* **

Study on the Retraction of Anterior Teeth in the Lingual Orthodontics with the Three-Dimensional Finite Element Method

Jung-Han Song, Hoon Huh and Hyun-Sang Park

| Key Words : | Finite Element Method(|), Lingual Orth | nodontics(), | |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---|
| | Malocclusion (|), Miniscrew(|), Tanspalatal Arch Wire(TPA |) |

Abstract

In these days, the orthodontic surgery including lingual orthodontics has attracted a person's attention due to its functional and esthetic appreciation. The delivery of the optimal orthodontic treatment is greatly influenced by clinician's ability to predict and control the tooth movement by applying force system to dentition. The skeletal anchorage system with the miniscrew has been used recently in the lingual orthodontics to assist the anchorage control. Precise understanding of the force system produced from the various orthodontic appliances is necessary. However, the qualitative and quantitative effect of the miniscrew has not been identified well. In this paper, three dimensional finite element analysis is introduced on the lingual orthodontics to investigate the effect of anterior retraction force on the miniscrew and transpalatal arch wire. The purpose of this study is to determine the location of the miniscrew and the point of force application of the anchorage system in the lingual orthodontics.





Fig. 1 Schematic diagram of the lingual orthodontics

2004



Fig. 3 Finite element modeling for the analysis of the lingual orthodontics: (a) tooth; (b) periodontal ligament; (c) alveolar bone





| Wire | Dimension | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Mushroom arch wire | 0.018" × 0.025" | | |
| TPA | 0.9 mm | | |
| Connecting wire | 0.7 mm | | |
| Lever arm | 0.018" × 0.025" | | |



Fig. 4 Definition of the reference coordinate.



Fig. 5 Schematic diagrams of lingual orthodontic model for finite element analysis: (a) reference model; (b) model ; (c) model ; (d) model ; (e) model

| , Y | | , Z | | | | | | 6 |
|--------|-------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|---|
| | , Fig. 4 | | +X, | mm | | , | | |
| | +Y, | +Z | | n | niniscrew | connecting | wire | |
| | - | | | | | | | |
| | | | , | Model | | | | |
| | | | | minis | crew | 1 | | |
| | | | | model | | 3 mm | TPA | |
| | | | | | | | miniscrew | / |
| | 3. | | | со | nnecting w | ire | model | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Model | | | miniscrev | N |
| | | 가 | | | | TPA | | |
| | , | minisc | rew | • | model | mode | el | |
| | | • | | miniscrew フ | † TPA | 6 mm | | |
| | | | | | | | model | |
| | 4 가 | | | Model | miniscre | w가 TPA | 6 mm | |
| Fig. 5 | | | | miniscrev | w 1 | l | | |
| | 1 | TPA | | | Mode | el | | |
| TPA | 16 mm | | TPA | | | | . Model | |
| | miniscrew 가 | TPA | 3 mm | | | | | , |
| | | | | 1 | mini | screw | | |
| Model | miniscrew | | connecting wire | n | nodel | | | |
| | miniscrew | 1 | | , model | | | | |
| | | minisci | æw | min | iscrew | 가 TPA | | |
| | | | 3 mm | | | | | |
| | . m | iniscrew | TPA | | 가 . | moo | lel model | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Model | Measured Point | Reaction Force (X-direction) | Increment to the ref. | Reaction Force (Y-direction) | Increment to the ref. | Reaction Force (Z-direction) | Increment to the ref. |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | TPA end 1 | -42.26 gm | • | 114.48 gm | • | -54.62 gm | • |
| Reference | TPA end 2 | 39.81 gm | • | 446.31 gm | • | -54.95 gm | • |
| | miniscrew | -5.57 gm | • | 303.02 gm | • | 27.63 gm | • |
| Model | TPA end 1 | -76.50 gm | 81.0 % | 23.56 gm | -79.4 % | -115.48 gm | 111.5 % |
| | TPA end 2 | 77.43 gm | 94.5 % | 28.06 gm | -75.9 % | -114.21 gm | 107.8 % |
| | miniscrew | -8.32 gm | 49.4 % | 482.19 gm | 59.2 % | 147.79 gm | 434.9 % |
| Model | TPA end 1 | -123.12 gm | 193.1 % | -23.58 gm | -79.4 % | -155.81 gm | 185.2 % |
| | TPA end 2 | 120.32 gm | 202.2 % | -18.86 gm | -83.8 % | -152.22 gm | 176.9 % |
| | miniscrew | -10.4 1gm | 87.2 % | 591.21 gm | 95.1 % | 134.13 gm | 385.3 % |
| Model | TPA end 1 | -90.96 gm | 115.2 % | 28.03 gm | -75.5 % | - 14.31 gm | -73.8 % |
| | TPA end 2 | 87.93 gm | 120.9 % | 28.25 gm | -75.7 % | -14.62 gm | -73.4 % |
| | miniscrew | -6.21 gm | 11.6 % | 477.52 gm | 57.6 % | 110.88 gm | 301.5 % |
| Model | TPA end 1 | -63.82 gm | 51.0 % | -30.96 gm | -73.0 % | -16.25 gm | -70.2 % |
| | TPA end 2 | 61.20 gm | 53.7 % | -30.02 gm | -74.2 % | -15.58 gm | -71.6 % |
| | miniscrew | -5.01 gm | -10.0% | 609.4 gm | 101.1 % | 142.02 gm | 413.9 % |

Table 3 Analysis results for the reaction force on the TPA ends and miniscrew





Fig. 6 Analysis result of the CASE IV model for lingual orthodontics: (a) deformed shape (b)distribution of von Mises stress in teeth.

