



# **Effect Of Different Treatment Protocols For Kennedy Class II Cases Using OT Attachment Versus Using Conventional Partial Denture 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**

**Hossam El-Deen Abdel Hamied Ibrahim Salem**

**B.D.S, October 6 University  
(2009)**

**Faculty of Dentistry  
Ain Shams University  
(2018)**

# Supervisors

## **Prof.Dr. Rami Maher Ghali**

Professor of Prosthodontics, Prosthodontic department

Vice Dean for Environmental Affairs and Community Service

Faculty of Dentistry

Ain shams University

## **Dr. Shimaa Lotfy Mohamed Ouda**

Lecturer of Prosthodontics

prosthodontic department

Faculty of Dentistry

Ain shams University

## **Dr. Mohamed shady Nabhan**

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  
الآية (32) سورة البقرة

# 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 **Prof.Dr. Rami Maher Ghali**, 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. Mohamed shady Nabhan**, Lecturer 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, for thier 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 parents and brothers. Thank you for your unlimited love, support and encouragement that keeps me going on through tough times.*

Hossam El-Deen Abdel Hamied Ibrahim

# ***Dedication***

***To my great parents:***

*I would like to dedicate this to you my lovely family. 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.*

Hossam El-Deen Abdel Hamied Ibrahim

# List of Contents

<b>Title</b>	<b>page</b>
<b><u>INTRODUCTION.....</u></b>	<b><u>1</u></b>
<b><u>REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
➤ Kennedy class II removable partial denture.....	3
➤ Problems of Kennedy class II removable partial denture.....	3
▪ Problem of support.....	4
▪ Problem of retention.....	5
▪ Problem of bracing stability.....	6
➤ Different treatment modalities of Kennedy class II.....	8
▪ Conventional removable partial dentures.....	7
▪ Attachment retained removable partial denture.....	11
▪ Implant supported Removable Partial Denture.....	20
▪ Shortened dental arch.....	21
▪ Fixed prosthodontics with implant or cantilever.....	21
➤ Extra coronal attachments.....	22
➤ Different types of extracoronal attachments.....	22
▪ Dalbo attachment system.....	22
▪ SA Swiss Anchor.....	22
▪ ASC 52 ball attachment.....	23
▪ O-Ring System-Distal Extension (ORS-DE).....	23
▪ Stern ERA and Stern-RV.....	23
▪ The OT attachment system.....	23

➤ Radiographic evaluation.....	26
▪ Conventional Radiography.....	26
- Extra-oral conventional radiography.....	26
○ Panoramic radiography.....	26
○ Lateral cephalometric radiography.....	27
○ Cross-seccional tomography.....	27
- Intra-oral conventiona parallel radiography.....	27
▪ Advanced Digital radiography.....	29
- Intra-oral digital radiography.....	30
○ Indirect digital radiography.....	30
○ Direct digital radiography.....	30
- Extra-oral digital radiography.....	31
○ Scanography.....	31
○ Computed tomographic scans.....	31
○ Cone beam computed tomography.....	32
<b><u>AIM OF THE STUDY.....</u></b>	<b>33</b>
<b><u>MATERIALS AND METHODS.....</u></b>	<b>34</b>
<b><u>RESULTS.....</u></b>	<b>47</b>
<b><u>DISCUSSION.....</u></b>	<b>56</b>
<b><u>SUMMARY.....</u></b>	<b>64</b>
<b><u>CONCLUSION.....</u></b>	<b>66</b>
<b><u>REFERENCES.....</u></b>	<b>67</b>
<b><u>ARABIC SUMMARY.....</u></b>	<b>1</b>





## Table of figures

FIG.	Description	Page
<b>FIG. 1</b>	Intra-oral view of Lower Kennedy Class II	<b><u>37</u></b>
<b>FIG. 2</b>	Primary impression for lower and upper arches	<b><u>37</u></b>
<b>FIG. 3</b>	Primary lower cast	<b><u>37</u></b>
<b>FIG. 4</b>	Secondary impression of lower arch	<b><u>39</u></b>
<b>FIG. 5</b>	finished and polished metallic framework	<b><u>39</u></b>
<b>FIG. 6</b>	finished and polished removable partial denture	<b><u>40</u></b>
<b>FIG. 7</b>	reduced last two teeth	<b><u>41</u></b>
<b>FIG. 8</b>	Impression of the prepared abutments	<b><u>42</u></b>
<b>FIG. 9</b>	Metal try-in for the two crowns with double OT attachment	<b><u>42</u></b>
<b>FIG. 10</b>	Metal try-in examined intraorally	<b><u>43</u></b>
<b>FIG. 11</b>	the crowns with the attachment assembly rechecked intraorally	<b><u>43</u></b>
<b>FIG. 12</b>	Pick up impression for attachment assembly	<b><u>44</u></b>
<b>FIG. 13</b>	Try in metal framework intraorally	<b><u>44</u></b>
<b>FIG. 14</b>	Recording jaw relation	<b><u>45</u></b>

<b>FIG. 15</b>	Male and female part	<b><u>46</u></b>
<b>FIG. 16</b>	Checking occlusion of final prosthesis	<b><u>46</u></b>
<b>FIG. 17</b>	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)	<b><u>48</u></b>
<b>FIG. 18</b>	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)	<b><u>49</u></b>
<b>FIG. 19</b>	A graph showing difference in bone resorption between the two groups from 0 to 6 months follow-up	<b><u>51</u></b>
<b>Fig. 20</b>	A graph showing difference in bone resorption between the two groups from 6 to 12 months follow-up	<b><u>53</u></b>
<b>Fig. 21</b>	A graph showing difference in bone resorption between the two groups through the whole follow-up period	<b><u>54</u></b>

## List of tables

<i>Table</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Page</i>
<b>Table 1</b>	Table 1. Paired t test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for group A at the two intervals of follow up period.	<u><b>48</b></u>
<b>Table 2</b>	Paired t test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for <b>group B</b> at the two intervals of follow up period.	<u><b>49</b></u>
<b>Table 3</b>	Table 3. Independent T Test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for group A (Conventional clasp retained partial denture) and group B (Unilateral retained double OT attachment removable partial denture) from zero (time of insertion) to 6 months follow up.	<u><b>51</b></u>
<b>Table 4</b>	Independent T Test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for <b>group A</b> and <b>group B</b> from 6 to 12 months follow up.	<u><b>52</b></u>
<b>Table 5</b>	Independent T Test, Mean values (mm), Standard deviation (SD), results of bone resorption recorded for <b>group A</b> and <b>group B</b> at overall period of follow up	<u><b>54</b></u>

# **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 <sup>(1, 2)</sup>.

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 <sup>(3)</sup>

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 <sup>(4)</sup>.

RHEIN OT Cap (Extracoronar 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 <sup>(5)</sup>. 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**

Distal extension RPD is defined by the academy of prosthodontics as a removable dental prosthesis that is supported and retained by natural teeth only at one end of the denture base segment and in which a portion of the functional load is carried by the residual ridge. According to Kennedy's classification of the RPDs, Kennedy class II is a unilateral edentulous area located posterior to the remaining natural teeth.<sup>(6)</sup>

The primary objectives of partial denture design should be the preservation of the remaining teeth and their supporting structures in a healthy condition, at the same time replacing the missing teeth and improving aesthetics, phonetics ,mastication and patient satisfaction.<sup>(7)</sup>

I-Problems and management of kennedy class II cases:

A) Problems of kennedy class II cases:

The problems associated with the kennedy class II (unilateral free end saddle)partial dentures are support, poor stability, and minimal retention .these problems are attributed to the stomatognathic structures which support the removable partial denture which are anatomically made of different tissues.Due to absence of distal tooth support. Therefore, difference in the resiliency between the mucoperiostium of the residual ridge and periodontal ligament of the last abutment.<sup>(8)</sup>

The partial denture design influences distribution of forces to abutment teeth because it is through the structure of the denture forces of mastication are transmitted from the occlusal surfaces of the artificial teeth to the natural teeth and ridge. Basic denture design should incorporate proper bracing, retentive and supporting elements that distribute forces as widely as possible through the teeth and ridges, which means less torquing of abutment teeth.<sup>(9)</sup>

a)Support:

Support is defined as the quality inherent in the dental prosthesis acting to resist the displacement towards the basal tissues or underlying structures<sup>(6)</sup>

It is the major problem in distal extension base removable partial dentures due to the absence of the posterior abutment, the partial denture shares its support between the teeth and the edentulous ridge, which differ markedly in the viscoelastic response to loading. The mucosa covering the edentulous ridge is much more easily displaced than the periodontal ligament of the abutment teeth and has a slower rate of recovery that may extend to several hours. The difference in displacement between the mucosa and the periodontal ligament was estimated to be up to 13 times.<sup>(11,12)</sup>

i) Tooth support:

Vertical support for RPDs is provided by any unit of the partial denture that rests on a tooth surface which is termed a rest. Rests should be always located in rest seats which are teeth surfaces properly prepared to receive them. Rests serve in transferring portion of the functional stresses to the teeth, while the remainder of the load is absorbed by the edentulous ridge where firm and positive contact between rest and rest seat minimizes vertical displacement of the prosthesis and prevents injury of the soft tissues.<sup>(10,11)</sup>

ii) Tissue support:

The viscoelastic reaction of the supporting soft tissues plays an important role in the evaluation of design concepts for removable partial dentures for patients with distal extension ridges. An increase in the loading time as during continuous clenching even if it is light, results into ischemia and delays the recovery of the blood flow in the mucosa underlying the denture after release of compression.<sup>(12,13)</sup>