	Occlusal view of the bracket placment and checking of each bracket.	<b>45</b>
<b>28</b>	Placement of the U-shaped tray over the brackets and teeth.	<b>46</b>
<b>29</b>	The U-shaped tray after subtraction of the brackets and teeth with the position of brackets printed inside it.	<b>46</b>
<b>30</b>	The U-shape tray after 3D printing.	<b>47</b>
<b>31</b>	Bar chart representing mean differences in deviation angle measurements of lower anterior teeth.	<b>49</b>
<b>32</b>	Bar chart representing mean differences in deviation angle measurements of lower premolars.	<b>50</b>

<b>33</b>	Bar chart representing mean differences in deviation angle measurements of upper anterior teeth.	<b>51</b>
<b>34</b>	Bar chart representing mean differences in deviation angle measurements of upper premolars.	<b>52</b>
<b>35</b>	Bar chart representing mean slot distance measurements of lower anterior teeth.	<b>56</b>
<b>36</b>	Bar chart representing mean slot distance measurements of lower premolars	<b>57</b>
<b>37</b>	Bar chart representing mean slot distance measurements of upper anterior teeth.	<b>58</b>
<b>38</b>	Bar chart representing mean slot distance measurements of upper premolars.	<b>59</b>
<b>39</b>	Bar chart representing mean slot distance measurements of lower anterior teeth compared to the master model.	<b>63</b>
<b>40</b>	Bar chart representing mean space measurements of lower premolars compared to that measured on models.	<b>64</b>
<b>41</b>	Bar chart representing mean slot distance measurements of upper anterior teeth compared to master model.	<b>65</b>
<b>42</b>	Bar chart representing mean slot distance measurements of upper premolars on the CBCT compared to that on the model for all teeth.	<b>66</b>



## **LIST OF TABLES**

<b>TABLE</b>		<b>PAGE</b>
<b>(1)</b>	MBT bracket positioning recommendations.	<b>26</b>
<b>(2)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the differences in deviation angle of lower anterior teeth.	<b>49</b>
<b>(3)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the differences in deviation angle of lower premolars.	<b>50</b>
<b>(4)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the differences in deviation angle measurements of upper anterior teeth.	<b>51</b>
<b>(5)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the differences in deviation angle measurements of upper premolars.	<b>52</b>
<b>(6)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the intra-observer agreement regarding deviation angle measurement differences of lower teeth.	<b>53</b>
<b>(7)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the intra-observer agreement regarding deviation angle measurement differences of upper teeth.	<b>53</b>
<b>(8)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the inter-observer agreement regarding deviation angle measurement differences of lower teeth.	<b>54</b>
<b>(9)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the inter-observer agreement regarding deviation angle measurement differences of upper teeth.	<b>55</b>
<b>(10)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the slot distance measurements of lower anterior teeth.	<b>56</b>
<b>(11)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the slot distance measurements of lower premolars.	<b>57</b>

<b>(12)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the slot distance measurements of upper anterior teeth.	<b>58</b>
<b>(13)</b>	Descriptive statistics of the slot distance measurements of upper premolars.	<b>59</b>
<b>(14)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the intra-observer agreement regarding slot distance measurements of lower teeth.	<b>60</b>
<b>(15)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the intra-observer agreement regarding slot distance measurements of upper teeth.	<b>60</b>
<b>(16)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the inter-observer agreement regarding slot distance measurements of lower teeth.	<b>61</b>
<b>(17)</b>	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient results for the inter-observer agreement regarding slot distance measurements of upper teeth.	<b>62</b>
<b>(18)</b>	Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of one-sample t-test for comparison between slot distance measurements of lower anterior teeth on the CBCT and that on the model.	<b>63</b>
<b>(19)</b>	Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of one-sample t-test for comparison between slot distance measurements of lower premolars on the CBCT and that on the model.	<b>64</b>
<b>(20)</b>	Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of one-sample t-test for comparison between slot distance measurements of upper anterior teeth on the CBCT and that on the model for all teeth.	<b>65</b>

<b>(21)</b>	Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of one-sample t-test for comparison between slot distance measurements of upper premolars on the CBCT and that on the model for all teeth.	<b>66</b>
<b>(22)</b>	Points used in tracing.	<b>85</b>
<b>(23)</b>	Lines used in tracing.	<b>87</b>
<b>(24)</b>	Planes used in tracing.	<b>88</b>
<b>(25)</b>	Angles used to measure the difference between the original long axis on the patient's CBCT image and the long axis drawn on each model CBCT image.	<b>89</b>
<b>(26)</b>	Distance measure from incisal edges and cusp tips to the horizontal wire glued to each tooth in the cast.	<b>90</b>
<b>(27)</b>	Bracket prescription: Incisors through premolars.	<b>91</b>

# Introduction

Since evolution of straight wire appliance, attentions were directed to precise bracket placement as it is the key factor for ideal tooth positioning. The ability to place brackets in their ideal position allows the clinician to achieve the best outcome in minimum time, and to minimize the need for further archwire bending and bracket repositioning. Clinicians focused on how to achieve best results in bracket placement through various techniques such as shifting to indirect bracket placement techniques and introduction of new tools which aid in bracket placement.

The problems in bracket positioning are many including difficulty in accessibility, anatomical variations and morphological diversity of the clinical crowns of different teeth. Another problem encountered during placement is the use of the long axis of the clinical crown as a guide during bracket positioning which could be different from the actual long axis of the tooth when the root is considered. The ability to align teeth considering both the crown and the root improves the treatment outcome and decreases the chances of relapse.

Attempts were made in order to reach the best method for bracket placement. Unfortunately, none of them was able to come out with a reproducible and reliable technique. Indirect bonding technique was introduced to avoid the obstacles of inaccessibility and lengthy appointments hence, obtaining standard results, yet the clinician factor can't be underestimated.

Bracket placement gauges are used extensively aiming to place the brackets in the accurate position. Despite the fact that these gauges could minimize bracket positioning errors yet, they can't negate it.

Many factors might affect the clinician precision in bracket positioning. These include years of experience, sharpness of sight and physical condition. Hence, unceasing attempts are going on trying to overcome these factors.

Evolution of imaging techniques has opened new horizons for both diagnoses and treatment. Recent imaging techniques allowed complete visualization of the different tissues in three dimensions.

Cone beam computed tomography has been proven to be of great diagnostic value, with the ability to produce accurate images of the patient's soft and hard tissues this could be utilized to solve the problems that clinician faces with bracket position. Hence, allowing implementation CBCT technology not only as diagnostic aid but as a treatment aid as well.

# Review of Literature

This review will try to cover most of the attempts in improving the bracket positioning. In order to try to find what was the defect and reviewing the recent tools and technology in order to overcome these obstacles.

The review of this study will be presented under the following titles:

- I. Accuracy of bracket placement.
- II. Cone beam CT accuracy.
- III. Different bracket positioning devices.
- IV. Comparison between direct bonding and indirect bonding.
- V. The influence of different bracket placement techniques.
- VI. Recent methods for bracket positioning.

**I. Accuracy of bracket placement:**

Bracket position should be accurate in order to fully express the built in tip and torques in order to reach the proper alignment of teeth described by **Lawrence Andrews (1972)** <sup>(2)</sup>. Six keys of normal occlusion were described in order to reach proper alignment of teeth. The concept of straight wire appliance was explained clearly by **Lawrence Andrews (1976)** <sup>(3)</sup>.

**Balut et al. (1992)** <sup>(5)</sup> conducted a study on the variation in bracket placement in the preadjusted orthodontic appliance. The study was conducted to determine the accuracy of bracket placement with the direct bonded technique. Ten orthodontic faculty members bonded a preadjusted orthodontic appliance on models of five cases of malocclusion in a simulated clinical situation (mannequin). A total of 50 sets of models served as the population of the study. Photographs of the models were measured to determine vertical and angular discrepancies in position between adjacent bracket pairs from a constructed reference line. Variations were evaluated with respect to the classification of malocclusion, specific tooth type, and intra/inter operator differences. A mean of 0.34 mm for the vertical discrepancies and a mean of 5.54 degrees for the angular discrepancies were found in placement of the brackets.

**Miethke and Melsen (1992)** <sup>(26)</sup> conducted a study on the effect of variation in tooth morphology and bracket position on first and third order correction with preadjusted appliances. They found out that the rationale of the totally preadjusted appliance can be rejected. Considering the intertooth variation, it still made sense to use brackets individually designed for different teeth. On the other hand, minor differences related to different prescriptions did not have significant impact. Each of the