

Crown-root angulations of the maxillary anterior teeth according to malocclusions: A cone-beam computed tomography study in Korean population

Running title : Crown-root angulations according to malocclusions

Kyoung-Hoon Lee^a, Dong-Soon Choi^b, Insan Jang^b, Bong-Kuen Cha^b

^aPostgraduate student, Department of Orthodontics, College of Dentistry, Gangneung-Wonju National University, Gangneung, South Korea

^bProfessor, Department of Orthodontics, College of Dentistry, Gangneung-Wonju National University, Gangneung, South Korea

Corresponding Author: Dong-Soon Choi, D.D.S., M.S.D., PhD.

Professor, Department of Orthodontics, College of Dentistry, Gangneung-Wonju National University, Jukheon gil-7, Gangneung, Gangwon, South Korea, 25457.

Phone: +82-33-640-3152

E-mail: dschoi@gwnu.ac.kr

Crown-root angulations of the maxillary anterior teeth according to malocclusions: A cone-beam computed tomography study in Korean population

Abstract

Objective: To compare crown-root angulations of the permanent maxillary anterior teeth in skeletal Class I, Class II, and Class III Korean malocclusion patients using cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) images.

Material and Methods: Sixty CBCT images were collected from orthodontic patients archive based on skeletal Class I ($0^\circ < ANB < 4^\circ$), Class II ($ANB \geq 4^\circ$), and Class III ($ANB \leq 0^\circ$) to have 20 samples in each group. Mesiodistal crown-root angulation (MDCRA) and labiolingual crown-root angulation (LLCRA) were evaluated after orientation of images. Crown-root angulations were compared among Class I, Class II, and Class III groups and among the maxillary anterior teeth in each group.

Results: LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisor and the lateral incisor were significantly lower in Class III group than those in Class I group. However, those of the canine showed no significant differences among groups. MDCRAs of the maxillary anterior teeth did not significantly differ among groups either.

Conclusions: Our results suggest that skeletal Class III malocclusion might affect labiolingual crown-root angulation of the maxillary incisors, especially the central incisor.

KEYWORDS: CT, Tooth shape, Class III, Malocclusion

INTRODUCTION

Variability in tooth morphology plays an important role in attainment of an optimal occlusion of teeth.¹ Tooth morphology has a close relationship with angulation, inclination, and height of tooth in straight archwire technique introduced by Andrews.² In straight archwire technique that has been widely used in orthodontic treatment, final tooth positions are dependent on the bracket position, not on archwire bending.^{3,4} However, if the crown morphology does not correspond to that for which the bracket is developed, optimal tooth position will not be obtained.⁵⁻⁸ Root morphology is also of crucial importance for attaining functional and stable occlusion and good prognosis of orthodontic treatment.⁹ For this reason, many studies have been performed on tooth morphology. However, little attention has been paid to root morphology or the relationship between crown and root.

The maxillary central incisor is the most visible teeth during unstrained facial activity.¹⁰ Variations in anatomic features of the maxillary central incisors can affect either the treatment or the retention phase of orthodontic therapy.¹ Hence, the morphology of the maxillary central incisors has been investigated.^{1,10-15} According to Bryant et al.¹, the long axis of the root and the long axis of the crown often do not coincide. Sicher and Du Bruil¹⁶ have found that the root axis is commonly bent palatally to the crown axis. On the contrary, Taylor¹⁷ has found that the root axis is often bent facially to the crown axis.

The term 'crown-root angulation' (CRA) has been used to describe the angle between the crown axis and the root axis. It can be measured on labial view (mesiodistal crown-root angulation, MDCRA) and proximal view (labiolingual crown-root angulation, LLCRA). Some previous studies have used lateral cephalometric radiograph to measure LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisors.^{1,6,11,12,15} However, results are divergent on measurements of LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisors. These various results might be due to inherent tracing error on lateral cephalometric radiograph.

A few studies have been performed on LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisor among different malocclusions.^{1,12-14,18} According to most studies, the mean LLCRA of the Class II division 2 group is significantly lower than that of Class II Division 1, and Class III groups.^{1,13,14} On the other hand, some lateral cephalometric studies have reported that Angle Class III cases possess significantly lower LLCRA than Angle Class I and Class II division 1 cases.^{12,18}

In contrast with LLCRAs, up to date, no study has tried to measure MDCRAs of the maxillary anterior teeth. Moreover, very few attempts have been made to measure CRAs for central incisor, lateral incisor, and canine. In most previous studies, LLCRAs of maxillary central incisors were measured on two-dimensional (2D) radiograph images without orientation of the teeth according to consistent standard. However, in recent years, the development and use of cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) in orthodontics have allowed us to observe the crown and root of each teeth in three-dimension (3D) as well.¹⁹

The aim of this study was to compare CRAs of the permanent maxillary anterior teeth according to skeletal malocclusions in Korean population using CBCT.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Samples

Sixty pretreatment CBCT images were collected from the patient archive of the Department of Orthodontics, Gangneung-Wonju National University Dental Hospital, South Korea. This study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of Gangneung-Wonju National University Dental Hospital. Samples were consecutively collected until each skeletal Class I, Class II, and Class III malocclusion group based on ANB angle (Class I: $0^\circ < \text{ANB} < 4^\circ$; Class II: $\text{ANB} \geq 4^\circ$; Class III: $\text{ANB} \leq 0^\circ$) had twenty samples. Root dilacerations,²⁰ attritions on the crown²¹, and moderate or severe crowding cases²² were excluded from this retrospective study. Other details of exclusion criteria for the sample selection are summarized in Table 1. Distributions of age, ANB angle, mandibular plane angle, overjet, and overbite of patients in all groups are shown in Table 2.

Orientations of the teeth and measurements of crown-root angulation

CBCT images used in the present study were taken using an Alphard-3030 (Asahi Roentgen Industries Co., Japan) with 0.39 mm in slice thickness. The device was set at 6.0 mA and 80 kV for adult patients and 5.0 mA and 80 kV for children patients. OnDemand 3D software (Cybermed, Seoul, Korea) was used for reconstruction and orientation of images and measurement of CRA.

The maxillary central incisors, lateral incisors, and canines of the right side were evaluated in this study. As shown in Figure 1, root apex, midpoints of the mesial cemento-enamel junction (M-CEJ) and distal cemento-enamel junction (D-CEJ), and the most prominent point of the cingulum were used as landmarks for orientation and measurement.

X-axis was the line passing through M-CEJ and D-CEJ (Figure 2). The sagittal reference plane was defined as a plane being perpendicular to X-axis and passing through apex. Y-axis was the line passing projected distal CEJ point (D-CEJ') and projected cingulum point (Cingulum') on the sagittal reference plane. Z-axis was the cross product of X-axis and Y-axis.

After the orientation of each tooth, 2D coronal and sagittal images such as periapical radiograph were generated using the function in the OnDemand software. Crown axis and root axis were created on each coronal and sagittal 2D image. On the coronal image, MDCRA was measured (Figure 3A). The root axis was the line passing the root apex and the midpoint of M-CEJ and D-CEJ. The crown axis was the line passing the midpoint of M-CEJ and D-CEJ and the midpoint of incisor edges for incisors and the cusp tip for the canine. On the sagittal image, LLCRA was measured (Figure 3B). The root axis was the line passing the root apex and the midpoint of M-CEJ and D-CEJ. The crown axis was the line passing the mesiodistal midpoint of CEJ and incisor edges for incisors and the cusp tip for the canine. The obtuse angle between the root axis and the crown axis was measured to evaluate the CRA (Figure 3). An angle of less than 180° represented distal angulation of root on sagittal images and lingual angulation on coronal images. All technical procedure, orientations, and

measurements of all teeth were carried out by one examiner (Lee K. H.) with a blind procedure to minimize the examiner bias.

Method errors

Ten of 60 CBCT images were randomly selected. Landmark identifications, orientations, and measurements were repeated by the same examiner (Lee K. H.) to test method errors. The method error was calculated using Dahlberg's formula ($ME = \sqrt{\sum d^2 / 2n}$), where d was the difference between measurements and n was the sample size. Method errors of repeated measurement were 0.58° , 0.37° , and 0.39° for the MDCRA and 0.50° , 0.64° , and 0.58° for the LLCRA of the central incisor, the lateral incisor, and the canine, respectively.

Statistical analysis

The null hypothesis was that the CRA of each maxillary anterior tooth was not significantly different among skeletal Class I, Class II, and Class III groups. A nonparametric statistical test was used because variables did not show a normal distribution in the Shapiro-Wilk test. Kruskal-Wallis test was used to test differences among three groups. Mann-Whitney U test was then used to evaluate any significant difference between the two groups, and the alpha value was set at 0.017 according to Bonferroni correction ($0.05/3$). All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (PASW Statistics 18.0; IBM Co., Armonk, NY, USA).

RESULTS

Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviation of CRAs of the maxillary anterior teeth in each skeletal malocclusion group. Mean MDCRAs of the maxillary central incisor were 177.9° , 177.2° , and 178.7° in Class I, Class II, and Class III groups, respectively. MDCRAs for the lateral incisor were 177.8° , 177.6° , and 178.3° in Class I, Class II, and Class III groups, respectively. MDCRAs for the canine were 174.0° , 173.0° , and 173.9° in Class I, Class II, and Class III group, respectively. The mean MDCRAs of the maxillary anterior teeth showed no significant difference among groups.

The mean LLCRA of the maxillary central incisor was significantly lower in skeletal Class III group (174.0°) than that in Class I group (178.2°) or Class II group (178.4°). The mean LLCRA of the lateral incisor was also significantly lower in skeletal Class III group (174.0°) than that in Class I group (175.9°). Mean LLCRAs of the canine were 184.3° , 182.6° , and 183.5° in Class I, Class II, and Class III groups, respectively, showing no significant difference among groups.

Results of statistical comparisons among CRAs of the maxillary anterior teeth for each malocclusion group are shown in Table 4. The mean MDCRA of the canine was significantly lower than that of the central incisor or lateral incisor in all groups. The mean LLCRA of the maxillary canine was the greatest, followed by that of the central incisor and the lateral incisor in Class I and Class II group. However, Class III group showed no significant difference in LLCRA between the central incisor and the lateral incisor.

DISCUSSION

Tooth morphology is one of the most interesting issues in orthodontic treatment. And CRA is considered as an important feature of the tooth morphology, particularly in single rooted anterior teeth. In anatomical studies about tooth morphology, some authors have stated that the LLCRA of the maxillary central incisor is lower in deep overbite (“deckbiss”) cases.^{14,15,23} Many studies have investigated LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisors using the extracted teeth or 2D cephalometric radiograph.^{1,11-15,18} These previous studies have shown various ranges of LLCRAs of maxillary central incisors. However, no study has tried to measure MDCRAs of maxillary central incisors. This might be due to methodological limitation for measuring MDCRAs of maxillary central incisors. This was the first study to try to assess not only LLCRAs, but also MDCRAs of the maxillary anterior teeth using CBCT.

The present study showed that MDCRAs of maxillary anterior teeth were not significantly different among skeletal malocclusion groups (Table 3). In this study, samples were divided only according to skeletal malocclusion by sagittal relationships. However, other possible factors that might influence MDCRAs of maxillary anterior teeth should be considered in the future. For example, during root development and tooth eruption, crowding due to small apical base in maxilla and relationship between tooth germs might influence MDCRAs.

In the present study, the MDCRA of the maxillary central incisor was similar to that of the maxillary lateral incisor in each skeletal malocclusion. The MDCRA of the maxillary canine was significantly lower than that of the maxillary central or lateral incisor (Table 4). This indicates that orthodontists do not need to give different esthetic bend according to skeletal malocclusions in edgewise appliance technique. In addition, during positioning the bracket on canine, more crown distal tipping than original standard might be better for establishment of root parallelism.

The present study showed that the mean LLCRA of the maxillary central incisor in Class III malocclusion was lower than that in Class I or Class II division 1 malocclusion. This result is similar to the result of 2D cephalometric study conducted by Harris et al.¹². This configuration might be explained in two ways. First, Harris et al.¹² suggested that the bending phenomenon of leading low LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisors in Class III malocclusion with anterior crossbite might have resulted from maxillary central incisors being trapped within the lower arch. Second, there might be relatively increased effect of the upper lip due to a low position of the tongue in skeletal Class III malocclusion. Because teeth are generally on equilibrium state among surrounding environments, the bending phenomenon of the maxillary central incisors might be induced by the relative increased pressure of the upper lip in skeletal Class III malocclusion.

In some previous studies using 2D radiograph images, the relationship between the crown and the root of the maxillary central incisor has been determined according to malocclusions.^{1,12-14,18} Most of these studies reported that LLCRAs of maxillary central incisors in Class II division 2 were lower than those in Class I,

Class II division 1, or Class III. Backlund²³ has suggested that the lower lip can influence the maxillary incisor during eruption, causing bending phenomenon of the crown relative to the root because the level of lip line in Angle Class II division 2 is often higher than that in other malocclusions.

The differences in LLCRAs of the maxillary incisors suggest some clinical implications during orthodontic treatment. In camouflage treatment of skeletal Class III malocclusion with non-extraction, maxillary incisors generally become proclined. In such situation, orthodontists must be aware of the possibility of contact between the root and palatal cortical bone. Delivanis et al.¹⁴ and Bryant et al.¹ have also suggested similar clinical complication of low LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisor in Angle Class II division 2. McIntyre et al.¹³ have suggested that when maxillary incisors with pronounced low LLCRAs are observed, a prediction template tracing can be used to ascertain whether the expected tooth movements are feasible or whether the incisors apex would touch the palatal cortical plate.

FEM study conducted by Heravi et al.²⁴ has also pointed out that, while retracting maxillary incisors with low LLCRAs, the equivalent force can be heavier. Therefore, the amount of retraction force has to be paid attention in skeletal Class III surgery with maxillary premolar extraction.

For the maxillary lateral incisors, although LLCRAs in skeletal Class III malocclusion tended to be lower than those in skeletal Class I and Class II malocclusions, the extent was not remarkable, unlike that of the maxillary central incisors (Table 3). The mean LLCRA of the maxillary lateral incisors was similar to that of the maxillary central incisors (Table 4). These results might mean that LLCRAs of the maxillary central incisors are more influenced by skeletal Class III malocclusion than those of the maxillary lateral incisors.

Until recent times, there has been very little agreement on what factor, either environmental factor or genetic factor, has the most effect on the bending phenomenon of the maxillary incisors. Some studies have suggested that the bending phenomenon of the maxillary incisors among malocclusions is due to multiplicity of environmental forces such as lip, tongue, and overbite relationship.^{12,23} However, Logan²⁵ has indicated that genetic factor also can be a primary cause of the relationship between the crown and the root of the maxillary incisors.

There have been some previous studies about LLCRAs of the maxillary anterior teeth using 2D cephalometric radiograph.^{1,12-14,18} However, studies using 2D cephalometric radiograph generally have inherent tracing error by overlap of the anterior teeth, 3D position of the teeth or blunt.^{26,27} Some classical studies have also used extracted incisors to measure LLCRAs.^{11,15} Clinically speaking, it is difficult to collect the extracted sound anterior teeth. Therefore, this present study first tried to investigate CRAs of anterior teeth after orientation of individual teeth via reference lines using CBCT.

This study has several limitations. To assess CRAs of maxillary anterior teeth according to skeletal malocclusions, some environmental factors that might influence CRAs were not considered. Also, because of sample shortage, Angle Class II division 2 malocclusion could not be evaluated. A further direction of this study will be to elucidate various environmental factors and assess CRAs of not only anterior teeth, but also posterior teeth with sufficient sample size.

CONCLUSIONS

- Mesiodistal crown-root angulations of the maxillary anterior teeth were not significantly different among skeletal Class I, Class II, and Class III malocclusion groups.
- However, labiolingual crown-root angulations were significantly lower in skeletal Class III group than those in Class I and Class II groups.
- Skeletal Class III malocclusion might affect labiolingual crown-root angulation of the maxillary incisors, especially the central incisor.

REFERENCES

1. Bryant RM, Sadowsky PL, Hazelrig JB. Variability in three morphologic features of the permanent maxillary central incisor. *Am J Orthod* 1984;86:25-32.
2. Andrews LF. The straight-wire appliance, origin, controversy, commentary. *J Clin Orthod* 1976;10:99-114.
3. Carlson SK, Johnson E. Bracket positioning and resets: five steps to align crowns and roots consistently. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2001;119:76-80.
4. Taylor NG, Cook PA. The reliability of positioning pre-adjusted brackets: an in vitro study. *Br J Orthod* 1992;19:25-34.
5. Meyer M, Nelson G. Preadjusted edgewise appliances: theory and practice. *Am J Orthod* 1978;73:485-98.
6. Germane N, Bentley B, Isaacson RJ, Revere JH, Jr. The morphology of canines in relation to preadjusted appliances. *Angle Orthod* 1990;60:49-54.
7. Balut N, Klapper L, Sandrik J, Bowman D. Variations in bracket placement in the preadjusted orthodontic appliance. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1992;102:62-7.
8. Creekmore TD, Kunik RL. Straight wire: the next generation. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1993;104:8-20.
9. Shroff B. Root correction during orthodontic therapy. *Semin Orthod* 2001;7:50-8.
10. Mavroskoufis F, Ritchie GM. Variation in size and form between left and right maxillary central incisor teeth. *J Prosthet Dent* 1980;43:254-7.
11. van Loenen M, Degrieck J, De Pauw G, Dermaut L. Anterior tooth morphology and its effect on torque. *Eur J Orthod* 2005;27:258-62.
12. Harris EF, Hassankiadeh S, Harris JT. Maxillary incisor crown-root relationships in different angle malocclusions. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1993;103:48-53.
13. McIntyre GT, Millett DT. Crown-root shape of the permanent maxillary central incisor. *Angle Orthod* 2003;73:710-5.
14. Delivanis HP, Kuftinec MM. Variation in morphology of the maxillary central incisors found in class II,

- division 2 malocclusions. *Am J Orthod* 1980;78:438-43.
15. Carlsson R, Rönnerman A. Crown-root angles of upper central incisors. *Am J Orthod* 1973;64:147-54.
 16. Sicher H, Du Brul EL. *Oral Anatomy* (5th edn.) St Louis: Mosby; 1970.
 17. Taylor RM. Variation in form of human teeth: I. An anthropologic and forensic study of maxillary incisors. *J Dent Res* 1969;48:5-16.
 18. Hong H, Baik HS. Maxillary incisor crown-root angle(collum angle) in different malocclusions. *Korean J Orthod* 1995;25:453-63.
 19. Tong H, Enciso R, Van Elslande D, Major PW, Sameshima GT. A new method to measure mesiodistal angulation and faciolingual inclination of each whole tooth with volumetric cone-beam computed tomography images. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2012;142:133-43.
 20. Chohayeb AA. Dilaceration of permanent upper lateral incisors: frequency, direction, and endodontic treatment implications. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 1983;55:519-20.
 21. Smith BG, Knight JK. An index for measuring the wear of teeth. *Br Dent J* 1984;156:435-8.
 22. Little RM. The Irregularity Index: A quantitative score of mandibular anterior alignment. *Am J Orthod* 1975;68:554-63.
 23. Backlund E. Tooth form and overbite. *Trans Eur Orthod Soc* 1960;36:97-103.
 24. Heravi F, Salari S, Tanbakuchi B, Loh S, Amiri M. Effects of crown-root angle on stress distribution in the maxillary central incisors' PDL during application of intrusive and retraction forces: a three-dimensional finite element analysis. *Prog Orthod* 2013;14:26.
 25. Logan WR. Deckbiss-a clinical evaluation. *Trans Eur Orthod Soc* 1959;35:313-7.
 26. Macri V, Athanasiou AE. Sources of error in lateral cephalometry. In Athanasiou AE. *Orthodontic cephalometry*. London: Mosby-Wolfe; 1995;125-40.
 27. Houston WJ, Maher RE, McElroy D, Sherriff M. Sources of error in measurements from cephalometric radiographs. *Eur J Orthod* 1986;8:149-51.




Figure 1. Four reference points: apex, mesial cemento-enamel junction (M-CEJ), distal cemento-enamel junction (D-CEJ), and cingulum. (A) Coronal view, and (B) proximal view.




Figure 2. 3D orientation of tooth. (A) X-axis is the line passing through M-CEJ and D-CEJ. Y-axis is the line passing projected distal CEJ (D-CEJ') and projected cingulum point (Cingulum') on the sagittal reference plane. (B) Z-axis is the cross product of X-axis and Y-axis.




Figure 3. Measurement of the crown-root angulation (CRA). (A) Mesiodistal CRA (MDCRA) in the coronal plane, and (B) labiolingual CRA (LLCRA) in the sagittal plane.

Table 1. Exclusion criteria for the sample selection

Incomplete root development of the anterior teeth
Root dilacerations (root deviation of 20 degrees or more by Chohayeb ²⁰)
Malformed tooth (including peg lateralis)
Fracture of the crown
Attrition on the crown (more than score 2 in the tooth wear index by Smith and Knight ²¹)
Restoration on the crown
Endodontic treatment of the root
Orofacial cleft and/or craniofacial syndrome
Moderate or severe crowding (more than score 4 in the irregularity index by Little ²²)
Previous orthodontic treatment
Severe retroclined incisors for the Class II group (Angle Class II division 2)
Positive anterior overjet for the Class III group

Table 2. Ages and sagittal and vertical relationships for all groups

	Class I (n=20)		Class II (n=20)		Class III (n=20)		Kruskal- Wallis test	Mann- Whitney U test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sig	Sig
Age (years)	16.4	2.7	16.5	4.9	19.0	3.2	**	III > I, II
Sagittal relationship								
ANB (degree)	2.6	1.1	7.0	1.4	-3.0	2.2	***	II > I > III
overjet (mm)	4.7	2.0	7.6	2.9	-3.1	1.5	***	II > I > III
Vertical relationship								
Go-Me to FH plane (degree)	26.9	5.4	29.9	4.9	26.2	4.5	NS	NS
overbite (mm)	1.4	1.3	2.9	1.9	2.7	1.9	*	II > I

ANB, A point-nasion-B point angle; FH, Frankfort horizontal; SD, standard deviation; NS, not significant.

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.

Table 3. Mean and standard deviation (SD) of CRA of three groups

CRA	Class I (n=20)		Class II (n=20)		Class III (n=20)		Kruskal- Wallis test	Mann- Whitney U test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sig	Sig
MDCRA								
#11	177.9	2.3	177.2	2.7	178.7	3.0	NS	NS
#12	177.8	3.8	177.6	3.1	178.3	3.7	NS	NS
#13	174.0	3.2	173.0	3.3	173.9	4.3	NS	NS
LLCRA								
#11	178.2	3.0	178.4	3.7	174.0	3.5	***	I, II > III
#12	175.9	1.8	175.0	2.3	174.0	2.4	*	I > III
#13	184.3	3.6	182.6	2.2	183.5	3.0	NS	NS

NS, not significant; *p<0.05; ***p<0.001.

Table 4. Statistical comparison of the maxillary anterior teeth in each group

CRA	Kruskal Wallis test	Mann-Whitney U test		
		#11 vs #12	#11 vs #13	#12 vs #13
MDCRA				
Class I	<.001***	.547	.002**	<.001***
Class II	<.001***	.904	<.001***	<.001***
Class III	<.001***	.738	<.001***	<.001***
LLCRA				
Class I	<.001***	.002**	<.001***	<.001***
Class II	<.001***	<.001***	<.001***	<.001***
Class III	<.001***	.968	<.001***	<.001***

P<0.01; *P<0.001.