



Mark Lowey MSc FDS BDS MOrth DOrth LDS RCS (Eng.) MNTF

REMOVABLE RETAINERS VERSUS FIXED RETAINERS.

RETENTION IT'S A FOREVER THING FOR 66% of the POPULATION.

From “**Current controversies in Orthodontics**” **BIRTE MELSEN 1991.**

”it is important to consider the controversial risk to the periodontium from orthodontic treatment. plaque-associated inflammatory lesion in a thin gingival unit that is already susceptible to breakdown

Eur. J. Orthod. 4: 77-86, 1982

[Levin L](#), [Samorodnitzky-Naveh GR](#), [Machtei EE](#). *J periodontal* 2008 79(11) 2087-92

“The use of postorthodontic fixed retainers made of wire and composite resin bonded to the lingual/palatal tooth aspect is a common practice that can affect gingival health. Labial gingival recession was significantly greater in treated (0.13 +/- 0.2 mm) patients compared to non-treated patients (0.05 +/- 0.2 mm; P = 0.03). Localized lingual gingival recession was significantly greater in teeth with fixed retainers (0.09 +/- 0.2 mm) compared to teeth with no fixed retainers (0.01 +/- 0.1 mm; P = 0.0002), as were plaque and gingival indices and bleeding on probing. Plaque on the lingual/palatal aspect showed a weak, positive correlation with lingual gingival recession (r = 0.16; P = 0.033). CONCLUSION: Orthodontic treatment and fixed retainers were associated with an increased incidence of gingival recession, increased plaque retention, and increased bleeding on probing;”

[Katsaros C](#), [Livas C](#), [Renkema AM](#). *Am J Orthod* 2007 132(6) 838-41

“Twenty-one patients with FSW (Fixed spiral wire) retainers bonded on all 6 mandibular anterior teeth presented unexpected posttreatment changes in that region. Almost half of these patients were assessed as needing retreatment. CONCLUSIONS: FSW retainers bonded on the 6 mandibular anterior teeth might cause unexpected movements of anterior teeth to such an extent that retreatment is necessary. Clinicians should consider this possibility when planning the retention strategy.”

[Atack N](#), [Harradine N](#), [Sandy JR](#), [Ireland AJ](#). *Angle Orthod* 2007 77(9)954-9


“RESULTS: Statistically significant changes in Little's index occurred in the lower labial segment of both study groups ($P = .001$) over the observation period. Bonded retainers tended to be placed in older patients ($P = .02$). CONCLUSIONS: Relapse can occur in the lower labial segment with both fixed and removable retainers. The amount of relapse seen with both types of retainer is not statistically significantly different.”

[Pandis N](#), [Vlahopoulos K](#), [Madianos P](#), [Eliades T](#). Eur J Orthod 2007 29(5) 471-6

“The long-term group presented higher calculus accumulation, greater marginal recession, and increased probing depth ($P < 0.05$). The results of this study raise the question of the appropriateness of lingual fixed retainers as a standard retention plan for all patients regardless of their attitude to dental hygiene. They also emphasize the importance of individual variability and cautious application of retention protocols after a thorough consideration of issues related to the anatomy of tissues and oral hygiene.”



Failed fixed retainer case. Orthodontics in Norway twice with premolar extractions which had to be retreated with fixed appliances for a third time and surgery. Fixed retainers had been placed on both the upper and lower jaw from 3-3 in both jaws. Case now 8 years post treatment with removable retainers.



failed fixed retainer from lower 3-3 with associated gum disease.



Failed fixed retainer in Norwegian patient. Removed and treated with a removable retainer only.



8 weeks treatment. Part time wear.



Failed Norwegian fixed retention case fixed retainers on both upper and lower jaws3-3. Paid for and treated twice. Offered a third course of fixed appliances. N.B.THE BUCCAL ROTATION.

Removed and treated by me with removable retainers only part time wear in 6 months.



The last photograph is my own wife's retainer. Her teeth are not stable either but she has used the same retainer for twelve years now at night to retain them.



I have a collection of numerous other cases with broken fixed retainers, periodontal disease, distorted arches and caries should you wish to see them.

© 27.1.14

Outcome of a scheme for specialist orthodontic care, a follow-up study in 31-year-olds.

[Lagerström L](#), [Fornell AC](#), [Stenvik A](#).

Source

Department of Orthodontics, Halmstad, Sweden. lennart.lagerstrom@telia.com

Abstract

Changes in the occlusion after orthodontic treatment have in several studies been analyzed by the use of the PAR Index developed by Shaw & Richmond. The use of the PAR Index has been shown by O'Brien & Shaw to be a reliable and reproducible method to evaluate orthodontic treatment results. The purpose of the study was to examine the long-range orthodontic treatment outcome by following a group of patients into adulthood to the age of 31 years. For the study 115 individuals from a previous randomized study were invited for follow-up examination at age 31 years. Seventy-two individuals, 32 males (44.4%) and 40 females (55.6%) of the original sample attended for clinical examination. Study casts were obtained and questionnaires addressing the patient's awareness and opinion of the treatment were distributed. In addition twenty-four subjects responded by returning filled-in questionnaires. The mean change in wPAR scores from start to retention represents a mean relative improvement in occlusion of 78.7%. The mean wPar score improvement from age 19 to 31 years was 11.9%. The relative mean wPar score change dropped to 53.5% at age 31 years. The differences in wPAR recordings between the recorded stages were all statistically significant. The treatment outcome as expressed by mean wPAR scores at age 31 years was significantly better among individuals treated with extractions compared to those treated without extractions. The mean wPAR scores of the individuals with retainers at age 31 years were significantly lower when compared to the mean score for those without retainers (unpaired t-test, $p = 0.020$). This clearly indicates the benefit of long-term retention. The changes in the concern scores from 19 to 31 years of age were small. At age 31 years only 8 of the 96 respondents (8.3%) expressed concern about the treatment outcome.

PMID:

[Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop](#), 2011 Feb;139(2):192-5.

Release of bisphenol-A from a light-cured adhesive bonded to lingual fixed retainers.

[Eliades T](#), [Voutsas D](#), [Sifakakis J](#), [Makou M](#), [Katsaros C](#).

Source

Department of Orthodontics, School of Dentistry, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece. teliades@ath.forthnet.gr

Abstract

INTRODUCTION:

Our aim was to quantitatively determine the bisphenol-A (BPA) released from a light-cured orthodontic adhesive used to bond lingual fixed retainers.

METHODS:

Eighteen recently extracted premolars, divided into 3 groups of 6 teeth each, were embedded in plaster in an arch shape. A light-cured adhesive (Transbond XT, 3M Unitek, Monrovia, Calif) was bonded to a .0195-in, 3-strand heat-treated twist flex wire (Wildcat, GAC International, Bohemia, NY) adjusted to the lingual surface of the teeth, and the arches were immersed in doubled-distilled water for 10, 20, and 30 days. The concentration of BPA in the 3 eluents was investigated with gas chromatography-mass spectroscopy; all assays were performed in triplicate, and the results were averaged.

RESULTS:

Measurable amounts of BPA were identified for all groups, with the highest found in the immersion media of the 1-month groups (2.9 µg/L), whereas the control (tooth storage solution) had 0.16 µg/L.

CONCLUSIONS:

The BPA released from a light-cured adhesive used to bond lingual fixed retainers might be assigned to the application mode of the material that differs from conventional use. Further testing including estrogenicity assays will assess the potential estrogenic action of this application. Composite restorative resins should replace orthodontic adhesives that were not intended to function with their surfaces in the oral cavity; alternatively, canine-bonded fixed retainers might reduce the amount of adhesive used.

Copyright © 2011 American Association of Orthodontists. Published by Mosby, Inc. All rights reserved.

PMID:

21300247

[PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

21591599

[PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

Long-term periodontal status of patients with mandibular lingual fixed retention

1. [N. Pandis*](#),
2. [K. Vlahopoulos*](#),
3. [P. Madianos**](#) and
4. [T. Eliades***](#)

[±](#)Author Affiliations

1. *Private practice, Corfu
2. **Department of Periodontology, School of Dentistry, University of Athens
3. ***Department of Orthodontics, School of Dentistry, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece
1. *Address for correspondence* Theodore Eliades, 57 Agnoston Hiroon, Nea Ionia 14231, Greece, E-mail: tealiades@ath.forthnet.gr

[Next Section](#)

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the periodontal tissues of patients with mandibular fixed retention for long or short periods of time. A total of 64 individuals were selected for this study using the following inclusion criteria: long-term lingual fixed retention; identical type of lingual fixed retainer bonded with the same materials; no cavities, restorations, or fractures of the mandibular anterior teeth; absence of habits and occlusal interferences; and canine guidance bilaterally. The resultant sample comprised 32 patients (mean age 25 years) who had been in retention for a mean period of 9.65 years (range 9–11 years) and an equal number retained for a period between 3 and 6 months. Plaque, gingival, and calculus indices, probing pocket depth, marginal recession, and bone

level at the mandibular six anterior teeth were recorded for both groups. Demographic, clinical, and radiographic data were investigated with conventional descriptive statistics. Comparisons of the different variables between the two participant groups (long- and short-term retention) were carried out using a Mann–Whitney test for indices (plaque, gingival, and calculus), and a Fisher's exact test (two sided) for the remaining variables.

No significant difference was found with respect to the plaque and gingival indices and bone level between the two groups. The long-term group presented higher calculus accumulation, greater marginal recession, and increased probing depth ($P < 0.05$). The results of this study raise the question of the appropriateness of lingual fixed retainers as a standard retention plan for all patients regardless of their attitude to dental hygiene. They also emphasize the importance of individual variability and cautious application of retention protocols after a thorough consideration of issues related to the anatomy of tissues and oral hygiene.

[Previous Section](#)[Next Section](#)

Introduction

Fixed lingual retainers, bonded to mandibular anterior teeth, were introduced in the 1970s ([Knelrim, 1973](#)), and established as an integral part of orthodontic treatment to prevent relapse or secondary crowding of mandibular incisors ([Little et al., 1988](#)). A survey ([Keim et al., 2002](#)) showed that nearly one-third of the practitioners in the United States of America routinely use fixed retainers in the mandibular arch, a higher figure than that reported previously.

The first generation of fixed retainers, typically involved large-diameter section stainless steel round wire (0.030–0.032 inch), bonded on the lingual surface of the canines. Later, smaller diameter braided or coaxial round wires, or reduced cross-section rectangular wires of various compositions and resilience, bonded on all mandibular anterior teeth were introduced ([Zachrisson, 1977, 1983](#); [Årtun and Zachrisson, 1982](#)). More recently, fibre-reinforced materials ([Diamond, 1987](#); [Orchin, 1990](#); [Geserick et al., 2004](#)), as well as alumina ceramic retainers ([Amundsen and Wisth, 2006](#)) have been used.

The main advantage of the mandibular fixed intercanine retainer compared with the removable retainer is that they are invisible, are well-tolerated by patients and as such are virtually compliance free ([Zachrisson, 1977](#)). On the other hand, some of the disadvantages are attributed to the demanding technique of placing the retainer ([Zachrisson, 1983](#)) and the potential for tooth movement due to distortion or lack of passivity of the wire. Bond failures may also constitute a problem, estimated to range between 6 and 20 per cent, depending on the technique used and follow-up observation period ([Dahl and Zachrisson, 1991](#); [Årtun et al., 1997](#)). Additionally, bonded fixed retainers have been shown to increase plaque and calculus accumulation compared with removable retainers. This, however, was not found to have detrimental effects on the integrity of the dental hard tissues adjacent to the wire ([Gorelick et al., 1982](#)). Interestingly, no difference in plaque accumulation was found between multistrand and plain wire lingual retainers ([Årtun, 1984](#)).

Despite the fact that there is a definitive trend to resort, at an increasingly high rate, to fixed retention in an attempt to seek long-term stability ([Keim et al., 2002](#)), there is very limited information on the periodontal effects of long-term mandibular lingual fixed retention ([Heier et al., 1997](#)). With fixed retention periods becoming longer, it is important to evaluate the possible effects of long-term fixed retention on the surrounding tissues.

The purpose of this study was therefore to evaluate the periodontal tissues of patients with mandibular fixed retention for long- or short-term periods of time.

[Previous Section](#)[Next Section](#)

Subjects and methods

The record of individuals participating in the study group were selected from a larger pool of patients treated at the practice of the first author, using the following inclusion criteria: lingual fixed retention for a period of at least 9 years; identical type of lingual fixed retainer; no cavities, restorations, or fractures on the mandibular anterior teeth; absence of habits and occlusal interferences; and canine guidance bilaterally. Thirty-two patients (11 males, 21 females, mean age 25 years) who had been in retention for a mean period of 9.65 years (range 9–11 years) were recalled for an examination and a comprehensive periodontal evaluation. These patients had been treated by the same orthodontist with a 0.022-inch edgewise appliance. In all cases, the fixed mandibular retainer was placed following the completion of treatment and was constructed intraorally using a braided 0.195-inch wire (Wildcat,

GAC, Central Islip, New York, USA), bonded with a two-phase paste adhesive (Excel, Reliance Orthodontics, Itasca, Illinois, USA), by the same clinician. At the time of placement of the retention wire, all patients were instructed to undertake meticulous dental hygiene and to visit their dentist annually for monitoring of the periodontal status. Regarding the recall for the study, patients were asked to avoid visiting the dentist for a period of at least 1 month prior to the recall appointment at the orthodontic office.

The control group consisted of 32 patients treated by the same orthodontist who had undergone similar treatment, who had their treatment completed and received a similarly constructed fixed lingual retainer 3–6 months before the recall. Before this appointment, all patients were instructed not to visit the general dentist for dental cleaning. The patients were informed of the purpose of the study and consent was obtained.

For both groups, the following clinical variables were assessed by a periodontist:

1. Plaque index (PI), as described by [Löe \(1967\)](#), was evaluated with a disclosing agent (Dual Tone, Young Dental, Earth City, Missouri, USA) on the buccal and lingual surfaces for all mandibular anterior teeth (incisors and canines). Plaque accumulation was categorized using the following scale:

- absence of plaque 0:
- plaque disclosed after running the probe along the gingival margin 1:
- visible plaque 2:
- abundant plaque 3:

The results of the PI were averaged for all six mandibular teeth and a mean value for each subject was estimated.

2. Gingival index (GI) as described by [Löe \(1967\)](#) was estimated on a participant basis as an average of the measurements of the individual GI on the mesial, lingual, buccal, and distal surfaces of the six selected teeth according to the following scale:

- absence of inflammation 0:
- mild inflammation, with a slight change in colour and subtle change in texture; no bleeding on probing 1:
- moderate inflammation with a moderate glazing, redness, oedema, and hypertrophy; bleeding on pressure 2:
- severe inflammation with marked redness and hypertrophy tendency to spontaneous bleeding ulceration. 3:

3. Calculus index (CI) evaluated as an estimate of the coronal extension of supragingival calculus and/or the presence of separate flecks of a continuous band of subgingival calculus ([Greene and Vermillion, 1960](#)). The following scale was used:


- absence of calculus 0:
- presence of calculus covering up to one-third of the tooth surface 1:
- presence of calculus covering up to two-thirds of the tooth surface and/or the presence of separate flecks of subgingival calculus 2:
- presence of calculus covering more than two-thirds of the tooth surface and/or the presence of a continuous band of subgingival calculus. 3:

The results of the CI were averaged for all six mandibular teeth and a mean value for each subject was calculated.

4. Probing depth (PD), measured with a periodontal probe (NC 15, Hu-Friedy, Chicago, Illinois, USA), was recorded as the distance from the gingival margin to the most apical part of the sulcus. Six readings were carried out per tooth

(mesiobuccal, mesial, distobuccal, mesiolingual, lingual, distolingual). PDs smaller than or equal to 3 mm ($PD \leq 3$ mm) received a value of zero, while readings larger than 3 mm ($PD > 3$ mm) were assigned a value of one. Data analysis included the resultant entries per individual.

5. Marginal recession, defined as the distance between the cementoenamel junction (CEJ) and the gingival margin was measured with a periodontal probe (NC 15, Hu-Friedy). Scores in millimetres were recorded only when a recession was present, i.e. when the CEJ was visible. Data analysis included the resultant recordings per participant.
6. Bone level, defined as the distance from the CEJ to the alveolar crest on radiographs. For this purpose, two digital periapical radiographs were taken of each subject including the mesial of the lower canines, and all four mandibular incisors, using the Elitys radiographic unit (Trophy, Kodak, New York, USA). The parallel cone technique was used with a Rinn XCP holder (Dentsply, York, Pennsylvania, USA) and a 10 mm probe (NC 15) was placed at the lingual side of the teeth prior to taking the radiographs in order to calibrate measurements using the integrated digital radiography software (Trophy RVG; [Figure 1](#)). Bone level (B-CEJ) readings smaller than 2.5 mm received a value of zero, while readings larger than 2.5 mm were given a value of one. Data analysis included the resultant recordings per subject.



[View larger version:](#)

- [In this page](#)
- [In a new window](#)
- [Download as PowerPoint Slide](#)

Figure 1

Radiograph of a patient with bone loss (periodontal probe is attached for estimation of loss).

Statistical analysis

Demographic, clinical, and radiographic data were investigated with conventional descriptive statistics. Comparisons of the different variables between the two groups were undertaken using the Mann–Whitney test for indices (plaque, gingival, and calculus), and Fisher's exact (two-sided) for tests producing ordinal data (PD, clinical attachment loss, and bone level). All data analysis was performed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Inc., version 14.0, Chicago, Illinois, USA) and the level of statistical significance in all analyses was set to 0.05.

[Previous Section](#)[Next Section](#)

Results

[Table 1](#) shows the distribution of demographic variables in the two groups. The gender distribution, Angle classification, and the number of extractions were the same in the two

groups. In contrast, age demonstrated a statistically significant difference with the short-term retention group showing, on average, a 9-year difference relative to the long-term group.

[View this table:](#)

- [In this window](#)
- [In a new window](#)

Table 1

Demographic and clinical characteristics of the two groups in the study.

[Table 2](#) shows the PI, GI, and CI scores for the long- and short-term groups. No difference was found for PI and GI, whereas the long-term group showed significantly higher CI scores.

[View this table:](#)

- [In this window](#)
- [In a new window](#)

Table 2

Comparison of periodontal (PI), gingival (GI), and calculus indices (CI) scores between the long- and short-term retention groups.

[Tables 3–6](#) depict the findings for PD, marginal recession, and bone level measurements. A significantly higher prevalence of deep pockets (≥ 4 mm) and marginal recession was found for the long-term retention group. It should be noted, however, that out of eight subjects exhibiting recessions, two showed a lingually located recession. No difference was noted with respect to bone level between the groups.

[View this table:](#)

- [In this window](#)
- [In a new window](#)

Table 3

Comparison of probing depth interval scores between the long- and short-term retention groups.

[View this table:](#)

- [In this window](#)
- [In a new window](#)

Table 4

Comparison of marginal recession interval scores between the long- and short-term retention groups.

[View this table:](#)

- [In this window](#)
- [In a new window](#)

Table 5

Location of recessions observed in the long-term retention group. Only sites with recession ≥ 1 mm are shown.

[View this table:](#)

- [In this window](#)

Table 6

Comparison of bone level data between the long- and short-term retention groups.

[Previous Section](#)[Next Section](#)

Discussion

Use of lingual fixed retainers in the mandibular arch offers the advantage of a lack of occlusal interferences and the necessity for bonding the wire in the proximity of free gingiva. On the other hand, bonding of this type of retainer in the maxillary arch is often complex since the opposing mandibular incisors occlude with the wire or adhesive, whereas gingival orientation of the wire to avoid premature contacts may promote gingival reactions.

The use of indices initially focused on individual patient needs, such as assessing the progression of pathology or hygiene compliance in specific arch sites. However, their application has expanded to involve research with the objective of characterizing the periodontal status of a population and the effectiveness of treatment protocols. The latter application constitutes an inappropriate use because indices scores, which are basically ordinal data, are treated as nominal, and a mean and standard deviation from multiple measurements are extrapolated. Apart from this inappropriateness, the results obtained have no physical meaning: for example, a PI index of 1.4 does not mean that the area of tooth covered by plaque is 1.4 times higher than that with an index of 1. Nonetheless, since their introduction, there have been numerous publications on this issue and this fact coupled with their popularity as a research tool, render their use valid in the comparative assessment of periodontal status of patients before and after the initiation of treatment or a change in hygiene routine ([Løe, 1967](#)). The results of this study suggest that the placement of lingual fixed retainers for long periods promote calculus accumulation, marginal recession, and increased PD, but has no effect on plaque and gingival indices or bone level.

Calculus accumulation relates to the increased availability of retentive sites for microbial colonization, which are being calcified at a later stage. It is probable that retainers increase the calculus presence through the resin margins, which extend lingually to the free gingiva, offering a substrate favouring biofilm precipitation. In general, the outcome of biofilm adsorption is dependent on the biological fluid flow rate at the site of contact, the type of interfacial interactions involved, and the attachment strength with the substrate ([White, 1997](#)). The multiplicity of oral flora and biofilm changes accompanying the placement of a material in the oral cavity emphasize the necessity for meticulous fabrication of lingual retainers. A firm adaptation of the wire to the lingual tooth surface is critical, along with the application of a very thin layer of adhesive, which should not extend beyond the middle two-thirds of the lingual crown surface. Care must be taken to ensure clearance of the resin from the interproximal and gingival areas. For greater control, a layer of varnish should be applied to the lingual tooth surface area where resin is undesirable prior to acid etching, to prevent resin impregnation into these areas.

The increased marginal recession in long-termed retained mandibular teeth documented in this study may have many explanations. Although it could correlate with the increased calculus accumulation, since the latter has been found to significantly promote recession ([Albandar and Kingman, 1999](#); [Susin et al., 2004](#)), it seems that in these subjects, a direct connection between the placement of retainers and recession is unlikely due to the buccal location of recession in the majority of subjects.

Additionally, proclination of mandibular incisors induced by treatment has been linked to decreased attachment levels, contributing to recession ([Yared et al., 2006](#)). Even though this hypothesis has not been unanimously accepted ([Ruf et al., 1998](#); [Allais and Melsen, 2003](#)), there is a possibility that proclined mandibular incisors retained with a fixed bonded appliance for long periods of time may cause attachment loss. The investigations which rejected the involvement of incisor proclination in recession, did not consider the long-term presence of a bonded appliance on the proclined teeth for a period of 10 years. This may differentiate the effect of proclination, potentially inflicting additional changes in the periodontium.

In this study, the numbers of extractions in each group were randomly distributed thus excluding the possibility that the recession may be treatment associated, such as excessive protrusion of incisors.

It may be worth noting that because of the difficulty in following the same population for a decade, this study included different samples with a mean age difference of 9 years. The effect of this age difference may have a discriminating action in modifying some of the variables recorded in this study. In general, recession tends to increase with age ([Vehkalahti, 1989](#); [Thomson et al., 2006](#)), because of the accumulation of damage and microbial action over the years, the higher probability for disease and smoking, as well as inappropriate brushing techniques. The latter has been demonstrated through studies in individuals who brushed frequently and presented higher recession than those who brushed less frequently ([Serino et al., 1994](#)). A factor, which differentiates the effect of brushing on recession in this investigation is that the former studies focused almost exclusively on premolars and molars and not mandibular incisors.

A small number of studies have included distribution of recession site per tooth type. [Susin et al. \(2004\)](#) found, in a group between 14 and 29 years of age, marginal recession of 29.5 per cent with approximately 29 per cent prevalence on lower incisors, and around 9 per cent for lower canines. [Thomson et al. \(2000\)](#) evaluated the periodontium of 914 individuals, all 26 years of age, and found marginal recession equal to or larger than 1 mm in 70 per cent of the sample. Regarding the location of marginal recession, approximately half of the mandibular canines and incisors were affected. The sample studied in this investigation, with an average age of 26 years, showed a 25 per cent marginal recession of the anterior mandibular region, and in view of the aforementioned findings, it may be argued that the marginal recession rate of this sample exhibited patterns which were no worse compared with those reported by [Thomson et al. \(2000\)](#). Thus, orthodontic retention may not have affected the recession prevalence in the long-term sample. However, it was not specified in the studies by [Susin et al. \(2004\)](#) and [Thomson et al. \(2000\)](#) whether the sample included individuals, who received, at some point, orthodontic treatment and were fitted with lingual retainers.

PD increase seems to be independent of age, with the exception of subjects where heavy smoking and negligent oral hygiene establish an early periodontal breakdown and premature onset of periodontal disease; however, these parameters should not be attributed to age-induced alterations ([Erdemir and Bergstrom, 2006](#)). Thus, more likely, increased PD should be attributed to long-term irritation of tissues induced by the retainer.

Bone level in this research was shown not to vary between the two groups. Nonetheless, there is some scepticism over the reliability of periapical radiographs in revealing the extent of this treatment side-effect because of the orientation of the crown and the lack of information on the labial and lingual bony plates. Although a standard screening examination relies on periapical radiographs to assess bone levels, research on autopsy material has revealed bone dehiscence and fenestrations, which were not depicted on radiographs ([Wehrbein et al., 1995](#)). Therefore, the screening examination as employed in this study possesses a high false negative value because of its inability to detect loss at specific areas.

The findings of this investigation should be interpreted with caution because cultural variations and oral hygiene may have an effect on the examined variables. Clinical trials have demonstrated a cultural variability in a number of orthodontic treatment parameters. For example, clinical failure rate of brackets has shown a preference to male participants in a Scandinavian population ([Adolfsson et al., 2002](#)), in contrast to other European countries, whereas failure in some cases is confined to a specific side ([Pandis et al., 2006](#)). Thus, the level of oral hygiene of the participants, along with other dietary factors may have a pronounced effect on altering the results of some of the variables examined.

[Previous Section](#)[Next Section](#)

Conclusions

The findings of this study, albeit taking into account the foregoing limitations, suggest that long-term retention with mandibular-bonded appliances results in some changes in the periodontal condition of subjects with retainers, which in most cases is confined to a minute increase in various indices and parameters. The clinical impact of these changes may be overestimated in this study, particularly for those variables which show age dependence. However, the findings emphasize the value of individual variability and cautious application of retention protocols after a thorough consideration of anatomic, hygiene, social, and cultural

factors. Most importantly, the evidence presented highlights the importance of close monitoring of patients through frequent recalls.

- [© The Author 2007. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Orthodontic Society. All rights reserved. For permissions, please email: \[journals.permissions@oxfordjournals.org\]\(mailto:journals.permissions@oxfordjournals.org\).
\[Previous Section\]\(#\)](#)

References

1. 

1. Adolfsson U,
2. Larsson E,
3. Øgaard B
. Bond failure of a no-mix adhesive during orthodontic treatment. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics 2002;122:277-281.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

2. 

1. Albandar J M,
2. Kingman A
. Gingival recession, gingival bleeding, and dental calculus in adults 30 years of age and older in the United States, 1988–1994. Journal of Periodontology 1999;70:30-43.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

3. 

1. Allais D,
2. Melsen B
. Does labial movement of lower incisors influence the level of the gingival margin? A case-control study of adult orthodontic patients. European Journal of Orthodontics 2003;25:343-352.

[Abstract/FREE Full Text](#)

4. 

1. Amundsen OC,
2. Wisth PJ
. LingLock™ the flossable retainer. Journal of Orthodontics 2006;32:241-243.

[CrossRef](#)

5. 

1. Årtun J
. Caries and periodontal reactions associated with long-term use of different types of bonded lingual retainers. American Journal of Orthodontics 1984;86:112-118.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

6. 

1. Årtun J,
2. Zachrisson BU

. Improving the handling properties of a composite resin for direct bonding. American Journal of Orthodontics 1982;81:269-276.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

7. 

1. Årtun J,
2. Spadafora AT,
3. Shapiro PA
. A 3-year follow-up study of various types of orthodontic canine-to-canine retainers. European Journal of Orthodontics 1997;19:501-509.

[Abstract/FREE Full Text](#)

8. 

1. Dahl EH,
2. Zachrisson BU
. Long-term experience with direct-bonded lingual retainers. Journal of Clinical Orthodontics 1991;25:619-632.

[Medline](#)

9. 

1. Diamond M
. Resin fiberglass bonded retainer. Journal of Clinical Orthodontics 1987;21:182-183.

[Medline](#)

10. 

1. Erdemir EO,
2. Bergstrom J
. Relationship between smoking and folic acid, vitamin B and some haematological variables in patients with chronic periodontal disease. Journal of Clinical Periodontology 2006;33:878-884.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

11. 

1. Geserick M,
2. Ball J,
3. Wichelhaus A
. Bonding fiber-reinforced lingual retainers with color-reactivating flowable composite. Journal of Clinical Orthodontics 2004;38:560-562.

[Medline](#)

12. 

1. Gorelick L,
2. Geiger AM,
3. Gwinnett AJ
. Incidence of white spot formation after bonding and banding. American Journal of Orthodontics 1982;81:93-98.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

13. 

1. Greene JC,
2. Vermillion JR
. The Oral Hygiene Index: a method for classifying oral hygiene status. Journal of the American Dental Association 1960;61:172-179.

14. 

1. Heier EE,
2. De Smit AA,
3. Wijgaerts IA,
4. Adriaens PA
. Periodontal implications of bonded versus removable retainers. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics 1997;112:607-616.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

15. 

1. Keim RG,
2. Gottlieb EL,
3. Nelson AH,
4. Vogels DS
. JCO study of orthodontic diagnosis and treatment procedures. Part 1: results and trends. Journal of Clinical Orthodontics 2002;36:553-568.

[Medline](#)

16. 

1. Knelrim RW
. Invisible lower cuspid to cuspid retainer. Angle Orthodontist 1973;43:218-219.

[MedlineWeb of Science](#)

17. 

1. Little RM,
2. Riedel RA,
3. Årtun J
. An evaluation of changes in mandibular anterior alignment from 10 to 20 years post-retention. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics 1988;93:423-428.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

18. 

1. Löe H
. The gingival index, plaque index and the retention index system. Journal of Periodontology 1967;38 Supplement:610-616.

[MedlineWeb of Science](#)

19. 

1. Orchin JD
. Permanent lingual bonded retainer. Journal of Clinical Orthodontics 1990;24:229-231.

[Medline](#)

20. 

1. Pandis N,
2. Polychronopoulou A,
3. Eliades T
. Failure rate of self-ligating and edgewise brackets bonded with conventional acid etching and a self-etching primer: a prospective *in vivo* study. Angle Orthodontist 2006;76:119-122.

[MedlineWeb of Science](#)

21. 

1. Ruf S,
2. Hansen K,
3. Pancherz H
. Does orthodontic proclination of lower incisors in children and adolescents cause gingival recession? American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics 1998;114:100-106.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

22. 

1. Serino G,
2. Wennström JL,
3. Lindhe J,
4. Eneroth L
. The prevalence and distribution of gingival recession in subjects with a high standard of oral hygiene. Journal of Clinical Periodontology 1994;21:57-63.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

23. 

1. Susin C,
2. Haas AN,
3. Oppermann RV,
4. Haugejorden O,
5. Albandar JM
. Gingival recession: epidemiology and risk indicators in a representative urban Brazilian population. Journal of Periodontology 2004;75:1377-1386.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

24. 

1. Thomson WM,
2. Hashim R,
3. Pack AR
. The prevalence and intraoral distribution of periodontal attachment loss in a birth cohort of 26-year-olds. Journal of Periodontology 2000;71:1840-1845.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

25. 

1. Thomson WM,
2. Broadbent JM,
3. Poulton R,

4. Beck JD
. Changes in periodontal disease experience from 26 to 32 years of age in a birth cohort. Journal of Periodontology 2006;77:947-954.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

26. [↗](#)

1. Vehkalahti M
. Occurrence of gingival recession in adults. Journal of Periodontology 1989;60:599-603.

[MedlineWeb of Science](#)

27. [↗](#)

1. Wehrbein H,
2. Fuhrmann RAW,
3. Diedrich PR
. Human histologic tissue response after long-term orthodontic tooth movement. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics 1995;107:360-371.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

28. [↗](#)

1. White DJ
. Dental calculus: recent insights on occurrence, formation, prevention, removal and oral health effects of supragingival and subgingival deposits. European Journal of Oral Sciences 1997;105:508-522.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

29. [↗](#)

1. Yared KFG,
2. Zenobio EG,
3. Pacheco W
. Periodontal status of mandibular central incisors after orthodontic proclination in adults. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics 2006;130:6.e1-6.e8.

30. [↗](#)

1. Zachrisson BU
. Clinical experience with direct-bonded orthodontic retainers. American Journal of Orthodontics 1977;71:440-448.

[CrossRefMedlineWeb of Science](#)

31. [↗](#)

1. Zachrisson BU
. The bonded lingual retainer and multiple spacing of anterior teeth. Journal of Clinical Orthodontics 1983;17:838-844.

Articles citing this article

- **Glass fibre reinforced versus multistranded bonded orthodontic retainers: a 2 year prospective multi-centre study** Eur J Orthod (2010) 32(2): 117-123

○ [Abstract](#)

- [Full Text \(HTML\)](#)
- [Full Text \(PDF\)](#)
- [Dent Update](#). 2010 Nov;37(9):627-30.

- **First aid for orthodontic retainers.**

- [Patel A](#), [Sandler J](#).

- **Source**

- FTTA Orthodontics Chesterfield Royal Hospital/Charles Clifford Dental Hospital, Sheffield, UK.

- **Abstract**

- The need for long-term retention to prevent post-treatment tooth movement is now widely accepted by orthodontists. This may be achieved with removable retainers or permanent bonded retainers. This article aims to provide simple guidance for the dentist on how to maintain and repair both removable and fixed retainers. CLINICAL RELEVANCE: The general dental practitioner is more likely to review patients over time and needs to be aware of the need for long-term retention and how to maintain and repair the retainers.

- PMID:

-

- 21179933

-

- [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

- **MeSH Terms**