[Forum] Matsumoto Shigaku 27:40~45, 2001

 $\mathbf{key\ words}: \mathbf{Morphological\ difference} - \mathbf{Dento-Craniofacial\ characteristic} - \mathbf{Racial\ Caucasian} - \mathbf{Japanese}$

Different Approaches to Orthodontic Treatment Based on the Characteristics of Dento-Craniofacial Morphology in Caucasians and Japanese

KUNI KAMIJO^{1,2}, YASUHIRO MINOSHIMA³ and YUJI ASHIZAWA³

Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Implantology, Eastman Dental Institute for Oral Health Care Sciences, University College London¹ Department of Orthodontics, Eastman Dental Institute for Oral Health Care Sciences, University College London² Department of Orthodontics, Matsumoto Dental University School of Dentistry³

Summary

Recently, with the increasing opportunities for global travel and the immigration of peoples, orthodontists may be required to treat patients of different racial origin. It is imperative to understand the morphological difference between racial groups to appreciate the aetiology of the malocclusions, and hence, to ensure that treatment is appropriately directed.

This clinical topics outlines some of the differences in the morphology, aetiology, and orthodontic treatment outcomes for Japanese and Caucasian populations.

Aetiology of malocclusion

It is well known that either Angle Class II or skeletal Class 2 malocclusion is one of the most common malocclusions in the Caucasian population^{1,2)}, whilst in Japanese the incidence of Angle Class III malocclusion or skeletal Class 3 pattern is much higher^{3,4)}. Enlow⁵⁾ reported that ethnic groups with a brachycephalic headform (Figure 1 A and B) are likely to have relative retrusion of the nasomaxillary complex with a more anterior placement of the entire mandible, resulting in a greater tendency towards a Class III profile. These racial growth characteristics may influence the results of orthodontic treatment. Although Deguchi et al.⁶⁾ reported that early (mean age, 4 years 2 months) face mask therapy resulted in a significant advancement of the maxilla at a mean follow-up period of 7 years 5 months, the absence of an increase in SNA angle at post-retention (mean age, 11 years 0 months) indicated that the genetic growth trend in a Japanese Class III sample with a brachycephalic headform predominated over the orthopaedic effects obtained after treatment.

Not only skeletal Class 3 but also Class 2 malocclusion may result in a different treatment outcome. Skeletal Class 2 in Chinese population manifests a more protrusive maxilla and retrusive mandible compared with Caucasians⁷. Furthermore, skeletal Class 2 pattern is associated with not only horizontal but also vertical problems, either division 1^{8,9} or division 2¹⁰. In Japanese, the angle of Frankfort plane to mandibular plane is greater than in Caucasians. These differences in skeletal

(submitted February 21, 2001; accepted April 16, 2001)

松本歯学 27(1) 2001



Fig.1A

Fig.1B

Fig. 1 A : Lateral photo of a skeletal Class 3 Japanese girl at pretreatment.
Fig. 1 B : A skeletal Class 3 Caucasian girl at pretreatment. Note a difference in the angle of Frankfort plane to mandibular plane and anterior facial height.



Fig. 2 A

Fig. 2 B



morphology may indicate less horizontal growth of the mandible associated with skeletal Class 2 malocclusion in Japanese.

For excessive vertical growth of the mandible, Japanese adults show a longer lower facial height associated with a dolichofacial pattern, compared with that of Caucasians^{11,12)} (Figure 2 A and B). This characteristic morphology in growing Japanese patients may indicate that mechanical clockwise rotation of the mandible should be avoided or carefully controlled during treatment.

41

Size and shape of teeth

The size of teeth in the Asian population, including Japanese, is larger than that of the Caucasians^{13,14} (Figure 3 A and B). Large maxillary incisors may have a protrusive position leading to an increased overjet, thus increasing the likelihood of extraction treatment if necessary in combination with a reduction of tooth size through interdental stripping of the maxillary incisors.

Furthermore, the shape of the anterior teeth in Japanese is characterised anatomically as shovel teeth¹⁵⁾ (Figure 3 A) which frequently results in 3 or 4 mm of overjet anatomically. When over-correction of a large overjet in the Angle Class II malocclusion is needed, trimming or flattening of the lingual surface of maxillary incisors is often necessary to obtain an edge to edge incisor relationship or 1 mm overjet with an ideal overbite.

Shape of the dental arch

The ovoid shape of the dental arch in Japanese represents a brachycephalic pattern while the V-



Fig. 3A







shaped dental arch in Caucasians corresponds to a dolichocephalic pattern. The most popular treatment approach for growing patients with skeletal Class 3 is a combination of expansion and protraction of the maxilla^{16, 17, 18)}. However, skeletal Class 3 malocclusion in Japanese is less likely to show a need for maxillary expansion because of the wide maxillary arch¹⁸⁾.

Soft tissue profile

The priority of treatment is a good profile. Mongoloid individuals show a low nose and less prominent chin which affect the protrusive profile associated with the cephalometric measurements of the "Esthetic line" ¹⁹⁾ when compared with Caucasians (Figure 4 A and B). In general, Japanese patients show little variation in the nose and chin morphology between individuals and therefore the "Esthetic line" can be considered the ideal measurement to accurately determine the position of the lips. The mean value for the upper lip to E line in young Japanese adults is 1 mm compared with -2 mm in Caucasians, whereas the lower lip to E line is 2 mm and -4 mm in Japanese Caucasians respectively^{19,20)}.

Japanese patients tend to exhibit a retrusive profile, resulting in more extraction choice. In comparison, Caucasian adults tend to show a "dished in" face²¹⁾. Since the start of the debate on the relationship between extractions and TMJ disorders in the mid 1980's^{22, 23)}, non-extraction treatment

42





Fig. 4B



has became popular in the USA. The method of non-extraction treatment is mainly based on widening the dental arch, expansion of the basal arch, posterior movement of molars and a little flaring of the incisors.

As mentioned above, these four procedures are not beneficial to the dento-craniofacial morphology in Japanese patients, particularly in borderline cases. With globalisation of the world, orthodontists in regional countries are more likely to treat patients of different races. This clinical topics outlines differences in the morphology, diagnosis, treatment planning and outcome of orthodontic treatments among various ethnic groups.

References

- Haynes S (1970) The prevalence of malocclusion in English children aged 11-12 years. Rep Congr Eur Orthod Soc: 89-98.
- 2) Proffit WR, Fields HW Jr and Moray LJ (1998) Prevalence of malocclusion and orthodontic treatment need in the United States : estimates from the NHANES III survey. Int J Adult Orthodon Orthognath Surg 13 : 97–106.
- Susami R, Asai Y, Hirose K, Hosoi T and Hayashi I (1971) The prevalence of malocclusion in Japanese school children. 1. Total frequency. J Jpn Orthod 30: 221-9.
- 4) Kitai N, Takada K, Yasuda Y, Adachi S, Hirase E, Kitaguchi T and Sakuda M (1990) Prevalence of malocclusions and demand for orthodontic treatment among students at a women's high school. J Osaka Univ Dent Sch 35: 321–7.
- 5) Enlow DH (1975) Handbook of facial growth.192.WB Saunders, Philadelphia.
- Deguchi T, Kanomi R, Ashizawa Y and Rosenstein SW(1999)Very early face mask therapy in Class III children. Angle Orthod 69: 349-55.

- 7) Lau JW and Hagg U (1999) Cephalometric morphology of Chinese with Class II division 1 malocclusion. Br Dent J **186**: 188–90.
- Miura F, Sakamoto T, Irie M and Yano Y(1958)Analysis of Class II, division 1 malocclusion in Japanese by Henry's method. J Jpn Orthod 17: 201-9.
- 9) Iwasawa T, Nakakuki M and Matsumoto Y (1969) A study on lateral head plates of normal occlusion and malocclusions. J Jpn Orthod 28: 105-12.
- 10) Deguchi T, Togari A, Matsui K, Ozawa M, Teramachi K and Matsuda Y (1981) Morphological variation of Angle Class II division 2 in Japanese male adults. J Jpn Orthod 40: 300–7.
- 11) Deguchi T, Mimura H and Togari A (1993) Comparison of body height and mandibular length between Caucasian and Japanese children. Aust Orthod J 13: 23-8.
- 12) Miyajima K, McNamara JA Jr, Kimura T, Murata S and Iizuka T (1996) Craniofacial structure of Japanese and European-American adults with normal occlusions and well-balanced faces. Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop 110 : 431-8.
- 13) Yuen KK, So LL and Tang EL (1997) Mesiodistal crown diameters of the primary and permanent teeth in southern Chinese–a longitudinal study. Eur J Orthod **19**: 721–31.
- 14) Aoki H, Tsuta A, Ukiya M and Reitz P (1971) A morphological study and comparison of the dental arch form of Japanese and American adults : detailed measurements of the transverse width. Bull Tokyo Dent Coll 12 : 9–14.
- 15) Takei T, Hamada N and Ohmori T (1970) Odontometrical study of shovel-shaped upper incisors in the people of Northern Kyushu. Bull Tokyo Dent Coll 11: 201–10.
- 16) Macdonald KE, Kapust AJ and Turley PK (1999) Cephalometric changes after the correction of Class III malocclusion with maxillary expansion / facemask therapy. Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop 116: 13–24.
- 17) McNamara JA Jr (1987) An orthopedic approach to the treatment of Class III malocclusion in young patients. J Clin Orthod **21**: 598-608.
- 18) Takada K, Petdachai S and Sakuda M (1993) Changes in dentofacial morphology in skeletal Class III children treated by a modified maxillary protraction headgear and a chin cup: a longitudinal cephalometric appraisal. Eur J Orthod 15: 211–21.
- Ricketts RM (1968) Esthetics, environment, and the law of lip relation. Am J Orthod 54: 272– 89.
- 20) Motohashi K, Kashiwagi H, Machida M, Tsuchimochi T and Kanemoto M (1977) A study of "acceptable face" based on the esthetic line. Shigaku **64** : 988–95.
- 21) Drobocky OB and Smith RJ (1989) Changes in facial profile during orthodontic treatment with extraction of four first premolars. Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop **95** : 220–30.
- 22) Kremenak CR, Kinser DD, Harman HA, Menard CC and Jakobsen JR (1992) Orthodontic risk factors for temporomandibular disorders (TMD). I: Premolar extractions. Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop 101: 13–20.
- McNamara JA Jr (1997) Orthodontic treatment and temporomandibular disorders. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod 83: 107–17.

⁴⁴

Kamijo et al. : Orthodontic Approaches in Caucasians and Japanese

抄録:日本人と白人における歯・顎顔面形態の特徴に基づいた矯正治療のアプローチについて

上條 都(ロンドン大・口腔顎顔面インプラント,歯科矯正)

簑島保宏, 芦澤雄二(松本歯大・歯科矯正)

今日,世界的規模で多くの人々が移住者や旅行者として生活する機会が増加するに伴って,矯正歯科 医は他民族の患者の治療をすることが要求されつつある.それに対処するには,まず民族間での歯,顎 顔面形態の差異を十分に理解することが必要であり,その上で不正咬合の原因論を正しく認識し,適切 な治療法を確立すべきであると考えられる.

この臨床的話題は、上記の人種間の違いを日本人と白人の症例を呈示して、その形態学的、原因論的 そして矯正治療後の状態について幾つかの相違点を略述した.