

Letters to the editor*

Induced ankylosis of primary canines

I have just finished reading and re-reading the very interesting article, "Induced ankylosis of primary canines for absolute anchorage in the treatment of a patient with Class III malocclusion and cleft soft palate" (Zhang M, Liu S, Chen S, Yu F, Zhong C, Huang J, Lu H. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2019;155:398-410). This case report is a useful addition to our arsenal of treatment strategies for early intervention in patients with Class III maxillary retrusion, and I applaud the extent of the improvements that were obtained and the relative stability of the results.

However, as a frequent reviewer for the *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, I was frustrated with the reviewing and editing of the article itself. I believe that careful attention to the details of articles is critical to their quality and usefulness, especially when the original authors' first language is not English.

There are many questions that should have been asked by the reviewers and answered by the authors, before this article was published. Providing answers to the following questions would have improved the clinical usefulness of the article:

1. Why were primary canines chosen to be ankylosed? Why not primary molars with their much larger root structures?
2. A "rigid splint" to promote ankylosis of the canines is mentioned. What was this? What was the design? What was the rationale for its use?
3. It was stated that the primary canines were left in the splint for 3 months. Why was this time period chosen? Is there any support in the literature for that time period?
4. How was it determined that the primary canines were truly ankylosed?
5. If they were ankylosed, how do you explain the spaces that occurred between them and the first primary molars (Figs 4 and 5)?
6. Why were brackets placed on the primary incisors, none of which were ankylosed?
7. What are the upside-down surgical hooks for on the archwire? I assume they were what the elastics were attached to (see next question), but I do not see that they would have been mechanically useful

in those positions. Would they not have given an upward and forward vector on the maxilla, rather than the downward and forward vector I think one would want?

8. Why "alternately use maxillary deciduous canines and deciduous incisors as abutments for maxillary protraction to encourage anterior maxillary growth?" This made no sense to me.
9. For how long did protraction continue?
10. Did the ankylosed primary canines need to be extracted or did they exfoliate normally?
11. For how many years was this patient in active treatment? From the photographs and text, I calculated that it was about 7 years. Was this necessary and appropriate?
12. Figure 5 was just Figure 4 repeated. I am not sure if this was an author error or a layout/editing error, but it should have been caught by someone.
13. Where did the change from Figures 1 to 4 come from? It was implied that Figure 4 is simply the appearance of the appliance after the 3-month waiting period for ankylosis was over, but the patient is almost out of anterior crossbite at this point.

I would greatly appreciate if these questions were answered so that their answers can be attached to the article itself to improve it.

Diane Johnson
Mooresville, Ind

Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2019;156:579
0889-5406/\$36.00

© 2019 by the American Association of Orthodontists. All rights reserved.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2019.08.003>

Authors' response

We are very grateful for your interest in our study and are happy to discuss the comments.

We read the article that reported intentional ankylosis of deciduous canines to reinforce maxillary protraction.¹ A tentative attempt was made to use this way to treat our patients. Animal experiments have proved that intentional extraction and replantation of teeth would induce ankyloses.²⁻⁷ In 1985, Kokich et al⁸ reported a case in which intentionally ankylosed deciduous canines were used for protraction. After that,

*The viewpoints expressed are solely those of the author(s) and do not reflect those of the editor(s), publisher(s), or Association.

many studies have tried this method and produced stable results.⁹ Recently, a retrospective study analyzed the influence of intentional ankylosis of deciduous canines in patients with Class III malocclusion treated by maxillary protraction. This result demonstrates that these teeth can reinforce the orthopedic effect induced by maxillary protraction yet does not avoid some dental compensation in the maxilla.¹⁰

A previous study introduced the procedure for intentional ankyloses.¹¹ The teeth were extracted under local anesthesia with periodontal ligament scraped completely with curettes and gauze and the alveolus with curettes only. The root canals were cleaned, and a resorbable paste made of eugenol or with zinc oxide was injected into the canals. The access preparations were filled with composite acrylic.⁸ A rigid splint was bonded to fix the teeth for 40–60 days before activation of maxillary protraction. Experiments have shown that the periodontal ligament is replaced by bone within 8 weeks after replantation.⁶ It is better to confirm security by taking periapical radiographs after fixation.

There are also some tips for using ankylosed teeth for maxillary protraction. Because the deciduous teeth resorption would inevitably happen as their permanent successors erupt,^{10,11} to increase the available time for treatment, we chose deciduous canines because they absorb the latest compared with posterior deciduous teeth and with long roots. Otherwise, the design of traction spot of the deciduous teeth would avoid pressure on lips.

The patient came to our office in December 2006; the procedure of intentional ankyloses was performed in January 2007, and a rigid splint was bonded for replantation. The protraction began in April 2007. Different from root canal treatment for adults, endodontic treatment for deciduous teeth might be faced with more unreliable results. The deciduous canines exfoliated and became loose after 3-months protraction, then we alternately used maxillary deciduous canines and deciduous incisors as abutments, which might also have provided additional alveolar remodeling. The inverted hooks served as the starting point for protraction and would avoid lip irritation from the traction elastic. At the onset of the dental transition of maxilla, the maxillary protraction was removed. The total protraction time was about 6 months. The spaces that appeared distal to the

deciduous canines can be attributed to primary spaces and the orthopedic effect, which we preferred to see as premaxillary growth. The deciduous canines exfoliated and were extracted later. All the brackets were removed, and we waited for the eruption of the permanent successors.

Phase II treatment began in December 2010 and entered the intense adjustment period in July 2012. However, treatment finished more than 1 year later, in November 2013, because the patient could not come at the appointment time. The results were still stable after a 4-year retention.

Thank you for your comments. We might put more details in our later article.

Menghan Zhang
Haiping Lu

Shanghai and Hangzhou, People's Republic of China

Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2019;156:579-80
0889-5406/\$36.00

© 2019 by the American Association of Orthodontists. All rights reserved.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2019.08.004>

REFERENCES

1. Da Silva Filho OG, Ozawa TO, Okada CH, Okada HY, Carvalho RM. Intentional ankylosis of deciduous canines to reinforce maxillary protraction. *J Clin Orthod* 2003;37:315-20: quiz 313.
2. Biederman W. Etiology and treatment of tooth ankylosis. *Am J Orthod* 1962;48:670-84.
3. Hammarström L, Blomlöf L, Lindskog S. Dynamics of dentoalveolar ankylosis and associated root resorption. *Endod Dent Traumatol* 1989;5:163-75.
4. Hamner JE, Reed OM, Stanley HR. Reimplantation of teeth in the baboon. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1970;81:662-70.
5. Lindskog S, Pierce AM, Blomlöf L, Hammarström L. The role of the necrotic periodontal membrane in cementum resorption and ankylosis. *Endod Dent Traumatol* 1985;1:96-101.
6. Loe H, Waerhaug J. Experimental replantation of teeth in dogs and monkeys. *Arch Oral Biol* 1961;3:176-84.
7. Sherman P Jr. Intentional replantation of teeth in dogs and monkeys. *J Dent Res* 1968;47:1066-71.
8. Kokich VG, Shapiro PA, Oswald R, Koskinen-Moffett L, Clarren SK. Ankylosed teeth as abutments for maxillary protraction: a case report. *Am J Orthod* 1985;88:303-7.
9. Omnell ML, Sheller B. Maxillary protraction to intentionally ankylosed deciduous canines in a patient with cleft palate. *Am J Orthod* 1994;106:201-5.
10. Tocci LF, da Silva Filho OG, Fuziy A, Lauris JR. Influence of intentional ankylosis of deciduous canines to reinforce the anchorage for maxillary protraction. *Dent Press J Orthod* 2013;18:94-102.
11. Sheller B, Omnell L. Therapeutic ankylosis of primary teeth. *J Clin Orthod* 1991;25:499-502.