

## Original Article

### Assessment of Lingual Orthodontics practice among Orthodontists- A questionnaire survey

Nameeta Kaur ,

Lecturer , Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics , Government Dental College , Srinagar, India

#### ABSTRACT:

**Background:** Lingual orthodontics provides the best option for comprehensive treatment of most malocclusions. The present study was conducted to assess practice of lingual orthodontics among orthodontists. **Materials & Methods:** The present study was conducted in the department of Orthodontics. It comprised of 112 orthodontists selected for the study. All were provided with a questionnaire and asked to respond. Use of email for responding and whatsapp was preferred. **Results:** Out of 112 dentists, males were 60 and females were 52.45% dentist used lingual orthodontics, 60% used 2 dimensional technique, 65% were urban dentists, in 60% dentists, duration required for rebonding a single bracket was 15- 30 mins, 75% required 2-4 months for premolar (7 mm) space closure, 60% responded that finishing procedure is required in lingual orthodontics, 80% used power chain for space closure. The difference was significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). **Conclusion:** Lingual orthodontics is emerging field in orthodontics. The use is increasing among orthodontist day by day as patient desire in enhancing.

**Key words:** Bracket, Lingual orthodontics, Malocclusion.

Received: 20 January 2018

Revised: 22 February 2018

Accepted: 26 February 2018

**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Nameeta Kaur, Lecturer , Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics , Government Dental College , Srinagar, India

**This article may be cited as:** Kaur N. Assessment of lingual orthodontics practice among orthodontists- A questionnaire survey. Int J Res Health Allied Sci 2017; 3(2):51-53.

#### INTRODUCTION

One of the most important challenges in orthodontics is to attain excellence in treatment with comfortable and esthetic appliances. From the esthetic perspective, lingual orthodontics provides the best option for comprehensive treatment of most malocclusions while maintaining full three-dimensional (3D) control of the dentition.<sup>1</sup>

Despite the demand for "invisible braces," lingual orthodontics failed to catch on in the United States in the mid-1980s, and it became less significant thereafter. However, further developments at different levels, such as laboratory-based bracket positioning, archwire fabrication, indirect bonding and perseverance of dedicated clinicians has led to a rise in the number of lingually treated patients in Europe and Asia. When doctors with experience in this technique are asked why they have ceased to use it, three explanations are commonly given: The bracket loss rate is substantially higher than in labial cases, and the indirect rebonding technique is complex and

imprecise; the finishing process is time-consuming, and the average quality falls far short of that of labial cases.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, the lingual position of the brackets is less obvious and contributes to esthetic appearance of the patients, but on the other hand, it has some unique implications on other aspects of the treatment such as patient comfort or treatment mechanics that may hinder achieving the orthodontic goals.<sup>3</sup> The present study was conducted to assess practice of lingual orthodontics among orthodontists.

#### MATERIALS & METHODS

The present study was conducted in the department of Orthodontics. It comprised of 112 orthodontists selected for the study. All were informed regarding the study and written consent was obtained. All were provided with a questionnaire and asked to respond. Use of email for responding and whatsapp was preferred. Results thus obtained were subjected to statistical analysis. P value less than 0.05 was considered significant.

**RESULTS**

**Table I: Distribution of patients**

<b>Total- 112</b>		
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>
Number	60	52

Table I shows that out of 112 dentists, males were 60 and females were 52.

**Table II Questionnaire used in study**

Question	Response	Number	P value
1. Do you use lingual orthodontics	Yes	45%	0.8
	No	55%	
2. Appliance used for technique	2 dimensional	60%	0.02
	3 dimensional	40%	
3. Where do you practice	Urban	65%	0.03
	Rural	35%	
4. Duration required for rebonding a single bracket?	10- 15 mins	40%	0.02
	15- 30 mins	60%	
5. Average number of days required for premolar (7 mm) space closure?	2-4 months	75%	0.01
	4-6 months	25%	
6. Do you feel that finishing procedure is required in lingual orthodontics?	In every case	40%	0.02
	Few cases	60%	
7. Method of spaceclosure used?	NiTi coil springs	20%	0.01
	Power chain	80%	

Table II shows that 45% dentist used lingual orthodontics, 60% used 2 dimensional technique, 65% were urban dentists, in 60% dentists, duration required for rebonding a single bracket was 15- 30 mins, 75% required 2-4 months for premolar (7 mm) space closure, 60% responded that finishing procedure is required in lingual orthodontics, 80% used power chain for space closure. The difference was significant (P< 0.05).

**DISCUSSION**

Few aspects of dentistry have undergone as dramatic a boom in recent years as dental esthetics. However in contrast to services provided by general dentists, orthodontic therapy often extends over a long period, so not only is the outcome of esthetic significance to the patient, but also the course taken to achieve that outcome. From the esthetic perspective the best appliance to be totally invisible and give complete three-dimensional (3D) control to correct any kind of malocclusion is a fixed lingual appliance.<sup>4</sup> Lingual orthodontics is developing in India, and many clinicians practice extraction and complex cases. Many orthodontists do not have excellent results, and this shows that there is still room for improvement.<sup>5</sup> Individualization of the bracket base, a process used in various laboratory processes and always essential in the lingual technique, takes place during fabrication of the single brackets; in other words, each tooth has its own customized bracket, made with state-of-the-art computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM) software coupled with high-end, rapid prototyping techniques. The iLingual 3D

system is one such innovation using state of the art CAD/CAM technology.<sup>6</sup> The present study was conducted to assess practice of lingual orthodontics among orthodontists.

We found that out of 112 dentists, males were 60 and females were 52. In this study, 45% dentist used lingual orthodontics, 60% used 2 dimensional technique, 65% were urban dentists, in 60% dentists, duration required for rebonding a single bracket was 15- 30 mins, 75% required 2-4 months for premolar (7 mm) space closure, 60% responded that finishing procedure is required in lingual orthodontics, 80% used power chain for space closure.

Fillion et al<sup>7</sup> found that a total of 248 orthodontists responded to the survey, 70% orthodontists said that they practice lingual orthodontics. Among the orthodontists who practice lingual orthodontics, 71% orthodontists treat extraction and non extraction cases and 29% treat only non extraction cases. Forty percent orthodontists said their final finishing of case is good, 16% said that final finishing is average, 26.5% said that final finishing is very good, and

only 17.5% said that it is excellent. Statistically significant correlation exists ( $P = 0.004$ ) between the treatment outcome and use of laboratory for initial setup.

The first prototype of iLingual braces were developed by Dr. Jignesh Kothari in the year 2007 and thereafter several prototypes were produced to modify the design and make it more user-friendly at the same time making it more efficient for treatments. The brackets were made by CAD design manufactured with rapid prototyping and casted in gold alloy. In 2009 iLingual ribbon arch stock bracket ( $0.025'' \times 0.0175''$  slot size) was introduced with vertical insertion in anteriors and horizontal insertion in posteriors, the same was used with the modified target setup for individualization.<sup>8</sup>

### CONCLUSION

Lingual orthodontics is emerging field in orthodontics. The use is increasing among orthodontist day by day as patient desire in enhancing.

### REFERENCES

1. Echarrri P. Revisiting the history of lingual orthodontics: A basis for the future. *Semin Orthod* 2006;12:153-9.
2. McCrostie H. Lingual Orthodontics: The Future. *Semin Orthod* 2006;12:211-14.
3. Chato A. A view from behind: A history of lingual orthodontics. *J Orthod* 2013;40: 1:2-7.
4. Fritz U, Diedrich P, Wiechmann D. Lingual technique - patients' characteristics, motivation and acceptance. Interpretation of a retrospective survey. *J Orofac Orthop* 2002;63:227-33.
5. Kothari J. Excellence in lingual orthodontics: Its challenges and solutions — The iLingual three-dimensional low-profile tandem slot. *APOS Trends Orthod* 2015;5:279-88.
6. Creekmore T. Lingual orthodontics — Its renaissance. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1989;96:120-37.
7. Fillion D. Lingual orthodontics: Clinical reflections. *Rev Orthop DentoFaciale* 1990;24:475-98.
8. Fujita K. New orthodontic treatment with lingual bracket mushroom arch wire appliance. *Am J Orthod* 1979;76:657-75.

**Source of support:** Nil

**Conflict of interest:** None declared

This work is licensed under CC BY: ***Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.***