

How to Cite:

Patyal, A., Karpe, S., Chacko, P. K., Khandelwal, M., Puri, S., & Kandikatla, P. (2022). Efficacy of fixed versus removal retainer post orthodontic treatment: A comparative study. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S3), 6491–6500.
<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS3.7451>

Efficacy of fixed versus removal retainer post orthodontic treatment: A comparative study

Dr. Arun Patyal

M.D.S. Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Medical officer (Dental), Regional Hospital, Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh

*Corresponding author email: drpatyal2001@gmail.com

Dr. Shameem Karpe

Registrar Orthodontics, Security Force Hospital, Makkah, KSA

Email: shameemkarpe@yahoo.com

Dr. Prince K. Chacko

M D S, Reader, Dept. Of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Educare Institute of Dental Sciences, Chattiparambu, Malappuram, Kerala

Email: drprincechacko80@gmail.com

Dr. Mayank Khandelwal

Consultant Orthodontist & Private Practitioner, Bangalore, Karnataka

Email: orthodontics.drmk@gmail.com

Dr. Swapna Puri

Associate Professor, Dept of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Saraswati Dhanwantari dental college and hospital, Parbhani, Maharashtra

Email: dr.swapnapuri@gmail.com

Dr. Pradeep Kandikatla

Reader, Dept. of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Vishnu Dental College, Bhimavaram, AP

Email: pkandikatla@gmail.com

Abstract---The dearth of prolonged, prospective evaluation, the relative impact of fixed and the removable retainers eventualities can only be speculated upon. Hence in this study was to compare the stability of orthodontic outcomes with fixed and removable retainers over a period of at least 4 years. Of the 82 participants included in the previous RCT, data were obtained from 48 at 18-month follow up. Orthodontic stability was based chiefly on the irregularity of the mandibular incisors using Little's Irregularity Index to assign a cumulative score for the contact point displacement in 4 the

mandibular inter-canine region. Eighty-two participants were enrolled in the original RCT. After adjusting for confounders, the median between-groups difference was 1.64mm higher in those wearing vacuum-formed retainers ($P= 0.02$; 95% CI: 0.30, 2.98mm). No statistical difference was found between the treatment groups in terms of inter-canine ($P= 0.52$; 95% CI: -1.07, 0.55) and inter-molar widths ($P= 0.55$; 95% CI: -1.72, 0.93), arch length ($P= 0.99$; 95% CI: -1.15, 1.14) and extraction space opening ($P= 0.84$; 95% CI: -1.54, 1.86). No statistical difference in relation to periodontal parameters was found between fixed and removable retainer groups. On the basis of the present study, it therefore appears that fixed retainers may be the approach of choice to maintain alignment of the lower anterior teeth in the long-term but there is a clear need for optimal oral hygiene before, during and after orthodontics to avoid increased levels of gingival inflammation.

Keywords---orthodontics, fixed retainer, removable retainers, efficacy.

Introduction

Prolonged and indeed indefinite retention is routinely prescribed following orthodontic treatment to mitigate against post-treatment change related to unstable positioning of teeth, physiological recovery and age-related changes. 1,2 Notwithstanding this, there is a lack of high-quality evidence concerning the relative effectiveness of fixed and removable variants. 3 Moreover, the long-term impact of fixed or removable retention on the periodontium has been the subject of little prospective analysis and compliance levels with prolonged removable retention is unclear. 4 Relatively few randomized controlled studies have involved comparison of the effectiveness of fixed and vacuum-formed retainers (VFRs). 5,6 In particular, compliance with removable retainer wear may wane leading to the development of post-treatment change primarily due to unchecked maturational changes in the medium-term. Similarly, failure of fixed retainers may also promote deterioration of the post-treatment outcome. 4 Notwithstanding this, in view of the dearth of prolonged, prospective evaluation, the relative impact of these eventualities can only be speculated upon. In terms of periodontal health, fixed retainers may hinder scrupulous oral hygiene measures; however, it is not known whether this necessarily leads to worsening of periodontal outcomes, particularly in the long-term.7 A number of observational studies have involved assessment of periodontal integrity during the retention phase. 7-10 Hence in this study was to compare the stability of orthodontic outcomes with fixed and removable retainers over a period of at least 4 years.

Materials and Methods

Participants received either a mandibular vacuum-formed retainer (VFR) (Essix Ace Plastic 120mm in diameter, (DENTSPLY)) or fixed retainer (0.0175" coaxial archwire; Ortho-Care, Shipley, UK) bonded with Transbond™ LR composite material (3M Unitek, UK). Those in the removable retainer group were instructed to wear the mandibular vacuum-formed retainer on a full-time basis for the first 6

months, nights only for the second 6 months, and alternate nights from 12 to 18 months following removal of active appliances. Thereafter, intermittent nights only wear (1 to 2 nights weekly) was recommended. Of the 82 participants included in the previous RCT, data were obtained from 48 at 18-month follow up. An information sheet was provided to those participants willing to participate at a minimum of 48-month follow-up following removal of active appliances, and oral and written consent was obtained. Participants were advised not to visit their dentist for scaling for 1 month prior to their appointment with those taking medications known to have an effect on gingival health excluded from the periodontal assessment.

Orthodontic stability was based chiefly on the irregularity of the mandibular incisors using Little's Irregularity Index to assign a cumulative score for the contact point displacement in 4 the mandibular inter-canine region. 11 Allied measurements including inter-canine and intermolar widths, arch length and extraction space opening were also recorded. 6 Five clinical measures of periodontal health were scored: gingival inflammation,¹² calculus and plaque levels,^{13,14} clinical attachment level (CAL) and bleeding on probing (Appendix). An impression of the mandibular arch was taken for all participants using hydrophilic vinyl polysiloxane (Virtual®, Ivoclar Vivadent AG, Schaan, Liechtenstein). The impression was then cast in hard (Type III gypsum) stone. Orthodontic stability was measured from the study models, adopting the same technique used in the previous study. 6 The lingual surfaces of mandibular labial segment were obscured on the study models using prosthetic dental wax (Ribbon Wax, Metrodent, Huddersfield, UK) to ensure assessor blindness. Measurements were performed by one researcher using a digital caliper (150mm DIN 862, ABSOLUTE Digimatic caliper, model 500-191U; Mitutoyo, Andover, Hampshire, UK) with a resolution of ± 0.01 mm. Periodontal measurements were recorded for the labial and lingual surfaces of mandibular canines, central and lateral incisors. Each tooth surface was divided into thirds using vertical lines based on the morphology and position of the dental papilla to demarcate mesial, mid and distal surfaces. All participants were asked about frequency, duration, type of tooth-brushing and the time elapsed since the last visit to the dentist. Patients wearing mandibular vacuum-formed retainers were also asked to complete a retainer wear chart. The self-reported compliance levels were categorized as follows: - Compliant: reported wear of retainers was as advised, - Partially-compliant: retainer wear instructions were not followed precisely - Non-compliant: not wearing retainers. The status of the fixed retainer in addition to history of retainer repair and previous breakage was recorded in the fixed retainer group. Inter- and intra-examiner reliability of clinical and of study model measurements were tested by assessing agreement between repeat measurements. 15 For stability outcomes, intraexaminer reliability was performed on 10 randomly selected study models 4 weeks after the 5 initial measurements. Suitable statistical tools were applied and the $p < 0.05$ was considered as significant.

Results

Eighty-two participants were enrolled in the original RCT. 6 Of these, 48 attended at 18-month follow-up (T3). At the 4-year follow-up (T4), 42 participants returned- 21 per group. Groups were well-matched in terms of age, gender and treatment

protocol with the majority being females and 43% and 48% having extraction-based treatment in the fixed and removable groups, respectively (Table 1). In terms of fixed retainer integrity, all (100%) were in place at recall although three (14%) were partially detached and two (10%) had history of repair. In the removable retainer group, reported non-compliance levels increased from 0% over the initially 6 months to 19% from 6-12 months, 52% in the second year and 67% thereafter.

Orthodontic stability with fixed versus removable retention In terms of the irregularity of the mandibular anterior segment, data from 42 participants were analyzed (Table 2). Some degree of relapse occurred in both treatment groups at 4-year follow-up with median increases in the degree of irregularity of 0.85mm and 1.47mm in fixed and removable retainer groups, respectively. After adjusting for confounders, the median between-groups difference was 1.64mm higher in those wearing vacuum-formed retainers ($P= 0.02$; 95% CI: 0.30, 2.98mm). No statistical difference was found between the treatment groups in terms of inter-canine ($P= 0.52$; 95% CI: -1.07, 0.55) and inter-molar widths ($P= 0.55$; 95% CI: -1.72, 0.93), arch length ($P= 0.99$; 95% CI: -1.15, 1.14) and extraction space opening ($P= 0.84$; 95% CI: -1.54, 1.86).

Periodontal outcomes

For modified gingival index, score 3 was the most frequent in both fixed (55.4%) and removable (52.6%) retainer groups at 4-year follow-up. In relation to plaque index, score 4 was most frequently observed in both fixed (31.3%) and removable retainer groups (27.7%). When calculus was present, score 2 was the most common score in both groups (18.9% in fixed, 17.6% in removable). However, around two thirds of tooth surfaces were free of calculus in both fixed and removable retainer groups. 7 No statistical difference in relation to periodontal parameters was found between fixed and removable retainer groups (Table 3). In particular, median scores for modified gingival index was slightly lower in the fixed retainer group ($P= 0.76$). However, median plaque levels ($P= 0.27$) and CAL ($P= 0.23$) was slightly higher in the fixed group, although this was not of statistical significance. When periodontal outcomes for the lingual surfaces of the mandibular anterior segment in the fixed and removable groups were compared, no significant difference was found ($P> 0.05$). Similar findings were found in relation to the buccal surfaces. 8

Table 1
Baseline characteristics overall and in both groups.

		Overall sample n= 42	Fixed retainer group n= 21	Vacuum-formed retainer group n= 21
Mean age in years (SD)		21.15 (2.41)	21.54 years (3.06)	20.77 years (1.49)
Gender	Males	n= 10	n= 3	n= 7
	Females	n= 32	n= 18	n= 14
Mean years in retention (SD)		4.16 (0.35)	4.09 (0.25)	4.23 (0.42)
Treatment protocol	Extraction	n= 19	n= 9	n= 10
	Non-extraction	n= 23	n= 12	n= 11
Type of tooth-brush	Manual	n= 37	n= 18	n= 19
	Electric	n= 5	n= 3	n= 2
Daily tooth-brushing frequency	1X	n= 7	n= 6	n= 1
	2X	n= 35	n= 15	n= 20
Time spent in tooth-brushing	<1 minute	n= 1	n= 0	n= 1
	1-2 minutes	n= 29	n= 14	n= 15
	>2 minutes	n= 12	n= 7	n= 5
Use of other oral hygiene measures	None	n= 23	n=13	n=10
	Dental floss	n= 10	n= 4	n= 6
	Interdental brush	n= 3	n= 2	n= 1
	Toothpick	n= 9	n= 4	n= 5
Last visit to the dentist	< 6 months	n= 10	n= 5	n= 5
	6 months – <1 year	n= 5	n= 3	n= 2
	1 – 2 years	n= 12	n= 9	n= 3
	> 2 years	n= 15	n= 4	n= 11
Smokers		n= 4	n= 3	n= 1
Gingival biotype	Thick	n= 17	n= 7	n= 10
	Thin	n= 24	n= 14	n= 10
Fraenal attachment	Low	n= 41	n= 21	n= 20
	High	n= 1	n= 0	n= 1

Table 2
Stability outcomes in fixed and removable retainer groups

Outcome measures	Number of participants	Time point	Statistical measures	Fixed retainer group	Vacuum-formed retainer group	Coefficient	95 Confidence Interval	P-value
Irregularity index	FR group: n= 21	T0	Median	0.25	0.42	1.64	0.30, 2.98	0.02*
			IQR	0.47	0.84			
	VFR: n= 21	T4	Median	1.23	3.16			
			IQR	1.27	2.74			
	T4-T0	Median	0.85	2.37				
		IQR	0.91	2.26				
Intercanine-width	FR group: n= 21	T0	Median	26.9	26.77	-0.26	-1.07, 0.55	0.52
			IQR	1.89	2.29			
	VFR group: n= 21	T4	Median	26.74	25.62			
			IQR	1.84	2.51			
	T4-T0	Median	-0.28	-0.52				
		IQR	0.88	1.6				
Intermolar-width	FR group: n= 21	T0	Median	42.8	41.77	-0.40	-1.72, 0.93	0.55
			IQR	3.96	4.03			
	VFR group: n= 19	T4	Median	42.23	42.66			
			IQR	5.82	4.93			
	T4-T0	Median	0.15	-0.42				
		IQR	2.08	2.09				
Arch length	FR group: n= 21	T0	Median	24.45	25.84	-0.01	-1.15, 1.14	0.99
			IQR	3.83	7.04			
	VFR group: n= 19	T4	Median	22.15	20.81			
			IQR	2.96	8.33			
	T4-T0	Median	-3.63	-3.78				
		IQR	0.59	2.1				
Extraction site opening	FR group: n= 9	T0	Median	0	0	0.16	-1.54, 1.86	0.84
			IQR	0.19	0			
	VFR group: n= 10	T4	Median	1.37	1.65			
			IQR	0.72	1.57			
	T4-T0	Median	1.23	1.65				
		IQR	1.14	2.13				

Table 3
Periodontal outcomes in fixed and removable retainer group

Outcome measures	Statistical measures	Fixed retainer group (n= 21)	Vacuum-formed retainer group (n= 21)	P-value
Modified gingival index	Median	2.5	3	0.76
	IQR	3	3	
Plaque index	Median	3.5	3	0.27
	IQR	1	2	
Calculus index	Median	0	0	0.19
	IQR	1	1	
Clinical attachment level	Median	2	1.5	0.23
	IQR	1	1	
Bleeding on probing	Median	1	1	0.87
	IQR	2	2	

Discussion

Based on the findings of this 4-year follow-up study, fixed retainers appear to be more effective in preserving mandibular anterior segment alignment in comparison to vacuum formed retainers with in excess of 1.6mm less irregularity observed in the previous, although some deterioration was observed in both groups. Given that subjects were randomly allocated to retainer type, irrespective of baseline oral hygiene levels and previous periodontal condition, it appears that fixed retention offers the potential benefit of improved preservation of alignment in the long-term without significantly increasing the risk of periodontal deterioration relative to removable retainers. It is important to note, however, that periodontal conditions cannot be considered healthy in either group, with significant gingival inflammation and elevated plaque levels a common finding which highlights the premium on periodontal maintenance following orthodontics. Few previous randomized controlled studies have involved a comparison of the effectiveness of fixed and vacuum-formed retainers. 5,6,17 One of these involved a comparison between lingual fixed retainer combined with a nights-only Hawley retainer and vacuum-formed retainers prescribed for full-time wear. Similar stability of the mandibular incisors alignment was noted at 1-year follow-up. 5 However, this study risked attrition bias due to high levels of drop-out with a small sample size. Similarly, in the earlier report of the present study, O'Rourke et al. (2016) alluded to a lack of significant between-groups difference in relation to mandibular anterior segment stability after 18 months. The findings from the present study imply that the benefit of fixed retention may well become more apparent following more prolonged periods of retention mitigating against both unstable tooth positioning and also against maturational change, while declining

levels of compliance with removable retention may predispose to change. The observation of waning compliance over time with removable retention is unsurprising; moreover, it is likely that the suboptimal levels of wear claimed in the present sample, with 9 67% non-compliant more than 2 years into the retention phase, represents an overestimate of co-operation.

Although VFRs are commonly prescribed as orthodontic retainers, only one randomized controlled trial has involved periodontal assessment of patients wearing VFRs. 5 In a 12-month follow-up, higher calculus index scores were associated with fixed retainers compared to VFRs, 5 although periodontal assessment in the latter was confined to calculus scores, in isolation. Furthermore, patients in the fixed retainer group were instructed to wear an additional removable retainer at night, making it difficult to distinguish between the effects of different types of retainers. In the present study, participants with bonded wires were not prescribed supplementary wear of removable retainers ensuring that the impact of retainer type both on stability and periodontal outcomes could be clearly elucidated. Participants in the present study were previously randomized into different retainer groups, ensuring that all groups were likely to be similar with respect to potential confounders including oral hygiene levels, although levels of hygiene were suboptimal overall. This continued to be borne out in the present follow-up.

Stability was assessed in the mandibular arch as instability tends to be more salient in the mandibular anterior region both due to treatment-induced and physiological changes. 20 As such, more significant between-groups differences may be apparent in the lower arch; nevertheless, 10 maxillary fixed retainers are similarly likely to be associated with optimal stability. Stability was assessed directly from study models using Little's irregularity index;¹¹ this is the most accepted approach to assessing stability. However, it fails to account for vertical displacements, reciprocal rotations, angulation and inclination changes. Based on lay and professional opinion, however, horizontal displacements are consistently scored as the most salient feature and this is reflected in Little's scores.

In relation to the periodontal assessment, both an overall evaluation and analysis of buccal and lingual surfaces, in isolation, were included. The latter ensured that the effect of plaque accumulation adjacent to bonded wires on the lingual surfaces would not be diluted. The plaque scores present in both groups were relatively high with median plaque index scores of 3 to 3.5, being approximately 0.5 units higher than the mean plaque scores found on the lingual surfaces of the mandibular incisors with fixed and Hawley retainers over a 6- month period. A recently published RCT, involved a comparison between fixed and vacuum formed retainers in the mandibular labial segment with no significant difference found in gingival and plaque indices; however, fixed retainers were associated with significantly higher plaque scores. A The present study was limited by a relatively small sample size potentially reducing the statistical power and risking false negative results; however, significant findings were 11 observed for the main outcome. Moreover, drop-out was significant over the 4-year period, although the final sample of 42 was just 6 less than that obtained 2.5 years previously.⁶

Future research evaluating the effectiveness of long-term approaches to orthodontic retention should therefore be mindful of this issue. Furthermore, as this study was conducted at a single, university-based Centre, the findings are applicable to patients with similar characteristics and may not be generalizable to other settings and patient groups. However, recruitment of an age-matched, untreated control with similar occlusal characteristics over a prolonged period could not be justified from an ethical standpoint. Moreover, the magnitude of attachment loss observed was small indicating that minimal effect could be attributed to either retention regime.

Conclusions

Fixed retainers may be more effective in retaining mandibular anterior segment alignment compared to vacuum-formed retainers at 4-year follow-up, although some change arose in both groups. Both fixed and removable retainers were associated with similar levels of gingival inflammation and poor oral hygiene. On the basis of the present study, it therefore appears that fixed retainers may be the approach of choice to maintain alignment of the lower anterior teeth in the long-term but there is a clear need for optimal oral hygiene before, during and after orthodontics to avoid increased levels of gingival inflammation.

References

1. Horowitz SL, Hixon EH. Physiologic recovery following orthodontic treatment. *Am J Orthod* 1969;55:1-4.
2. Blake M, Bibby K. Retention and stability: a review of the literature. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1998;114:299-306.
3. Littlewood SJ, Millett DT, Doubleday B, Bearn DR, Worthington HV. Retention procedures for stabilising tooth position after treatment with orthodontic braces. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016.
4. Al-Moghrabi D, Pandis N, Fleming PS. The effects of fixed and removable orthodontic retainers: a systematic review. *Prog Orthod* 2016;17:24.
5. Xiao-Cen X, Ren-Mei L, Guo-Hua T. Clinical evaluation of lingual fixed retainer combined with Hawley retainer and vacuum-formed retainer. *Shanghai Journal of Stomatology* 2011;20:623- 626.
6. O'Rourke N, Albeedh H, Sharma P, Johal A. 2016. Effectiveness of bonded and vacuum-formed retainers: A prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2016;150:406-415.
7. Pandis N, Vlahopoulos K, Madianos P, Eliades T. Long-term periodontal status of patients with mandibular lingual fixed retention. *Eur J Orthod* 2007;29:471-476.
8. Booth FA, Edelman JM, Proffit WR. Twenty-year follow-up of patients with permanently bonded mandibular canine-to-canine retainers. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2008;133:70- 76.
9. Levin L, Samorodnitzky-Naveh GR, Machtei EE. The association of orthodontic treatment and fixed retainers with gingival health. *J Periodontol* 2008;79:2087-2092.
10. Renkema AM, Fudalej PS, Renkema A, Kiekens R, Katsaros C. Development of labial gingival recessions in orthodontically treated patients. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2013;143:206- 212.

11. Little RM. The irregularity index: a quantitative score of mandibular anterior alignment. *Am J Orthod* 1975;68:554-563.
12. Lobene RR, Weatherford T, Ross NM, Lamm RA, Menaker L. A modified gingival index for use in clinical trials. *Clin Prev Dent* 1986;8:3-6.
13. Greene JC, Vermillion JR. The oral hygiene index: a method for classifying oral hygiene status. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1960;61:172-179.
14. Turesky S, Gilmore ND, Glickman I. Reduced plaque formation by the chloromethyl analogue of vitamin C. *J Periodontol* 1970;41:41-43.
15. Bland JM, Altman D. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet* 1986;327:307-310.
16. Rowland H, Hichens L, Williams A, Hills D, Killingback N, Ewings P, et al. The effectiveness of Hawley and vacuum-formed retainers: a single-center randomized controlled trial. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2007;132:730-737.
17. Forde K, Storey M, Littlewood SJ, Scott P, Luther F, Kang J. Bonded versus vacuum-formed retainers: a randomized controlled trial. Part 1: stability, retainer survival, and patient satisfaction outcomes after 12 months. *Eur J Orthod* 2017;cjx058. 14
18. Al-Moghrabi D, Salazar FC, Pandis N, Fleming PS. Compliance with removable orthodontic appliances and adjuncts: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2017;152:17-32.
19. Pratt MC, Kluemper GT, Hartsfield JK, Jr., Fardo D, Nash DA. Evaluation of retention protocols among members of the American Association of Orthodontists in the United States. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 2011;140:520-526.
20. Little RM, Riedel RA, Artun J. An evaluation of changes in mandibular anterior alignment from 10 to 20 years postretention. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop* 1988;93:423-428.