Comparison of dental arch and arch perimeter changes between bonded rapid and slow maxillary expansion procedures
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SUMMARY The purpose of this study was to evaluate and compare the dental effects of bonded rapid maxillary expansion (RME) and bonded slow maxillary expansion (SME) treatment methods. Subjects with a maxillary bilateral crossbite were selected and two treatment groups each with 12 patients were constructed. At the beginning of treatment, the average chronological ages were 11.96 years for the RME group and 12.31 years for the SME group. The Hyrax screw in the RME treatment group and the spring of the Minne-Expander in the SME treatment group were embedded in the posterior bite planes, which had a thickness of 1 mm. The treatment time for the RME group varied from 0.70 to 1.60 months and for the SME group 1.00–5.16 months. At the end of active treatment the appliances were worn for retentive purpose for an additional 3 months. Orthodontic casts taken at the beginning and end of treatment, and at the end of the retention period formed the material for the study. Increases in the transversal width between the upper molars, upper first premolars, upper canines, lower canines, and in the upper arch perimeter were obtained. The increase in the upper inter-canine width was found to be significantly greater in the RME group compared with the SME group. Regression analysis indicated that arch perimeter gain through the treatment could be predicted as 0.65 times the amount of the posterior expansion for the RME group and 0.60 times the amount of posterior expansion for the SME group.

Introduction

Aetiological causes of buccolingual discrepancies can be either genetic or environmental. Harvold et al. (1972) stated that upper arch narrowness was generally due to anomalous functions. Posterior crossbite is one of the most commonly seen transversal malocclusions generally accompanied with upper arch crowding (Harvold et al., 1972; Bishara and Staley, 1987). The current trend in orthodontics has shifted towards the principles of dentofacial orthopaedics and non-extraction treatment modalities. Maxillary expansion appliances increase available arch length and result in the correction of posterior crossbite (Adkins et al., 1990). However, Krebs (1964) demonstrated stable increases in the maxillary base and nasal cavity but diminution in width of the dental arch following mid-palatal separation.

Several authors have recommended different types of maxillary expansion appliances by changing the rate of expansion and form of the appliance. With maxillary expansion treatment, the aim is to achieve minimal dental and maximum skeletal effects (Haas, 1961). Rapid maxillary expansion appliances show the best examples of true orthopaedics in that changes are produced primarily in the underlying structures and therefore are found to be more stable (Haas, 1980; Bishara and Staley, 1987; Adkins et al., 1990; McNamara, 1993). However, clinical and histological studies have shown that relapse, microtrauma of the temporomandibular joint, microfractures at the mid-palatal suture and especially external root resorption are observed in rapid maxillary expansion treatment (Linder-Aronson and Lindgren, 1979; Barber and Sims, 1981; Langford, 1982). To eliminate these disadvantages and
obtain increased physiological tissue reaction, slow maxillary expansion has become more popular (Mew, 1983; Vardimon et al., 1991). It has also been shown that slow maxillary expansion has orthopaedic effects (Cotton, 1978; Hicks, 1978; Bell and LeCompte, 1981; Mossaz-Joélson and Mossaz, 1989).

Recently, the use of bonded expanders has been recommended as these result in less tooth tipping compared with banded expanders. In addition, the acrylic occlusal coverage opens the bite posteriorly, facilitating the correction of crossbites (Howe, 1982; Spolyar, 1984).

In several studies changes in maxillary and mandibular inter-canine, and inter-molar widths have been recorded through maxillary expansion (Haas, 1965, 1970; Timms, 1980). The opening of a diastema between the maxillary central incisors has also been reported by several authors (Haas, 1961, 1965; Wertz, 1970).

Though changes in the dental arch after maxillary expansion treatment have been reported, comparison of different force duration has not previously been investigated. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of bonded rapid maxillary expansion (RME) and bonded slow maxillary expansion (SME) treatment on dental arch and arch perimeter, and to compare the obtained results.

Subjects and methods

The sample included 24 patients with maxillary bilateral crossbite caused by basal apical narrowness, and showing a Class I or II molar relationship. Following examination by an otolaryngologist, none of the patients showed a nasal obstruction requiring surgical intervention.

Two treatment groups (with 12 patients in each) were constructed. The first group was treated by bonded RME and the second group by bonded SME. The mean ages at the initiation of treatment were 11.96 years (10.40–13.50) for the RME group and 12.31 years (9.83–13.50) for the SME group. At the beginning of treatment, the average skeletal ages were 12.10 years (10.41–13.66) for the RME group and 12.19 years (9.91–13.75) for the SME group.

A Hyrax appliance was used in the RME treatment group and a Minne Expander in the SME group (Figures 1 and 2). Both were embedded in the posterior bite plates, which had a thickness of 1 mm. The mid-point of the palatinal and buccal surfaces, and cusp tips of the upper premolars or deciduous molars and first molars were etched with a 37 per cent solution of phosphoric acid. After rinsing and drying the etched teeth, the maxillary expansion appliances were bonded with Paladur (Kulzer, Hereaus, Germany). The Hyrax screws were activated by the patients twice a day with a one-quarter turn in the morning and in the evening. The Minne Expanders were compressed each week to
produce a continuous force of 900 g. The subjects were observed weekly until over-correction was obtained, insofar as the palatal cusp of the upper molar was in a similar plane to the buccal cusp of lower molar. At that time both appliances were removed in order to facilitate impressions, then replaced and used as a retention device. The retention period continued for 3 months.

Maxillary and mandibular study casts were taken at the beginning and end of treatment, and at the end of the retention period. Points from which measurements were to be taken were marked with 0.3 mm pencil. All measurements were read to the nearest 0.1 mm (Figures 3 and 4).

For all casts all parameters were measured again after 15 days and measurement error was determined. All measurement error coefficients were found to be near 1.00 and within acceptable limits (Table 1).

The average differences at the beginning and end of treatment; at the end of treatment, and at the end of retention; at the beginning of treatment and at the end of retention were evaluated with the paired \( t \)-test. A Student’s \( t \)-test was applied for comparison of the groups. To estimate the arch perimeter changes, a regression analysis was performed between the arch perimeter and inter-molar, inter-premolar, and inter-canine widths.

### Results

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations and the significance of the treatment, post-treatment and net changes for RME group. The increase during treatment was significant for all parameters in this group. In the post-treatment interval there was a significant decrease in inter-canine, inter-incisor width, and arch perimeter in the maxillary arch. Inter-molar and inter-canine

---

**Table 1  Method error co-efficients.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 6 + 6</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4 + 4</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3 + 3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1 + 1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arch perimeter</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 6 – 6</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 3 – 3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
width in the mandibular arch showed a statistically significant increase post-treatment in the RME group (Table 2).

Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and the significance of the treatment, post-treatment, and net changes for the SME group. Except inter-incisor width, all parameters were significantly increased during treatment in this group. In the post-treatment interval a significant decrease was observed in inter-canine width and arch perimeter in the maxillary arch. Inter-molar and inter-canine widths in the mandibular arch also showed a significant increase post-treatment (Table 3).

For both groups the net change was significant for all parameters except inter-incisor width (Tables 2 and 3).

Comparison between the RME and SME groups

Increases in inter-canine and inter-incisor widths were significantly greater in the RME than SME group during treatment. In the post-treatment interval the decrease in inter-incisor width and arch perimeter in RME group showed a significant difference compared with the SME group. The net change for inter-canine width exhibited a statistically significant difference between the groups (Table 4).

Linear regression analysis of the three independent variables (inter-molar, inter-premolar, and inter-canine width increase in the maxillary arch) showed that premolar width increase was the best predictor of the increase in arch perimeter for both the treatment and post-treatment
periods. This relationship was represented by the following equations: for the RME group, Arch perimeter change = 0.62 + 0.65 × premolar width change (R–S(Sq(adj) = 67.5 per cent); the SME group, Arch perimeter change = 0.03 + 0.60 × premolar width change (R–S(Sq(adj) = 43.4 per cent).

For the pretreatment – post-retention (net change) interval the following equations were represented.

RME group: Arch perimeter change = 0.01 + 0.54 × premolar width change (R–S(Sq(adj) = 30.6 per cent).

SME: Arch perimeter change = 0.16 + 0.52 × premolar width change (R–S(Sq(adj) = 42.4 per cent).

**Discussion**

Application of expansion is generally to avoid the extraction of permanent teeth and thus determination of dental changes through RME and SME treatment would be helpful in planning orthodontic treatment.

During the treatment period inter-molar width showed an increase of 9.05 mm in the RME group and 9.81 mm increase in the SME group. This change occurred as a result of opening of the mid-palatal suture, bending and moving of the alveolar processes laterally, and buccal tipping of the anchorage teeth (Haas, 1961; Barber and Sims, 1981; Langford, 1982; Langford and Sims, 1982). Both in studies of RME and SME a significant increase in inter-molar width has been reported (Haas, 1961, 1970; Cotton, 1978; Hicks, 1978; Timms, 1980; Bell and LeCompte, 1981; Mossaz-Joëlson and Mossaz, 1989).

In all groups inter-premolar width change was approximately the same as the inter-molar width change. This is in agreement with the findings of a RME study (Wertz, 1970). In an experimental SME study it was reported that inter-premolar width increased 7.5–9 mm while inter-molar width showed a 6.9–9.6 mm increase (Cotton, 1978).

Mossaz-Joëlson and Mossaz (1989) noted that inter-canine width showed a smaller increase than inter-molar width in the maxillary arch, both in bonded and banded Minne Expander groups. This is in agreement with our findings for RME and SME groups. Contrary to these findings, it has been reported that opening of the mid-palatal suture is greater in the anterior than posterior region (Wertz, 1970; Biederman, 1973; Ekström *et al.*, 1977; Bell and Le-Compte, 1981). As the appliances used in this study were not anchored to canine teeth, this result is not a surprise. However, the increase in upper intercanine width in the RME group was greater.

**Table 4** Descriptive statistics for mean changes and results of the Student’s *t*-test indicating significant differences between the RME and SME treatment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Treatment change</th>
<th>Post-treatment change</th>
<th>Net change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RME group</td>
<td>SME group</td>
<td>RME group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D    SD</td>
<td>D    SD</td>
<td>D    SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxilla</td>
<td>1. 6 + 6</td>
<td>9.05  0.40</td>
<td>9.81  0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 4 + 4</td>
<td>9.54  0.49</td>
<td>9.85  0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 3 + 3</td>
<td>6.35  0.45</td>
<td>4.15  0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 1 + 1</td>
<td>3.68  0.56</td>
<td>0.00  0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arch perimeter</td>
<td>6.85  0.38</td>
<td>5.90  0.49</td>
<td>-1.79  0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>6.6 – 6</td>
<td>0.36  0.07</td>
<td>0.44  0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 3 – 3</td>
<td>0.64  0.07</td>
<td>0.80  0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001.
than in the SME group. The longer treatment time in the SME group permits the perioral muscles to be more effective on upper canines. In the post-treatment interval the upper inter-canine width was decreased 1.01 mm in the RME group and 0.77 mm in the SME group. Herold (1989) after a 5-month retention period observed a 0.8 mm decrease in the SME group and 1.3 mm decrease in RME group for upper canine width. Haas (1980) reported that after a few years without retention upper canine width remained the same. Some authors, however, have reported a greater relapse in inter-canine width than in inter-molar width in the maxillary arch (Krebs, 1964; Linder-Aronson and Lindgren, 1979).

The opening of a diastema between the maxillary central incisors is one of the changes accompanying RME. Later, the incisor crowns show a mesial tipping caused by the elastic recoil of the transeptal fibres (Haas, 1961, 1965, 1970; Wertz, 1970). While the inter-incisor width was increased in the RME group, no difference was observed in the SME group at the end of treatment. Opening of a diastema has also not been reported in other SME studies (Ekström et al., 1977; Mossaz-Joëlson and Mossaz, 1989). As the treatment time was longer in this group transeptal fibres caused the tipping of the crowns before the end of the active treatment. In the RME group, a significant decrease was observed at the end of the retention period.

While the diastema between the upper incisors was closed, arch perimeter was increased and space was gained for rotation or impacted teeth (Haas, 1961, 1980; Bishara and Staley, 1987; McNamara, 1993). At the end of treatment the arch perimeter increase in the RME and SME groups was 6.85 and 5.90 mm, respectively. This was not statistically significant.

Adkins et al. (1990) reported that RME with the Hyrax appliance produced increases in maxillary arch perimeter at the rate of approximately 0.7 times the change in premolar width. In this study, by regression analysis, inter-premolar width was determined as the best predictor of the increase in arch perimeter. Evaluation of the prediction equations show that increase in arch perimeter through treatment was 0.65 times the amount of the posterior expansion for the RME group and 0.60 times the amount of expansion for the SME group. Though there was some decrease in the retention period, the net increase gain in arch perimeter was 5.05 mm for the RME group and 4.86 mm for the SME group. The prediction equations for the net change indicated that perimeter gain for the RME group could be predicted as 0.54 times the amount of expansion in premolar width and for the SME group 0.52 times the amount of expansion. As there was a decrease in arch perimeter in the retention period, the use of fixed retainers would be necessary especially for borderline cases.

The increase in inter-canine and inter-molar width in the mandibular arch during treatment was related to the altered muscular balance exerted on the dentition and the altered forces of occlusion. This increase might also be attributed to the lowered position of the tongue due to the palatal position of the appliances (Haas, 1961, 1980; Cotton, 1978; Adkins et al., 1990; Halazonetis et al., 1994). A significant increase was also observed in lower inter-canine and inter-molar widths at the end of the retention period. This significant increase was expected as the posterior bite plates eliminated the effect of relapse of the upper inter-molar width in the lower arch.

**Conclusions**

1. Increase in upper inter-canine width was significantly greater in the RME group than in the SME group. This could be related to the faster increase in width in the RME group.
2. Regression analysis indicated that arch perimeter gain through treatment could be predicted as 0.65 times the amount of the posterior expansion for the RME group and 0.60 times the amount of posterior expansion for the SME group.
3. Evaluation of the prediction equations showed that RME produces increases in the maxillary arch perimeter at the rate of 0.54 times the change in first premolar width at the end of the retention period. For the SME group arch perimeter gain could be predicted as 0.52 times the amount of posterior expansion at the end of the retention period.
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