

An Innovative way to calculate Bolton's Discrepancy in cases with Impacted or Congenitally Missing teeth

¹Dr. Abhishek Bansal, Private practitioner, Ex Reader, VDCRC, Daman.

²Dr. Mandar Shah, Reader, Dept of orthodontics and Dentofacial orthopedics, HKES'S S N Institute of Dental Sciences and Research, Kalaburagi

³Dr. Sudha R halkai, Associate Professor, Dept of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, HKES'S S N Institute of Dental Sciences and Research, Kalaburagi

⁴Dr. Kasturi Patil, Sr Lecturer, Dept of orthodontics and Dentofacial orthopaedics, HKES'S S N Institute of Dental Sciences and Research, Kalaburagi

⁵Dr. Harshavardhan Reddy, Reader in Department of Orthodontics, H.K.D.E.T's Dental College, Humnabad

⁶Dr. Kailash L. Rathi, Senior Lecturer, Department of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopaedics, S B Patil Dental College & Hospital, BIDAR

Corresponding Author: Dr. Mandar Shah, Reader, Dept of orthodontics and Dentofacial orthopedics, HKES'S S N Institute of Dental Sciences and Research, Kalaburagi

Citation of this Article: Dr. Abhishek Bansal, Dr. Mandar shah, Dr. Sudha R halkai, Dr. Kasturi Patil, Dr. Harshavardhan Reddy, Dr. Kailash L. Rathi, "An Innovative way to calculate Bolton's Discrepancy in cases with Impacted or Congenitally Missing teeth", IJDSIR- December - 2021, Vol. – 4, Issue - 6, P. No. 45 – 48.

Copyright: © 2021, Dr. Mandar Shah, et al. This is an open access journal and article distributed under the terms of the creative commons attribution noncommercial License. Which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Type of Publication: Original Research Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

The incidence of impacted teeth and congenitally missing teeth is fairly increasing. For the achievement of an ideal occlusion and a good intercuspation, we need to identify the interarch tooth size discrepancy. But in cases with unerupted and missing tooth, considering the tooth size of the missing tooth is questionable. Thereby, we have proposed a mathematical concept for the calculation of the mesiodistal width of the missing tooth. The use of this method in our department is a testimony of its usefulness.

Keywords: Impacted tooth, Missing tooth, Bolton's Analysis, Mixed dentition analysis, Prediction.

Introduction

The incidence of impacted teeth and congenitally missing teeth is fairly increasing.¹ Orthodontic treatment objective is not just aligning the teeth into arch, but also is to fulfil three main goals: Functional efficiency, Structural balance & Esthetic harmony.^{2,3} To achieve these goals, proper inter-digitation of opposing teeth is a must, which is only possible if we know the total tooth material in an arch and their interrelationship, so that in case of any

discrepancy it could be matched to achieve a good occlusion.

Though there are many model analyses into existence, but Bolton's analysis⁴ for the prediction of inter-arch tooth size discrepancy has stood to the test of time. Bolton's discrepancy analysis is one of the diagnostic tools which dictates the extraction plans in an orthodontic practice.⁵ There are a few mixed dentition model analysis which predicts the tooth size of canines and premolars based on the mesiodistal width of incisors. A few of the most commonly used analysis are Moyer's mixed dentition analysis⁶, Tanaka Johnson mixed dentition analysis⁷, Huckaba's analysis⁸ etc. The values predicted by these analysis, though varies on different population due to ethnic variability, but still correlates to the nearest of the values which could be used for predicting the approximate values of the mesiodistal width of buccal segments.⁹

Thus, thinking logically, If $2 + 2 = 4$, $1 + 3 = 4$, and $4 \times 2 / 2 = 4$, why not $4 - 2 = 2$, $4 - 1 = 3$, and $2 \times 16 / 8 = 4$. Confused????

Simple, if we could predict the mesiodistal width of canine and premolars taking the mesiodistal width of

incisors in mixed dentition, why can't we use the same in adult population. In cases of impacted or missing teeth, we could use the predicted width, and subtract the width of teeth present in a segment, so that we could compute the width of single tooth, which could be used for performing Bolton's analysis.

Here is a case presented as an example to explain the logic and the applicability of the 3 analysis (Moyer's analysis, Tanaka-Johnston analysis, and Huckaba's analysis) for predicting the width of impacted/ missing teeth.

A 15 year old female patient having a class I malocclusion with missing canines in all the four quadrants (13, 23, 33, and 43) and an unerupted upper right second premolar (15). Due to missing teeth, Bolton's analysis was not applicable. But as the case demanded tooth size discrepancy prediction, we tried to go round the way to estimate the tooth material values. The measurement of the teeth in each quadrants are as follows:

Tooth number (FDI System)	16	15	14	13	12	11	21	22	23	24	25	26
Tooth size (mm)	11	UE*	6.5	-	5.5	5.7	6.5	5.5	-	7	6	11
Tooth size (mm)	10.8	6.8	6.5	-	5.8	5.5	6	5.8	-	6.5	6.8	10.5
Tooth number (FDI System)	46	45	44	43	42	41	31	32	33	34	35	36

Note: UE* = Unerupted tooth.

Therefore, to find the mesiodistal tooth width of 15, we considered the opposing side's premolar width and also correlate it with the Huckaba's analysis which considers

the use of radiographic width and the actual width of tooth. The formula is as follows:

$$X/X' = Y/Y' \text{ where}$$

X is the radiographic width of adjacent tooth

X' is the original width of adjacent tooth

Y is the radiographic width of tooth to be predicted

Y' is the original width of tooth to be predicted.

Thus the width of 15 obtained is 6 mm.

Now for the prediction of mesiodistal width of missing canines, we used Tanaka Johnston and Moyer's mixed dentition analysis. Therefore sum of mesiodistal tooth width of lower incisors was computed. And using the formulas the estimated width of lower and upper canine and premolars were calculated.

Sum of lower incisors = 23.1 mm. So for lower incisor width of 23.1 mm, following are the values according to Tanaka Johnston and Moyer's mixed dentition analyses.

Tanaka Johnston Analysis:

Arch	Predicted width of canine and premolars (X)	Width of premolars (Y)		Estimated canine width (X-Y)	
		Right	Left	Right	Left
Upper (mm)	22.55	12.5	13	10.05	9.55
Lower (mm)	22.05	13.3	13.3	8.75	8.75

Moyer's mixed dentition analysis at 75 percentile:

Arch	Predicted width of canine and premolars at 75 percentile (X)	Width of premolars (Y)		Estimated canine width (X-Y)	
		Right	Left	Right	Left
Upper (mm)	21.3	12.5	13	8.8	8.3
Lower (mm)	21.3	13.3	13.3	8	8

Moyer's mixed dentition analysis at 50 percentile

Arch	Predicted width of canine and premolars at 50 percentile (X)	Width of premolars (Y)		Estimated canine width (X-Y)	
		Right	Left	Right	Left
Upper (mm)	20.6	12.5	13	8.1	7.6
Lower (mm)	20.5	13.3	13.3	7.2	7.2

Then taking means of these values, we can consider the width of canine for the Bolton's analysis.

Analysis	Upper Right canine (13)	Upper Left canine (23)	Lower right canine (43)	Lower left canine (33)
Tanaka Johnston	10.05	9.55	8.75	8.75
Moyers (75)	8.8	8.3	8	8
Moyer's (50)	8.1	7.6	7.2	7.2
Mean	8.98	8.48	7.98	7.98

Note: Mean was taken for the three analysis, because these analysis were done on different populations, so average of the values will give near approximate values. Thereby, using these values for Bolton's analysis, the inter-arch tooth discrepancy could be calculated.

Reliability of this analysis

As this method is a mathematical calculation, and mathematics doesn't need any proof. It's an exact principle, which never changes. Therefore, the reliability need not be necessary but still out of curiosity we have used this analysis in 40 patients with whole set of teeth,

and have calculated the width of canine using this formula. The values were approximately the same as that of the original canine width, which proves the reliability of this method and formula.

Indications

- In cases with missing tooth
- Cases with impacted tooth.
- In cases with gross crowding along with Unerupted teeth.

Advantages

- It helps as a guiding path in the estimation of inters arch discrepancy.
- Has a futuristic view for the malocclusion correction.
- Helps to predict and plan the extraction pattern.
- In case of replacement, gives us the estimated size of tooth to be replaced.

Disadvantages

- Though approximately correct, but exact values are not always necessarily calculated.

References

1. Adrian Becker. The orthodontic treatment of impacted teeth. 1998, Martin Dunitz Ltd. London.
2. William R. Proffit, H. Fields, & D.Sarver. Contemporary Orthodontics: 4th Edition; 2007, Mosby Elsevier Publications.
3. T. M. Graber, Robert. L. Vanarsdall, Katherine W.L. Orthodontics: Current principles and techniques; 4th Edition, Elsevier Mosby Publications, 2000.
4. Wayne A. Bolton. Disharmony in tooth size and its relation to the analysis and treatment of malocclusion. Am. J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop July 1958; 28(3):113-130.
5. Marianne Heusdens, Luc Dermaut, Ronald Verbeeck. The effect of tooth size discrepancy on occlusion: An experimental study. Am. J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2000;117:184-91

6. Robert E. Moyers. Handbook of orthodontics, 4th edition. 1988. Year book medical publishers, Inc.
7. Tanaka MM, Johnston LE. The prediction of the size of unerupted canines and premolars in a contemporary orthodontic population. J Am Dent Assoc. 1974; 88:798-801.
8. Huckaba GW. Arch size analysis and tooth size prediction. Dent Clin North Am 1964; 11:431-40.
9. Santosh M Sholapurmath, Deepa B Benni, Parveen Mandroli. Applicability of two mixed dentition analysis in children of Jangam community of Belgaum city. World J Dent 2012;3(4):324-29