Treatment effects of the R-appliance and twin block in Class II division 1 malocclusion
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SUMMARY The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of a differently designed functional appliance (the R-appliance) with a twin-block (TB)-treated group.

Thirty patients (18 girls and 12 boys) with a mean age of 10.5 ± 0.7 years were treated with the R-appliance for 16.2 ± 0.3 months and 25 (11 boys and 14 girls) with a mean age of 11.2 ± 1.3 years with a TB for 16.1 ± 1.4 months (control). All had a Class II division 1 malocclusion due to mandibular deficiency. Lateral cephalograms obtained at the beginning (T1) and end (T2) of the study were analysed.

Paired t-tests showed that SNB significantly increased in both groups. The incisor mandibular plane angle (IMPA) was reduced in the R-appliance group by 1.9 ± 4.9 degrees (P < 0.04) but increased by 0.5 ± 5.1 degrees (P < 0.6) in the TB group. SNA in the R-appliance group showed an increase of 0.2 ± 1.8 degrees (P < 0.5), while it was decreased by 0.2 ± 1.3 degrees (P < 0.3) in the TB group.

Both treatment modalities were successful in moving the mandible forward. However, with the R-appliance, this was achieved without retroclination of the lower incisors.

Introduction

Class II division 1 malocclusions due to mandibular deficiency have been extensively studied regarding the skeletal and dental characteristics and method of treatment (McNamara, 1981). Different removable functional appliances have been used to treat this malocclusion (Clark, 1988; Ghafari et al., 1988; Tulloch et al., 1997; Ehmer et al., 1999; Wheeler et al., 2002; O’Brien et al., 2003). Past studies that have described positive effects with the various functional appliances have focused on the skeletal and dental structures (Bishara and Ziaja, 1989; Mills, 1991; Petrovic et al., 1991; Morris, 1995; Aelbers and Dermaut, 1996; Barton and Cook, 1997; McSheny and Bradley, 2000; McDonagh et al., 2001; Chen et al., 2002; Jacobs and Sawaengkit, 2002; Shen et al., 2005). The twin-block (TB) appliance first introduced by Clark (1988) is one of the most popular appliances used for treating Class II division 1 malocclusions associated with mandibular retrusion (Morris et al., 1998; Singh and Clark, 2003). However, the TB has been shown to have an inhibiting effect on growth of the maxilla (Clark, 2002). In general, functional appliances restrict growth of the maxilla (Kerr et al., 1989; Perillo et al., 1996; Toth and McNamara, 1999; Trenouth, 2000; Pangrazio-Kulbersh et al., 2003; Hägglund et al., 2008). Labial tipping of the lower incisors is evident in TB therapy (Clark, 2002) as well as with other types of functional appliances (Pancherz, 1982; Vargervik and Harvold, 1985). Restriction of the maxilla and proclination of the lower incisors are the main disadvantages of most functional appliances.

To avoid these side-effects, the R-appliance was designed (Jamilian et al., 2009). The aim of this study was to evaluate dentoskeletal changes achieved with the R-appliance in comparison with the TB in the treatment of Class II division 1 patients, in the late mixed dentition.

Subjects and methods

This retrospective study consisted of 55 patients who were randomly assigned to two groups using a standard random number table. All subjects gave informed written consent and all met the following inclusion criteria:

1. ANB > 4 degrees, SNB < 78 degrees, overjet ≥ 5 mm at the start of treatment.
2. No syndromic or medically compromised patients.
3. No previous surgical intervention.
4. No use of other appliances before or during the period of functional treatment.
5. A normal mandibular growth pattern: neither horizontal nor vertical.
6. No skeletal asymmetry.

Thirty patients (18 girls and 12 boys) were treated with the R-appliance (Figure 1). Their mean age was 10.5 ± 0.7 years, and the average treatment time was 16.2 ± 0.3 months. The patients were instructed to wear the appliances full-time except for eating, contact sports, and tooth brushing.
The R-appliance is a tooth- and tissue-borne appliance. It consists of buccal and lingual shields, which are connected to each other through the occlusal clearance during bite construction. These shields are extended to the distal of the first permanent molars and cover the buccal and lingual regions and the depth of the vestibule. The lingual shield was fabricated with minimal undercut relief to allow the appliance to settle more easily. The left and right lower lingual shields were connected and reinforced with a heavy archwire (1 mm diameter) to withstand muscular activity loading. The heavy wire, which acts as a tongue bow, was positioned posteriorly to connect the right and left acrylic parts on the palatal aspect in order to reinforce the appliance. The labial bow was constructed of 0.7 mm stainless steel wire extending from canine to canine with vertical loops in the canine region. In this group, the construction bites were taken with the upper and lower anterior teeth in an edge-to-edge occlusion with 2–3 mm posterior clearance. Lateral cephalograms of the R-appliance group were taken in centric occlusion at the start ($T_1$) and after 16 months of observation ($T_2$).

SNA, SNB, ANB, overjet, 1 to SN (angle between the long axis of the upper central incisor and anterior cranial base), incisor mandibular plane angle (IMPA; angle between the long axis of the lower central incisor and mandibular plane), and the Jarabak index (the ratio between posterior and anterior face heights; $S$–$Go$/$N$–$Me$) were measured on all radiographs.

Both groups were treated by one practitioner in a private orthodontic office. All measurements were carried out twice by two individuals. The reliability of the measurements was determined by randomly selecting 10 cephalograms at the beginning and end of the treatment from each group. They were traced twice by the same trained dentists on two separate occasions after a 1 month interval. Paired $t$-tests showed no statistically significant differences between the two measurements. The correlation analyses between the first and second measurements consistently showed coefficients greater than 0.90.

Data were tested for normality and appropriate statistical test were applied (Table 1). Paired $t$-tests were used for intragroup evaluation and a $t$-test for intergroup evaluation. Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$. The magnification factor of the cephalograms was standardized at 8 per cent. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Version 16 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois, USA), was used to analyse the data.

**Results**

Paired $t$-tests showed that the SNB in the R-appliance group increased by $2.2 \pm 1.6$ degrees ($P < 0.001$), while ANB and overjet significantly decreased. The changes in SNA and the Jarabak index were not significant. IMPA showed a decrease of $1.9 \pm 4.9$ degrees ($P < 0.04$; Table 2). In the TB group, SNB increased $1.8 \pm 1.2$ degrees ($P < 0.001$) and ANB and overjet significantly decreased. SNA showed a non-significant decrease. The Jarabak index did not show any significant changes. IMPA was increased by $0.5 \pm 5.1$ degrees ($P < 0.06$; Table 2).

Intergroup evaluation showed that SNA was increased with the R-appliance but reduced with the TB. However, the difference was not statistically significant. IMPA was decreased in the R-appliance group by $1.9 \pm 4.9$ degrees, while it increased in the TB group by $0.5 \pm 5.1$ degrees ($P < 0.08$). SNB showed an increase in both groups but the difference was not statistically significant. 1 to SN was reduced by $9.1 \pm 8.7$ degrees in the R-appliance group but by $4.7 \pm 7.7$ degrees in the TB group. The difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (Table 3). Figure 2 shows the pre- and post-treatment images of one patient treated with the R-appliance.
Discussion

The findings of this study showed that both the R-appliance and the TB can successfully improve the profile of patients with mandibular deficiency. Both overjet and ANB were reduced while SNB was increased. However, the lower incisors were protruded in the TB group while they were retroclined in the R-appliance group (Table 2). The TB has been shown to restrain maxillary development and cause proclination of the lower incisors (Clark, 2002). Significant forward movement of the mandibular landmarks was the most distinct effect of activator and TB appliances. Additionally, significant proclination of the mandibular incisors at the end of functional appliance use might have contributed to forward movement of the lower lip. In several studies concerning soft tissue profile effects of Class II functional appliances; similar changes have been reported (Bishara and Ziaja, 1989; McDonagh et al., 2001; Cozza et al., 2004; Quintão et al., 2006). In another study, significant dental changes were found with edgewise Herbst treatment, including retraction of the maxillary and proclination of the mandibular (VanLaecken et al., 2006).

The R-appliance improved mandibular deficiency in the anterio-posterior dimension without proclination of the
Mandibular closure might create excessive retraction forces on the upper anterior teeth, which could be the reason for upper anterior lingualization during treatment. In other words, the retracting force on the upper anterior dentition takes place only at the beginning of mandibular closure. SNA increased in the R-appliance group while it decreased in the TB group (Table 2). In other words, the R-appliance did not affect the maxillary base while it tipped the upper incisors palatally. However, point A would move in a forward position if the palatal tipping is corrected by fixed appliances. In the TB group, the retractor muscles are activated, which will orthopaedically affect the maxilla. TBs have many advantages, which have made them the most popular functional appliance in the UK (Gill et al., 2005). Some advantages have been highlighted by Clark (1997):

1. They can be worn full time due to their smaller size.
2. The absence of lip, cheek, and tongue pads allows of normal function and does not distort the patient’s facial appearance during treatment.
3. Good patient compliance is required to achieve neuromuscular adaptation.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn based on this study’s findings:

1. The R-appliance and TB will result in forward positioning of the mandible in phase 1 of treatment.
2. In the R-appliance group, while the lower incisors retroclined, the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant.
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