

Correlation between the Sagittal Skeletal Relationship and Lower Anterior Facial Height - A Retrospective Study

Dr. Mathew Thomas Maliael,

Department of Orthodontics, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai – 77, Tamil Nadu, India
Email ID - dr.mathewthomasm@gmail.com

Dr. M. Naveen Kumar

Senior Lecturer, Department of Orthodontics, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai – 77, Tamil Nadu, India. Email ID - naveenkumarm.sdc@saveetha.com

Article Info

Volume 83

Page Number: 2710 - 2717

Publication Issue:

July-August 2020

Article History

Article Received: 06 June 2020

Revised: 29 June 2020

Accepted: 14 July 2020

Publication: 25 July 2020

Abstract:

This investigation aimed to study and evaluate the correlation between the Sagittal Skeletal Relationship and the Lower Anterior Facial Height. A single-center data collection was done. 490 Lateral Cephalograms were collected and traced. Only adult patients with average were considered for the study. 31 cephalograms were included. Beta angle measurement was used to divide the cephalograms into 3 groups. The lower anterior facial height measurement was made for each cephalogram. The Data was tabulated into an MS Excel spreadsheet. One Way ANOVA analysis was performed to study the correlation between the groups. The average Lower anterior facial height for all the groups 68.47 ± 11.3 mm. The significance derived from the ANOVA test is 0.762. No statistically significant correlation between the Sagittal Skeletal Relationship and Lower Anterior Facial Height in the south Indian population.

Keywords LAFH, Sagittal, Skeletal.

Introduction -

In orthodontics, facial forms are generally classified into long, average, and short according to the vertical facial dimensions ('A classification of skeletal facial types', 1969; Kim, 1974)(Sivamurthy and Sundari, 2016). It is long regarded that vertical dimension control is one of the most difficult tasks in orthodontics(Kim, 1974)(Samantha *et al.*, 2017). The understanding of this morphology is a key element in planning orthodontic treatment. There exists a close

link between aesthetics and vertical facial dimension(Ta *et al.*, 2018)(Vikram *et al.*, 2017). Thus achieving the ideal vertical facial profile for patients becomes a key objective in orthodontic treatment(Johnston *et al.*, 2005)(Dinesh *et al.*, 2013). Previous studies made their findings based on the emphasis that individuals with malocclusion should not be treated through assessment by generic cephalometric analysis, but rather by individualized norms(Website, no date a)(Website, no date a, Website, no date b; Kim, 1974)(Website, no date a, Website, no date b; Kim,

1974; Solow, 1980)(Viswanath *et al.*, 2015). Literature evidence points to a large variation in skeletal relationships in normal occlusion samples(Website, no date a, Website, no date b)(Krishnan, Pandian and Rajagopal, 2017), thereby suggesting that significant anatomical variations exist in those with normal occlusion and to a greater degree in those with malocclusion(Krishnan, Pandian and Kumar S, 2015)(Kamisetty *et al.*, 2015). This investigation aimed to study and evaluate the correlation between the Sagittal Skeletal Relationship and the Lower Anterior Facial Height(LAFH).

Materials and Methods -

The study was conducted with data acquired from a single center. The cases were those who sought treatment from the Department of Orthodontics, Saveetha Dental College and Hospital in Chennai, India. The cases that were considered were those being treated by the Postgraduates in the 3-year orthodontic Postgraduate program in the Department of Orthodontics. 490 Lateral cephalograms were sought. These cephalograms were taken during August 2019 to March 2020. They were taken by a single operator using the same machine. The cephalograms were traced using FACAD version 3.11 (Ilexis AB, Sweden) by the first investigator(MTM). Landmarks were marked and required measurements were taken [Mandibular plane angle(MPA)(Steiner, 1953), Beta angle(BA)(Baik and Ververidou, 2004), and LAFH(Burstone *et al.*, 1978; Baik and Ververidou, 2004)]. These tasks were performed by a single operator to avoid bias. Intra-operator bias was validated by repeating a few tracings. The second investigator verified(MNK) the landmarks and tracings. Based on the MPA, the growth

pattern(GP) was evaluated and the cephalograms were divided into three groups (vertical, horizontal, and average) based on GP. In this investigation, only cephalograms of adults (age 18 years and above) with average GP were considered for further evaluation. Those 27 cephalograms that remained were further divided into three groups (skeletal pattern; Class I, class II, and class III) based on their ba values. Once grouping was complete, there were 12 cephalograms in the Class I group, 9 cephalograms in the Class II group, and 6 cephalograms in the Class III group. Of the 27, cephalograms 14 were female and 13 were male cephalograms. In the Class I group, 5 were male and 7 were female cephalograms. In the Class II group, 5 were male and 4 were female cephalograms. In the Class III group, 3 were male and 3 were female cephalograms. The lower anterior facial height measurements for cephalograms in each group were tabulated into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (Microsoft Office Home and Student 2013; Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington, USA). A One way ANOVA test and Chi-Square test was conducted using IBM SPSS software version 23 (IBM Corporation, USA).

Results and Discussion -

The average LAFH for all 3 groups is 67.8 ± 8.69 mm. The average for the class I group is 66.75 ± 5.42 mm, the average LAFH in the class II group 64.93 ± 7.87 mm, and the average LAFH for the class III group is 74.2 ± 12.74 mm . The ANOVA test for the data had a p value of 0.108, therefore the results were insignificant implying that there is no correlation (Table 1).

ANOVA
LAFH in mm

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	332.950	2	166.475	2.447	0.108
Within Groups	1632.530	24	68.022		
Total	1965.480	26			

Table 1 - One way ANOVA analysis was done to compare the Lower Anterior Facial Height of among the three groups. The result of the test had a significance of 0.108. Therefore the lower anterior facial height difference among the three groups is not significant.

This differs from the conclusion put forth by other studies. The various plausible explanations for these results include variation in anterior cranial base (Kasai *et al.*, 1995) (Felicita, 2018), a more acute cranial base angle in skeletal class III group (Mouakeh, 2001; Choi *et al.*, 2010; Parajuli *et al.*, 2012; Celebiet *et al.*, 2013) (Felicita, 2017b), cranial base bend, and forward rotation of the mandible in the class III group (Obaidi, 2006a, 2006b) (Felicita, 2017a). The study parameters eliminated cephalograms with vertical and horizontal GP to avoid skewing of the results due to the presence of outliers in these groups. Accurate assessment of a patient's skeletal pattern in all planes, vertical, sagittal, and transverse direction is essential during orthodontic diagnosis and treatment planning (Wang *et al.*, 2013; Fathalla, El Kadi and Nadim, 2017; Ta *et al.*, 2018) (Felicita, Chandrasekar and Shanthasundari, 2012, 2013). Variability in the vertical pattern determines the biomechanical approach for the treatment and facial proportions (Ta *et al.*, 2018) (Khan, 2016) (Rubika, Sumathi Felicita and Sivambiga, 2015). The diagnosis of the facial discrepancy in the vertical plane is of utmost importance not only for diagnosis but also for retention and stability ((‘The diagnostic facial triangle in the control of treatment objectives’, 1969, ‘The long face syndrome: Vertical maxillary excess’,

1976) (Pandian, Krishnan, and Kumar, 2018). Cephalometric norms vary amongst ethnic and racial lines and it has been determined and compared. The need for individualized norms has been demonstrated (Opdebeeck and Bell, 1978) (‘The long face syndrome: Vertical maxillary excess’, 1976), to better understand the cephalometric characteristics of various groups (Jain, Kumar and Manjula, 2014) (Ramesh Kumar *et al.*, 2011; Jain, Kumar and Manjula, 2014). The study failed to examine sex-based variations amongst the population. Further studies in this field are necessary.

Conclusion -

Within the limitations of this study, no significant difference for mean lower anterior facial height among class I, class II and class III malocclusions was noted. Also no difference for the mean LAFH in between the groups was noted.

Conflict of Interest -

The authors would like to inform you that there is no conflict of interest in this investigation.

Acknowledgment -

The authors would like to express gratitude to the Heads of Department of Orthodontics, Saveetha Dental College and Hospital, Dr. S.Aravind Kumar, and Dr. S.P.Saravana Dinesh for letting us conduct this study and the authors would also to express their gratitude to Dr. R R Soumya Varshini, Dr. Arya S Prasad, and Dr. Sruthi H for their help in the collection of the data and their invaluable support in completing this study. Both authors played key roles in conducting this investigation.

References -

1. A classification of skeletal facial types' (1969) *American journal of orthodontics*. Mosby, 55(2), pp. 109–123.
2. Baik, C. Y. and Ververidou, M. (2004) 'A new approach of assessing sagittal discrepancies: the Beta angle', *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics: official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics*, 126(1), pp. 100–105.
3. Burstone, C. J. et al. (1978) 'Cephalometrics for orthognathic surgery', *Journal of oral surgery*, 36(4), pp. 269–277.
4. Celebi, A. A. et al. (2013) 'Cephalometric Evaluation of Turkish Children With Class III Malocclusion in the Mixed Dentition', *Turkish Journal of Orthodontics*, pp. 85–91. doi: 10.13076/j.tjo.2013.26.02_85.
5. Choi, H.-J. et al. (2010) 'Cephalometric Characteristics of Korean Children with Class III Malocclusion in the Deciduous Dentition', *The Angle Orthodontist*, pp. 86–90. doi: 10.2319/120108-605.1.
6. Dinesh, S. P. S. et al. (2013) 'An indigenously designed apparatus for measuring orthodontic force', *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 7(11), pp. 2623–2626.
7. Fathalla, R., El Kadi, A. and Nadim, M. (2017) 'Three-dimensional Evaluation of Facial Harmony in Orthodontic Patients with Vertical Growth Pattern', *Suez Canal University Medical Journal*, pp. 114–121. doi: 10.21608/scumj.2017.47300.
8. Felicita, A. S. (2017a) 'Orthodontic management of a dilacerated central incisor and partially impacted canine with unilateral extraction - A case report', *The Saudi dental journal*, 29(4), pp. 185–193.
9. Felicita, A. S. (2017b) 'Quantification of intrusive/retraction force and moment generated during en-masse retraction of maxillary anterior teeth using mini-implants: A conceptual approach', *Dental press journal of orthodontics*, 22(5), pp. 47–55.
10. Felicita, A. S. (2018) 'Orthodontic extrusion of Ellis Class VIII fracture of maxillary lateral incisor - The sling shot method', *The Saudi dental journal*, 30(3), pp. 265–269.
11. Felicita, A. S., Chandrasekar, S. and Shanthasundari, K. K. (2012) 'Determination of craniofacial relation among the subethnic Indian population: a modified approach - (Sagittal relation)', *Indian journal of dental research: official publication of Indian Society for Dental Research*, 23(3), pp. 305–312.
12. Felicita, A. S., Chandrasekar, S. and Shanthasundari, K. K. (2013) 'Determination of craniofacial relation among the subethnic Indian population: a modified approach (vertical evaluation)', *Indian journal of dental research: official publication of Indian Society for Dental Research*, 24(4), pp. 456–463.
13. Jain, R. K., Kumar, S. P. and Manjula, W. S. (2014) 'Comparison of intrusion effects on maxillary incisors among mini implant anchorage, j-hook headgear and utility arch',

- Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 8(7), pp. ZC21–4.
14. Johnston, D. J. *et al.* (2005) ‘The influence of lower face vertical proportion on facial attractiveness’, *European journal of orthodontics*. Oxford Academic, 27(4), pp. 349–354.
 15. Kamisetty, S. K. *et al.* (2015) ‘SBS vs Inhouse Recycling Methods-And Invitro Evaluation’, *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 9(9), pp. ZC04–8.
 16. Kasai, K. *et al.* (1995) ‘Relationship between cranial base and maxillofacial morphology’, *The European Journal of Orthodontics*, pp. 403–410. doi: 10.1093/ejo/17.5.403.
 17. Khan, M. Y. A. (2016) ‘Alveolar and Skeletal Chin Dimensions Associated with Lower Facial Height Among Different Divergent Patterns’, *JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC RESEARCH*. doi: 10.7860/jcdr/2016/19932.7811.
 18. Kim, Y. H. (1974) ‘Overbite depth indicator with particular reference to anterior open-bite’, *American Journal of Orthodontics*, pp. 586–611. doi: 10.1016/0002-9416(74)90255-3.
 19. Krishnan, S., Pandian, S. and Kumar S, A. (2015) ‘Effect of bisphosphonates on orthodontic tooth movement-an update’, *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 9(4), pp. ZE01–5.
 20. Krishnan, S., Pandian, S. and Rajagopal, R. (2017) ‘Six-month bracket failure rate with a flowable composite: A split-mouth randomized controlled trial’, *Dental press journal of orthodontics*, 22(2), pp. 69–76.
 21. Mouakeh, M. (2001) ‘Cephalometric evaluation of craniofacial pattern of Syrian children with Class III malocclusion’, *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics: official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics*, 119(6), pp. 640–649.
 22. Obaidi, H. (2006a) ‘The variation of the cranial base parameters in Class I, II and III skeletal relationships’, *Al-Rafidain Dental Journal*, pp. 6–13. doi: 10.33899/rden.2006.39787.
 23. Obaidi, H. (2006b) ‘Variation of facial heights among the Class I, II and III dentoskeletal relationships (Cephalometric study)’, *Al-Rafidain Dental Journal*, pp. 98–105. doi: 10.33899/rden.2006.40070.
 24. Opdebeeck, H. and Bell, W. H. (1978) ‘The short face syndrome’, *American journal of orthodontics*, 73(5), pp. 499–511.
 25. Pandian, K. S., Krishnan, S. and Kumar, S. A. (2018) ‘Angular photogrammetric analysis of the soft-tissue facial profile of Indian adults’, *Indian journal of dental research: official publication of Indian Society for Dental Research*, 29(2), pp. 137–143.
 26. Parajuli, U. *et al.* (2012) ‘Cephalometric Evaluation of Craniofacial Pattern of Nepalese Patients with Class III Malocclusion’, *Orthodontic Journal of Nepal*, pp. 21–27. doi: 10.3126/ojn.v2i1.9290.
 27. Ramesh Kumar, K. R. *et al.* (2011) ‘Depth of resin penetration into enamel with 3 types of enamel conditioning methods: a confocal microscopic study’, *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics: official publication of the American Association of Orthodontists, its constituent societies, and the American Board of Orthodontics*, 140(4), pp. 479–485.
 28. Rubika, J., Sumathi Felicita, A. and Sivambiga, V. (2015) ‘Gonial Angle as an Indicator for the Prediction of Growth Pattern’, *World Journal of Dentistry*, pp. 161–163. doi: 10.5005/jp-journals-10015-1334.
 29. Samantha, C. *et al.* (2017) ‘Comparative Evaluation of Two Bis-GMA Based

- Orthodontic Bonding Adhesives - A Randomized Clinical Trial', *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 11(4), pp. ZC40–ZC44.
30. Sivamurthy, G. and Sundari, S. (2016) 'Stress distribution patterns at mini-implant site during retraction and intrusion--a three-dimensional finite element study', *Progress in orthodontics*, 17, p. 4.
 31. Solow, B. (1980) 'The dentoalveolar compensatory mechanism: background and clinical implications', *British journal of orthodontics*, 7(3), pp. 145–161.
 32. Steiner, C. C. (1953) 'Cephalometrics for you and me', *American Journal of Orthodontics*, pp. 729–755. doi: 10.1016/0002-9416(53)90082-7.
 33. Ta, Y. *et al.* (2018) 'Vertical Facial Height and its Correlation with Skeletal Pattern Among Young Nigerian Orthodontic Patients', *International Journal of Dentistry and Oral Science*, pp. 661–666. doi: 10.19070/2377-8075-18000130.
 34. 'The diagnostic facial triangle in the control of treatment objectives' (1969) *American journal of orthodontics*. Mosby, 55(6), pp. 651–667.
 35. 'The long face syndrome: Vertical maxillary excess' (1976) *American journal of orthodontics*. Mosby, 70(4), pp. 398–408.
 36. Vikram, N. R. *et al.* (2017) 'Ball Headed Mini Implant', *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 11(1), pp. ZL02–ZL03.
 37. Viswanath, A. *et al.* (2015) 'Obstructive sleep apnea: awakening the hidden truth', *Nigerian journal of clinical practice*, 18(1), pp. 1–7.
 38. Wang, M. F. *et al.* (2013) 'Vertical facial height and its correlation with facial width and depth', *international journal of stomatology & occlusion medicine*, pp. 120–129. doi: 10.1007/s12548-013-0089-4.
 39. Website (no date a). doi: 2.0.co;2">10.1043/0003-3219(1984)054<0005:dasvwt>2.0.co;2.
 40. Website (no date b). doi: 10.1016/s0889-5406(97)70288-9.




Figure 1 - Means plot of the One way ANOVA test. The mean LAFH of the skeletal class II group was the lowest at 64.93 ± 7.87 mm, followed by the mean of the skeletal class I group at 66.75 ± 5.42 mm, the skeletal class III had the highest mean value at 74.2 ± 12.74 mm.

(I)Skeletal Base Relationship	(J) Skeletal Base Relationship	Mean Difference (I - J)	Std Error	Sig	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Skeletal Class I	Skeletal Class II	1.8167	3.6368	0.872	-7.266	10.899
	Skeletal Class III	-7.4500	4.1238	0.189	-17.748	2.848
Skeletal Class II	Skeletal Class I	-1.8167	3.6368	0.872	-10.899	7.266
	Skeletal Class III	-9.2667	4.3468	0.104	-20.122	1.589
Skeletal Class III	Skeletal Class I	7.4500	4.1238	0.189	-2.848	17.748
	Skeletal Class II	9.2667	4.3468	0.104	-1.589	20.122

Table 2 - Post-hoc Tukey analysis for the data. The Post-hoc analysis was done to compare the LAFH values amongst the groups. The p value was >0.05 in all comparisons. Hence, there was no statistically significant

differences amongst the three groups.'




Figure 2 - Bar graph representing the mean among the sagittal skeletal malocclusions. X-axis represents the sagittal skeletal base relationship and Y-axis represents the mean LAFH in mm. One way ANOVA test was performed to evaluate the mean difference of LAFH among the three malocclusions. The p value is 0.108(>0.05) therefore no significant difference in LAFH among the three malocclusions was noted.